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Being a language teacher in the content classroom

Teacher identity and content and language integrated learning (CLIL)

Tom Morton

Introduction

This chapter aims to show how applied linguistic work on identity can contribute to our understanding of a real world issue in language education. In this case, how content teachers charged with teaching their subjects through the medium of English in bilingual education programmes deal with the complexities of integrating content and language in their instructional practices and the identity issues this entails. This is an important issue in social, educational and economic terms, as more and more education systems in the non-Anglophone world are diverting resources to integrating English as a basic skill and medium of instruction, and not just another subject in the curriculum, as predicted by Graddol (2006).

The chapter also aims to contribute to strengthening ties between two related fields: applied linguistics and language education. According to Nicholas and Starks (2014: 4), much of the applied linguistics literature that focuses on issues relevant to language education does not engage with ‘the ways of knowing and doing and the talking about knowing and doing of Language Education’. In focusing on how ‘ways of knowing and doing and the talking about knowing and doing’ are inextricably linked to issues of identity, the chapter draws on applied linguistics work on identity that sees it as a discursive process (e.g. Benwell and Stokoe 2006, this volume; De Fina et al. 2006; McAvoy, this volume). As Li Wei (2014a: 6) points out, applied linguists have to be a ‘Jack of all trades’, drawing on different models and frameworks from linguistics and adjacent fields to address real world problems in which language is a central issue. Thus, the case described in this chapter draws on conversation analysis (CA) as an approach to talk-in-interaction, combining it with two more psychological approaches: discursive psychology and positioning theory.

The chapter is structured as follows. First, there is a brief overview of the background to the language education issue under examination: content and language integrated learning (CLIL) and the challenges CLIL raises for teachers. CLIL refers to bilingual education that aims to
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integrate the learning of foreign/additional languages with that of academic subjects. This is followed in the same section by a brief introduction to the theoretical framework used: mainly a version of positioning theory linked to discursive psychology. The context of the study, its main participants and the methods used are then described. This leads to a section in which data from one participant, Carlos, are presented, with these data showing how identity issues were played out in how he talked about his ‘knowing and doing’. The chapter ends by highlighting the key argument: close attention to how teacher identities are played out in how they talk about their knowing and doing can make a strong contribution to crossing the bridges between the concerns of applied linguists and language educators in the field of bilingual education.

Overview

CLIL and teacher identity

In many parts of the world, there is a growing interest in forms of language education in which participation in subject-matter learning through the medium of an L2 is seen as a means of promoting plurilingual competence. The variety of forms such educational initiatives can take is kaleidoscopic, with terms such as immersion, English-medium instruction, sheltered instruction, content-based language instruction and content and language integrated learning (CLIL) all being used. In a state-of-the-art article on this subject, Cenoz et al. (2014) attempted to impose some order by recommending that CLIL be used as a blanket term to incorporate this diversity. In this article, Cenoz et al. identify as ‘the most important’ direction for future research that of finding ‘efficient ways to effectively integrate language and content instruction’, and they argue that more classroom research is needed in this aspect of CLIL if we are to ‘enhance teacher effectiveness’ (ibid.: 258, emphasis added). Thus, the teacher is put at the centre of the CLIL enterprise, but this is not without its challenges, as ‘there are many aspects of the integration of language and content instruction that require careful theoretical, empirical, and pedagogical attention’ (ibid.: 258–259).

The challenges of CLIL are very apparent in recent studies of teachers in contexts in which they are charged with the task of integrating content and additional language instruction, such as immersion education in the US (Cammarata and Tedick 2012), English-medium instruction in Malaysia (Tan 2011) and vocational CLIL in Austria (Hüttner et al. 2013). Cammarata and Tedick (2012) depict the process of these teachers coming to see themselves as content and language teachers as a struggle to establish new identities. Tan (2011) shows how science, mathematics and English language teachers may be entrenched within their disciplinary identities, holding dichotomous beliefs about their respective roles, which may be limiting for their students’ learning opportunities. Hüttner et al. (2013) found that the Austrian content teachers in their study positioned themselves as having an expert identity in the content they were teaching but oriented to an identity as co-learners with the students in terms of their knowledge of English. What these studies point to is that, while CLIL advocates integration of content and language, based on sound theoretical and pedagogical principles, the field as a whole may not only be underestimating the demands on teachers in bringing this about, but also the extent to which being a content and language teacher is a struggle to establish a new identity. The studies cited here have begun to explore how CLIL teachers construct their identities, with studies like that of Cammarata and Tedick using qualitative data to tap into teachers’ lived experiences. However, fewer studies focus on the actual discursive actions by which such teachers do their ‘talking about knowing and doing’ within CLIL, and CLIL-oriented contexts. This is the gap that the case study described in this chapter attempts to fill: teacher identities, not as fixed and immutable properties, but as emergent in discursive processes.
Theoretical perspectives

The theoretical perspectives on language and identity that inform the case described in this chapter draw on discursive approaches to identity. Benwell and Stokoe (2006: 17–18) point out that discursive approaches to identity can both explicate its ‘fixedness’, in that it can show consistency in people’s accounts of who they and others are, while also showing identity’s contingency in unfolding interaction, in the ongoing ways in which people position themselves and others in discourse. Benwell and Stokoe identify three main, and related, strands in discursive approaches to identity: ethnomethodological conversation analysis (CA) (see Benwell and Stokoe, this volume); membership categorisation analysis; and discursive psychology (see McAvoy, this volume).

The case study described in this chapter draws mainly on the third strand, discursive psychology, which grew out of social psychologists’ concern with the ways in which discourse was used in social psychological studies to explore such constructs as attitude and memory (Edwards and Potter 1992; Edwards 1997). Their main critique was that discourse was being used as a resource to gain access to ‘cognitive’ constructs such as attitude or memory, rather than examining the nature of the discourse through which participants in psychological studies (or in everyday life) themselves oriented to psychological matters in their interactions. Thus, in discursive psychological work, identity is not seen as some fixed construct that people have and which can be accessed through their talk, but as something people do as they orient to who they, and others, are in their discursive actions (Antaki and Widdicombe 1998).

The other theoretical perspective informing the case in this chapter is a version of positioning theory, which is very close to discursive psychology both in its theoretical and methodological assumptions. Positioning theory originates in the work of Harré and his colleagues (e.g. Harré and van Langenhove 1999) and is a field of research that sets out to explore how the speakers in a conversation take up, resist or offer ‘subject positions’ (see McAvoy, this volume). These positions may draw on wider social grand narratives and they may appear in the local domain where interaction occurs as concepts and principles relating to beliefs and practices involving rights and duties. Korobov (2010: 272), in a discursive psychological take on positioning, brings identity explicitly to the fore. For him, a discursive psychological approach sees positioning as ‘the identity-relevant force of certain discursive actions’. Thus, positioning theory as informed by discursive psychology allows us to examine how identity work is performed through discursive actions, rather than positions being seen as reflecting some kind of normative moral order or ‘rules’ that lie behind the interaction. In the case in point here, constructing an identity as a teacher responsible for both content and language instruction is seen as something which emerges in situ as the participant positions himself and relevant others as he reacts to videorecorded examples of his own classroom practices.

Methodology

The context from which the case examined in this chapter is drawn is the Bilingual Education Project (BEP), a large-scale national project jointly run by the Spanish Ministry of Education and the British Council, involving, by 2009, 74 primary schools and 40 secondary schools (Dobson et al. 2010). One of the stated goals of the BEP was ‘[t]o promote the acquisition and learning of both languages (Spanish and English) through an integrated content-based curriculum’ (ibid.: 12). In participating schools, around 40 per cent of the curriculum was taught in English, with the main subjects being history, geography and biology. Other subjects, such as
technology, could also be taught through English. The participating schools taught an integrated curriculum combining elements from both the Spanish and UK national curricula.

The aim of the study, on which the data in this chapter is drawn, was to investigate the relationship between teacher cognitions (knowledge and beliefs), identities and classroom practices in relation to the integration of content and language (Morton 2012). Specifically, the study focused on how teachers of science, technology, history and geography approached the integration of content and language in their planning, teaching and post-teaching reflection. Four teacher participants were chosen for the study who fulfilled certain key criteria: they were primarily trained as content teachers; they were fluent and competent users of English; and they were relatively experienced in teaching their subjects in English (at least two years each).

The data were collected over a period of six months in the Bilingual Department of a secondary school near Madrid that had begun its participation in the BEP in 2004. Data collection methods included a pre-interview teaching unit preparation task designed to represent teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge (Loughran et al. 2004), semi-structured interviews, video-recordings of lessons and stimulated recall sessions in which the teachers talked about their practices in attempting to integrate content and language. Other data included documents such as lesson plans, materials used and samples of students’ work. I had gained access to this setting through participation in a Comenius teacher education project and had led professional development workshops that three of the four teachers had attended. Thus, I needed to carefully manage my own double identity as teacher educator and researcher and this, in fact, contributed to my choice of discursive psychology as a theoretical framework. In other words, rather than seeing discourse data as a resource to access other stuff, such as knowledge and beliefs, it is seen as a topic in which all aspects of identity can be played out, including the positioning of the researcher in relation to the participants.

The interview, stimulated recall and classroom interaction data were transcribed using the conventions of conversation analysis (see appendix), and the methodological procedure of building collections of interactional sequences in which phenomena of interest appear was followed (see Sidnell 2010 for a full methodological account). Thus, for the current study, the data were examined to find sequences of interaction in which issues relevant to content and language integration were topicalised and in which the teachers were positioning themselves, or others, in relation to this issue, thus making relevant certain identity positions. More specifically, for each such episode the following analytic procedure was followed:

1. Identify which discursive actions such as complaining, criticising, praising, etc. are being brought off in the interactional sequence;
2. Show how speakers use rhetorical devices to carry out these actions, e.g. by accentuating or mitigating them, or by accompanying them with other actions, such as displays of knowledge;
3. Show how doing this positions the speakers, and others, in terms of available relevant identities in the context (in this case relating to integration of content and language in a bilingual education project);
4. Show how certain rules, norms and identities which are relevant to the context are worked up or played down in and through the social interaction as an effect of how speakers rhetorically manage their own positioning with regard to these items.

The resulting collection consisted of sequences drawn from all three interactional settings. However, it was found that the video-stimulated recall sessions were a particularly rich context
for such identity and positioning work, and it is two data extracts from one of these sessions that are analysed in the next section.

The interaction in the video-stimulated comments sessions had the following overall pattern: after viewing the short (around a minute) video clip, the interviewer produced an invitation for the teacher to comment, usually in the form of the question ‘What was going on here?’ This normally produced a ‘discourse unit’ (DU) response (ten Have 2004). In DU interviews or sections of interviews, the interviewer allows the interviewee to be positioned as an expert on their own experiences, as the questions mark out an ‘answering space’ indicating broadly what kind of response is expected (ibid.: 64). It is in these spaces, in which teachers produced accounts of their practices, including their aims and intentions, and their views of what was happening, that issues relating to CLIL teacher identities emerged.

While issues related to teacher identities emerged in one way or another for all four participating teachers in the study, in this chapter I present data relating to the technology teacher, Carlos (a pseudonym). This case is chosen as the specific type of teaching represents a challenge that is likely to be present for CLIL teachers more generally, especially in more technical and scientific subjects, where teaching takes place not just in classrooms, but in labs or workshops. Such variety of interactional situations can put pressure on teachers’ linguistic competence and raise rich issues for individual reflection. In the stimulated recall session, Carlos comments on clips from two 7th grade (12 to 13 years old) technology lessons, one in the classroom and one in the workshop. The students’ task was to work in small groups to design and make a wooden toy with simple, moveable parts. In the first (the classroom) lesson, Carlos introduced the task, calling this the ‘theory’ part, and he focused a lot of the lesson on how the students were to read instructions and write summaries of the information they had gathered.

In the second lesson (in the workshop), the students began working in small groups to design and make the toy, and Carlos, after setting up the activity, went round helping and orienting groups with their work. The first data extract corresponds to a clip from the first lesson, in which Carlos draws the class’s attention to a language item, ‘a wide range of facts’, in the material they are reading. In the second data extract, Carlos is commenting on a segment of the workshop lesson in which he is orienting a group while they work at their table on designing the toy. The two extracts illustrate ways in which Carlos positioned himself, and others, with regards to two separate issues relating to language instruction in the context of content teaching: explicit focus on language items and the use of the target language in the classroom (both by himself and by his students). The extracts are also chosen because they exemplify how particular social actions (self-criticism and self-justification) can be implicated in such positioning and identity work.

The data

**Integrating a language focus in instruction**

In the classroom incident Carlos is commenting on (not shown for reasons of space), he mainly relies on translation into Spanish to get across the meaning of ‘wide range of facts’. The extract begins with the usual interviewer’s question after the viewing of the video clip:

---

**Extract 1: ‘Wide range of facts’**

208 Tom okay I’d just like you to comment on this wide range of facts.  
209 Carlos yeah
Many of the descriptions and evaluations produced by Carlos in this extract can be seen as formulated so as to bring off the discursive action of ‘self-criticism’. This is done explicitly at lines 213, 214, 225, 226, 231 and 232, and perhaps more implicitly at lines 241 and 242. This self-criticism is a positioning activity that makes relevant certain identities pertinent to the activity of bilingual teaching that Carlos can take up or resist. After his first negative evaluation of his own performance at lines 213 and 214, he produces, from lines 215 to 223, a narrative of habitual practice in another context (meetings with parents) to show that what he has done in the classroom contradicts what he tells parents about good practice. Thus, his actions in the classroom can be seen as contradicting a stated belief (at least in interaction with parents) that it is not good practice to rely on translation, for example by looking up words in a bilingual dictionary. But, as he states in line 224, relying on translation is precisely what he has done in the classroom episode. By adopting this position, he orients to a rule or norm, one that is quite familiar in monolingually oriented communicative language teaching, that translation is not an effective practice for getting meaning across, especially if it involves looking up a lot of words.
in dictionaries. By aligning himself with this denial of the benefits of translation, at least in his reported statements to parents, and implicitly in the position he is taking up in the here and now of the stimulated comment session, he brings off an identity as a methodologically informed language teacher, at least at these moments where language becomes the focus of attention.

After the second explicit negative self-evaluation at lines 225–226, Carlos also positions himself as knowledgeable with regard to the practices of communicative language teaching by suggesting that it might have been a better idea for them to guess the meaning of the expression from the surrounding text (lines 227–230). It is not, then, that Carlos is positioning himself in terms of an identity as an academic subject teacher who has no knowledge or interest in language teaching pedagogy. Indeed, by highlighting his own negative performance with respect to an aspect of language instruction, he highlights a position as a reflective, thinking practitioner, who is well aware of pedagogical alternatives when it comes to dealing with language items, and is capable of critical self-appraisal of his failure to use a more appropriate one on this particular occasion.

However, lines 233–235 point to a deeper underlying tension in the struggle to balance language and content instruction. After another explicit self-criticism in lines 231 and 232, he begins line 233 with ‘or’, signalling that a different interpretation of the whole scenario that he has just commented on is forthcoming. Rather than seeing what has transpired in the classroom as a piece of intentional language teaching, he reframes its possible intention as simply an attempt to make sure his students could follow what he was talking about. Here, the identity position oriented to is not that of a language teacher, but that of a content teacher who happens to be teaching in another language, and who needs to ensure, as any teacher does, that the students can follow the lesson. However, in lines 239–242, he undermines this interpretation by pointing out that, in fact, the vocabulary focused on was not actually that important and not a particularly good use of time. In lines 244–245 he shifts back to a position more aligned with a language teacher identity by justifying his actions in drawing attention to this vocabulary by the need to get the students to ‘focus on English’. Interestingly, if focusing on English is an orientation, but the actual English focused on is not that important (it is just ‘English’), this raises questions about how this teacher orients to the task of balancing both types of instruction. It would seem that another available position, that of a content teacher who selects language to focus on motivated by the nature of the content topic, is not picked out. Attention to language, in this orientation, may be a somewhat random and incidental addition to the content teaching, an occasional attempt to get them to ‘focus on English’.

**Using the target language in the classroom**

In the second extract from the same video-stimulated comment session (divided into two parts for ease of analysis), Carlos positions himself and his students with regard to competence and willingness to use the target language, English, in the classroom. In the first part of the extract, he again produces a self-criticism, this time of his own competence in using English in the type of situation seen in the video clip, that is, when he is going round the tables helping and encouraging the students with their work.

*Extract 2a: ‘I find myself not so prepared to teach in English’*

343 Tom talk about this situation a little bit
344 Carlos no that’s quite often (.)
In Carlos's long discourse unit (DU) turn from lines 351 to 376, he again brings off the social action of self-criticism in his explicit negative evaluations of his own competence at lines 355–357 and 370–371, and more implicitly throughout the turn. Interestingly, he situates his evaluations of his own competence in the context of responding to the needs of his students, in that they have problems in getting started on the task of building the toy. At lines 353–354, he pinpoints the nature of the problem. The kind of language he needs to use in this context is much more challenging than the language he uses in the classroom, where he manages ‘very very well’ (lines 359–361). But here, in the workshop, he has to work with individual groups ‘more particularly’ and he may have problems in finding words due to the fact that very specific technical vocabulary is used. He illustrates the kind of language needed by shifting into performance (lines 367–369) to enact a typical classroom moment where he may have to explain a process to students. He ends the DU by expressing a desire to learn and practise more English for use in this type of situation. Interestingly, he characterises this as ‘true’ English (line 374), as if, by implication, the kind of language he uses in the classroom is somehow not genuine English but perhaps a restricted classroom variety.

In bringing off this discursive action of self-criticism of his own performance and in the details of the account he produces in the answering space, Carlos positions himself as an English
language learner. In terms of English language competence, Carlos depicts himself as needing to improve his English in order to meet the needs of his students in an interactional situation (working in the workshop with small groups), which occurs frequently because of the nature of his subject. There is no sense of a learner identity when it comes to teaching his subject, as we saw in the previous extract where he may have been concerned that the students knew ‘what he was talking about’. There can be little doubt, from his construction of that incident, that he himself knew what he was talking about – the doubts only arose in the context of how and why he was focusing on language. In this extract, in the way in which Carlos constructs his first revelation of his lack of competence at line 355, with two long pauses, a stretching of ‘a::m’, the phrase ‘I may tell you’ and the micro-pause, we can see that this may be something of a delicate matter for him. It touches on his positioning of self, as a person who may be less than competent in a crucial aspect of his work, attending to the needs of learners in a key interactional context typical of his subject.

In the second part of this extract, Carlos shifts attention from his own use of English to that of his students, and his own pedagogical preferences and responsibilities in this area.

*Extract 2b: ‘I am supposed to make them speak to each other in English’*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Tom</th>
<th>Carlos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td></td>
<td>Carlos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td></td>
<td>Carlos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td></td>
<td>Carlos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At lines 377–378 he positions himself as less than agentive in the requirement to get the students to speak to each other in English – it is constructed as an external constraint (‘I am meant’, ‘I am supposed to’). This indexes the wider contexts of the aims of the BEP and of his methodological
training, in which there was a focus on communicative L2 use in the classroom. However, in his DU turn beginning at line 380, he describes reality as being in contrast with this requirement – there is ‘no way’ the students will use English spontaneously as they are so ‘enthusiastic’ and ‘happy’ to be working in the workshop. The inference here (and it is confirmed later at lines 393–397) is that attempts to ‘force’ them to speak English would destroy this enjoyment and enthusiasm. At lines 384–388 he accentuates this position by providing a vivid description of what goes on in these workshop contexts, again enlivened with performance features (lines 386–387). This lively description prepares the ground effectively for his positioning himself as unable or unwilling to make them talk in English (‘I’ve given up trying to’ – line 390). In contrast to his comments on his attempts to explain ‘wide range of facts’ or his lack of competence in using English in small group situations, here there is less self-criticism, as his unwillingness to keep on trying to enforce an English space in the workshop is justified by the vivid account of the students’ enjoyment and enthusiasm when carrying out workshop activities.

Carlos positions himself as allowing L1 Spanish in spite of external constraints (‘no I mean I should but’ – line 392). Thus he orients to a kind of resistance identity, as someone who is willing to forego a key aim of the project he is involved in (the acquisition and learning of both languages) in order to maintain his own pedagogic preference for the students to ‘enjoy the lesson’. Indeed, in lines 395–397, his characterisation of what it would be like if they had to speak English (‘tightened’, ‘tight’, ‘forced to’) invokes a kind of language policing that would be detrimental to the classroom atmosphere he wants to maintain. His description of what happens when he does insist on their using English (lines 398–402) only serves to highlight the futility of doing so, as they only speak in English for ‘five seconds’ and go back to Spanish as soon as he leaves the group.

In this second part of the extract, Carlos, rather than bringing off the social action of self-criticism through his evaluations and formulations, produces a self-justification, using lively descriptions of his students’ actions to support this. He positions himself with regard to an identity of a subject teacher more concerned with maintaining a lively and positive classroom atmosphere than enforcing the demands of the Bilingual Education Project he is working within. It seems that he is not willing to sacrifice this classroom atmosphere (which presumably is more conducive to achieving subject-related goals) on the altar of achieving another key goal of the BEP, the learning of English. It would seem that there is not a strong enough identification with the goals and methods of communicative language instruction (in a CLIL context) to push aside, make room beside or merge with a strong subject teacher identity.

Discussion

Studies such as that by Cammarata and Tedick (2012) which document the protracted identity struggles of teachers as they attempt to integrate content and language, or that of Tan (2011) which show the potentially harmful effects on their learners of teachers holding dichotomous beliefs, have contributed much to understanding about what is necessary for the enhancement of teacher effectiveness in bilingual education. The discursive approach to identity adopted in this study contributes to this understanding by documenting the subtle shifts in positioning which occur when a CLIL teacher talks about what he knows and does. Rather than using the discursive data to tap into Carlos’s lived experiences, the analyses presented here show how identity issues are played out in ongoing interaction as he positions himself and others in relation to the task of integrating content and language. Carlos’s discursive actions are not seen as a window onto something real beyond the discourse itself, such as his beliefs, knowledge or identity. By
carrying out such discursive acts as self-criticism or justification, Carlos brings into play a set of identity-relevant items that relate to issues of knowledge and competence. In analysing Carlos’s identity-relevant discursive actions, we can throw more light on some of the issues that were the focus of the studies on CLIL/immersion teachers and their beliefs and identity struggles.

The analyses support Hüttner et al. (2013) findings that CLIL teachers, as opposed to EFL teachers, saw themselves more as ‘co-learners’ (Li Wei 2014b) in terms of their English language competence, while maintaining their subject matter expertise. Thus, Carlos’s readiness to position himself as less than competent in using English in one teaching situation in no way implied any negative assumptions about his competence in teaching technology. Hüttner et al. (2013) also found that the CLIL teachers in their study did not at all orient to having explicit language aims in their instruction, and indeed seemed astonished at the idea. They suggest that if schools insisted on the inclusion and enactment of explicit curricular aims for English, this would have ‘detrimental effects on the perception of CLIL as a success, as the relaxed atmosphere and positive affect would not realistically be maintained’ (ibid.: 278). Although Carlos was not referring to explicit language goals, his comments on how insisting on English use in the workshop would affect the classroom atmosphere very much echo this.

A strength of the discursive approach taken here is that it warns us to be cautious about ascribing to teachers like Carlos fixed beliefs or identities in relation to issues such as their own, or others’, competence. We can see that Carlos subtly positioned himself as being aware of his own ‘incompetent’ behaviour when it came to focusing on a piece of vocabulary. He did not position himself as a content teacher only concerned with technology, but as someone who was aware of language teaching options he had not taken. Thus, this ‘incompetence’ can be seen as transitory and more easily remedied than the gaps in his competence in interacting with students in the workshop. Findings such as this have implications for work on teachers’ knowledge, as what teachers know, rather than being seen as a fixed entity, can be seen as shifting and changing according to the contingencies of interaction and identity positioning.

**Issues for applied linguistics**

The perspective on language and identity taken in the case study reported in this chapter is closely allied with the ethnomethodological, conversation analytic and discursive psychological approaches (see Benwell and Stokoe, this volume; McAvoy, this volume). It is an approach which does not attempt to read off larger social issues from discourse data, but examines the ways in which actors position themselves, and others, in their discursive actions. For applied linguists interested in such language education topics as teacher beliefs and identity, this approach can avoid the pitfalls of some qualitative research studies, especially those based on interviews, which obviate the co-constructed nature of the discursive events that produce the data from which claims about beliefs and identity are made (see Mann 2011). It can thus allow applied linguists’ claims about ‘the ways of knowing and doing and the talking about knowing and doing’ (Nicholas and Starks 2014: 4) of language educators such as the CLIL teacher in this study to be grounded in the details of the interactions that unfold between participants.

The case in this chapter can be seen as contributing to what Nicholas and Starks (2014) identify as a need to build bridges between the two fields of applied linguistics and language education. Applied linguists can use studies such as this one to engage in dialogue with language educators and researchers beyond the more well-trodden terrain of EFL and ESL, something
that has been lacking in the field of CLIL/bilingual education. As Cenoz et al. (2014: 258) point out, much CLIL research has focused on L2 attainment (especially in English) to the detriment of ‘students’ achievement in non-language academic domains, such as mathematics and science’. The case study described in this chapter shows how applied linguists can engage with educational research that focuses on what non-language content teachers know and do and how they construct their practices in talk. Such work can illuminate the ways in which discursive practices both inside and outside the classroom may impact on students’ opportunities for learning both non-language content and language.

Language educators can use insights from the ways in which applied linguists draw on a range of models and frameworks from linguistics and communication to see the importance of teacher identity and its discursive negotiation to meeting their aims of enhancing pedagogic practice (in this case, in CLIL/bilingual education). The theoretical and methodological sophistication of applied linguistics perspectives on language, discourse and identity can provide language education researchers with new tools with which to tackle issues that are of key importance to them, such as enhancing teacher effectiveness and strengthening professional identities for teachers who face the task of integrating language and content in bilingual education.

**Related topics**

Ethnomethodological and conversation analytic approaches to identity; Discursive psychology and the production of identity in language practices; A linguistic ethnography of identity: adopting a heteroglossic frame; Challenges for language and identity researchers in the collection and transcription of spoken interaction; Disability identities and category work in institutional practices: the case of a ‘typical ADHD girl’; Identity in language learning and teaching: research agendas for the future.

**Further reading**

Cammarata, L. and Tedick, D.J. (2012). ‘Balancing content and language in instruction: the experience of immersion teachers’, *Modern Language Journal, 96*: 251–269. (A different approach to identity to the one in this chapter, but one of the few studies to look at the challenges for teachers in integrating content and language from an identity perspective.)


**References**


Appendix

Transcription conventions

. A full-stop indicates a falling, final tone.
? A question mark indicates rising intonation, not necessarily a question.
, A comma indicates continuing intonation.
↑↓ Up or down arrows indicate sharply rising or falling intonation, with the arrow placed just before the syllable in which the change in intonation occurs.
: Colons indicate the stretching or prolongation of the sound preceding them.
[ Square brackets indicate overlapping talk onset.
= Equal signs indicate latching of immediately previous utterance.
(0.5) Numbers in brackets indicate silence, represented in tenths of a second.
Being a language teacher

(.) A dot in brackets indicates a ‘micro-pause’ of less than 0.2 of a second.

word Underlining indicates stress or emphasis.

> < ‘More than’ and ‘less than’ signs indicate that the talk between them was speeded up.

< > ‘Less than’ and ‘more than’ signs indicate talk is produced noticeably more slowly than surrounding talk.

.hhh Aspiration is represented by the letter h. A row of hs with a dot indicates an inbreath. Without the dot it indicates an outbreath.

m(h)e An h or row of hs in brackets within a word indicates aspiration, which may be breathing or laughter.

(()( )) Double parentheses contain the transcriber’s descriptions of events.

(word) Words in parentheses indicate that the transcription is uncertain, but is a likely possibility.

( ) Empty parentheses indicate that something was said but it was not possible to hear it clearly enough for transcription.

(Based on Sidnell 2010: ix–x)