



Teachers' narratives of resistance to Madrid's bilingual programme: An exploratory study in secondary education

Isabel Alonso-Belmonte*, María Fernández-Agüero

Facultad de Formación de Profesorado y Educación, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, C/Tomas y Valiente, no. 3, Madrid 28049, Spain

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 9 May 2020

Revised 16 March 2021

Accepted 17 March 2021

Available online 26 March 2021

Keywords:

Bilingual education

Content and language integrated learning

Critical discourse analysis

Professional discourse

English as a foreign language

positioning theory

ABSTRACT

This paper looks at secondary teachers' discourse about Madrid's Bilingual Programme (Spain). Madrid's Bilingual Programme is a large education plan whereby some content subjects are taught in a foreign language –mainly English– following Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) and whose characteristics and ubiquity have had an impact on teachers' daily lives and professional career. By drawing on both Grounded Theory and Positioning Theory as analytical tools, data were collected and analysed from the transcription and annotation of 30 semi-structured interviews with experienced secondary teachers working in CLIL and non-CLIL secondary schools. Our findings point to clear tensions in reconciling these teachers' personal beliefs and professional motivations within the current organisational and political setting and describe a pattern of resistance towards the Bilingual Programme which manifests discursively through emphatic and emotional verbalisations. The results may be of interest to education authorities, policy makers and researchers.

© 2021 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Inc.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license

(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

1. Introduction

In the Region of Madrid, 123 state secondary schools offer between 30% and 50% of their studies in English (Madrid Regional Authorities, 2018a), both in the subject of English and in other content subjects. These schools belong to a large network of schools that participate in the “Programa Bilingüe de la Comunidad de Madrid”, or Madrid's Bilingual Programme (BP henceforth), based on the teaching methodology commonly known as Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). CLIL is defined as “a dual-focused education approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language” (Coyle, Hood & Marsh, 2010: 1). That is, the emphasis on both language and content is the very hallmark of CLIL. The area of Madrid is an illustrative example of what is happening in other monolingual regions of Spain where CLIL has gathered momentum over the last decade, being perceived as the long-awaited answer to the need to train European citizens who are competent in several languages in plurilingual Europe (Pavesi, Bertocchi, Hofmannová & Kazianka, 2001: 77). CLIL provisions are abundant and research results unequivocally report the supremacy of CLIL tuition over language-driven instruction, especially in the long term (Admiraal, Westhoff & De Bot, 2006; Dafouz & Guer-

rini, 2009; Dalton-Puffer, Nikula & Smit, 2010). Significantly higher levels of foreign language (FL) competence have been reported for CLIL tracks compared to conventional language classes on all the linguistic components and skills sampled (Nikula, 2005; Pérez-Cañado & Lancaster, 2017). Content outcomes have been equally positive: CLIL learners acquire the same content knowledge as peers taught in their mother tongue (L1), outstripping them in the long run (Bergroth, 2006; Pérez-Cañado, 2018).

CLIL provisions do not only affect students' learning outcomes in the FL. In casual conversations with teachers and professionals of education in Madrid, we detected anecdotal evidence of their concern about their career prospects in the BP and the effect of CLIL on their daily practice. Notwithstanding some interesting exceptions carried out in the fields of language policy and critical sociolinguistic ethnography (for example Codó & Patiño-Santos, 2018; Fernández-Barrera, 2017; Relaño-Pastor, 2015), which explain how local teaching practices either support or reject educational policy measures in Spain, there is a paucity of research in applied linguistics on the ways in which BPs are impacting Spanish teachers' practice and professional careers. More specifically, we know very little about their stances regarding the BP programme.

To fill this gap, this paper carries out a situated analysis of secondary teachers' discourse on the topic of Madrid's BP from the perspective of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), a well-known theoretical frame employed to “explore relationships of causality between discursive practices, events and texts, and wider

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: isabel.alonso@uam.es (I. Alonso-Belmonte).

social and cultural contexts and examine how these practices, events and texts arise and are ideologically shaped by power relations" (Fairclough, 1993: 135). That is, we approach teachers' discourse as a form of social action and interaction (Bourdieu, 1994) which conveys a mediated image of the professional community they represent, as well as of their ideological and social stance (Fairclough, 1992). Thus, our research objective is to unveil teachers' semi-private¹ subject positions regarding the regional BP and explore how these positions have an impact on their career and on their daily practice as teachers, in the context of an existing public, institutionalised, hegemonic discourse about the BP at regional and national levels (Raiter, 2003; Raiter and Zullo, 2008, 2012).

For this purpose, we draw on Positioning Theory (PT), a multidisciplinary proposal developed by the psychologist Rom Harré and his colleagues (Davies & Harré, 1990; van Langenhove & Harré, 1999), to analyse "how people use words (and discourse of all types) to locate themselves and others" (Moghaddam & Harré, 2010: 2). Davies and Harré define a subject position as a discourse construct which

"incorporates both a conceptual repertoire and a location for persons within the structure of rights for those that use that repertoire. Once having taken up a particular position as one's own, a person inevitably sees the world from the vantage point of that position and in terms of the particular images, metaphors, storylines and concepts which are made relevant within the particular discursive practice in which they are positioned" (Davies & Harré, 1990: 46).

To achieve our goals, we collected and transcribed 30 interviews with in-service language and content-subject teachers. In the context of a wider project on the analysis of teachers' professional discourse (called "Emergent and Peripheral Discourses: Critical and Socio-cognitive Approach"), the interviews were first analysed following Grounded Theory (GT; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). PT was then applied to the analysis of the codes resulting from GT, which is, to our knowledge, an unprecedented combination of analytical approaches. In the interviews, based on a semi-structured questionnaire designed *ad hoc* for this study, teachers make a personal account of their learning/teaching experiences and offer their personal reflections regarding a number of dimensions of CLIL teaching practice, by constructing a *narrative* (Cortazzi, 1993).

2. Literature review

2.1. The context of this study: the Madrilenian BP in secondary education

In 2004, Madrid's regional authorities implemented a model of BP in state education whereby students receive curricular FL instruction (5 h a week) and other subjects in that language – mostly English. In secondary, students opting for CLIL in English are streamed upon transition (at the age of 11–12) depending on the results of a high-stakes examination on their English competence at the end of primary. In particular, they are classified into two CLIL strands –High Exposure (HE) and Low Exposure (LE)– which differ in intensity and in the choice of subjects taught in English. The HE students get more advanced English classes and do CLIL in subjects such as Social Science, History and Natural Science;

¹ A distinction is made here between 'semi-private discourse', namely, the kind of discourse that is shared by individuals with other colleagues in professional communities of practice and settings –as in this investigation– as opposed to private, informal conversations with friends or relatives and to public professional discourse such as conferences and other public events, statements in the press and the Internet.

in the LE strand, at least one of the subjects in English should be Arts, Education for Citizenship, Music, PE or Technology.

For teachers, transitioning to CLIL implies adapting their teaching paradigm to the new school setting and redefining their roles as content or language experts. CLIL teachers should become *both* content and language teachers, adopt a more extensive pedagogic repertoire (De Graaff, Koopman, Anikina & Westhoff, 2007) and establish a tighter collaboration amongst colleagues (Lorenzo, Casal & Moore, 2009). For secondary school teachers to work in the HE strand, they must be in possession of a linguistic certificate complying with the procedures established by the General Directorate of Human Resources.² In recognition for CLIL's additional workload, these teachers also have access to more training and international mobility, a financial bonus in accordance with the number of FL hours, and a reduction in teaching hours for programme coordinators. Non-certified teachers are allocated amongst the LE groups or work in other non-bilingual state schools. Both content and language teachers are usually non-native speakers of the FL.

2.2. Madrid's institutional discourse regarding secondary education BP

In the official documents published by Madrid's regional authorities it can be seen that the BP is their flagship in education. Indeed, the hegemonic discourse on the BP portrays an institutional gaze (Foucault, 1973) whose backbone rests on three persistent notions: the BP improves communicative competence, promotes quality and boosts equity in education:

"Over the last decade, bilingual education has become a hallmark of Madrid's state schools, *raising the overall calibre of the education* provided in the region, and *fostering equal opportunities* in state schooling. The Government of the Community of Madrid believes that mastery of the English language is a necessary tool for its students to compete successfully in a job market characterized by the globalization of information and communication technology." (Madrid Regional Authorities, 2018a: 46; emphasis added).

The main claim made by Madrid's government is that the regional BP improves communication skills in English, which in turn enhances students' employability. This can be seen in the most recent official evaluation report, full of terms such as "success", "high ratings" and "investment" (Madrid Regional Authorities, 2018b). This claim is supported by official statistical information about the good results yielded in high-stakes examinations: in Madrid, students coming from the BP scored 0.78 points above the regional average (7.28 vs. 6.50 over 10) in the general phase of the 2016 University Entrance Examination. The difference is greater in the specific test for English, where these students obtained an average mark of 7.58, more than one point higher than the regional average, which was 6.54 (Madrid Regional Authorities, 2018b).

The authorities also position themselves as promoters of academic excellence, with a special emphasis on the English language and plurilingualism. The programme is said to be excellent because it is innovative, endorsed by a long list of prestigious universities and supported by ground-breaking European training programmes all of which translates into an improvement of teachers' linguistic competence. As explained in their corporate website, "the Region of Madrid has been, since the year 2004–2005, a forerunner in Spain in the implementation of a bilingual programme that is

² There are two procedures to obtain the certificate: (a) to submit certain university degrees or official language certifications deemed to be equivalent to CEFR level C1 or above; and (b) to pass an exam which recognises –exclusively for teaching positions in the Region of Madrid– a C1 level of linguistic proficiency according to the CEFR.

geared to turning bilingualism into a hallmark"³ (authors translation).

Concerning equity, the authorities posit that the BP "benefits the overall education community", reaching students of all social classes alike. The latest official evaluations of the BP depict an exemplary scenario, whereby schools in the region are more equitable than in the whole of Spanish and even the OECD countries (Madrid Regional Authorities, 2018b: 49). The regional government's discourse about Madrid's BP resonates with that of CLIL supporters in academia: "CLIL is becoming increasingly positioned as a change agent, [...] to work towards a more equitable distribution of linguistic and social capital" (Coyle, 2013: 244–245). Such claims clash, though, with very recent research on the segregation of students as a collateral effect of CLIL, due to screening mechanisms of the schools themselves and self-selection of the pupils –and/or their families (Bruton, 2011, 2013; Fernández-Agüero & Hidalgo-McCabe, 2020; Hidalgo-McCabe & Fernández-González, 2019). This selection bias casts doubts upon the causality between CLIL and good learning outcomes, and relates CLIL to elitism, which runs counter to the aims of this approach (Van Mensel, Hiligsmann, Mettwie & Galand, 2019) and to Madrid's public discourse.

2.3. Teachers' semi-private discourses in CLIL

By and large, teachers pose a variety of responses towards the legitimate discourse dictated by the authorities about CLIL. At times, they express compliance, acquiescence or acceptance. For instance, Codó and Patiño-Santos (2018), in a study carried out in a state plurilingual secondary school in Barcelona, identify three "neoliberalised subject positions": the committed entrepreneurial headteachers, the activated civil servants, who depict themselves as "exemplary moral agents" (*op. cit.*: 479), and the flexible temporary teachers, who experience anxiety towards the BP but are also willing to embrace it. Likewise, Fernández-Barrera (2017) captures the position adopted in Castilla La Mancha by native teachers of the target language as ideal speakers who are seen by other teachers' and parents' as personifying the most desirable form of knowledge.

At the other end, teachers' narratives sometimes contest the hegemonic gaze through resistance in an attempt to challenge or reverse uneven power relations. Resistance is understood as the "intentional, and hence conscious, acts of defiance or opposition by a subordinate individual or group of individuals against a superior individual or set of individuals" (Seymour, 2006: 305). Recent research carried out in different parts of Spain shows recounts of Catalan CLIL teachers who report that they are implementing CLIL alone (Pladevall-Ballester, 2015) and of teachers of Spanish subjects in Andalusian bilingual schools who are reluctant to participate in integration (Lorenzo et al., 2009). There is scholarly literature on how some FL teachers feel redundant and neglected because content teachers play the lead in BPs (Pavón & Ellison, 2013: 74). Content teachers, for their part, generally see themselves as content experts mainly (Banegas, 2012; Mehisto, 2008), find it difficult to understand their dual role and sense they have inadequate FL competence (Skinnari & Bovellan, 2016), thus rejecting the ascription of language teachers. In line with these studies, this paper aims at offering an evidence-informed contribution to the extant research on CLIL's influence on the teaching profession in Secondary Education in the Region of Madrid.

3. The study: method, participants and procedure

As mentioned before, this paper aims at identifying and classifying in-service secondary teachers' subject positions on Madrid's BP. According to different scholars (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004; Davies & Harré, 1990; Hall, 1990; Törrönen, 2001), subject positions are discourse constructions which evolve in communication as the co-effect of two different elements: the speakers' categorisations and their positionings. Within this framework, this study's goals are to:

- 1 unveil how Madrilenian secondary teachers –namely, certified and non-certified content and language teachers– conceptualise the regional BP and describe their work experiences,
- 2 map the variety of discourse positionings adopted regarding the impact of CLIL on their daily practice and fundamentally, on their professional careers; and,
- 3 explore how these teachers' individual, semi-private discourses interact, support or differ from the more public, institutionalised, hegemonic discourses about the BP.

Data were collected from an opportunistic convenience sample consisting of 30 interviews with experienced secondary teachers who work as content and language (mostly English) teachers in state education across the Region of Madrid, in various socio-economic environments. These participants were considered social actors representative of their teaching community because "although teacher's attitudes, assumptions and expectations [...] vary individually, they are situationally constructed and reflect the values of the communities they belong to" (Skinnari & Bovellan, 2016: 148). All the interviewees were Spanish citizens in their 30–40s with Spanish as an L1, who had been involved in state secondary education for several years.

Table 1 describes the characteristics of the teachers involved in the study:

Teachers' narratives were elicited in face-to-face, semi-structured interviews which were conducted in Spanish to facilitate participation and rapport. The recorded interviews were lengthy (they all lasted between 20 and 30 min, which amounts to 786 min and 6 s in total) and resembled day-to-day conversations. They were organised around 22 open-ended questions, divided into three blocks: (a) identification questions on the interviewees' professional profile; (b) questions pertaining to their work experience in bilingual education; and finally, (c) a set of questions tapping into their opinion on the case of Madrid's BP.

The interview was first piloted and validated with five FL teachers in March 2018. The Cronbach coefficient ($\alpha=0,86$) indicated adequate internal consistency and confirmed the reliability of the instrument. Later, we sent an invitation to 387 secondary schools across the Region of Madrid, retrieving 30 positive responses. The researchers carried out the interviews and obtained consent information at the teachers' workplace. The recorded interviews were transcribed, were given a numeric code (e.g. LT10) and analysed using Atlas.Ti (v.8).

As analytical tools for disentangling teachers' positionings on Madrid's BP, we first applied GT (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) and then PT (Davies & Harré, 1990; van Langenhove & Harré, 1999). Although we presuppose familiarity with these frameworks of analysis, we shall provide a brief account of them.

3.1. Phase 1: grounded theory

GT is an inductive form of qualitative investigation which allows researchers to identify core theoretical concepts and develop tentative linkages between data and theory "in investigations of relatively uncharted waters or to gain a fresh perspective in a familiar situation" (Stern, 1980: 20). It acknowledges the complexity and richness of the education ambit and can serve to capture the

³ <https://www.comunidad.madrid/inversion/madrid/educacion-bilingue>.

Table 1
Profile of teachers interviewed.

		Content teachers (N = 13)		Language teachers (N = 17)	
			%		%
Gender	Male	8	61,5	2	11,8
	Female	5	38,5	15	88,2
Years of experience	>5	2	15,4	2	11,8
	6–10	8	61,5	7	41,2
	11–15	0	0,0	4	23,5
	16–20	2	15,4	3	17,6
	<21	1	7,7	1	5,9
Areas taught	History and Geography	4	30,8	0	0,0
	PE	5	38,5	0	0,0
	Science	3	23,1	0	0,0
	English	0	0,0	15	88,2
	Spanish	0	0,0	1	5,9
	French	0	0,0	1	5,9
Labour condition	Civil servant	7	53,8	10	58,8
	Temporary teacher	3	23,1	3	17,6
	Displaced civil servant*	2	15,4	0	0,0
	Mobile civil servant**	1	7,7	4	23,5
		10	76,9	9	52,9
Linguistic certificate	Yes	3	23,1	8	47,1
	No	0	0,0	2	17,6
Management position at present	Yes	13	100,0	15	82,4
	No	10	76,9	13	76,5
BP school at present	Yes	3	23,1	4	23,5
	No	4	30,8	3	17,6
Location	Madrid city –centre	6	46,2	9	52,9
	Madrid city –suburbs	3	23,1	5	29,4
	Town in Region of Madrid				

* Civil servants affected by processes of redistribution or relocation of staff in state education institutions.

** Administrative situation whereby the civil servant lacks a stable post at an institution and is waiting for it to be assigned.

teachers' ongoing story as it arises from their own recounts. That is why it was employed to pinpoint and classify the teachers' conceptualisations of Madrid's BP.

The coding methodological strategy was bottom-up. Following the constant comparison method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), we initially immersed ourselves in the data to gain a holistic understanding; then we proceeded to code the first case of opinion in connection to CLIL, which was interpreted and assigned a descriptive label as close as possible to the participants' words. Next, we coded the second instance of opinion and compared it to the first one to assess their similarity. If different, we then gave it a different descriptive code. Gradually, we assigned codes or labels to text, clustered codes into patterns or categories and finally articulated hypothesis to explain these patterns. Data was analysed until we reached the point of "theoretical saturation" (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) and no new or relevant data emerged as regards the categories.

To ensure validity, the corpus was divided into two overlapping sections and analysed separately by the researchers. Subsequently, in a joint meeting, we collated our findings and checked the consistency of our interpretations from the initial analyses by recoding parts of the data set. Adjustments were made accordingly.

The analysis rendered 570 instances of teachers' opinions and beliefs regarding CLIL, organised into codes and categories. Table 2 portrays the categories that emerged from the analysis, concerned with the teachers' views on Madrid's BP. Some of the codes derive from the questions of the interviews. Other, such as "career development opportunities" and "conceptualisation of the BP", emerged in conversation.

3.2. Phase 2: positioning theory

In the second stage, the 570 coded instances of teachers' opinions and beliefs resulting from Phase 1 were re-examined to explore how the interviewed teachers positioned themselves and others through discourse in relation to the BP. For this purpose, we

drew on Positioning Theory (PT; Davies & Harré, 1990; van Langenhove & Harré, 1999), a "trans-disciplinary conceptual and analytical framework" (Slocum-Bradley, 2009: 79), particularly suitable to carry out a discourse analysis of the interviewees' interaction. PT explores how individuals and groups attribute rights and duties to themselves and others, how such rights and duties are accepted or disputed, and how actions become influenced by the rights and duties introduced (Warren & Moghaddam, 2018: 327). In PT, any communicative event can be framed as a mutually determining triad: the speakers' positions (presentations of the self or of others), the communicative acts which enact those positions (through specific illocutionary forces), and the storylines, that is, the individual and social narratives which furnish and support the speakers' specific positions. These three elements are contingent on each other and determine the speaker's positioning.

PT is becoming increasingly popular, both as a theoretical lens and analytic framework in applied linguistics (Kayi-Aydar, 2019). It has been repeatedly used in classroom-based studies (for a revision, see Kayi-Aydar & Miller, 2018) and in CDA research to explore teachers' and students' positioning (Menard-Warwick, 2008; Trent, 2012). To our knowledge, however, there are no previous studies which combine GT and PT as methodological tools. Thus, in order to integrate the two phases of this study, we equated the categories of Table 2 –conceptualizations of BP, effectiveness, the teaching experience, educational and social inequality, career development opportunities and hierarchies– to the storylines which convey the interviewed teachers' positions regarding the BP because they offer an account of the main topics tackled during the interviews. Then, within these storylines, we re-examined the 570 instances of teachers' beliefs and opinions regarding CLIL, paying attention to the main actors mentioned in the interviews and the distinctive linguistic choices through which the actors' positions are enacted, namely speech acts, evaluative language and lexical choices. Example (1) illustrates this type of analysis. The main social actors in the following exchange are the interviewed teacher

Table 2
categories and codes that emerged from the analysis.

Categories	Codes
Conceptualisation of the BP	1 Marketing strategy 2 Imposed by the authorities 3 Does not enhance real bilingualism
Effectiveness	4 It works but with nuances
The teaching experience	5 Stimulating for FL teachers 6 Class dynamics affect the content teachers' experience 7 More workload
Educational and social inequality	8 Student segregation causes inequality 9 BP affects students' identity and self-esteem
Career development opportunities	10 Working condition choices 11 Instability for non-certified teachers 12 Inequality amongst teachers
Tension and hierarchies amongst professionals	13 A source of conflict

(LT10), Madrid's regional authorities and the parents, who are positioned with rights and duties:

(1) T – Bilingualism is marketing, to sell compulsory secondary education better.

R – [...] You mean that the BP is marketing?

T – Of course, and the [regional] authorities know it. It sells well amongst parents. [LT10]⁴

By conceptualising the BP as a marketing strategy (code 1), LT10 attributes the regional government the responsibility of having re-configured Madrilenian secondary education as a commodity to be sold to families. The use of assertive speech acts and assertive lexical choices like “of course”, helps LT10 to show his position of resistance towards this policy.

Following this type of global, inductive analysis, we identified four broad ideological positionings in the interviews with respect to the benefits of Madrilenian BP claimed by the regional education authorities:

- Implicit or explicit acknowledgement of the benefits claimed, which can be seen in sentences such as:

(2) Objectively, with the results of the university entrance examinations, the results in English have improved tremendously. [LT15]

- Implicit or explicit denial of the benefits, for example:

(3) I think that no politician will be capable to reverse this because none will be sincere or brave enough to say this is not working. [CT3]

- Resistance against the benefits, for instance:

(4) We are all aware that we need English, but there are much better ways to do it than with the BP. [CT8]

- Ambivalence, applied to those utterances that present opposing opinions, as in:

(5) The BP works? Well... it works for learning another language, but it leaves other things behind. [LT9]

Those utterances that could not be identified as expressing a clear position in terms of their discursive stance were classified as “uncertain”. A case in point is this:

(6) You have bilingual groups and groups in Spanish so it's like doing the same thing twice. [CT4]

4. Results

The results will be organised into six subsections which tally with the categories that emerged from GT, put in relation with the ideological positionings identified in the second phase of the analysis. Concerning the latter, even though a frequency count of the different positionings would not be significant given the limited number of interviewees, case-count hints at a higher number of Denials and Resistance in contrast with very few Acknowledgements and Ambivalent comments (438 versus 132 instances).

4.1. Conceptualisation of the BP

When conceptualising the BP, most teachers ($N = 22$) perceived Madrid's BP not only as a marketing strategy (code 1) but also as imposed by politicians –embodied in the education authorities or in the school managing teams (code 2). This was frequently associated with references to competition amongst schools (in 23% of the instances registered), and verbalisations that joining the BP was a “survival strategy” (in 18% of the cases), either to get the best students or to avoid disappearing, as can be seen in quotations (7) to (9):

(7) I don't think being bilingual is a sign of distinction, because the authorities encourage and press the school managing teams for all the schools to be bilingual. [LT13]

(8) The BP is a political decision, imposed, shoehorned into a monolingual region such as Madrid. [CT1]

(9) The school where I was became bilingual for the prestige, because they wanted to associate the school with a certain level, compete with the schools in the area that got better students. [CT13]

As the above shows, in these verbalisations teachers use assertive speech acts together with a type of direct language whose specific lexical choices unveil positions of denial and resistance. For example, the reaction against the BP, chiefly in relation to top-down external pressure and the interference of other social agents, was verbalised through lexical choices with negative connotations (“press”, “imposed” and “shoehorned”). Also, the terms “prestige”,

⁴ The participants' quotes are translated from Spanish.

“selling” and “competition” were often used to expound one’s position against the commodification of obligatory education (Relaño-Pastor, 2015; these words are mentioned by 13 interviewees).

Finally, many teachers ($N = 19$) patently expressed that bilingual education was distinct from what they understood as “authentic” bilingualism (code 3), both with respect to students’ and teachers’ competence. As the BP is called “bilingual” –officially and by lay people–, expressing this detachment from “authentic” bilingualism could be tantamount to denying its benefits, for example the improvement in communicative competence and academic achievement registered in high-stakes examinations. In addition, rejecting that the programme promotes “authentic” bilingualism entails that its name is contradictory, and thus, inaccurate. Examples (10) and (11) are cases in point:

- (10) Creating bilingual students is not what we do. [CT2]
 (11) I have a decent level of English, I explain things quite well, but I am not bilingual. [CT7]

4.2. Effectiveness

Most teachers interviewed ($N = 25$) positioned BPs as positive and advantageous for students in general, although two thirds of these pointed at severe flaws in the actual implementation of this particular programme (code 4). This reveals an ambivalent position towards it. Some objections were that teachers were insufficiently prepared, that is that content teachers lacked linguistic expertise, and that the choice of subjects in English was not carefully thought through, especially in the case of very contextually-situated subjects such as History (as in 12 and 13 respectively):

- (12) The BP is positive, but I know of teachers who don’t have the level of English enough to teach the content. [LT4]
 (13) I support the BP but I don’t understand why History is taught in English. [LT17]

Nonetheless, positionings here varied and in certain cases were downright negative, expressing denial and resistance, with strong emotion. These cases were found amongst those who do not fully participate in the programme – non-certified teachers who do not get to teach in HE; displaced civil servants (typically non-certified teachers who are removed from their schools when these enter the BP); teachers currently working in non-bilingual schools, either certified or not; and teachers of subjects that are never taught in the FL. Quotation (14), from a teacher of Spanish working in a bilingual school, exemplifies the subject position of denial through the word “blunder”:

- (14) T – They have made some mistakes here, we all have.
 R – With the BP?
 T – The BP is a blunder. One can speak very well without going through this system. [LT3]

In relation to this, interviewees showed concern over the type of English that the students learned (as in Moate, 2011), by delving into the notion of “speaking English well” as equivalent to having good communicative competence, which is reconcilable with conceiving English as a global language of communication (Moate, 2011). However, in the case of two teachers, this concern was expressed in relation to “having an accent” or “not sounding Spanish”, which may reveal a tendency to perceive effectiveness as connected with achieving native speakerlike proficiency or becoming “an authentic bilingual”.

Another recurrent idea was that bilingual education had a marked effect on the contents of the subjects taught in English. Six interviewees highlighted that a special focus on English overrode other contents, and made them simpler. On the other hand, five HE teachers stated the opposite: they posited that the HE gave

them the opportunity to teach even more complex content. This duality is summarised in example (15), which displays an ambivalent position:

- (15) T – There are many teachers who teach fewer contents. Then there are other versions. There are also people who say that they teach much more content because the students are very good.
 R – And which is more frequent?
 T – I’ve seen both. I don’t know, I see both points of view. [LT7]

This ambivalence, which turns around the contrast between LE and HE strands, has a reflection on the teaching experience of content teachers, as we will see in the following section.

4.3. The teaching experience

Concerning daily teaching practice and how it was perceived and experienced by the participants, we can distinguish two main trends. On the one hand, the 16 FL teachers tended to express acceptance and acknowledgement of the benefits of the BP. Above all, they found teaching the HE groups particularly stimulating (code 5). The FL certified teachers ($N = 9$) admitted to having the “good groups”, and enjoying it:

- (16) T – The BP is good for the English teachers because they have the same group for five hours [a week], so you get to know the group well, you see them every day and you make more progress.
 R – So you think it’s good then.
 T – Yes, it’s good for me, I am happy to have got certified. [LT6]

The positioning of these teachers seems to indicate that they endorse public, institutional discourse in this respect, embrace bilingual education, and consider its advantages for their professional development –in contrast with the negative recounts found in Pavón and Ellison (2013).

On the other hand, content teachers ($N = 13$) portrayed more resistance and ambivalence. They recurrently stated that the BP, and more precisely teaching in the HE strand, had deeply affected their teaching experience (code 6). References to this were found in 10 interviews. The language of instruction was contrasted with the subject content, and was considered a separate entity that could interfere with daily practice:

- (17) My subject is now seen as a complicated subject where they may not get a good mark because of English. [CT5]

This supports the hypothesis that some content teachers find it difficult to come to terms with their dual role in CLIL, in line with existing research (Banegas, 2012; Mehisto, 2008; Skinnari & Bovellan, 2016).

Both language and content teachers unanimously agreed on the fact that the BP entailed an increased workload (code 7). For instance, training the language assistants provided by the programme and putting their support to good use was typically referred to as a time-consuming task. In any case, these additional tasks were commonly assumed as “a necessary evil”, as part of their job. Many ($N = 18$) referred to the monthly bonus –and the reduction of teaching hours in the case of the BP coordinator– as compensating for the extra effort. That is, regarding the commitment demanded by the BP, these teachers’ positioning was ambivalent: acknowledgement of the work came with acceptance and conformity.

4.4. Educational and social inequality

The streaming of students that takes place at the beginning of secondary education was clearly perceived as a source of inequality

and deep concern (code 8). Resistance towards the BP was openly voiced in relation to this code. This was verbalised vehemently in varied ways, by highlighting the differences between HE and LE, and emphasising the social gap between them: it was mentioned that HE students could receive more extramural exposure, get more help at home, come from more stable social backgrounds, and so on. As one teacher stated, things would be different if students were streamed on the basis of their knowledge of mathematics and not their English. Quotation (18) depicts the way in which the interviewees tended to conceptualise HE and LE:

- (18) Students in HE strand are good, they are the elite, LE students are average. [LT2]

In a similar vein, other lexical choices about the HE groups were “superior” and “successful”, whereas for the LE strand, we found euphemistic uses of the lexicon to conceal seemingly inappropriate alternatives (“they can’t cope”; “they play in another league”). On occasion, the LE groups were associated to populations in risk of exclusion, troubled environments, dysfunctional families and even poverty lines. This was uttered by four teachers who worked in economically challenged areas. In fact, as one teacher put it, there were different BPs depending on the school’s location:

- (19) I’m speaking about the BP in Vallecas [working class neighbourhood], not in Las Rozas [privileged wealthy status]. [LT5]

This was reflected in these teachers’ narratives as a sign of social inequity, a drawback noticeably conveyed with resistance and denial.

In this category, special emphasis was placed on the students’ feelings. According to the teachers of our sample, the Madrilenian BP’s segregating model was affecting students’ self-perception and self-esteem (code 9): teachers were adamant that the HE students position themselves as superior whereas the LE ones felt that they “came second”. Fifteen teachers held strong reactive views on this, which they expressed emphatically and unambiguously, as in examples (20) and (21):

- (20) HE strand students themselves feel superior. That’s dangerous. [CT12]
 (21) The LE groups see themselves as worse, as the dumb students of the school. [LT1]

This was said to have an impact on the teaching practices. For instance, one teacher put forward that HE students were grounded less often. In addition, some said that the development (or not) of a positive self-concept affected students’ identity as FL learners: five interviewees referred to the fact that low self-esteem diminished the students’ desire to learn and lowered their ability to focus, thus decreasing learning outcomes. In general, this caused uneasiness and discomfort amongst the teachers: they undoubtedly positioned themselves against the fact that streaming greatly affected students, and articulated this in an emphatic emotionally-loaded way. As a matter of fact, this is the most frequent category in our data, and the one most expressed with resistance positioning (119 instances out of 570, 98 of which were categorised as resistance).

4.5. Career development opportunities

Regarding career development opportunities, these teachers visibly acknowledged the advantages of certifying their English proficiency: it allowed both content and FL teachers to access a teaching position more easily and have more stable employment. The data reveals that for certified teachers ($N = 19$), the BP offered good job opportunities and career prospects, and they showed a position of acceptance towards this (code 10):

- (22) My level of English has benefitted me because I have been able to remain at the same school for longer. [CT1]
 (23) The BP has allowed me to be ahead of other people when choosing a school in the centre of Madrid, which is quite difficult. [CT11]

This applies both to content and language teachers participating in the BP. For the latter, these encouraging prospects add up to an enhanced work experience, as stated in 4.3.

However, for non-certified teachers ($N = 11$) –who are not usually young–, the BP favours professional instability. Hence, their discourse is fraught with resistance against it (code 11). This is very clear in the case of the two teachers displaced from their schools. Quotation (24) comes from a PE teacher with 25 years of experience who had recently been displaced from her previous school when it became bilingual:

- (24) T – The schools are filling in with teachers with little experience who cannot be guided by veterans because they are disappearing from those schools.
 R – And how do you feel about this?
 T – [...] I can’t stand it. It makes me angry to think about all this. [CT3]

It can be derived from the above that BP was seen as conditioning career development and generating professional inequality. This was recorded in our data (code 12), for example in (25) below:

- (25) Certified teachers have more options to get training. The others are at the end of the list. Certified teachers have more professional opportunities. [...] I understand that resources are limited but it is hard to take. [LT16]

This case of ambivalent positioning comes from a FL teacher who worked in a bilingual school but was not certified and did not benefit from the training opportunities afforded by the BP.

4.6. Tensions and hierarchies amongst professionals

Arguably, some of the above, for example the differences in career opportunities and daily duties, has had an impact on teachers’ relationships with each other. According to the interviewees, the BP has been a source of conflict in some schools (code 13). Three experienced content teachers (with more than 15 years of teaching experience) reported to have felt intimidated by the newly arrived certified colleagues. This was spoken in association to resistance and denial, normally with emphasis and emotion. Words and expressions such as “dividing the staff”, “threats” and “being cornered” were sometimes used (examples 26 to 28):

- (26) Many stable teachers without certification had to change schools and there came others with certification but less merits. That divides the teaching body. [LT1]
 (27) Some non-certified colleagues see certified teachers as a threat, as they can be displaced from their stable job because there are not enough teaching hours for them. [CT9]
 (28) Some teachers have found themselves a bit cornered by the BP. [LT8]

A number of interviewees ($N = 7$) had developed an apparent resentment towards some colleagues or reported other people’s resentment. This was manifested in negative comments (example 29) and boycott actions (example 30):

- (29) T – Very good teachers with an incredible methodology and knowledge of the students were replaced by youngsters with a very good English but no idea of teaching.
 R – Why is this so?
 T – Because of their English. It’s incredible. [LT2]

- (30) I have teachers who have been here a lot of years and they also oppose the BP, so they pose many obstacles to what you want to organise. [LT5]

These obstacles may lead to a perceived absence of teacher collaboration and provoke a deep debilitating feeling of isolation amongst some teachers, as verbalised by a non-certified content teacher:

- (31) We, non-certified teachers, do not have a place in the schools. [CT3]

5. Discussion

Evidence provided so far shows how language and content teachers negotiate, resist or challenge PBs at their own school context. More specifically, data analysis unveils the following relationships between the categories that resulted from the GT analysis and the teachers' positioning: the conceptualisation of the BP as imposed and different to "authentic" bilingualism tended to be expressed with resistance. The opinions on the effectiveness of the BP were often voiced with ambivalence ("it works but...") and sometimes with denial and resistance, especially by those teachers who were excluded from the programme: non-certified teachers, displaced civil servants, teachers currently working in non-bilingual schools and teachers of subjects taught in Spanish. As regards the teaching experience, we frequently registered acknowledgement by FL teachers, and more resistance and ambivalence amongst the content teachers. Career development opportunities were both acknowledged and resisted, often depending on the professional situation of the interviewee. Finally, strong resistance was perceived towards inequality amongst students, and strains in teachers' relations. This could be considered as a negative, even hostile reaction against a sort of two-speed bilingualism, which left certain students and teachers behind.

Thus, the results reported by the Madrilenian secondary teachers participating in our interviews depict a pattern of resistance towards the hegemonic discourse held by the regional government and the BP defenders. In particular, political and academic claims of CLIL being a democratising tool are denied by most interviewed teachers who report that the two CLIL strands naturalise socio-economic disadvantage (see Section 4.4.). Recent research on this issue also supports these teachers' views (Bruton, 2011, 2013; Fernández-Agüero and Hidalgo-McCabe, 2020. This citation should be linked to the corresponding reference in the bibliography."?>). We believe these findings are explicable in terms of the recent neoliberal educational agenda in Madrid (Hidalgo-McCabe & Fernández-González, 2019) and that more research is needed to explore the effect of neoliberal policies on students' learning and on teachers' professional development.

The issue of "authentic bilingualism" is also worth a reflection here. Most teachers acknowledge that the regional BP improves communication skills in English, but at the same time they diminish its value claiming that secondary students of English will not become balanced, simultaneous bicultural individuals. This coincides with other research in Madrid (Pena-Díaz & Porto-Requejo, 2008) and in other Spanish regions (Relaño-Pastor, 2018; Relaño-Pastor & Fernández-Barrera, 2018). This resistance to the BP may conceal native speakerism attitudes and a rejection of CLIL as a model of pedagogic bilingualism. However, we believe further research is needed to make generalisations at this point.

As a matter of fact, we must acknowledge that the limited number of interviews is a caveat of this investigation, particularly for generalising purposes. As already mentioned, frequency count of the different positionings was not found significant, and for an accurate depiction of the teachers' positionings, the sample should be further expanded at a regional, national and transnational scale.

Even so, our analysis hints at a stronger presence of denial and resistance rather than acceptance and ambivalent remarks. Besides, the subject positions analysed in this study are regarded as intricate, transient and subjective, being built and transformed as the teachers construct their discourse through the interaction with the researchers. Indeed, sometimes the same teacher expressed conflicting or contradictory subject positions. For example, some participants openly challenged the affordances of the BP pertaining to quality and equity claimed by the education authorities, but they also acknowledged the benefits of the programme, for example in relation to career opportunities, in a different moment of the conversation. Likewise, ambivalence –rather than resistance– was noticeable when these teachers expressed that they contentedly assumed an extra workload in the face of considerable odds, for example when the regional government scaled back on public expenditure. In this sense, they are similar to Codó and Patiño-Santos' "activised civil servants", who find in BPs "the opportunity to contest the public imagining of state employees as lazy, passive and comfortable in their stable situations" (Codó and Pa (2018): 490). Yet, this instability is characteristic of any form of discourse that differs from the institutionalised hegemonic one, alternative discourses typically being new, dynamic and unstable (Raiter, 2003; Raiter and Zullo, 2008, 2012).

Despite all this, our findings clearly describe a pattern of resistance towards the regional BP, which is discursively articulated through emphatic and emotional verbalisations –e.g. "dumb students", "threats", "cornering". In other words, teachers seem reluctant to adopt a "bilingual" identity (Fernández-Barrera, 2017; Pavlenko & Norton, 2007), more distinctive and prestigious, sanctioned by many school management teams to promote their social image in the local community. Apart from the rejection of participation in a form of educational bilingualism which they believe is not "authentic", this resistance could also stem from a reaction against imposition or, as one of the participants said, "shoe-horning", irrespective of the needs of the local education contexts. Our interviewees straightforwardly question the decisions of the regional government apparatus, when they state that adopting survival strategies does not seem to be a sensible reason to make changes in education. This substantiates the claim that these teachers consider their active location at schools undermined by the education policies (Moore, Edwards, Halpin & George, 2002) and they react against rather than settle for them.

Still, a nuanced approach to the data reveals dissension amongst groups of teachers. On the one hand, FL and certified teachers expressed acceptance more often, as the programme has benefited their professional development: they have more opportunities for training, stability, and economic profit. The BP seems to have empowered these teachers in stark contrast with others. On the other hand, content teachers, who usually lack linguistic expertise, tended to stress content and neglect language learning (Creese, 2005), taking up positions of ambivalence and even resistance when reflecting on their teaching experience. Finally, the most negatively affected group seems that of non-certified teachers, who saw their careers constrained in the BP, and expressed reaction and denial more frequently than any other group. This can be clearly noticed in the account of the senior non-certified content teacher CT13, who said that he frequently imagined himself in a worse-case scenario: being relocated to a remote school after nearly 20 years of experience. For practitioners like this one, BPs are perceived as a real threat for their career.

6. Concluding remarks

Data show that the BP policy adopted by Madrid's regional government has an affective and professional impact on these teachers that goes well beyond the linguistic benefits claimed for stu-

dents. On the whole, our findings show there is considerable potential for increasing job satisfaction amongst the teachers involved in the regional BP, both language and content teachers. The promotion of all teachers' professional careers involved in bilingual education should be a major issue for education policy makers and researchers. In this respect, we suggest that certain measures can be applied with relative ease. For example, there is a well-established regional network for innovation and training - <https://innovacionyformacion.educa.madrid.org/> - that offers professional development opportunities such as in-service workshops and seminars delivered at specific training centres, at the schools themselves or even online. In this context, sustained efforts should go into prioritising the linguistic and methodological training of content and non-certified teachers. Other more intricate medium-term procedures to be considered could be (1) revising teacher allocation policies and school organisational patterns following a bottom-up approach that is sensitive to teachers' needs and idiosyncrasies; and (2) setting up professional learning communities for the critical analysis of classroom practice, for example, via job-shadowing.

All in all, in light of our research, it does not seem advisable to disregard the role of teachers in pushing Madrid's BP agenda forward and helping all students thrive in their learning, as "the main strength of any education system lies in the human factor, i.e., it is rigorously, highly qualified and committed teachers that make all the difference and have a remarkable impact on students' learning" (Martínez-Serrano, 2017: 200). Thus, we hope that the results of this investigation are useful for policy makers, teachers and researchers alike.

Declaration of Competing Interest

None

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Competitiveness (Research Project FFI2016-77540-P).

References

- Admiraal, W., Westhoff, G., & De Bot, K. (2006). Evaluation of bilingual secondary education in The Netherlands: Students' language proficiency in English. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 12(1), 75–93. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13803610500392160>.
- Banegas, D. L. (2012). CLIL teacher development: Challenges and experiences. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, 5(1), 45–56.
- Bergroth, M. (2006). Immersion students in the matriculation examination three years after immersion. In S. Björklund, K. Mard-Miettinen, M. Bergström, & M. Södergard (Eds.), *Exploring dual-focussed education. integrating language and content for individual and societal needs* (pp. 123–134). Vaasa: University of Vaasa, Centre for Immersion and Multilingualism.
- Bourdieu, P. (1994). *Raisons pratiques: Sur la théorie de l'action*. Paris: Seuil.
- Bruton, A. (2011). Is CLIL so beneficial, or just selective? *Re-evaluating some of the research*. *System*, 39, 523–532.
- Bruton, A. (2013). CLIL: Some of the reasons why... and why not. *System*, 41, 587–597.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2004). Language and identity. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 369–394). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Codó, E., & Patiño-Santos, A. (2018). CLIL, unequal working conditions and neoliberal subjectivities in a state secondary school. *Language Policy*, 17(4), 479–499.
- Cortazzi, M. (1993). *Narrative analysis*. London: Falmer.
- Coyle, D. (2013). Listening to learners: An investigation into 'successful learning' across CLIL contexts. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16(3), 244–266.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL. content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Creese, A. (2005). Is this content-based language teaching? *Linguistics and Education*, 16(2), 188–204.
- Dafouz, E., & Guerrini, M. (2009). *CLIL across educational levels: Experiences from primary, secondary and tertiary contexts*. Richmond.
- Dalton-Puffer, C., Nikula, T., & Smit, U. (2010). *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms*. John Benjamins.
- Davies, B., & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning. The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 20, 43–63.
- De Graaff, R., Koopman, G. J., Anikina, Y., & Westhoff, G. (2007). An observation tool for effective L2 pedagogy in content and language integrated learning. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(5), 603–624.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical discourse analysis and the marketisation of public discourse: The universities. *Discourse and Society*, 4(2), 133–168.
- Fernández-Agüero, M., & Hidalgo-McCabe, E. (2020). CLIL students' affectivity in the transition between education levels: The effect of streaming at the beginning of secondary education. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2020.1795864>.
- Fernández-Barrera, A. (2017). Language appropriations, ideologies and identities in bilingual schools in Castilla-La Mancha (Spain). *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature*, 10(2), 41–58.
- Foucault, M. (1973). *The birth of the clinic. an archaeology of medical perception*. London: Routledge.
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New York: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Hall, S. (1990). Cultural identity and diaspora. In Jonathan Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity, community, culture, difference* (pp. 222–237). London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Hidalgo-McCabe, E., & Fernández-González, N. (2019). Framing 'choice' in language education. The case of freedom in constructing inequality. In L. Martín Rojo, & A. Del Percio (Eds.), *Language and neoliberal governmentality (Language, society and political economy)* (pp. 69–90). London: Routledge.
- Kayi-Aydar, H. (2019). *Positioning theory in applied linguistics: Research design and applications*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kayi-Aydar, H., & Miller, E. R. (2018). Positioning in classroom discourse studies: A state-of-the-art review. *Classroom Discourse*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2018.1450275>.
- Lorenzo, F., Casal, S., & Moore, P. (2009). The effects of content and language integrated learning in European education: Key findings from the Andalusian bilingual sections' evaluation project. *Applied Linguistics*, 31(3), 418–442.
- Madrid Regional Authorities. (2018a). *Madrid, a bilingual community 2017-2018*. Madrid: Dirección General de Innovación, Becas y Ayudas a la Educación de la Consejería de Educación, Juventud y Deporte de la Comunidad de Madrid Retrieved on 20th April 2020 from: <http://www.madrid.org/bvirtual/BVCM016411.pdf>.
- Madrid Regional Authorities. (2018b). *Informe sobre la evaluación del programa de enseñanza bilingüe de la Comunidad de Madrid June 2018*. Retrieved on 20th April 2020 from: http://www.comunidad.madrid/sites/default/files/doc/educacion/sgea_eval_informe_programabilingue.pdf.
- Martínez-Serrano, L. M. (2017). In-service teacher professional development and bilingual education: Towards a comprehensive teacher training curriculum. In E. Gómez-Parra, & R. Johnstone (Eds.), *Educación bilingüe: Tendencias educativas y conceptos clave* (pp. 197–208). Madrid: Ministerio de Educación Cultura y Deporte.
- Mehisto, P. (2008). CLIL counterweights: Recognising and decreasing disjuncture in CLIL. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1(1), 93–119.
- Menard-Warwick, J. (2008). 'Because she made beds. Every day'. Social positioning, classroom discourse and language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 29(2), 267–289.
- Moate, J. M. (2011). The impact of foreign language mediated teaching on teachers' sense of professional integrity in the CLIL classroom. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 34(3), 333–346.
- Moghaddam, F., & Harré, R. (2010). *Words of conflict, words of war: How the language we use in political processes sparks fighting*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.
- Moore, A., Edwards, G., Halpin, D., & George, R. (2002). Compliance, resistance and pragmatism: The (re)construction of schoolteacher identities in a period of intensive educational reform. *British Educational Research Journal*, 28, 551–565.
- Nikula, T. (2005). English as an object and tool of study in classrooms: Interactional effects and pragmatic implications. *Linguistics and Education*, 16(1), 27–58.
- Pavesi, M., Bertocchi, D., Hofmannová, M., & Kazianka, M. (2001). Teaching through a foreign language: a guide for teachers and schools to using foreign languages in content teaching. Retrieved on 20th April 2020 from: <http://www.ub.es/filoan/CLIL/profesores.pdf>
- Pavlenko, A., & Norton, B. (2007). Imagined communities, identity, and English language teaching. In J. Cummins, & C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of english language teaching* (pp. 669–680). New York: Springer.
- Pavón, V., & Ellison, M. (2013). Examining teacher roles and competences in content and language integrated learning (CLIL). *Linguarum Arena*, 4, 65–78.
- Pena-Díaz, C., & Porto-Requejo, D. (2008). Teacher beliefs in a CLIL education project. *Porta Linguarum*, 10, 151–161.
- Pérez-Cañado, M. L. (2018). CLIL and educational level: A longitudinal study on the impact of CLIL on language outcomes. *Porta Linguarum*, 29, 51–70.
- Pérez-Cañado, M. L., & Lancaster, N. K. (2017). The effects of CLIL on oral comprehension and production: A longitudinal case study. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 30(3), 300–316.
- Pladevall-Ballester, E. (2015). Exploring primary school CLIL perceptions in Catalonia: Students' teachers' and parents' opinions and expectations. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 18(1), 45–59.
- Raiter, A. (2003). *Lenguaje y sentido común: Las bases para la formación del discurso dominante*. Buenos Aires: Biblos.
- Raiter, A., & Zullo, J. (2008). *Lingüística y política*. Buenos Aires: Biblos.
- Raiter, A., & Zullo, J. (2012). *Esclavos de las palabras* (Coords.). Universidad Nacional de Buenos Aires.

- Relaño-Pastor, A. M. (2015). The commodification of English in 'Madrid, comunidad bilingüe': Insights from the CLIL classroom. *Language Policy*, 14(2), 131–152.
- Relaño-Pastor, A. M. (2018). Bilingual education and neoliberal CLIL practices. In J. W. Tollefson, & M. Pérez-Milans (Eds.), *The oxford handbook of language policy and planning* (pp. 505–525). Oxford: OUP.
- Relaño-Pastor, A. M., & Fernández-Barrera, A. (2018). Competing bilingual schools in La Mancha city: Teachers' responses to neoliberal language policy and practice. *Foro de Educación*, 16(25), 283–309.
- Seymour, S. (2006). Resistance. *Anthropological Theory*, 6(3), 303–321.
- Skinnari, K., & Bovellan, E. (2016). CLIL teachers' beliefs about integration and about their professional roles: Perspectives from a European context. In T. Nikula, E. Dafouz, P. Moore, & U. Smit (Eds.), *Conceptualising integration in CLIL and multilingual education* (pp. 145–274). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Slocum-Bradley, N. (2009). The positioning diamond: A trans-disciplinary framework for discourse analysis. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 40(1), 79–107.
- Stern, P. N. (1980). Grounded theory methodology: Its use and processes. *Image: The Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 12(1), 20–23.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Törrönen, J. (2001). The concept of subject position in empirical social research. *The Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 31(3), 313–330.
- Trent, J. (2012). The discursive positioning of teachers: Native-speaking English teachers and educational discourse in Hong Kong. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(1), 104–126.
- van Langenhove, L., & Harré, R. (1999). Introducing positioning theory. In R. Harré, & L. van Langenhove (Eds.), *Positioning theory. moral contexts of intentional action* (pp. 14–31). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Van Mensel, L., Hilgsmann, P., Mettwie, L., & Galand, B. (2019). CLIL, an elitist language learning approach? A background analysis of English and Dutch CLIL pupils in French-speaking Belgium. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2019.1571078>.
- Warren, Z., & Moghaddam, F. M. (2018). Positioning theory and social justice. In P. L. Hammack (Ed.), *The oxford handbook of social psychology and social justice* (pp. 319–330). Oxford: OUP.