8. Languaging teachers: CLIL and the politics of precarisation in Catalonia

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

Abstract

The aim of this chapter is to investigate CLIL as a site of struggle for educators and school heads. It takes a sociolinguistic and political economy perspective that focuses on the investigation of schools as neoliberalised workplaces and of teaching as a profession in transformation. Data comes from two institutional ethnographies conducted near Barcelona (2015-2017) in a state school and a publicly-subsidised private school. The analysis shows that, as a wholesale process of languaging teachers, CLIL is a stratifying mechanism that alters established regimes of value, subjectifies teachers to marketise and precarise themselves, and especially in the state sector, reinforces existing inequalities between permanent and temporary staff.

Introduction

As we began to investigate CLIL initiatives in Barcelona schools around 2015,[1] we quickly realised that each school was unique in the way in which it made sense of, appropriated and implemented CLIL. However, we also realised that there were commonalities in the way CLIL systematically shook up established regimes of value as well as hierarchies of knowledge and expertise in the schools. In all cases we asked, what is CLIL doing for this institution? But also, what makes CLIL possible here? And, how is CLIL changing the social order of this school?

Our gaze was more concerned with the sociolinguistics of CLIL than with its pedagogical dimension; we viewed CLIL as a site of struggle (Darvin, Lo & Lin, 2020) rather than a consensual language policy or a technicised methodology. This perspective foregrounded the many-fold ways in which CLIL impacted not just students but also teachers, their work conditions, career development possibilities and private lives. Our ethnographic approach was concerned with schools as workplaces –as well as educational establishments–, defined by specific legal regulations, aspirations, trajectories, ethos and organisational cultures. Investigating these aspects was fundamental to understanding the life of CLIL in all its contextual and material dimensions. As sociolinguists and language policy scholars, we felt this anchored and assemblage-oriented[2] (Pietikäinen, 2021) view was missing from CLIL scholarship, which often focused on teachers' beliefs and perspectives as separate and separable from the material and symbolic conditions of their work (see, among many others, Skinnari and Bovellan, 2016).

This chapter intends to ethnographically dig into the struggles of CLIL and the ways in which actors, in particular school administrators and teachers, make sense and navigate them. As any educational policy, CLIL is profoundly dilemmatic (Codó, 2022); but the dilemmas that teachers face cannot be understood as detached from the material constraints and possibilities they encounter. This chapter aims to shed light on the conditions that frame the appropriation

of CLIL in specific locales and their consequences. The two ethnographic stories of CLIL that are told in this chapter depart from the lived experiences of teachers as we observed them and as they were made accountable to us in the multiple occasions of self-reflection that our presence triggered. It must be said that although the introduction of CLIL had fuelled suspicion and resentment, no one dared overtly speak against it.[3] As the country was slowly exiting a harsh recession that had enshrined *internationalisation* (of institutions and people) as a technology of government (Sunyol and Codó, 2020), the socially circulating narrative of hope (see also Patiño-Santos and Poveda, this volume), modernity and prosperity associated with English (and its intensified learning) had deactivated critique. However, our school ethnographies enabled us to identify the symbolic and material unease engendered by CLIL, as it got entangled with and fuelled processes of labour transformation in the educational sphere.

This chapter is aligned with the body of research that has, in recent years, examined the shifting articulation of language and labour in the new globalised economy (see Boutet, 2001, 2012; Dlaske, Barakos, Motobayashi and McLaughlin, 2016; Garrido and Sabaté-Dalmau, 2020; Hassemer and Garrido, 2021; Lønsmann and Kraft, 2018; and Urciuoli, 2008, among others). Although workplaces have become productive spaces of investigation for critical language scholars, interestingly, mainstream schooling has been left out of the radar. And yet, it seems clear that the conditions of teachers' work as well as the aptitudes, knowledge and skills (including language) that are required today are quite dissimilar from those of previous decades (Dlaske et al. 2016; Hall, 2004). After all, schools –and education systems in general– have been the favourite target of neoliberal restructuring (Hirrt, 2009). However, the available sociolinguistic studies of teaching have focused almost exclusively on language education, either in relation to the type of training offered to language teachers (Block and Gray, 2016), or more frequently, in the commercial adult language teaching sector (Barakos, 2021; Codó, 2018; Stanley, 2016; Thornbury, 2001). Recent work has also examined peripheral language teaching figures, such as transient foreign language assistants (Codó and McDaid, 2019). In all these cases, language education has been portrayed as deskilled, exploitative, precarised and low-prestige employment. Yet, as mentioned earlier, sociolinguistic critique has not honed in on mainstream education.

It is true that, within the sociology of education, a significant amount of work has been devoted to examining the consequential effects of neoliberal policy on education (Hirrt, 2009). Ball (2003, 2009), for example, has examined the processes by which the culture of performativity has shaped teaching goals, contents and practices in schools, and has had an impact on teachers' lived professional experiences, and satisfaction levels. Performativity requirements have translated into pervasive bureaucratic regimes of accountability and assessment, with a strong emphasis on outcomes and standards, understood as objectifiable and measurable aspects of teachers' work. This penetration of private sector rationalities into mainstream education has radically transformed the way teachers see themselves as professionals and their relationships to others (colleagues, administrators, parents, etc.). Hall (2004) identifies the following processes affecting teachers' work lives: heavier workloads, increased bureaucratisation and managerialisation, intensification of multiple forms of surveillance and control, de-professionalisation/de-skilling, heightened expectation for self-management, enforced deployment of entrepreneurial subjectivities, etc. Hall (2004) defines these as trends towards the "proletarianisation" of teaching (p. 8), which aligns the profession with the *cognitariat* that is, the new (pauperised) class of cognitive workers that are central to the functioning of the knowledge economy or cognitive capitalism (Keucheyan, 2014). Despite their high levels of education, the cognitariat is defined by precarious, seasonal and exploitative work, and due to the impossibility of measuring immaterial labour, the blurring of the distinction between work and life, as we shall also see in some of the CLIL teacher stories narrated later. Along these lines, Neilsen (2009) speaks of the "causalisation of mainstream teaching employment […]

even short contract work is heavily competed for, and tenure is becoming harder to secure" (p. 5). In turn, Ball (2009) argues that flexibility and adaptability have become normative worker dispositions in schools "making [workplace relations] more like those in other public and private sector organisations, more like 'the firm'" (p. 87).

The aim of this chapter is to bring this critical, political economy and workplace angle to the examination of CLIL implementation in two schools. It builds on two institutional ethnographies conducted in the Barcelona metropolitan area between 2015 and 2017, and seeks to understand what CLIL meant for teachers' understanding of their work, their position within the school and their professional careers. For this purpose, I draw on the concept of *languaging* workers (Dlaske et al., 2016), which as I will argue, enables us to understand the ways in which CLIL feeds into processes of structuration. We shall see how languaging operated locally, and what reactions it generated among teachers depending on the constraints and possibilities they envisaged in each context.

This chapter will be organised as follows. To shed light on the contextual dimension, the next two sections will provide a historicisation of CLIL in Catalonia as well as an account of the different schooling options, and their main legal and employment differences. This will be followed by a discussion of the relevance and import of the concept of *languaging* for this research. The next section will delve on the epistemological approach adopted, which is *institutional ethnography* (Smith, 2005). After a brief description of the two schools and the data collected therein, the ethnographic analysis of the impact of CLIL on teachers' work conditions and subjectivities will be presented. The conclusions will bring together the insights from both case studies together and will point towards broader ongoing transformations of the teaching profession in the Catalan context.

CLIL and the politics of language in Catalonia

Education is highly (though not totally) decentralised in Spain. This means that each region (or *comunidad autónoma*) has considerable leeway in deciding, among others, on aspects of language policy and methodological innovation. For this reason, it is necessary to discuss in detail the complexities and particularities of policy implementation in each regional context.

Catalonia spearheaded the introduction of CLIL in Spain. In the late 1990s, the CLIL pioneers (basically, Coyle, Marsh and Hood) were regularly invited by the Catalan Department of Education to offer CLIL training workshops to teachers, teacher trainers and policy makers. The "word of CLIL" spread quickly but this was not followed by swiftness or systematicity in the implementation of the policy (Navés & Victori, 2010). In parallel, so-called "bilingual programmes" (Spanish-English), loosely informed by CLIL principles, began to be introduced in state schooling in other regions of Spain (see, among others, Llinares and Whittaker (2006) for the region of Madrid, and Lorenzo, Casal & Moore (2010) for Andalusia), which eventually made the haphazard trajectory of CLIL in Catalonia more evident. The losing of impetus of Catalan CLIL can be attributed to the fact that, in the early 21st century, international migration rocketed in Catalonia (where foreign-born inhabitants moved from representing 2.90% of the total population in 2000 to 15.95% in 2010).[4] Most official resources and efforts were placed on the establishment of a reception infrastructure for a quickly growing foreign student population (for an ethnographic study of three such reception classes, see Trenchs-Parera & Patiño-Santos (2013)). Another reason is the complex and tense language-in-education policy scenario in Catalonia, with a system that tries to reconcile the buttressing of the socio-academic position of Catalan in competition with Spanish, both the state and a global language, and the need to raise English competence levels significantly.

The first CLIL programmes in Catalan schooling developed under the umbrella of experimental programmes ORATOR (1999-2005), PELE (2005-2010) and PILE (2012-2015).[5] These schemes provided training and additional resources for schools that decided to implement some form of CLIL. In 2013, a new programme was launched, GEP. GEP initially followed the experimental line of the initiatives previously mentioned –centred around the development of foreign language competences– and progressively turned into a tool to foster pedagogical innovation in relation to language-in-education policies.[6] This is reflected in the document *Model lingüístic del sistema educatiu de Catalunya* (Subdirecció General de Llengua i Plurilingüisme, 2018), which establishes the guiding principles for the "Catalan language model" (p. 5). The model puts forth a "holistic approach" (p. 6) to language,[7] whose master lines are: (a) a focus on the fostering of students' plurilingual competence; (b) the integration of language work into all non-linguistic subjects; (c) the development of the academic register as tied to the construction of subject-specific knowledge and to the mastery of discursive genres (p. 27).

In this vein, the GEP programme, which is the policy framework for one of the ethnographies discussed in this chapter, was rather unspecific as to minimum CLIL teaching requirements per year (some course units were considered enough). However, there is a key difference between GEP –at least in its initial phases– and the previous CLIL programmes. GEP aimed to extend CLIL beyond innovation-prone schools, usually located in prosperous areas. This meant that potential GEP schools were identified and invited by school inspectors to join the scheme. In Codó and Patiño-Santos (2018), we dissect GEP's school choice rationale through the analysis of the category "schools with the capacity to progress" as it emerged in the in-depth interview with the official in charge of GEP design and implementation, and was embodied and enacted by the head and teaching staff of Els Pins, one of the schools that we will examine in detail later. GEP basically provided a recognition seal for schools and a 2-year 65-hour training programme for teachers oriented to introducing project-based learning as linked to CLIL implementation. No language training was provided, as GEP teachers were required to have (or be in a position to obtain) a B2 level of English (or French, German or Italian, the other possible CLIL languages). The logic of GEP was to create a school leading team that would inspire other colleagues, and thus, progressively transform practice. Although most of the CLIL schemes mentioned above were also open to state-subsidized private schools, they were mostly implemented in state schooling, and therefore, they help us delineate the evolution of CLIL in that sector.

No official figures exist on the spread of CLIL programmes in Catalonia (Vilalta 2016). According to information published in the newspaper *El País* (Pueyo, 2019), during the academic year 2018/19, 64.7% of Catalan primary education schools and 58.3% of secondary education schools were offering a minimum of an entire content course or parts of it in English. These figures reveal the penetration of CLIL in Catalan schooling. However, what is impossible to know is how CLIL is distributed unequally in the state and the private sector. The overall picture that emerges is that CLIL first emerged as linked to state schooling, but then spread mostly in the private sector (Vilalta, 2016), generally more focused on market needs and with more flexibility to adapt to them. It must also be noted that most newly-arrived students of migrant families were schooled in the public system, where the emphasis was put on their incorporation. This helps explains the different emphasis of each school type on CLIL (at least well until the second decade of the century). Although school ownership differences are key to understand the conditions of CLIL implementation, they have been systematically neglected in the literature on CLIL. In what follows, I will try to summarise the relevant differences in terms of school organisation and teacher recruitment that distinguish both types of schools, and the changes that have, as of recently, affected Catalan state education.

The Catalan school system: *concertades* vs state schools
There are three types of schools in Catalonia: state-owned schools, privately-owned schools that the state subsidizes (*escoles concertades*) and fully private schools. The first two types, together, school 94% of all Catalan students. This paper focuses on them (for details on fully private schooling in Catalonia, readers may want to refer to Sunyol, 2019). Both categories are regulated by the Catalan Law of Education (LEC). They implement the same curriculum and follow the same highly structured criteria for student selection, based on catchment areas and a point system. One key difference concerns teacher recruitment. Although in subsidized private schools, teachers must fulfil the same certification requirements as in public schooling, the hiring system is decided by the school head.

By contrast, in the public sector, access to teaching posts is strictly regulated. As teachers are civil servants, they must pass an official examination (*oposicions*) where both their knowledge of the subject matter and pedagogical ability are assessed. These official examinations tend to be organised regularly. However, because of the outbreak of the 2008 economic crisis and subsequent budget cuts, no examinations were organised for the period 2009-2019. With soaring retirement rates, this created a huge pool of *interins*, that is, non-permanent teachers who temporarily fill a vacancy and whose contracts are renewed annually. In 2021, the percentage of *interins* in the public system was 40% of all teachers (Longán, 2021).

This process of precarisation of the teaching force in Catalonia unfolded while a major change took place in the governance of the system. Basically, the new Catalan law of education approved in 2009, the LEC, enshrined school autonomy as the factor guaranteeing the quality of the system (cf. Decree 102/2010).[8] Each school was encouraged to define its own pedagogical project taking into consideration its trajectory, staff expertise, and socio-demographic and other relevant contextual circumstances (to be specified in the *Projecte educatiu de centre* or school educational project). One aspect of this newly-introduced school autonomy referred, for example, to language policy. Depending on their sociolinguistic context, schools could decide on the allocation of teaching hours (as vehicular languages) to the two co-official languages and students' first foreign language[9] –provided the central role of Catalan was maintained. This specific language policy was to be reflected in the *Projecte lingüístic de centre* (school language project). Pedagogical and organisational autonomy was accompanied by more flexibility in the management of human and material resources. This thrust towards school autonomy is considered the most significant change in the system of the last decade (Síndic de Greuges de Catalunya, 2016, p. 71).

The LEC generated consensus among political parties, but ample rejection among wide sectors of the educational community. It was viewed as a tool for deepening the process of marketisation of the traditional quasi-market regime of Spanish education (see Benito, Alegre and Gonzàlez, 2014). It also opened the door to the privatisation of some services, for example, in the sphere of special needs provision. In a report examining school segregation in Catalonia, the Catalan Ombudsman points out that the development of "singular" school projects has facilitated the discursive emergence of an imagined school map in Catalonia that considers those schools as "good", "modern" and "active" while those schools that do not have such an elaborate, distinctive pedagogical project are construed as "bad", "backward" and "passive". The Ombudsman challenges the equation of those narratives of quality with actual, real quality education, and warns about the homogeneising potential of those narratives of "pedagogical superiority", as they appeal to the social classes with more elaborate practices of school choice (Síndic de Greuges de Catalunya, 2016, p. 72).

One key aspect of the LEC is the novel way of managing school human resources (henceforth HR) through the *Decret de Plantilles*, released in 2014 (39/2014).[10] This decree enables heads to establish specific requirements for teaching positions, e.g. CLIL accreditation,[11] for up to 50% of positions in a school. Another major change is their active role in teacher selection. Previously, if there was a school vacancy because of retirement or leave of absence, teachers would be appointed to schools from a list that was divided by content specialisations (maths, physics, social science, English, etc.). This list was managed by the Department of Education. School heads had no say in choosing who was sent to their school. With the new decree, if a position is *perfilada* (that is, if requires specialist training, such as CLIL), principals get to interview candidates with that *perfil* even if they have just come out of university and recently joined the list. As we will show, this normative change has been crucial in enabling the implementation and extension of CLIL in Catalan state schooling.

The number of profiled positions has grown to reach 10% of all posts in the academic year 2020/21 (according to data reported in USTEC.STEs, 2020). Although the initial increase was rather sharp, growth seems to have stalled in the last couple of years (9.17% in 2019/20 to 9.99% in 2020/21). Since the decree was passed, all teacher unions have systematically opposed it. In their view, it questions the foundations of access to jobs in the public service, which should be guided by the principles of "merit, capacity and transparency" (interview with union leader, 23rd September 2016). They argue that it blurs the distinction between private and public schooling, and introduces a vertical, corporation-like logic of relations in schools where principals have the upper hand and especially non-permanents must "obey" them – rather than the horizontal, bottom-up and collaborative spirit that would, in their opinion, be desirable. This, according to union leaders, has strained relations in schools. The reaction of school heads has been more mixed (Saura, 2018). After this presentation of school types, employment regulations and changes in school governance, I will turn to the discussion of the main theoretical and epistemological groundings of this study.

Languaging teachers

I draw on the concept of *languaged* teachers to understand the transformation in teacher-as-workers' subjectivities triggered by the introduction of CLIL. I understand *languaging* as a process whereby actors are "called into being through linguistic and other interactional practices, simultaneously as workers, multilingual language users and subjects of movement and social change" (Dlaske et al. 2016, p. 346). The languaging lens enables a productive focus on the structuring power of language in schools insofar as certain types of linguistic skills, in this case, competence in English, get constructed as the central axis of professional distinction. As we shall see, proficiency in English defines not only teachers' adequacy, but also their work commitment and professionalism. From the perspective of neoliberal governmentalities (Martín Rojo and Del Percio, 2020), languaging is a tool for governing populations and naturalising inequalities:

> "[…] as self-governing and yet governed subjects who are ultimately responsible for their choices such as 'owing', learning, teaching, speaking, or not-speaking certain languages." (Dlaske et al. 2016, p. 351)

Languaging works as a mechanism gatekeeping resources and value. While it may enable some teachers to access a job, earn more or gain higher status and power within the school, it also downgrades and marginalises others. This is because the process of languaging is simultaneously a process of de-languaging. Drawing on Dlaske et al. (2016, p. 348), who speak of "acts of enablement, entitlement and empowerment", we view languaging as enabling *and* dis-enabling; as entitling *and* dis-entitling; as empowering *and* dis-empowering (see also Kraft

and Flubacher, 2020, for a similar perspective). It is precisely in this dialectic that we want to put our focus, that is, on how actors make sense of and navigate the perceived gains and losses that come with languaging (themselves).

In this chapter, languaging is not just conceptualised as a requirement institutionally "imposed" on teachers, that is, as something that happens to them, but as something they may do (or, only for some, afford to refuse to do). Languaging is, thus, a form of interpellation (Urciuoli, 2016, drawing on Althusser, 1971) by which subjects are asked "to respond to cues confirming a specific way of social being" (p. 470). It is in that sense that languaging is a process of self-positioning and self-identity, the result of taking certain stances and refusing others. What is important is that these stances are not ideologically neutral; they construe specific professional subjectivities as desirable and morally appropriate (Codó and Patiño-Santos, 2018) as they simultaneously problematise others. Languaging is a process of subjectification by which actors come to see themselves not only as active, entrepreneurial and flexible but also as hopeful, resourceful and agentive individuals. As we shall see in our data, this aligns educator subjectivities with those of workers in other economic sectors, and more specifically, places teachers among the contemporary cognitariat class mentioned earlier. It is my contention that the irruption of CLIL, as symptom and sign of the marketisation and managerialisation of education in Spain, has accelerated some of the work transformations that were already underway.

One may argue that language use has always been an esential part of teaching, and that some form of languaging has, after all, always been there. There is no denying that teaching is a language-intensive profession defined by the use of "the techniques of the spoken voice" (Boutet, 2012, p. 217). However, in line with the changing nature of work in general and of schooling more specifically, how teachers were languaged in the past differs from the way they are languaged now. As we know, the traditional mission of schooling has been the production of national citizens (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977). Accordingly, teachers embodied the national values, most distinctively indexed by mastery of the standard language. Under changing conditions of globalisation, however, the school production of national citizens has taken on new meanings. The goal is now to produce workers that can enhance the global competitiveness of the national economy (Del Percio and Flubacher, 2017). It is there that the intensified interest in English comes in. As LoBianco (2014) argues, English has now become a basic school skill, together with numeracy, literacy and ICT, a skill that all children are supposed to master. However, as a "marked" skill in Catalonia (in the sense of "existing outside historical or social norms", Urciuoli, 2016, p. 471), English is scarce. This is how it comes to define the market value of those who possess it. But the value of English is additionally determined by the relative difficulty of its acquisition, especially once in service, and its relative sudden appearance in the teaching labour market. This is why CLIL, as a wholesale process of languaging teachers, is a key mechanism of social structuration. This chapter now turns to a brief description of the epistemological groundings of our research.

An institutional ethnography perspective
Epistemologically, this chapter draws on the principles of institutional ethnography (Smith, 2005) to understand what the everyday reality of teachers across schools tells us about wider processes of work transformation. We find institutional ethnography (henceforth IE) appealing for our purposes because it understands institutions as "complexes of relations and hierarchical organization" (p. 206) rather than abstract structures separate from individuals' doings. Grounded on feminist epistemologies, IE assumes that embodied experience should be the starting point for any inquiry project into the social. Thus, IE departs from the "actualities of the lives of those involved in the institutional process" (p. 31); yet, those lived experiences are not an end in themselves, but provide the "standpoint" (p. 9) for the ethnography, the inquiry vantage point, or in Smith's words, the "problematic" (p. 206). This "problematic" comes from

"some issues, concerns, or problems that are real for the people and that are situated in their relationship to an institutional order" (p. 2). In the case of the two ethnographies of CLIL this chapter examines, we quickly realised that what structured practices, actions, relations and outcomes in the two schools was the issue of what (types of) teachers were becoming involved in CLIL. This observation defined the problematic in the sense that we started to view CLIL as more than a pedagogy; it was a work process that was transforming the ways teachers saw themselves and their work, skills and knowledge; their workplace and their position within it. It was also changing their aspirations and future expectations as professionals. While it offered (unexpected) opportunities for some actors, it alienated others. It became apparent to us that, as a teaching innovation that indexed commitment to the modernization of education, CLIL brought particular worker subjectivities into being (Codó and Patiño-Santos, 2018) that transcended the policy or the specific schools investigated and pointed at larger socio-political processes of change. This is an important dimension of IE as it takes "the everyday world as an unfinished arena of discovery in which the lines of social relations are present to be explored beyond it" (p. 39). The goal of IE is to "[map] the relations that connect one local site to others" (p. 29) and "how people are participating in those relations" (p. 36) through their situated positionings and coordinated actions. The translocal connections, according to Smith "are to be discoverable in the articulation of people's everyday experiences" (p. 37). The objective is to understand "how things work beyond the scope of our everyday knowledge" (p. 206).

Context: The two schools investigated
This chapter analyses ethnographic data collected over a period of three years (2015-2017) in two schools, Santa Creu and Els Pins, located in lower middle-class neighbourhoods of the Barcelona metropolitan area. Both schools are aspirational, in the sense that they strive to attract a higher number of middle-class families. Both are engaged in a constant process of self-reflection about their educational offer and close monitoring of the local educational market through informal surveying mechanisms. In both schools CLIL was appropriated as a tool for re-positioning the school in the local educational market. However, as two very different types of schools –Santa Creu being private though state subsidized, and Els Pins being public– they are subject to totally distinct governance regimes which will impact CLIL localization differently.

One of the schools, Santa Creu, is a convent school that offers all levels of compulsory and non-compulsory education, from age 1 (kindergarten) to age 18 (baccalaureate). As a publicly subsidised school, families must cover the cost of any additional, non-curricular activities offered, as well as maintenance costs. We will focus our ethnography of CLIL in primary education because this is where CLIL was most salient and caused most uproar. The other school is Els Pins. Els Pins is a state secondary school that offers the four years of compulsory secondary schooling (ages 12 to 16) plus the two years of non-compulsory baccalaureate (ages 17 and 18).

Our corpus consists of field work notes made during and after multiple ethnographic visits to the schools (22 research visits to Santa Creu and 47 to Els Pins), where we conversed formally (in the form of in-depth interviews or focus groups) and informally with school heads; programme coordinators; CLIL and non-CLIL teachers; students; and child and adolescent psychologists. We also observed classes pertaining to various levels and subjects, recorded CLIL lessons, attended school events, took photographs of the schoolscapes, and collected textual material of different sorts (didactic units, student work, institutional documents, webpage discourse, etc.). We complemented this ethnographic data with formal interviews conducted with several officials from the Catalan Department of Education and a representative from the biggest trade union in the teaching sector. We also informally gauged the perspectives of numerous primary and secondary school teachers during the period when we conducted our

fieldwork, either through personal contacts or through the participation of two research team members in a CLIL training programme at our university. The end result is a large, rich and textured corpus of situated discursive practice that grounds the institutional analyses presented in the next two sections.

Science at Santa Creu

When I first visited the school in July 2015, Pili,[12] the head teacher, told me she ambitioned to "bilingualise"[13] the school, by which she meant intensify the presence of English. Pili is a rather atypical school principal. She is a pharmacist and has no specific background in education. As a nun, she was put in charge of the school back in 1991 by the religious order that owns it. Recurrently, Pili grounds her educational decisions on common sense and/or experience; she is more of an HR manager than an inspiring educator and pedagogical leader. In our interview with her (conducted on 13th October 2015), she construes herself as someone who intuitively understood that English should become more prominent in the school to make its offer more attractive to the middle-class families it was receiving as a result of the gentrification of the neighbourhood (see also Shohamy 2019 for school heads as language policy makers who make choices often based on intuition).

The first step had been taken back in 2008 at the initiative of Ester, a recently hired primary education English teacher. Ester, who had just graduated from a private university, had received specialist CLIL training during her BA. At the time, CLIL seemed "like the thing to do" (interview with Ester, 2nd February 2016), and she presented the idea to the head, who was eager to drive it forward the following year. However, by the time we interviewed Pili, we could sense a feeling of stagnation. CLIL, implemented in science classes, had not revolutionised the school linguistically as much as she had initially expected. Although she felt that the students' overall level of English had risen substantially, it was time to move forward to "create an English atmosphere" in which children and teens would use English "naturally", as a "vehicle for communication", "without noticing".

With this in mind, when the occasion arose (September 2015, as we were beginning our fieldwork), she hired a native speaker to teach science in Year 3 and Year 4 (students aged 8 and 9). This person, whom we shall call Mary, was a Scottish nurse recently arrived from the States, with no background in teaching and no knowledge of either Catalan or Spanish, the two local languages. Hiring Mary was possible because the school had decided to teach science as a *complementària*, that is, as a non-curricular subject, where teacher qualification requirements do not apply. *Complementàries* are extra subjects offered by private schools. Ester described them as the space "beyond the rigid official curriculum" that allowed the school to organise innovative workshops (drama, social skills, study techniques, etc.) to help students' learning and social development. This was the context that framed the introduction of CLIL, which was construed as an add-on to strengthen EFL classes, and whose grade did not officially count. The decision to choose science as subject area was rather ad-hoc, according to the two main actors. Doing science in English "what was fashionable at the time" in Ester's words. *Science* began to be taught at Year 1 (age 6) and, year after year, got extended to higher levels. Its contents paralleled (and to a large extent overlapped) the contents of *medi natural* (the curricular science course taught in Catalan).

The school head was thrilled with Mary's recruitment for science; she was adamant that her lack of Spanish or Catalan would foster a true atmosphere of "English immersion" because it would force students to employ English with her. Mary was also believed to contribute cultural and linguistic authenticity to the school's CLIL project, which the principal saw as lacking.

Mary was not well received in the school. The feeling of discomfort could be sensed in the many ironical remarks teachers made to us during our visits to the school. She was alien to the teaching profession, as she had no teacher qualified status or experience. Her taking over some of the science classes had the effect of symbolically deskilling the rest. If she could teach science, anyone could. Educators felt that their professional authority was undermined by Mary's hiring. Another source of annoyance was the fact that Mary's schedule had been "arranged" to teach only in the mornings. She was seen as some sort of protégé of Pili's, the head, who was ready to "do anything", according to some teachers, to keep Mary in the school. But most importantly, Mary's arrival had caused the downgrading of Rosa, the regular science teacher, who was now asked to be Mary's teaching assistant. Clearly, ideologies of nativeness and linguistic authenticity (Relaño Pastor and Fernández Barrera, 2019) had overridden Rosa's experience and teaching expertise. But as Mary did not speak either of the two local languages, Rosa was needed to mediate between Mary and her students, and most importantly, keep discipline in the classroom. "Her class has become paper ball time," once said to me the primary education coordinator. Frustrated by her inability to keep students under control, Mary left the school two months later and Rosa was reinstated as the course main teacher.

Despite the failure of this initiative, Mary's presence embodied a threat that was feared by teachers far and wide in the school since the early days of CLIL, namely that CLIL was altering the existing regimes of value in the school. A new skill had gradually emerged as vital for teachers' careers. This skill was English. Of course, all teachers knew some English; this was not the point. What they needed was a level of fluency that would enable them to conduct a lesson in that language.

All of a sudden experience and expertise seemed to have become volatile. The only solid asset seemed to be English. Half-jokingly, some voiced their fears of being sacked, as Ester reports. What most of them knew, though, is that even if they were not sacked, they "were stuck in this school forever", as Joana, a teacher in her mid-fifties put it (field narratives, 1st April 2016). The wholesale introduction of CLIL and of other initiatives to intensify the presence of English in schools were lowering the market value of non-English proficient educators.

Some of the younger teachers reacted by capitalising themselves. One such case was that of Maria, in her late 30s. For some time, she had contemplated the possibility of trying to find a job in another school. She wanted to try a new place, a school with stronger pedagogical leadership. She taught in kindergarten, and thus was not directly affected by the introduction of CLIL at Santa Creu, which was taught in primary and secondary. However, she had come to the conclusion (through the experience of her colleagues and of other acquaintances in town) that to stand any chances of being hired elsewhere, she needed to become fluent in English. Despite having two very young kids, she decided to start self-languaging. She enrolled in after-work English classes. After she got the B2 certification, the officially required level to teach (in) English in kindergarten and primary education, she discovered that it would be difficult for her to compete with the younger generations, many of whom, apart from English, had more qualifications, in particular, a double bachelor degree (kindergarten-primary education) that legally enabled them to teach in both educational cycles. Maria did not, and so she abandoned the idea of quitting Santa Creu. However, interestingly, she decided to continue self-skilling in English "to keep the momentum" (field narratives, 1st April 2016).

Our ethnography of CLIL in Santa Creu revealed several important issues. First, that CLIL is more than a methodology; it is a stratifying process. The specific configuration of CLIL in Santa Creu, that is, the fact that it was a non-curricular subject (with no impact on student grades), meant that the stratifying power of CLIL impacted teachers most vividly –and not students as tends to be the case (see Patiño-Santos and Poveda, this volume). As a languaging

process, CLIL devalued some teaching profiles and valued others. The process was both material and symbolic. On the one hand, English specialists acquired prestige. In general, "they counted little", as reported by the primary coordinator. In the school hierarchy, programme coordinators came top followed by form teachers. Specialist teachers, that is, PE, music and English teachers, came last. However, the irruption of CLIL had re-positioned English teachers. They were now coveted because they were perceived as the only ones that could guarantee an optimal level of English in the CLIL classes. The fact that there were only few of them was even seen as hindering the school chances of taking CLIL a step further by introducing it in the official curriculum. But the process also had a material component. Teaching complementàries (2 hrs per week) meant an additional income of 120€ monthly (before taxes). It was form teachers that were usually appointed. With CLIL, some of them lost half of that income, some others all of it. So, the irruption of CLIL had a material impact too.

The reaction was varied, but not always confrontational. Some form teachers actually volunteered to teach CLIL. The criteria to be deemed competent by the school head were unknown to everyone I interviewed. In this context, the boldest teachers declared they were prepared to do CLIL. This engendered suspicion among other less confident colleagues who suspected the former had taken this move only to win over the head's support and driven by economic motivations, but in fact, cared little about teaching quality.

So, what this story shows is that CLIL opened a breach in the school. It was all fairly civilised but it was there. The teachers who up to then had viewed their job as fairly stable and secure felt precarised by the uncertainty ahead. Although no one was actually fired, some, like Rosa, had actually had the experience of being downgraded and replaced by someone with no teaching qualifications. Those who had built a solid career after years of commitment and experience now felt obsolete and not apt for the times, "lagging behind", according to Ester's account. Those who wanted to move around felt stuck. However, there were also winners, as we have seen. Given their linguistic profile, English teachers were now viewed as more versatile than their colleagues. In primary, where subject matter expertise is not central, they could teach English and any other subjects taught in English. So, they were more efficient in terms of HR management. And, very importantly, they were also more aligned with the new orientation of the school and its management. This analysis turns now to the story of CLIL at Els Pins, where the GEP programme framed the official introduction of CLIL classes in English as of September 2015.

GEP at Els Pins
Anna, the Physical Education (PE) teacher at Els Pins (henceforth EP), felt GEP was a little bit hers. She was proud of being *the* CLIL pioneer at EP. Although she was a PE teacher, her good command of English was known to her colleagues. Back in the 1990s she had spent her last year of high school[14] in Montana, the US. This was popular among Barcelonan upper-(middle) class families at the time. Previous to that, as a young adolescent, she had attended English summer classes in the UK and stayed with local families. She did this three summers in a row. However, it was her American experience that had changed her relationship with English. Upon return, she focused on passing the selective exams to train as a PE specialist and never considered taking any official English tests, which she now regrets, because at the time she did not know "she would make a living out of this" (note the lack of market value attached to English at that time). However, English "was something that stayed with me", she says (interview with Anna, 21st December 2015) and that she was able to capitalise on later. In the summer of 2013, while on vacation, she got a call from the head of Els Pins, Pepa. She was asked if she would be willing to teach an elective in English the following year because she was the "most ready" of all. She felt flattered and agreed. This was the seed of GEP.

Pepa had been elected in 2013 to head EP. Her three main goals were to improve student performance, foster foreign languages and enhance social cohesion (Interview with Pepa, 19th July 2016). This was part and parcel of a school transformation process that began in 2010 to revitalise the deteriorated image of EP. The revamping was, basically, an attempt to gentrify the school (by attracting more middle-class families) to which an intensified foreign language offer was instrumental (Patiño-Santos and Codó, 2021).

Seeing the success of Anna's experimental elective, the school decided to adopt GEP as a specialist programme for 2014-2015 so that teachers could receive CLIL training. CLIL teaching (except in the case of Anna, who had continued to teach in English since 2013) officially began in September 2015, when we started visiting the school. Of the five teachers making up the GEP/CLIL team, three were civil servants (one was the school's deputy head) and two (Anna and Juan) were *interins* (temporary staff). It turned out that Pepa, the head, who unlike Pili from Santa Creu, is a charismatic and respected figure at EP (see Codó and Patiño-Santos, 2018), had not been able to persuade any other civil servants to take part in GEP.[15] Though she was convinced that GEP would be beneficial for the school and had actually managed to have GEP approved by the school assembly (*claustre*) –as regulations required– she had had to rely heavily on *interins* (40% of the team) to drive it forward. The specific configuration of teachers and subjects that the GEP team articulated was the minimum required by GEP regulations.

Pepa managed to "trick" ("*enredar*") Anna and Juan, as she states in a focus group discussion (10th October 2015), to participate in GEP. Her use of the word "trick" is revealing of the tensions attached to the issue of what kinds of teachers were "asked" to do CLIL. As we got to know from informal contacts, some public high schools had collectively decided that only civil servants could legitimately be requested to become CLIL teachers. This is because doing CLIL meant investing more time and effort without any material reward (no pay bonus provided). Apart from significantly more hours of class preparation, it entailed, among other things, self-languaging to pass an official English accreditation (B2 was the required level) if teachers did not have it, and completing the assignments for the CLIL training. For the interins, having engaged in CLIL was not considered a substantial merit in the official tenure examinations (*oposicions*). According to Pepa, this was due to the fierce opposition by trade unions, which feared GEP might be used as a backdoor method to enter the civil service. When Anna finally passed her *oposicions*, in 2018, after 17 years of temporariness, she felt that that her GEP effort had counted "very little", as she told us.

The truth is that Anna and Juan were pleased with the work atmosphere at EP. In fact, at the time, Anna had been teaching there for 11 years and had made very close ties. However, her appointment was annual and could be revoked if a civil servant applied for her position. She was very vocal about the fact that she was temporary and had no other option but to agree to CLIL. That way, she assumed, Pepa would do anything to help her stay at EP (in fact, Pepa voiced her "loyalty" to Anna and Juan on myriad occasions). Beyond Pepa's professional and affective attachment to them, what she did was to turn their positions into specialist CLIL posts (*places perfilades*). This had been possible since 2014 by the changes in the law (LEC) discussed in section 3. As CLIL-qualified teachers were scarce, Pepa's move ensured the continuity of Anna and Juan in the school, and importantly, guaranteed the survival of GEP.

Juan's motivation was slightly different. In Codó and Patiño-Santos (2018) we discussed how Juan saw participation in GEP as an act of "masochism". On the one hand, he was overwhelmed by the amount of work CLIL entailed. On top of preparing technology classes in English, he had to take extra English lessons to get an official B2 certificate and submit the assignments for the GEP training course (this included attending classes, and designing and implementing

a CLIL didactic unit following project-based learning); on the other, he felt satisfied because he was, in his view, contributing to improving the state school system and giving more opportunities to working class teens, "from the hood" (*de barri*), as he put it. Because he was of working-class origin himself, he considered his engagement with CLIL a moral obligation.

Independently of Anna's and Juan's motivations, the fact was that they were essential for the GEP/CLIL project. The GEP regulations did not contemplate any requirements or constraints on teacher participation. As we have seen, Pepa's only option was to draw on the non-permanent staff to push GEP forward. What is more significant, however, is that this became her established *modus operandi* at EP. When I went back to the school for a follow-up visit in 2018, Pepa was very pleased to let me know that "now we don't take anyone in who does not speak English". This was possible because all vacancies were now tagged as CLIL positions.[16] She had been re-elected as school head and had managed to extend the reach of GEP thanks to this new mechanism of teacher recruitment. She had enlarged the GEP team with the newly-appointees, all of whom she had personally interviewed and selected. The interins now outnumbered civil servants among the CLIL team. Although one of the official objectives of the GEP programme was to train a promoter team that would drive CLIL forward by convincing reluctant educators, as we explained in section 2, this had not happened at EP. What had happened, instead, was that GEP had become the mechanism to socially engineer this public school's workforce in a way that was unprecedented.

It is true that for the newly qualified, GEP became an opportunity (for a similar stance see Alonso-Belmonte and Fernández-Agüero, 2021). By languaging themselves and obtaining a CLIL training certificate, their teaching profiles became coveted, especially in certain school subjects. CLIL posts became a sort of "hope labour" (Allan, 2019) to access the state education system. However, hope (and happiness) quickly turned into disappointment and a feeling of exploitation. Alicia's story illustrates this journey. She was a political science graduate and a qualified social science teacher that we met in a CLIL training course. She had recently accessed a CLIL state school position that had been advertised as "difficult to fill in" (*de difícil cobertura*). Because of this, she was able to jump the long list of applicants; the counterpart was committing to teach her classes in English. In her narrative (interview, 17th March 2017), she describes her arrival at the school as an anti-climax. She was very excited to join the teaching workforce (this was her first job as a teacher after a long history of precarious employment in the field of political communication). However, she describes encountering a head who was only interested in filling a vacancy. On top of being new to the school, to project-based learning (the school's preferred methodology) and to the teaching profession more generally, she was asked to teach all her courses in English (she was expecting her engagement with CLIL would be gradual given her lack of experience) and "to figure out" for herself ("*busca't la vida*"). So, an institutional problem (a school vacancy) was turned into an individual problem (Alicia's). In her narrative, Alicia's stance moves from gratitude to hesitation to veiled regret. She felt her huge effort was banalised.

Our state sector ethnographies have revealed significant trends. First, the implementation of GEP has relied heavily on the temporary teaching workforce. Second, this has been driven forward by the changes brought about by the new education law. Third, these processes have stratified even further an already stratified teaching body defined by the unequal differences in right and obligations between civil servants and temporary staff. Fourth, the large pool of temporary teachers has favoured the extension of these practices.

Conclusion
In her institutional ethnography approach, Smith (2005) compels researchers to depart from the analysis of a situated, empirically discoverable institutional problematic to understand "how

that stuff is hooked into a larger fabric not directly observable from within the everyday" (p. 39). This is what this chapter has aimed to do. It has departed from the ethnographic observation of the tensions and inequalities CLIL engendered among educators working in two different schools in Barcelona to understand not just how CLIL impacted them or their schools, but more importantly, how CLIL was tied to the deepening of market logics that built on the commodification of English as a mechanism of middle-class distinction. This affected educators both practically and symbolically, and added to the increasing lack of stability and precarisation of the teaching profession (in this line see also Alonso-Belmonte and Fernández-Agüero, 2021), with observed practices of self-exploitation among teachers that resemble those of the cognitariat.

This chapter has tried to bring a different angle to existing studies on CLIL. It has focused on teachers and school heads' lived experiences of CLIL, and on the (dis)ruptures and opportunities CLIL has brought to their professional trajectories. Rather than decontextualised understandings of effective CLIL implementation practices (Soler, González-Davies and Iñesta, 2020) or of the "additional stressors" impacting CLIL teachers' well-being (Gruber, Lämmerer, Hofstadler and Mercer, 2020), we have claimed that we need more structurally-informed, institutional and context-sensitive analyses of CLIL that foreground the ways in which CLIL acts as a hierarchising mechanism that alters established regimes of value or works to reinforce existing forms of stratification. For this reason, we have argued that analyses must open their focus beyond those actors impacted by CLIL most directly (the CLIL teachers) and direct their attention towards the whole teaching body.

In both schools, we have observed processes that indicate that educational institutions in Catalonia are becoming increasingly aligned "with the firm", as Ball argues (2009). While heads (both in the private *and* in the state sector) are concerned with marketising their schools to increase enrolment rates, teachers embrace adaptability and self-capitalisation (in this case through self-languaging) as normative worker subjectivities. Although in Santa Creu no-one was actually fired, teachers' long-term work narrative (Sennett, 1998) was symbolically shattered by CLIL. At EP inequalities were more blatant. While civil servants could refuse to engage in CLIL without further consequences, the temporary teachers risked adding more instability to their lives. So, they disciplined themselves to CLIL even though it meant precarising their lives further, as we have seen in the case of Juan.

Our ethnography has shown that CLIL has thrived on precarity in state schooling. The official urge to extend CLIL (see Codó, 2022, for further details) has instrumentalised the subalternity of a large section of the Catalan teaching workforce (up to 40% of temporary staff in 2021) thereby buttressing existing inequalities. This has been done by legally positioning school heads as gatekeepers and agents of power and exploitation in a way that was unprecedented in the Catalan public education system. As we could sense in our field work and some stakeholders have warned, this may have undesirable consequences. One might be newcomer teachers' perceived need to constantly display alignment with the school head in a way that mutes their voices and deactivates critique. Another effect might be the homogeneisation (and potential elitisation) of schools' teaching staff (Longán, 2021). This is all very problematic for the equity of the system. If the rationality for the expansion of CLIL in Catalan state schooling was to democratise students' access to English (Escobar and Evnitskaya, 2013), the gentrification logics to which CLIL has become attached could result in a more inequitable system.

References

Allan, K. (2019). Volunteering as hope labour: the potential value of unpaid work experience for the un-and under-employed. *Culture, Theory and Critique*, *60*(1), 66-83.

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

Ball, S. (2003) *Class Strategies and the Education Market: The Middle Classes and Social Advantage.* London: Routledge

Ball, S. (2009). Privatising education, privatising policy, privatising educational research: network governance and the "competition" state. *Journal of Education Policy*, *24*(1), 83–99.

Barakos, E. (2021). Language work and affect in adult language education. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*. Advance online publication.
https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12517.

Benito, R., Alegre, M.A. & Gonzàlez, I. (2014) School educational project as a criterion of school choice: Discourses and practices in the city of Barcelona. *Journal of Education Policy 24*(3), 397-420.

Block, D. & Gray, J. (2016). "'Just Go Away and Do It and You Get Your Marks': The Degradation of Language Teaching in Neoliberal Times." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development 37*(5), 481–94.

Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J.C. (1977). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Boutet, J. (2001). La part langagière du travail: Bilan et évolution. *Langage et Société*, *4*(98), 17–42.

Boutet, J. (2012). Language workers: Emblematic figures of late capitalism. In A. Duchêne & M. Heller (Eds.), *Language in Late Capitalism: Pride and Profit* (pp. 207–229). London: Routledge.

Codó, E. (2018). The intersection of global mobility, lifestyle and ELT work: A critical examination of language instructors' trajectories. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, *18*(4), 436–450.

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

Codó, E. & McDaid, J. (2019). English language assistants in the 21st century: Nation-state soft power in the experience economy. *Language, Culture and Society*, *1*(2), 219–243.

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

Darvin, R., Lo, Y. Y. & Lin, A. M. Y. (2020). Examining CLIL through a critical lens. *English Teaching and Learning*, *44*, 103–108.

Del Percio, A. & Flubacher, M.-C. (2017). Language, Education and Neoliberalism. Introduction. In A. Del Percio & M.-C. Flubacher (Eds.), *Language, Education and Neoliberalism: Critical Studies in Sociolinguistics* (pp. 1–18). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Dlaske, K., Barakos, E., Motobayashi, K. & McLaughlin, M. (2016). Languaging the worker: Globalized governmentalities in/of language in peripheral spaces. *Multilingua*, *35*(4), 345–359. Escobar Urmeneta, C., & Evnitskaya, N. (2013). Affording students opportunities for the integrated learning of content and language: A contrastive study on classroom interactional strategies deployed by two CLIL teachers. In J. Arnau (Ed.), *Reviving Catalan at School: Challenges and Institutional Approaches* (pp. 158–182). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Garrido, M. R. & Sabaté-Dalmau, M. (2020). Transnational trajectories of multilingual workers: Sociolinguistic approaches to emergent entrepreneurial selves. Special Issue of *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *17*(1), 1–216.

Gruber, M.-T., Lämmerer, A., Hofstadler, N. & Mercer, S. (2020). Flourishing or floundering? Factors contributing to CLIL Primary Teachers' Wellbeing in Austria. *CLIL. Journal of Innovation and Research in Plurilingual and Pluricultural Education*, *3*(1). https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/clil.24

Hall, C. (2004). Theorising changes in teachers' work. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy, 32*, 1-14. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ848225.pdf

Hassemer, J., & Garrido, M. R. (2020). Language as a resource with fluctuating values: Arabic speakers in humanitarian and social work. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *264*, 137–161.

Hirrt, N. (2009). Markets and education in the era of globalized capitalism. In D. Hill & R. Kumar (Eds.), *Global Neoliberalism and Education and its Consequences* (pp. 208–226). London: Routledge.

Keucheyan, R. (2014). *The Left Hemisphere: Mapping Critical Theory Today*. London: Verso Books.

Kraft, K. & Flubacher, M. (2020). The promise of language: Betwixt empowerment and the reproduction of inequality. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 264, 1-23.

Llinares, A. & Whittaker, R. (2006). Linguistic analysis of secondary school students' oral and written production in CLIL contexts: Studying social science in English. *VIEWS (Vienna English Working Papers)15*(3), 28-32.

LoBianco, J. (2014). "Domesticating the Foreign: Globalization's Effects on the Place/s of Languages." *The Modern Language Journal 98*(1), 312–25.

Longán, M.A. (2021, April 14) El decret de plantilles: la introducció del model de gestió privada en la funció pública. *Diari de l'Educació*. https://diarieducacio.cat/el-decret-de-plantilles-la-introduccio-del-model-de-gestio-privada-en-la-funcio-publica/

Lønsmann, D. & Kraft, K. (2018). Language in blue-collar workplaces. In B. Vine (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Language in the Workplace* (pp. 138–149). London: Routledge.

Lorenzo, F., Casal, S., & Moore, P. (2010). 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.

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

Navés, T. & Victori, M. (2010). CLIL in Catalonia: An overview of research studies. In D. Lasagabaster & Y. Ruiz de Zarobe (Eds.), *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, Results and Teacher Training* (pp. 30–53). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.

Neilsen, R. (2009). *Traveller's Tales: The Expatriate English Language Teacher in the New Global Culture*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.

Patiño-Santos, A. & Codó, E. (2021). Diversitat, globalització i desigualtat: una mirada etnogràfica a dues respostes de política lingüística educativa a Catalunya. *Revista de Llengua i Dret*, (75), 107-125.

Pietikäinen, S. (2021). Powered by assemblage: Language for multiplicity. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *267-268*, 235-240.

Pueyo, J. (2019, December 26). El model trilingüe s'estanca a l'escola catalana per dèficit d'anglès. *El País (Edició Catalunya)*. https://cat.elpais.com/cat/2019/12/26/catalunya/1577380816_183510.html

Relaño Pastor, A. M. & Fernández Barrera, A. (2019). The "native speaker effects" in the construction of elite bilingual education in Castilla-La Mancha: tensions and dilemmas. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *40*, 421–435.

Saura, V. (2018, September 25). Les "places perfilades" milloren el projecte de centre o fomenten l'arbitrarietat i l'amiguisme? *Diari de l'Educació*. https://diarieducacio.cat/les-places-perfilades-milloren-el-projecte-de-centre-o-fomenten-larbitrarietat-i-lamiguisme/

Sennet, R. (1998). *The Corrosion of Character: The Personal Consequences of Work in the New Capitalism*. New York: Norton & Company.

Skinnari, K., & Bovellan, E. (2016). CLIL teachers' beliefs about integration and 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. 145–170). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Shohamy, E. (2019). School principals as language policy makers. In C. Thurlow (Ed.), *The Business of Words: Wordsmiths, Linguists and Other Language Workers* (pp. 193–204). London: Routledge.

Síndic de Greuges de Catalunya. (2016). *La segregació escolar a Catalunya (II): condicions d'escolarització*. http://www.sindic.cat/site/unitFiles/4227/Informe segregacio escolar_II_condicions_escolaritzacio_def.pdf

Silverstein, M. (2003). Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. Language & communication, 23(3-4), 193-229.

Smith, D. (2005). *Institutional Ethnography: A Sociology for People*. Lantham, MD: Altamira Press.

Soler, D., González-Davies, M. & Iñesta, A. (2017). What makes CLIL leadership effective? A case study. *ELT Journal*, *71*(4), 478–490.

Stanley, P. (2016). "Economy Class? Lived Experiences and Career Trajectories of Private-Sector English-Language-School Teacher in Australia." In *The Career Trajectories of English Language Teachers*, edited by P. Haworth and C. Craig, 185–99. Oxford: Symposium Books.

Subdirecció General de Llengua i Plurilingüisme. (2018). *El model lingüístic del sistema educatiu de Catalunya. L'aprenentatge i ús de les llengües en un context educatiu multilingüe i multicultural*. Generalitat de Catalunya, Servei de Comunicació i Publicacions. http://educacio.gencat.cat/web/.content/home/departament/publicacions/monografies/model-linguistic/model-linguistic-Catalunya-CAT.pdf

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

Sunyol, A. & Codó, E. (2019). Fabricating neoliberal subjects through the International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme. In L. Martín Rojo & A. Del Percio (Eds.), *Language and Neoliberal Governmentality* (pp. 135–161). London/New York: Routledge.

Thornbury, S. (2001). "The Unbearable Lightness of EFL." *ELT Journal* 55 (4): 391–96.

Trenchs-Parera, M. & Patiño-Santos, A. (2013). Language attitudes of Latin American newcomers in three secondary school reception classes in Catalonia. In J. Arnau (Ed.), *Reviving Catalan at School: Challenges and Instructional Approaches* (pp. 49–71). Multilingual Matters - Institut d'Estudis Catalans.

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

Urciuoli, B. (2016). Imagining the languaged worker's language. *Multilingua*, *35*(4), 469–481.

USTEC.STEs. (2020, September 16). *USTEC.STEs (IAC) Comunicat d'inici de curs 2020-21*. https://www.sindicat.net/e/834/

Vilalta Caellas, J. (2016). *L'AICLE a les aules catalanes: estat de la qüestió*. Treball de Final de Grau/BA Dissertation. Grau en Llengües Aplicades, Universitat Pompeu Fabra.

---

[1] This was part of the Apinglo-Cat project, funded by the Ministerio de Ciencia e Innonación, grant no FFI2014-54179-C2-1-P. In both schools, our ethnographic engagement was a team endeavour. Emilee Moore, Elisabet Pladevall and MA student Anastassia Rassadina undertook fieldwork with the author at Santa Creu, whereas Adriana Patiño-Santos, Elisabet Pladevall, Andrea Sunyol, Jessica McDaid and the author were part of the Els Pins team. Because of the collective nature of our ethnography, I shall use the pronoun "we" to refer to the insights obtained. I want to thank M. Rosa Garrido for her perceptive feedback on an earlier version of this chapter.

[2] Pietikäinen (2021) defines this as "a multi-temporal, heterogenous arrangement of discourses, materialities, bodies and affects, powered by desires and influenced by capitalist transformations" (p. 235).

---

[3] As we shall see later, critical comments were made on occasion, but they were focused on issues of implementation (to do with teacher coordination, material design, etc.) or in relation to individual work situations (in the public school). The adequacy of CLIL as an approach was never questioned.

[4] Source: IDESCAT (Catalan Statistics Institute), https://www.idescat.cat/poblacioestrangera/?b=0.

[5] PELE and PILE stand, respectively, for *Pla Experimental de Llengües Estrangeres* (Experimental Plan for Foreign Languages) and *Pla Integrat de Llengües Estrangeres* (Integrated Plan for Foreign Languages).

[6] In fact, GEP initially meant *Grups d'Experimentació per al Plurilingüisme* (Groups for Experimenting with Plurilingualism) and was later was rebranded as *Generació Plurilingüe* (Plurilingual Generation).

[7] I am not aware that the document exists in English. The translations provided are my own.

[8] http://cido.diba.cat/legislacio/1354310/decret-1022010-de-3-dagost-dautonomia-dels-centres-educatius-departament-deducacio.

[9] These can officially be English, French, German or Italian. In the majority of schools, English is the first foreign language.

[10] http://cido.diba.cat/legislacio/1771003/decret-392014-de-25-de-marc-pel-qual-es-regulen-els-procediments-per-definir-el-perfil-i-la-provisio-dels-llocs-de-treball-docents-departament-densenyament

[11] To be officially accredited as a CLIL teacher, applicants must have a B2 level of English and have received 90-hrs of CLIL training.

[12] All the names that appear in this ethnographic narrative, including school names, have been invented by the researchers to preserve participant anonymity.

[13] There are different possible reasons why Pili uses "bilingualise" instead of "trilingualise" to refer to the introduction of English in an officially bilingual Spanish-Catalan community. Although her comment might be interpreted ideologically, my understanding here is that Catalan-Spanish bilingualism is so engrained in Catalonia that for some speakers they constitute a single L1 for all practical purposes.

[14] This final year prepared students to pass the university entrance examination and was known as *Curs d'Orientació Universitària* (COU).

[15] Individual freedom to act is enshrined in the Spanish civil service.

[16] The decision had to be supported by the school assembly (*claustre*).