Trajectories of Learning to Become CLIL Teachers: Lived Experiences and Professional Growth

Denchai Prabjandee[a,*], Punwalai Kewara[b]

[a] denchai@go.buu.ac.th, Faculty of Education, Burapha University, Thailand
[b] punwalai@go.buu.ac.th, Faculty of Education, Burapha University, Thailand
[*] Corresponding author, denchai@go.buu.ac.th

ABSTRACT

In many contexts, implementing CLIL is top-down, in which the policy is imposed on teachers to transform monolingual content classes into CLIL classrooms. This implementation brings several challenges to content teachers, who were previously trained as content specialists only. This study attempted to explore the lived experiences of these CLIL teachers, who were obliged to implement CLIL because of the school policy. The study utilised trajectories of learning as a theoretical framework and employed a narrative case study to interview five in-service CLIL teachers. The findings revealed that the teachers entered the CLIL community by accident; they were assigned to teach CLIL by the school directors simply after visiting a CLIL school. Even though their trajectory was accidental, these teachers moved to an insider and inbound trajectory through constant practice, networking, and extensive professional development. This paper argues that converting a monolingual content classroom into a CLIL classroom is more than changing a language of instruction; instead, it takes one's identity.

Keywords: CLIL, CLIL teachers, trajectories of learning

Introduction

It is widely understood that Content and Language Integrated Learning (hereafter CLIL) is a dual-focused instructional approach, mainly implemented in a non-language subject, for teaching and learning both content and a foreign language (Cenoz, 2015; Coyle et al., 2010; Dalton-Puffer, 2011). Since its development in Europe in the 1990s, CLIL has gained popularity worldwide (Lo, 2017). Georgiou (2012) summarised the underlying drives for the widespread CLIL implementation as solid support from the European Union, parents' perception of CLIL benefits, teachers' dissatisfaction with existing language teaching, and the practicality of CLIL to create a multilingual Europe.

The rise of CLIL has brought a fundamental challenge to finding qualified CLIL teachers, who must be both content and language specialist (Morton, 2016). The reality, however, is comfortless. In describing CLIL teachers' profiles, Lo (2020) summarised that "most CLIL programmes are conducted by teachers trained in either content teaching or language teaching" (p. 17). In many countries when CLIL was implemented, the policy requested extant content teachers, who currently use their first language to teach content subjects, to transform content classes into CLIL (Lo, 2020). This transformation brings numerous challenges to these teachers since they were previously trained only as content specialists in their first language (Mehisto, 2008; Moate, 2011; Lo, 2020; Wolff, 2012). When the policy was imposed, it caused the teachers concerns and uneasiness (Dvorjaninova & Alas, 2018; Lo, 2017; Pavón Vázquez & Rubio, 2010).

To understand the challenges these teachers lived through, prior research explored their experiences in implementing CLIL. An extensive review of the literature suggested that previous research had explored teachers in an immersion program (e.g., Cammarrata & Tedick, 2012; Martínez & Dominguez, 2018) or CLIL classrooms (e.g., Escobar Urmeneta, 2013; Lo, 2017; Moate, 2011; Thy, 2016). While these attempts are applaudable, more research must be conducted to understand other CLIL teachers' experiences. This study investigated the lived experiences of content teachers, who were previously trained as content specialists but were obliged to implement CLIL because of the school policy. This group of teachers are largely ignored in the literature even though they contribute to the vast majority in many CLIL contexts. To fill in the gap, the following research question guided the pursuit of knowledge: *What trajectories of learning are described by CLIL teachers who convert regular content classrooms into CLIL?* The knowledge gained from this study can offer significant implications for designing professional development for teachers who are requested to implement CLIL.

Literature Review

CLIL is an umbrella term inclusive of many variants and approaches (Cenoz et al., 2014). CLIL implementation varies from country to country and classroom to classroom, depending on socio-cultural and educational contexts (Villabona & Cenoz, 2021). In their critical analysis of CLIL, Cenoz et al. (2014) clarified the complexity of CLIL interpretation articulated in prior literature. They pointed out an essential CLIL feature, which emphasised the duality of content and language in content classrooms. Yet, this dual role is understood differently, such as the degree of balance (e.g., whether it is 50/50) and the form of balance (e.g., theme, unit, or project). Regardless of differences, integrating content and an additional language is believed to be essential in CLIL classrooms (Lo, 2017; Marsh et al., 2010). However, such integration is not easily achieved because CLIL can be content-driven or language-driven (Dalton-Puffer, 2011; Villabona & Cenoz, 2021).

The integration of content and language brings several challenges to CLIL teachers in both content-driven and language-driven classes (Villabona & Cenoz, 2021), especially for CLIL teachers who must transform their monolingual classrooms into CLIL because of the school policy (Escobar Urmeneta, 2013; Lo, 2017; Moate, 2011; Pavón Vázquez & Rubio, 2010 Thy, 2016).

Being forced to implement CLIL negatively impacts teachers' emotions and classroom practices (Cammarrata & Tedick, 2012; Moate, 2011). Moate (2011) interviewed CLIL teachers in Finland about how they handled the new demands of implementing CLIL and pointed out that they experienced immeasurable stress because their prior expertise became questionable. They could not rely on the familiar techniques in monolingual classrooms as resources to implement CLIL. These negative experiences fundamentally affected their professional integrity. Similarly, Cammarrata and Tedick (2012) examined teachers' lived experiences in an immersion program in the United States. They pointed out that the immersion teachers felt isolated, which is mainly influenced by the lack of collegial and administrative support.

Even though CLIL teachers were confronted with emotional challenges, previous research in many contexts has reported that they could find ways to survive the demands of freshly implemented CLIL (Thy, 2016). CLIL teachers continued implementing CLIL by themselves until they could implement it successfully (Urmeneta, 2013). Using a case study approach to explore the difficulties in implementing CLIL in Vietnam, for example, Thuy (2016) found that CLIL teachers used their first language to teach critical terms, Internet sources, self-designed materials, and translation. In addition, Urmeneta (2013) found that implementing CLIL provided a space for CLIL teachers to reflect upon their learning. Without reflection, the teachers would not be able to realise their practice.

In addition, teacher professional development is crucial for content teachers to transform their regular classrooms into CLIL (Kewara & Prabjandee, 2018; Lo, 2020; Taylor, 2022). In the Hong Kong context, Lo (2017) examined the development of teacher beliefs and language awareness after attending professional development. It was found that the teachers developed changing beliefs and language awareness with varying degrees depending on their prior learning, teaching experiences, epistemological beliefs, and school contexts. To design CLIL teacher professional development, competencies for CLIL teachers such as CLIL Teacher's Competences Grid (Bertaux et al., 2010) and European Framework for CLIL Teacher Education have been put forward. In their duoethnographic study on CLIL teacher education, Banegas and del Pozo Meamud (2020) revealed that CLIL teachers' competencies, as outlined by March et al. (2010), could be cultivated in a multiplicity of settings even though the proposal was developed in the European context.

Finally, transforming monolingual classes into CLIL involves identity transformation (Cammarrata & Tedick, 2012; Morton, 2016; Pappa et al., 2017). It is argued that implementing CLIL requires teachers to see themselves as both content and language specialist who must balance content and language (Morton, 2016). However, research on CLIL teacher identity construction pointed out consistently that CLIL teachers only saw themselves as content teachers rather than both content and language teachers (Hüttner et al., 2013; Tan, 2011). This self-perception influenced attitudes, competence, and pedagogical identity, in which CLIL teachers drew upon personal experiences to implement CLIL (Pappa et al., 2017). For example, when they see their identity as a content teacher, they may focus on teaching content only when implementing CLIL. This implementation is problematic since it does not prepare learners to achieve both content and language characterised by CLIL intention (Cenoz, 2015; Coyle et al., 2010; Dalton-Puffer, 2011). Apart from the pedagogical identity, CLIL teachers also encounter conflicts in their relational identity, in which they implement CLIL independently rather than sharing resources (Pappa et al., 2017). Papa et al. (2017 argued that "the possibility with others to share the workload and materials provides not only a support system but also supports the quality of practice" (p. 66). As a result, implementing CLIL alone affects the quality of CLIL implementation.

Theoretical Framework

Our inquiry was guided by the social learning theory, which characterised learning as social participation in a Community of Practice (COP) (Wenger, 1998). Building on his previous work (Lave & Wenger, 1991), Wenger (1998) defined COP as a social group configured by sustained

mutual engagement. Central to the theory is the reconceptualisation of learning as identity development; as one learns, one develops an identity of membership within a community of practice. In teacher education research, COP influences the establishment of a Professional Learning Community (PLC), defined as a group of teachers who decide to collaborate to solve a common problem through sharing and reflecting (Wang, 2015). PLC is regarded as a practical approach to enhancing teachers' learning and developing expertise (Hairon et al., 2017).

From the social learning theory, learning occurs when one participates in the COP. Participation is enacted through everyday practices during our lives, in which Wenger (1998) used the term *trajectories of learning*. Wenger (1998) argued that "a sense of trajectory gives us ways of sorting out what matters and what does not, what contributes to our identity and what remains marginal" (p. 155). Trajectories can be viewed as *peripheral, inbound, insider, boundary,* and *outbound*. Each trajectory describes the level of participation and the position within COP. Peripheral represents the position of membership at the edge of a community, in which one is not entirely a member of the community. Inbound occurs as one joins the community with attempts to become a full member. Insider is when one fully participates in the community, and one's identity continues progressing. Boundary takes place when one brokers identity across COP. Outbound is the process of leaving the community for a new one. It should be noted that these myriad ways of trajectories are not linear and can be influenced by a nexus of actions and events.

In teacher education research, the trajectory of learning theory was used to explore language teacher professional identity during educational reform in China (Liu & Xu, 2013), the professional legitimacy of primary school English teachers in Vietnam (Nguyen, 2019), and teacher identity in times of change in Sweden (Colliander, 2019). However, limited research has used the trajectory of learning to explore the lived experiences of CLIL teachers as they learned to transform their regular content classes into CLIL classrooms. Specially, we were interested in understanding what it takes to convert content classes into CLIL.

The Current Study

Research Design

To delve into the lived experiences of CLIL teachers, we employed a narrative case study approach, which is a combination between narrative inquiry and case study. Clandinin and Connelly (2000) defined narrative inquiry as studying experience through examining stories. Yin (2014) illustrated case study aims to capture a detailed description of a particular case with a bounded system. Taken together, the narrative case study seeks to explore human experience by using a case with a bounded system as the source of data. The case in this study is a *trajectory of learning* to implement CLIL. We were interested in the lived experiences of CLIL teachers who have been teaching CLIL for at least five years. Through this methodology, we hope to shed light on their trajectories of professional growth as they learn to adopt CLIL, their successful or adaptive stories, and how they cope with challenges to adopting CLIL. We were aware that this design did not allow generalisation because of the nature of qualitative research (Tracy, 2013).

Context and Participants

The participants in this study were CLIL teachers in the English Integrated Studies (EIS) curriculum at secondary schools in northeastern Thailand networked with the authors' university. Even though EIS is not labelled as CLIL specifically, the EIS curriculum shares many features with CLIL, as characterised by Dalton-Puffer (2011). EIS is a form of English enrichment measures packaged into content teaching. Content teachers use English as a medium of instruction in content-driven classes, and subjects are timetabled as content lessons. Since EIS was promoted in the educational reform policy in 2014, many schools in Thailand, especially in rural areas, started to adopt the EIS curriculum to increase student's English proficiency. Because EIS is implemented

locally, one strategy many schools use to implement EIS is to visit the first school that was successfully implemented.

Unlike other contexts, Thai teachers generally enjoy "high social status, a stable job, and social welfare" (Prabjandee, 2020, p. 52). They are public servants who receive salaries and additional benefits from the government. Thai teachers become a teacher through a restricted and licensed journey. They must hold a teaching license obtained through one of the 112 teacher education programs, accredited Faculty of Education by the Teacher Council of Thailand. To become a teacher, they must pass the national examination (Prabjandee, 2020).

A narrative case study is interested in the participants, who have stories to share (Barkhuizen et al., 2014), so it is essential to ensure that the participants have stories to tell. The participants were obtained through an email invitation to potential teachers from different secondary schools, networking with the authors' university. The email stated the objectives of the research, anticipated risks and benefits, procedure of data collection, and the eligible criteria (be more than 20 years old, have been teaching CLIL for at least five years, and willing to participate). These criteria were used to ensure that the participants had stories to share as intended by the goal of narrative inquiry. Upon sending the email to teachers from the pool of six-networked schools and waiting for the responses for two weeks, five teachers (all names are pseudonyms) volunteered to participate.

Table 1

Demographic information of CLIL teachers

Teachers	Gender	School	Content	Teaching Experience	CLIL teaching Experience
Pramote	Male	A	Mathematics	28 years	13 years
Dao	Female	A	Chemistry	30 years	11 years
Patita	Female	B	Mathematics	25 years	10 years
Jit	Female	C	Chemistry	17 years	12 years
Athip	Male	D	Mathematics	29 years	12 years

All teachers taught at secondary schools in the northeastern part of Thailand. Their schools were located in rural areas where they served students from adjacent communities. Their teaching experiences ranged from 17 to 30 years, with an average of 25.8 years. None of these teachers was trained as CLIL teachers during their teacher education. They were only prepared to be content specialists. After teaching content in the Thai language for approximately ten years, they were requested to implement CLIL by their school directors. Currently, their CLIL teaching experience ranged from 10 to 13 years, with an average of 11.6 years.

Data Collection

Guided by the three-interview series by Seidman (2006), the first author interviewed each teacher three times online in 2020. The first time was a semi-structured interview consisting of several topics, such as why they implemented CLIL, their experiences of implementing CLIL, and activities they participated in to implement CLIL. The interview questions were open-ended to encourage the teachers to tell their stories. Examples of interview questions were: Why did you decide to adopt CLIL? What was your experience like when you first implemented CLIL? What is it like to implement CLIL now? What were the challenges when you implemented CLIL? How did

you handle those challenges? During the interview, salient keywords, direct conversations, critical points, and some interpretative hunches were recorded to supplement the study.

Before collecting the second interview with the same teachers, we undertook a preliminary analysis. The first interviews were transcribed. The second author analysed the interview data and made notes for the first author to ask for more information in the second interview. Accordingly, the data were examined from an external angle by the second author who was not involved in the data collection. In the second interview, the teachers were asked to narrate specific details of the events mentioned in the first interview. Examples of the second interview questions were: Can you tell us more about this event? How does this event help you learn to implement CLIL? In the last interview, the teachers were asked about the meaning of their experiences; for example, given what you have talked about in your teaching content through English, how do you understand/ define this teaching experience? These three interviews per teacher help us gain richer data to answer the research questions.

Data Analysis and Trustworthiness

Before analysing the interview data, the transcript quality was maximised to ensure the analysis rigour (Poland, 1995). In doing so, the interviews were transcribed by a professional transcriber and later checked for accuracy by ourselves. To analyse the data, we employed an iterative analysis (Tracy, 2013) with a cross-case comparison (Yin, 2014). The iterative analysis "alternates between emic, or emergent, readings of the data and an etic use of existing models, explanations, and theories" (Tracy, 2013, p. 184). The iterative analysis is an inductive approach rooted in meanings in the data and active reflection on current literature to refine understanding. We analysed the transcript of each teacher separately by using the three-step coding method (Saldaña, 2009). First, the open coding step was conducted to label segments of the data. Some examples of the codes were "accidental journey," "first exposure to CLIL," or "professional development." We also listened to the interview records to supplement our interpretation during this step. Second, all codes were reexamined again in the axial coding step to determine their relationships to generate categories. During this step, we collaboratively categorised the codes found in each teacher. After that, we moved to analyse other teachers and compared the data across them. Third, we grouped the categories into themes that could be used to answer the research questions. During this step, we consulted with the theoretical framework – trajectories of learning by Wenger (1998). The goal of the consultation was not simply to filter the data through the theory. Instead, we used the framework to make sense of the data and aimed to be open to new insights. Based on our collaborative, iterative, and reflective analysis, we could maximise the trustworthiness of the analysis. Finally, an audit trail technique was also used to maximise trustworthiness by documenting detailed decisions made throughout the data collection and analysis process.

Findings

The interview data revealed that all participants (n = 5) described their trajectory of learning to become CLIL teachers similarly, so we decided to present the teachers' trajectories as collective narratives – stories drawn from all participants – rather than individual stories since the collective narratives represent common stages the teachers went through as they learned to become CLIL teachers. The trajectories of learning, presented in this section, are characterised as critical incidents and developmental stages of converting the monolingual classrooms into CLIL. The stages were described as *accidental* (stepping into CLIL: an accidental journey), *responsible* (conforming to new roles), *experimental* (the trial and errors method), *investment* (endless professional development), *transformative* (CLIL changes identity), and *perseverance* (implementing CLIL against collegial resistance). Each theme contributed to an understanding that transforming the monolingual classroom into CLIL takes one's identity.

Stepping into CLIL: An Accidental Journey

Becoming CLIL teachers was described as *an accidental journey*. All teachers reported that their directors took them to visit an original EIS school in eastern Thailand, which had an established reputation for implementing "an innovation of integrating English in a content classroom" (Dao's interview). It was surprising that all teachers were not aware of the real purpose of the visit. Dao narrated lightheartedly, "the director simply informed us that he would take us to the beach, so we just got on the bus. No questions asked."

The teachers reported that the directors' impetus to take them to visit the EIS school derived from a determination to improve the students' national test scores, called the ONET test (Ordinary National Educational Test), especially in the English subject. Their schools are located in rural areas, with limited contact with English outside the classrooms, making it impossible – from their perspectives – to improve the English scores. When the school directors heard a success story from a school with similar characteristics, they did not hesitate to take action.

Once they travelled back to their schools after the trip, it was shocking to learn that they were positioned as a trained CLIL teacher. The directors asked them to start teaching similar to the school they visited. Some of them (Pramote, Dao, Jit) were assigned to direct the EIS program. All of them reported that they had limited time to prepare.

> After the visit, I was assigned by the director to run a special classroom at our school. He asked me to form a team of teachers to teach in English. It was just over the summer that we had to teach a new way (Pramote's interview).

> During the visit, I got a handbook from the pilot school, and I became a CLIL teacher unconsciously (Dao's interview).

The quotes above clearly indicated that these teachers were not ready to implement CLIL after they were assigned new responsibilities. Promote described his experience: "We had to teach a new way over the summer." He did not even realise what "a new way" was. Dao's unreadiness is reflected in her word choice "I became a CLIL teacher unconsciously." The school did not even want to attempt to provide proper CLIL professional development for these teachers. The accidental journey started to change their lives.

Conforming to New Roles

Even though the entire school went on the trip to visit the original EIS school together, these five teachers decided to implement CLIL, while others had left a spark of interest at the school they visited. It was not about their love of a new adventure, nor was it not about their love of English. Instead, these teachers have suffered from past English learning experiences since they were young. Pramote smiled, "that's why I chose to major in mathematics because I hated English." They decided to implement CLIL because they wanted to conform to their new roles. This new role later powerfully shapes their identity. For example, Dao narrated a heartbreaking story, "I am the head of the department. If I don't do it, who will?

The five CLIL teachers shared similar views on their deficiency in English ability. For example, Dao said, "I have difficulty selecting the right words. I can understand what people talk about, but I am not certain which appropriate word I should use." Panita and Jit, on the other hand, have never imagined themselves using English in their career.

> It happens to me most of the time feeling embarrassed as I am a math teacher and using English, it doesn't relate to me; this is tough. I've been avoiding English the whole time. I can't get along well with English, but I have no choice. The director asks me to do this, and it's my duty, so I just have to follow (Panita's interview).

> My English is very poor. I don't remember I like English, and I don't think I need to
> use it in daily life. I was never happy being in an English classroom (Jit's interview).

The quotes above showed that these teachers were appointed to this new role, CLIL teachers, even though their knowledge and ability were restricted. The main problem for them is their perceived English proficiency. Panita used to words "embarrassed" and "avoiding English for the whole time" to indicate her insecurity about her English ability. Similarly, Jit used "very poor" and "never happy" when referring to her English proficiency and learning English experiences. To survive this new responsibility, they started to employ several strategies.

Trial-and-Error Methods

These five teachers were thrown into the pool of the CLIL implementation without proper preparation. In the interviews, the teachers acknowledged their absence of a clear concept of integrating English into content classrooms. Thus, they had to find ways to deal with this new responsibility. The trial-and-error methods are the best capture of what they do at the beginning stage to survive the demands of CLIL implementation. From their perspectives, one pressing concern to survive CLIL implementation was improving their English proficiency. They invested a significant amount of time studying English by themselves, preparing lessons, and hunting for teaching materials. For example, Dao recalled the memory that she started from scratch when she first implemented CLIL.

> I admit that I don't know where or how to start, so I started with classroom English. No
> matter what, it's right or wrong, I just go with it. I remember asking the director's
> permission to go to a book fair in Bangkok to buy books and materials. We went to find
> our materials. No plan. Just go and buy many books (Dao's interview).

Dao's interviews reflect her trial-and-error methods for implementing CLIL. She did not know "where or how to start," so she used a variety of ways to survive, such as "started with classroom English," "buy books and materials," and "no plan. Just go and buy many books." It seemed that having many materials comforted her to survive CLIL implementation.

In addition, Jit contacted experienced teachers from the original EIS school for help, and she also worked with a colleague at her school. They started to focus on material selection. Jit put herself in the students' shoes and tried to opt for short and accessible materials. Sometimes, Jit also asked the students to find "the best materials" for the lesson.

> We selected teaching materials and then discussed how we structured our lessons. It was
> stressful at the beginning, but we were positive because this made us prepared. Several
> times, I asked the students to look for possible online teaching materials for next week's
> lesson. They collaborated very well (Jit's interview).

However, Panita struggled with using English in the classroom rather than planning classroom activities or selecting teaching materials compared to Dao and Jit. She turned to the easy strategy available to her – translation.

> I planned to use English for my class, but it turned out that I translated every single
> sentence into Thai. The students had different levels of English. Some enjoyed it; some
> waited for the Thai translation; some shifted their attention to something else. This was
> a huge problem that I experienced. Mathematics is already complex for the secondary
> level, and adding English to the mathematics classroom became worse (Panita's
> interview).

Based on these stories, it is evident that these teachers were engaged in trial-and-error methods to survive the demand of implementing CLIL. They implemented CLIL independently

and alone, trying to survive their new roles – CLIL teachers. The trial-and-error methods almost caused them to quit CLIL implementation. For example, Jit admitted wanting to leave CLIL implementation after several months of trial and error.

Endless Professional Development

All teachers regularly attended multiple teacher professional developments organised by EIS partner schools or by undertaking self-study. They said they sacrificed their time with their family to attend "endless" professional development.

> I returned to the same EIS school I had visited more than ten times. I joined their professional development organised by the school every time. I went to Singapore to improve my teaching. I thought it was more than 20 times professional development in the first year (Pramote's interview).

> To upgrade my English, I bought a portable dictionary to look it up to kill time. You know…I also bought a small book about improving English or the correct/ incorrect English book, or English in daily life (Dao's interview).

The most helpful professional development was operated online by a university in the United States. The program aimed to help teachers improve their English proficiency and pronunciation. The teachers were asked to record their pronunciation and send it online to the trainers to receive feedback. Individual teachers also created lesson plans, and they discussed the lesson plans collaboratively with other teachers. At the end of the program, the trainers flew to Thailand to examine their teaching demonstration. "It was a wonderful experience, and my teaching ability improved greatly," Pramote reflected. It was clear that participating in this "endless" professional development helped them realise that they had mastered new skills and grown professionally.

CLIL Changes Identity

For the participating teachers, implementing CLIL goes beyond simply changing the language of instruction from Thai to English. More precisely, it takes "identity change" to implement CLIL. One salient identity change was about them having to become a learner again to upgrade their knowledge of English and attempting to find ways to implement CLIL.

> I realised I needed support from the school, so the school director provided me with an Internet connection and a desktop computer. I bought myself a digital dictionary, the best language personal assistant I could have then. I have changed my lifestyle by welcoming English into my everyday life. Also, I wasn't good at anything about technology or the Internet, but I had to improve myself (Dao's interview).

> In the beginning, I immersed myself in English. While I was ironing clothes, I was also reading something in English. I stuck new vocabulary words in the bathroom to see them while showering. I turned on English music when nobody was at home. I put on my earphones to listen to lectures in English. I did everything I possibly could. I don't think anyone would do something like me. I thought I was crazy (Jit's interview).

These stories indicated that the teachers had undertaken extensive changes in their lives to sustain implementing CLIL. Dao had to "change my ways of living", while Jit had to "read something in English." Initially, the goal of doing these things was mainly for survival, but later it changed their identity. They became a learner again, trying to learn new things.

Implementing CLIL against Collegial Resistance

The interview data revealed that all teachers reported implementing CLIL even though their colleagues were firmly against it. The resistance was both transparent and hidden within the school and across space.

> Half of the teachers were against the idea. I don't know why. It might be that they thought that the students still failed when teaching content in Thai. When teaching content in English, the students might get worse. The other group was senior teachers, who could not catch up with technology to search for materials. They were also against it (Pramote's interview).

> We have a wave of hidden resistance at school. I think other teachers don't want to adjust themselves. They have a lot of work already. They are already happy. Why do they need to change? Why do they need to jump into the mess? Also, they do not believe in CLIL. They think that learning content in Thai alone is problematic for students. Why do they need to throw in another complication?" (Dao's interview).

It should be acknowledged that although these teachers encountered resistance at the schools, they continued implementing CLIL. They observed that their students were "better in English." They also had to demonstrate their CLIL practice at an annual showcase among partner schools. These two factors drive them to continue implementing CLIL even though they did not gain more financial support from doing extra work.

Discussion

Utilising the trajectory of learning as a theoretical framework (Wenger, 1998), this study revealed that transforming a monolingual content classroom into CLIL was full of challenges, complicated, and time-consuming. The findings were consistent with previous extant literature (e.g., Cammarrata & Tedick, 2012; Moate, 2011; Thy, 2016; Urmeneta, 2013). The interview data showed that the teachers in this study reported their experiences as accidental, responsible, experimental, investment, transformative, and persevering. These descriptions could be understood from the trajectories of learning theory, in which Wenger (1998) describes five types of trajectories: peripheral, inbound, insider, boundary, and outbound. Having taught CLIL for more than ten years (10 – 13 years), the teachers in this study experienced only three types (peripheral, inbound, and insider).

The data revealed that becoming CLIL teachers is accidental because the school directors assigned them to implement CLIL right after they visited the original EIS school without proper professional development. Their established expertise of being monolingual content teachers for many years (17 – 30 years) was shaken tremendously by the authority of the school directors. Based on the findings, the teachers started participating in a new learning community – CLIL implementation – not by choice but by responsibility. The data indicated the legitimate *peripheral* participation that might be unique in Thailand, where the nature of curriculum implementation (CLIL) is top-down. Since these teachers were requested to implement CLIL without proper preparation, the stories narrated by these CLIL teachers clearly reflect an example of the "policy without a plan" discourse from the grassroots level in Thailand. This discourse negatively affects the lived experiences of these CLIL teachers.

Even though the teachers did not take an active role to step in the CLIL community, it was found that such participation could contribute to their identity change. As they continued implementing CLIL through trial-and-error methods, they transformed their identity until they experienced an *inbound* trajectory. Wenger (1998) described an inbound trajectory as an attempt to become fuller community members. We found that changing a monolingual content classroom into CLIL takes more than changing a language of instruction. Instead, it takes these CLIL teachers to change their identity. To elaborate, they embodied a "learner identity" to improve their English

proficiencies by doing intensive self-improvement activities, such as investing personal time to self-study English, listening to lecturers in English, or engaging in English activities every day. They also adopted a "pre-service teacher identity" by planning CLIL lessons, hunting learning materials, and soliciting feedback from experienced CLIL teachers. In so doing, they sacrificed their personal selves to perform their professional selves to survive CLIL implementation. The findings in this study were similar to the study by Escobar Urmeneta (2013), who pointed out that the context of implementing CLIL provided a space for the teachers to self-reflect about becoming CLIL teachers. Without the context to experiment with CLIL practice, CLIL teachers would not be able to realise their becoming.

Additionally, these teachers are now positioned in an *insider* trajectory and continue negotiating their identities. To elaborate, some started to relearn new skills while others began to practice English that they had hated since they were young. They attended countless teacher professional development and were highly engaged in self-study to implement CLIL in their classrooms. This finding echoed the ideas of teachers as learners. To become CLIL teachers, they had to become learners again. The results were consistent with Cammarata and Tedick (2012), who pointed out that becoming a teacher in the bilingual program involved identity transformation. However, this study adds insight into that before changing their identity, CLIL teachers in this study made explicit decisions to conform to their new roles first, and later the conformation changed their identity. One factor that mediated this change is the CLIL practice; as they implemented CLIL, they started to form a new identity as a CLIL teacher.

Furthermore, by examining the lived experience of CLIL teachers, we found that these teachers participated in professional development that could not be adequately described as proper CLIL preparation. The teachers were provided with only extensive English proficiency development. For stakeholders involved, implementing CLIL successfully means developing one's English proficiency. While it is true that English proficiency helps CLIL implementation, it is not enough to ensure successful CLIL implementation. These teachers were never exposed to clear CLIL concepts and practical applications of CLIL in classroom settings. This is probably why they did not pass through the boundary trajectory characterised by Wenger (1998) even though they had implemented CLIL for more than ten years.

Moreover, these CLIL teachers implemented CLIL with an unclear understanding of CLIL. This results in distress and resistance from colleagues. The findings were consistent with Moate (2011), who found that CLIL teachers encountered emotional minefields (*dramatic, exhausting,* and *stressful*) as they learned to survive CLIL implementation. In this study, the fact that CLIL was imposed on the teachers might be a source of resistance. Still, they decided to continue fumbling with improving English skills, finding the best teaching styles, hunting for attractive teaching materials, and building collaboration with other schools to become efficient CLIL teachers. Thus, it is safe to conclude that these teachers are professionally positive, and they represent exemplary teachers who can do the impossible possible (converting monolingual content classes into CLIL).

Implications and Conclusion

As revealed in this study, learning to implement CLIL changes teacher identity; it is not simply about changing the language of instruction. The accidental journey brings about CLIL teachers' hidden potential – they learn to transform monolingual content classes into CLIL. This complex transformation takes time, self-investment and perseverance, but it is achievable. By examining the lived experiences of CLIL teachers, we learn that the schools should not rush into throwing teachers into the pool of CLIL implementation if they have not provided adequate professional development. The schools should offer teacher professional development for CLIL teachers before they undertake any changes to ensure their readiness to implement CLIL.

Because CLIL pedagogy requires teachers to balance content and language (Cenoz et al., 2014), this requirement is very new to content teachers who were trained as content specialists

only during their teacher education. Thus, professional development programs should provide clear theoretical backgrounds of CLIL concepts and practical applications in the classroom setting. Additionally, since learning to become CLIL teachers involves identity transformation, the professional development programs should be strategic to engage CLIL teachers to reflect upon the kind of teachers they want to be and why they step into the CLIL community to ensure that they pass through the successful trajectory of becoming CLIL teachers. Moreover, when offering CLIL teacher professional development, it is vital to engage CLIL teachers to explore their agency since it empowers them to carry on CLIL implementation.

Based on the findings of this study, we hope that future research is directed toward designing CLIL teacher professional development that acknowledges the complexity of changing classroom practices and gives credit to the prior expertise of content teachers who must change their practices. This line of inquiry is also expected to provide a space for CLIL teachers to voice out their stories of CLIL implementation. Finally, given the nature of qualitative research, a narrative case study design, it is not our intention to generalise the findings across contexts. Even though these five CLIL teachers experienced similar stages of professional development, we do not claim that other content teachers, who are forced to implement CLIL, would experience similar trajectories. Rather, we encourage more research to listen other CLIL teachers' stories of implementing CLIL since this line of inquiry can uncover the many details of CLIL teachers' lived experiences and professional growth. Those details could be used to inform teacher professional development for CLIL teachers. We hope that the collective representation of these content teachers may raise policymakers' and other stakeholders' awareness to acknowledge the complexity of becoming CLIL teachers. It takes their identity to implement CLIL, not just skills.

Acknowledgements

About the Authors

Denchai Prabjandee: An assistant professor of teacher education at the Faculty of Education, Burapha University, Thailand. His research interests include critical issues in teacher education research such as teacher identity and teacher professional development. His research appears in Asian Englishes, Teacher Development, TESL-EJ, and Issues in Educational Research.

Punwalai Kewara: An assistant professor at the Faculty of Education, Burapha University, Thailand. She is currently chairing the Master Program in Teaching English as a Global Language, a position she has held since 2015. Her research interests focus on Content and Language Integrating Learning (CLIL) and Teacher Education. Punwalai's significant contribution is transforming conventional monolingual classes into active English-integrated classrooms. She has also worked on characterising content teachers' support for EMI classrooms and made valuable contributions to in-service content teacher training in CLIL-type classrooms.

References

Banegas, D. L., & del Pozo Beamud, M. (2020). Content and language integrated learning: A Do ethnographic study about CLIL pre-service teacher education in Argentina and Spain. *RELC Journal*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220930442.

Barkhuizen, G., Benson, P., & Chik, A. (2014). *Narrative inquiry in language learning and teaching research*. Routledge.

Bertaux, P., Coonan, C. M., Frigolos-Martin, M. J., & Mehisto, P. (2010). *CLIL Competence Grid*. CLIL Cascade Network. Retrieved from: http://www.ccn-clil.eu.

Cammarrata, L., & Tedick, D. J. (2012). Balancing content and language in instruction: The experience of immersion teachers. *The Modern Language Journal*, *96*(2), 251–269. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2012.01330.x.

Cenoz, J. (2015). Content-based instruction and content and language integrated learning: the same or different? *Language, Culture, and Curriculum*, *28*(1), 8 – 24. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2014.1000922.

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

Cladinin, J., & Connelly, M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. Jossey-Bass.

Colliander, H. (2019). Being transformed and transforming oneself in a time of change: A study of teacher identity in second language education for adults. *Studies in the Education of Adults*, *51*(1), 55–73. https://doi.org/10.1080/02660830.2018.1526447.

Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge University Press.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content-and-language integrated learning: From practice to principles? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 182–204. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190511000092.

Dvorjaninova, A., & Alas, E. (2018). Implementing Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) in Estonia: Subject and language teacher perspective, *Estonian Papers in Applied Linguistics*, *14*, 41–57

Escobar Urmeneta, C. E. (2013). Learning to become a CLIL teacher: Teaching, reflection, and professional development. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *16*(3), 334–353. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2013.777389.

Georgiou, S. I. (2012). Reviewing the puzzle of CLIL. *ELT Journal*, *66*(4), 495–504. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccs047.

Hairon, S., Goh, J. W. P., Chua, C. S. K., & Wang, L. (2017). A research agenda for professional learning communities: Moving forward. *Professional Development in Education*, *43(1)*, 72–86. http://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2015.1055861.

Hüttner, J., Dalton-Puffer, C., & Smit, U. (2013). The power of beliefs: Lay theories and their influence on the implementation of CLIL programmes. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *16*(3), 267–284. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2013.777385.

Kewara, P., & Prabjandee, D. (2018). CLIL teacher professional development for content teachers in Thailand. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 6(1), 93–108. https://doi.org/10.30466/IJLTR.2018.20492.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press.

Liu, Y., & Xu, Y. (2013). The trajectory of learning in a teacher community of practice: A narrative inquiry of a language teacher's identity in the workplace. *Research Papers in Education*, *28*(2), 176–195. https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2011.610899.

Lo, Y. Y. (2017). Development of the beliefs and language awareness of content subject teachers in CLIL: Does professional development help? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *22*(7), 818–832. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2017.1318821.

Lo, Y. Y. (2020). *Professional development of CLIL teachers*. Hong Kong: Springer.

March, D., Mehisto, P., Wolff, D., & Frigolas, M. J. (2010). *European framework for CLIL teacher education*. European Center for Modern Languages.

Martínez, J. M., & Dominguez, H. (2018). Navigating mathematics and language tensions in language immersion classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *75*, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.05.013.

Mehisto, P. (2008). CLIL counterweights: Recognizing and decreasing disjuncture in CLIL. *International CLIL Research Journal*, *1*(1), 93–119.

Moate, J. M. (2011). The impact of foreign language mediated teaching on teachers' sense of professional integrity in the CLIL classroom. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, *34*(3), 333-346. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2011.585023.

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

Nguyen, C. D. (2019). 'Everyone thinks that I just need to know a few words and sing some songs to teach English to the kids': primary school English language teachers struggled for their professional legitimacy. *Teacher Development*, *23*(2), 174–191. https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2019.1575273.

Pappa, S., Moate, J., Rouhotie-Lyhty, M., Eteläpelto, A. (2017). Teachers' pedagogical and relational identity negotiation in the Finnish CLIL context. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *65*, 61–70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.03.008.

Pavón Vázquez, V. P., & Rubio, F. (2010). Teachers' concerns and uncertainties about the introduction of CLIL programmes, *Porta Linguarum*, *14*, 45–58.

Poland, B. D. (1995). Transcription quality as an aspect of rigor in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *1*(3), 290–310. https://doi.org/10.1177/107780049500100302.

Prabjandee, D. (2020). Multifaceted motivation of becoming English teachers in Thailand: Beyond intrinsic, extrinsic, and altruistic reasons *Teacher Learning and Professional Development, 5*(1), 49-61.

Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Sage.

Seidman, I (2006). *Interview as qualitative research: A guide to researchers in education and the social sciences*. Teacher College Press.

Tan, M. (2011). Mathematics and science teachers' beliefs and practices regarding the teaching of language in content learning. *Language Teaching Research*, *15*(3), 325-342. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688114011.

Taylor, P. (2022). Perceptions of in-service teachers towards CLIL and CLIL teachers' target language and intercultural competences: The context of English-medium instruction schools in Thailand. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, *15*(1), 565-587.

Thy, L. N. T. (2016). Reconsidering the first steps of CLIL implementation in Vietnam. *European Journal of Language Policy*, *8*(1), 29–56

Tracy, S. J. (2013). *Qualitative research methods: Collecting evidence, crafting analysis, communicating impact*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Urmeneta, C. E. (2013). Learning to become a CLIL teacher: Teaching, reflection and professional development. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *16*(3), 334–353. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2013.777389.

Villabona, N., & Cenoz, J. (2022). The integration of content and language in CLIL: A challenge for content-driven and language-driven teachers. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum*, *35*(1), 35–50. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2021.1910703.

Wang, T. (2015). Contrived collegiality versus genuine collegiality: Demystifying professional learning communities in Chinese schools. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, *45*(6), 908–930. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2014.952953.

Wenger. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge University Press.

Wolff, D. (2012). The European framework for CLIL teacher education. *Synergies*, *8*, 105–116.

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and method*. Sage.