Implementing CLIL in a Japanese prefectural university: Reflecting on research-based pedagogy

John Lindsay Adamson   adamson@unii.ac.jp

Patrick Chin Leong Ng   chin@unii.ac.jp

University of Niigata Prefecture, Japan

Abstract

This study investigated the beliefs and practices of two English language teachers - an English as an Additional Language (EAL) speaker and an Anglophone speaker - towards Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at a regional Japanese university offering English medium instruction (EMI). Established in 2009, the university offers students EMI in the fields of international studies and regional development and international economy and prepares 1st grade students in a compulsory English for Academic Purposes (EAP) programme adopting a CLIL approach.

This study examined how the two teachers conceptualized and implemented their CLIL syllabi and what limitations and opportunities CLIL offered. Qualitative data elicited from a collaborative autoethnography (CAE) revealed CLIL as both a bridge into EMI and post-university life. For this purpose, both teachers scaffolded language and content materials, especially with general cultural and social science themes. Translanguaging was important in developing pragmatic integration of students' Japanese in classes. Difficulties were noted in teaching higher cognitive skills due to the test focus of secondary education. Pedagogically, both shifted along a CLIL continuum between language and content foci according to student needs. The perceived limitations stressed the problematic balance between content and language and a lack of a language threshold before embarking on CLIL. Further issues raised were the paucity of teacher development in CLIL and tension between content and language teachers in syllabus design. Finally, opportunities were mentioned in the knowledge transfer between content and language classes and the development of autonomous collaboration. Of final note, the teachers' linguistic backgrounds were seen as important for students. Overall, implications for this study suggested that teaching practitioners can reinforce their classroom instructions with research knowledge.

1. Introduction

Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) has gained momentum in the field of language teaching in recent years due to the spread of English medium instruction (EMI). The CLIL pedagogical approach proposes cognition, communication, content and communication as reference points for teaching and has attracted intense research interest. Although adopted in different educational contexts, CLIL is still under-explored in the educational landscape of Japan (Saito, 2020). In particular, little information exists on how CLIL principles influence teachers' pedagogical practices. This study intends to fill the gap by examining firstly, how CLIL is conceptualized and implemented in two classes at a prefectural Japanese university based on CLIL research. Secondly, we explore the limitations and opportunities in teaching courses adopting the CLIL approach.

Since its establishment in 2009, our institution, the University of Niigata Prefecture, a regional institution located on the North-West coast of Japan, has embarked on an EMI curricular policy. In order to prepare mostly Japanese first year students for EMI classes, a compulsory English preparation programme was established where students take English for Academic Purposes (EAP) courses adopting a CLIL approach geared towards their future EMI.

The authors of this paper are two teachers with diverse backgrounds and experiences - Patrick, an English as an Additional Language speaker from Singapore and John, an Anglophone speaker from the UK - with more than 10 years teaching experience in Japan. Whilst CLIL was a new concept for Patrick, John had EAP pre-sessional experience in the UK and was more familiar with the concept. To explore our views on CLIL, this study adopts a semester-long jointly narrativized collaborative autoethnography (CAE) (Chang et al., 2013) to reflect on beliefs and experiences.

We first review the literature surrounding CLIL paying close attention to its use in the Japanese content. After this, we outline our methodological procedure of CAE before presenting our findings and discussion. Conclusions and implications for CLIL practice are finally provided.

2. Literature Review

With the worldwide growth of EMI, Japanese tertiary education has followed this trend in recent years (Stigger, 2018). As a result, many university English language programmes prepare

students for EMI by adopting a CLIL approach to curriculum design and pedagogy (Brown & Adamson, 2014).

As an umbrella term for language and content integration, Mehisto et al. (2008) traced CLIL's roots to Europe in the 1990s to promote multilingualism and mid-1960s Canadian language immersion. Its principles of content, communication, cognition and culture stress a "dual focus" on language and content (Coyle et al., 2010, p. 1). Among its aims are the cultivation of students' multilingual competences (Mehisto et al., 2008), cognitive skills (Van de Craen et al., 2007) and intercultural awareness (Sasajima, 2013). Bentley (2010) suggested since higher cognitive skills are challenging, teachers should teach appropriate language, reduce their own talking time, and encourage group interaction.

Regarding CLIL pedagogy, as content is acquired in English, Ball et al. (2015) stressed "scaffolding language support" (p. 38) which, if insufficient, leads to student disengagement (Lasagabaster, 2011). Furthermore, Fujimoto-Adamson and Adamson (2015) noted the importance of simplifying authentic reading texts. Also, "slowing down one's pace" (Goodman, 2014, p. 139) is recommended to aid student comprehension. These pedagogical strategies require flexibility so the lesson shifts along a continuum from a primarily language focus to one more content-driven (Ball et al., 2015; Lo, 2020; Met, 2009). Importantly, the teacher must refocus on form (language) to formulate a "counterbalanced" (Lyster & Mori, 2008, p. 134) approach in CLIL instruction when students struggle linguistically.

In Japanese education where English is taught as a foreign language, CLIL is still a relatively new concept (Saito, 2020), meaning those entering university are linguistically unprepared for CLIL. In response, Ball et al. (2015) proposed a threshold level of L2 ability to cope with CLIL instruction.

For university instructors teaching CLIL classes for the first time, the lack of teacher development results in "disjuncture" (Mehisto, 2008, p. 93), the discomfort when teaching unfamiliar content in language lessons. Moving into discipline-specific academic English is also challenging (Wingate & Hakim, 2022) as "the traditional training they receive in language acquisition and pedagogy does not prepare them to teach on, and often design, specialized EAP classes" (Galloway & Rose, 2021, p. 36). Compounding this, language and content teachers must collaborate in interdisciplinary syllabus design (Gibbons et al., 1994), problematic as it

necessitates "horizontal alignment" (Turner, 2012, p. 24) between content and language teachers (p. 24), the latter of whom are frequently ranked lower in the academy (Lo, 2020).

Within the CLIL literature, the authenticity of content materials is important to lesson preparation. Despite motivational benefits for students due to the relevance to their field (Edsall & Saito, 2012), Pinner (2012) proposed that their authenticity should be more associated with purpose for engagement, rather than authenticity of the language.

Ideally, CLIL instruction draws upon students' content knowledge; however, Ottewill and Drew (2003) observed reticence among students to transfer skills from language to content classes as lessons are in "separate spheres" (p. 186). In our own university, evidence counters this as some content learned in a CLIL class was reported as relevant to content classes (Adamson & Coulson, 2015). The problem remains in writing instruction as little Japanese writing takes place in the test-driven secondary school system, meaning that students' first exposure to academic writing occurs frequently in university English classes (Mulvey, 2016).

Considering CLIL's wider role in students' lives, Coyle et al. (2010) noted CLIL not only prepares them for EMI, but also future working life. Despite a paucity of literature connecting CLIL to real life world contexts, Mehisto et al. (2008) believed that CLIL provides the necessary social skills for an ever-changing society.

One major issue in CLIL is the students' L1 use in L2 instruction, termed as "translanguaging", meaning "the adoption of bilingual supportive scaffolding practices" (Doiz et al., 2013, p. 213). For lower proficiency learners, it serves as "confirming important information" (Ohmori, 2014, p.45) and utilizes their linguistic "repertoires" (Creese & Blackledge, 2015, p. 22) essential on tasks. As Dinh (2023) reported, teachers attending to content and language needs through translanguaging increased student and teacher agency and engagement. Lasagabaster (2013) positioned translanguaging in CLIL as essential bilingual training for real world contexts. In practical terms, as proficiency levels vary in classrooms, it helps mediate and negotiate meaning on tasks (Martin-Beltran et al., 2017). Cross (2016) noted how teachers make sophisticated micro-sequential decisions on language choice so students can concentrate on content. One concern is how student "guilt" (Setati et al., 2002, p. 147) towards the L1 impacts L2 instruction, implying translanguaging is not natural for Japanese students (Ng et al., 2023). In fact, CLIL teachers too experience challenges in balancing content and language in instruction (Ó Ceallaigh et al., 2017; Mehisto, 2008).

Overall, research in CLIL highlights its benefits of authentic communication, promoting linguistic diversity and preparing for intercultural communication (Nawrot-Lis, 2019). However, more research is needed to show other opportunities and shortcomings of CLIL in specific teaching contexts.

3. Methodology

The methodological approach adopted for this study is collaborative autoethnography (CAE) (Chang et al., 2013), meaning the joint narrativization of experiences and beliefs. In contrast to solo narratives focusing on one subject's narrative elicited by a researcher, CAE has dual aims of producing written narratives for analysis and engaging researcher-participants in a process of self development and community building (Ellis et al., 2011; Keleş, 2022). As participants within the narrativization process and outside of it as analysts of our own talk, our dual roles help construct and challenge a deeper understanding of ourselves. Directly pertinent to our own backgrounds as EAL and Anglophone scholars, Norris and Sawyer (2012, p. 9) describe how in CAE "researchers of difference juxtapose their life histories to provide multiple understandings of the world" (Norris & Sawyer, 2012, p. 9). The effect of this is potentially transformative as new meanings and rationales underpinning experiences and beliefs emerge (Breault, 2016).

For this study, we wrote our CAE on Google Drive allowing us to easily amend or expand upon our narratives so requiring no transcription. The CAE followed two research questions (RQ):

i   How is CLIL conceptualized and implemented in two classes at a prefectural Japanese university based on CLIL research?

ii   What limitations or opportunities do teachers face in teaching courses adopting the CLIL approach?

To address these two questions, four "frames" (Barkhuizen & Wette 2008, p. 373) were chosen to guide our CAE. These are prompts to stimulate our narratives. For RQ i, the following frames were chosen:

Frame 1: Concepts adopted from CLIL research

Frame 2: Implementation of our two classes based on CLIL research

For RQ ii, the following frames were chosen:

Frame 3: Limitations in adopting the CLIL approach

Frame 4: Opportunities in teaching courses adopting a CLIL approach

Over two months (April to June, 2023), our reflections were written according to these four frames, after which responses were jointly analyzed. Important in this data analysis was identification of "macro reviews" (MR) (Chang, et al. 2013, p. 103), the naturally-occurring sub-themes within a frame. This entailed noting the nature of the sub-theme using the comment function to annotate text, called "memoing" (Strauss & Corbin, 2008, p. 117). An example of this interpretive process is in figure 1 where Patrick's CAE appeared in italics and John's in normal script. The resultant MR was written as an anonymized memoing comment in the right of the Google Drive screen, seen below:

Figure 1: CAE and memoing identifying a MR

Findings from the data analysis are summarized and discussed in the following section.

4. Findings & Discussion

The findings will be presented following the two research questions and four frames. Each extract represents a MR (theme) within each frame. We turn to the first research question: *How is CLIL conceptualized and implemented in two classes at a prefectural Japanese university based on CLIL research?* The first frame used to address this question explored the concepts adopted from CLIL research.

This frame elicited five key themes, the first being our initial influences on our CLIL practices:

Extract 1: Initial influences on CLIL practices

Patrick: *CLIL is a competence-based approach in which an additional language is used for learning both content and language (Coyle et al, 2010). The four main principles -*

cognition, community, content and communication - were the entry point in my CLIL teaching.

John: *I was familiar with it myself so I took my old content-related materials from when I prepared students on pre-sessional courses.*

Patrick: *My syllabus serves as a content-focused bridge to EMI at the university. Specifically, we hope to raise students' awareness about cross-cultural and East Asian studies.*

John: *Fundamentally, my CLIL class is also like a bridge for students into EMI.*

In extract 1, John was clearly more cognizant with CLIL from his previous working experiences, in contrast to Patrick who was becoming familiar with the basic concepts and principles from Coyle et al. (2010). For Patrick, this meant the creation of new materials integrating content and language, whilst John could recycle old pre-sessional materials and was aware of CLIL's role and positioning on the curriculum. Both saw CLIL as a "bridge" into EMI.

In extract 2, John and Patrick touched upon scaffolding.

Extract 2: Scaffolding and customizing content in CLIL

John: *The CLIL concepts impacting my thoughts include 'scaffolding' content input. I simplify authentic readings which are too difficult for 1st graders.*

Patrick: *Initially I had too high an expectation of students, forgetting they are learning English as a foreign language. The concept of 'scaffolding' that I gathered from my reading of CLIL reminded me that I should customize content more by building on students' existing knowledge.*

This exchange illustrates the importance of Ball et al.'s (2015) advice to scaffold language and also content (Fujimoto-Adamson & Adamson, 2015). Patrick's initial over-expectation of his students' language proficiency and subsequent shift towards customizing content also illustrate an awareness of the dangers of student disengagement with lessons if pitched too high (Lasagabaster, 2011).

Extract 3 was initiated by Patrick who addressed the content of his CLIL syllabus.

Extract 3: Connecting CLIL to real life world contexts

Patrick: *My cousin worked for the World Trade Organisation and has knowledge of economics and social sciences. Students will do well if they have a bit of training in social sciences.*

Here we note how Patrick sought to prepare his students not just for EMI demands, but those of the future workplace. This suggests that the close discipline-specific focus of materials should also consider wider student needs at the post-tertiary stage (Coyle et al., 2010; Mehisto et al., 2008). It also acts to problematize issues of authenticity (Pinner, 2013) and relevance (Edsall & Saito, 2012) as concepts connected purely to tertiary-level discipline-specific needs (Wingate & Hakim, 2022).

In extract 4, a major issue of L1 use in translanguaging was raised by John.

Extract 4: Translanguaging and bilingual competence

John: *Using the students' L1 builds a bilingual competence often required in real life/work. A monolingual approach in English-only classes bans this repertoire, especially if students need to discuss tasks or translate parts of Japanese texts in a project or essay.*

Patrick: *It is unrealistic to expect students to be able to discuss content knowledge only in English.*

This exchange reveals both value the role of the L1 in L2 instruction with John referring to the bilingual training potential inherent in CLIL (Lasagabaster, 2013) and, as with Patrick's comments in extract 3, justifying translanguaging with meeting future professional needs (Mehisto et al., 2008). The use of strategic translation as a means to exercise student "repertoires" (Creese & Blackledge, 2015, p. 22), in contrast to secondary school grammar-translation, is also of note here.

Extract 5 addressed the frequently mentioned concept of cognition in the CAE.

Extract 5: Cognition in CLIL

Patrick: *One selling point was developing higher cognitive skills. I felt CLIL would help my higher-level students to develop these skills.*

John: *This resonates with me as I shift from an over-focus on language accuracy. It's tough though as these higher cognitive skills are not practiced much at high school.*

Patrick: *I told my students not to focus on passing standard English tests but to think about issues deeply and communicate ideas clearly.*

John: *Mulvey (2016) said this step into using English beyond just exam preparation requires them to write a logical, evidence-based essay not taught at high school.*

In this section of the CAE, both of us agreed on the necessity to challenge students with higher cognitive skills development (Bentley, 2010; Van de Craen et al., 2007), rather than an "over-focus" on language accuracy for test taking as emphasized in secondary schools. John noted the difficulty of this move from language to cognitive skills as Mulvey (2016) reported on its absence on the Japanese secondary school curriculum.

The second frame for research question i elicited exchanges on the practical implementation of CLIL with two themes emerging.

Extract 6 below took up the issue of movement along the CLIL continuum.

Extract 6: From soft into a hard CLIL in the 2nd semester

Patrick: *I adopt a "hard" CLIL (Bentley, 2010) approach in the semester II class to emphasize content knowledge of culture..*

John: *I agree with the hard CLIL approach, however, I need to slip back regularly to a 'focus on form'.*

As our CLIL classes take place in the second semester of the first year, both concurred on the greater stress on the content of the class in contrast to the first semester courses which focused much more on general academic language. John noted, however, the need to move back to the more language focus on the continuum even in the second semester to create a "counterbalanced" approach (Lyster & Mori, 2008, p. 134) when content comprehension became difficult.

The next extract 7 referred to the themes included on the syllabus.

Extract 7: Thematic interrelatedness

Patrick: *My interrelated readings and materials were from an online intercultural course that I enrolled in on American concepts and principles of intercultural communication. An*

economics professor assured me that students already have lots of content knowledge and really need knowledge of other social sciences.

John: *My self-made syllabus has themes connected over more than one lesson, not 'one shot' themes as in EFL textbooks.*

Here Patrick indicated how his content themes were related to intercultural communication (Nawrot-Lis, 2019) and confirmed his beliefs expressed earlier in extract 3 that students need exposure to social science themes. This was justified by an economics professor in his faculty. Again, this reinforced his stance of moving away from strong discipline-specific content (Wingate & Hakin, 2022) and appeared to counter the necessity to create a specialized EAP syllabus for CLIL as advocated by Galloway and Rose (2021). John's syllabus design stressed the interrelated nature of themes to recycle content vocabulary, in contrast to typical textbooks with standalone themes.

Research question ii asked: *What limitations or opportunities do teachers face in teaching courses adopting the CLIL approach?* CAE data was elicited with two frames, the first of which addressed the limitations in the CLIL approach.

The first theme in extract 8 looked at the balance between content and language.

Extract 8: Finding a balance between content and language

John: *The balance changes as I sometimes integrate more content than language, and vice versa.*

Patrick: *I find it a challenge to find this balance as it requires planning and suitable materials to match student learning needs and expectations.*

Both teachers admitted to changes in the balance and encountering some difficulties, confirming the necessity to shift along the continuum by Ball et al. (2015), Lo (2020) and Met (2009) and the difficulties inherent in finding the balance between content and language (Ó Ceallaigh et al., 2017 and Mehisto, 2008).

Extract 9 raised the issue of language proficiency and standard tests.

Extract 9: Students' proficiency in CLIL and standard tests

Patrick: *I worry that students cannot appreciate the activity due to their handicap in English. Perhaps, students should attain a certain standard test threshold of English language proficiency.*

John: *I measure student proficiency on the IELTS test in academic writing. Without that gauge, I feel lost in assessing student progress.*

In this theme Patrick raised the issue of a threshold level of L2 ability (Ball et al., 2015) to cope with CLIL content. In contrast, John wished to make a standard test (IELTS) a measure of language proficiency attainment in academic writing, illustrating a slight sense of "disjuncture" (Mehisto, 2008, p. 93) without it to gauge language development.

In extract 10 the issue of teacher development was raised.

Extract 10: Lack of teacher development for CLIL in the Japanese context

Patrick: *No workshops or training were provided for teachers to stimulate enquiry, reflect, and evaluate their CLIL teaching.*

John: *We have information about course aims but how we interpret them is really left to us individually.*

In this exchange Patrick bemoaned the absence of teacher development opportunities for CLIL teachers which confirms the difficulties that teachers face when their training does not prepare them for CLIL (Galloway & Rose 2021) and implies some "disjuncture" (Mehisto, 2008, p. 93). John's comments pointed to a lack of orientation in how to "interpret" broad course aims.

Extract 11 investigated the theme of collaboration with content faculty for CLIL syllabus design.

Extract 11: Interdisciplinary communication between English and content faculty

John: *The interdisciplinary relationship with content teachers is at times hit and miss so I avoid over-reliance on content teachers' syllabi. A more general academic base in my materials is sufficient.*

In this extract, despite the calls for interdisciplinary syllabus design (Gibbons et al., 1994), John referred to the "hit and miss" relationship with content teachers. This highlighted the problematic hierarchical standing of English teachers compared to content faculty (Lo, 2020) and the difficulty to achieve "horizontal alignment" (Turner, 2012, p. 24). His rationale for avoiding a close discipline-specific CLIL syllabus contrasted with Patrick's reasons for content to cover social science and intercultural themes expressed in extracts 3 and 7.

The final frame elicited CAE exchanges on the opportunities we felt CLIL could bring. Extract 12 raised the issue of knowledge transfer and identity.

Extract 12: Knowledge transfer and identity

Patrick: *Providing input, I tapped into my multicultural identity as a Singaporean. In this sense, I leveraged on my knowledge of linguistics and linguacultural skills beneficial to my students.*

John: *CLIL has the capacity to create a sense of 'agency' among students whilst raising their awareness of their own Japanese identity. As an Anglophone speaker, I can't use myself as a model.*

Patrick: *Once I arranged an exchange class with international students where our students practiced English and acquired intercultural skills.*

John: *One student applied content from CLIL classes in EMI. That was unexpected.*

This extract is of some interest as Patrick's unique teaching experiences and identity as a multilingual teacher of English (Ng et al., 2023) were felt to position him more as a model to Japanese students than John as an Anglophone speaker. This aspect of teacher identity impacting the move into CLIL remains somewhat unresearched. What is highlighted, however, is that, despite these differences, both teachers brought valuable experiences into their CLIL practices, Patrick through his non-Anglophone status and his awareness of exposing students to multicultural exchanges as advocated by Sasajima (2013). John's final comment of how students transferred content knowledge from CLIL over to content classes (Adamson & Coulson, 2015) contradicted Ottewill and Drew's findings (2003).

The final theme addressing opportunities turned to group collaboration and autonomy.

Extract 13: Group collaboration and autonomy

> Patrick: *One advantage is the opportunity for group collaboration.*
>
> John: *Group work is fertile ground to explore content knowledge acquired from their L1 and L2 knowledge base. Autonomy becomes a key strategy which repositions the teacher as a facilitator and students determine their own learning goals.*

Patrick initiated this theme by stressing the benefits that CLIL brings to the class through group collaboration (Bentley, 2010). John concurred by noting how healthy group interaction should embrace content knowledge from both L1 and L2 sources (Martin-Beltran et al., 2017). Of final note, he saw group work as a means to exercise student autonomy and to reposition the teacher more as a "facilitator" in the lesson, rather as the source of all knowledge. As Cross (2016) advocated, this allowed students to take the lead in content knowledge construction.

5. Conclusions and Implications

We turn now to our conclusions and summarize our findings according to the two research questions. The first question was: *How is CLIL conceptualized and implemented in two classes at a prefectural Japanese university based on CLIL research?*

The first frame for this question addressed the concepts adopted from CLIL research and revealed that both Patrick and John saw CLIL as more than "bridge" into discipline-specific EMI, but also prepare students for transition into real-world after university. Both scaffolded CLIL lessons linguistically according to student proficiency levels, but John drew attention to the necessity to also scaffold content brought into the lesson by simplifying texts. Patrick noted the importance of cultural and social sciences-related materials rather than tightly tailoring content directly to the students' content field. Both felt that translanguaging was a pragmatic means to conduct lessons, especially in John's case for lower proficiency students. For Patrick's higher proficiency CLIL students, he saw an opportunity to expose them to higher cognitive skills development with John concurring, yet noting the difficulties of taking such steps due to the absence of such skills practice at Japanese secondary school.

Frame two exploring the pedagogical implementation practiced drew upon the analogy of a CLIL continuum from a mostly content focus to a language focus. Patrick and John agreed on the necessity to move towards more of a content focus in the second semester, but John highlighted

the flexibility needed to refocus on form when student comprehension was lacking. In terms of content themes for their syllabi, Patrick stressed the integration of cultural and social sciences themes to prepare students for post-university life, whilst John placed more importance on the thematic interrelatedness over the semester so that students could recycle language.

The second research question asked: *What limitations or opportunities do teachers face in teaching courses adopting the CLIL approach?*

Responses to frame three concerned the limitations in adopting the CLIL approach and showed both teachers felt the balance between content and language difficult to strike at times. Patrick thought a language threshold was needed before entry to CLIL and both noted the importance of measuring student language development according to standard test criteria. Patrick with previously less experience of CLIL than John perceived a lack of teacher development for CLIL, whilst John with more experience from previous pre-sessional work in EAP emphasized the hierarchical issues inherent in interdisciplinary collaboration with content teachers.

The final fourth frame covered the opportunities in adopting a CLIL approach. Patrick noted his own Singaporean identity as an English as an Additional Language speaker acted as a potential model for Japanese students, a point which John as an Anglophone speaker saw as a possible deficiency in his own status in the classroom. John pointed to the transfer of knowledge not only from content into the CLIL class, but, interestingly, from content acquired in the CLIL class back into other content classes. Of final note by both teachers was the potential CLIL classes held for healthy group collaboration and autonomy development which shifted the teacher's position in the class to more of a facilitator.

6. Implications

Implications from this small-scale study may not be generalizable but nevertheless resonant with other CLIL teachers. Key in our findings was the flexibility of shifting along a CLIL continuum (Ball et al., 2015; Lo, 2020; Met, 2009). Secondly, "scaffolding language" (Ball et al., 2015, p. 38) could also extend to simplifying content materials for lower proficiency learners which may alleviate difficulties in balancing content and language balance (Ó Ceallaigh et al., 2017; Mehisto, 2008). The role of the students' L1, Japanese, is a contentious issue but viewed by us as key to improving student agency. Further, interdisciplinary collaboration on CLIL syllabus design highlights hierarchical imbalances between language and content faculty, which may lead

to reticence to collaborate. Of some note is the CLIL teacher's own linguistic background as our findings illustrated that Anglophone speaker status may not be the best model for Japanese students. Finally, the methodology of CAE is potentially transferable over to other institutions where CLIL teachers seek to not only gather data, but explore more deeply, and possibly, transform beliefs and practices.

References

Adamson, J. L. & Coulson, D. (2015). Translanguaging in English academic writing preparation. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning 10*(1), 24-37. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/22040552.2015.1084674

Ball, P., Kelly, K., & Clegg, J. (2015). *Putting CLIL into Practice.* Oxford University Press.

Barkhuizen, G., & Wette, R. (2008). Narrative frames for investigating the experience of language teachers. *System, 36*(3). 372–387. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2008.02.002

Bentley, K. (2010). *The TKT Course: CLIL Module.* Cambridge University Press

Breault, R. A. (2016). Emerging issues in duoethnography. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 29*(6). 777–794. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2016.1162866

Brown, H. & Adamson, J.L. (2014). Localizing EAP in Light of the Rise of English-Medium Instruction at Japanese Universities. *OnCue Journal, 6*(3), 5-20. http://jaltcue.org/files/OnCUE/OCJ6.3/OCJ6.3_pp5-20_FA_Brown_Adamson.pdf

Chang, H., Ngunjiri, F. W., & Hernandez, K.-A. C. (2013). *Collaborative autoethnography*. Left Coast Press Inc.

Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). CLIL: Content and language integrated learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Creese, A. & Blackledge, A. (2015). Translanguaging and Identity in Educational Settings. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 35,* 20-35.

Cross, R. (2016). Language and content 'integration': the affordances of additional languages as a tool within a single curriculum space, *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 48*(3), 388-408. DOI: 10.1080/00220272.2015.1125528

Dinh, H. (2023). Teacher-Generated Instructional Materials for Integrating Content and Language Learning: Actualizing the Translanguaging for English Language Learners. In K. Raza, D. Reynolds & C. Coombe (Eds.), *Handbook of Multilingual TESOL in Practice* (pp. 1323-341), Springer Nature Singapore.

Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2013). Future challenges for English-medium instruction at the tertiary level. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities* (pp. 2213–2221). Multilingual Matters.

Edsall, D. & Saito, Y. (2012). The Motivational benefits of Content. *OnCue Journal, 6*(2), 66-94. (JALT College and University Educators SIG Journal). https://jaltcue.org/files/OnCUE/OCJ6.2/OCJ6.2_pp66-94_Edsall%26Saito.pdf

Ellis, C. S., Adams. T. E., & Bochner. A. P. (2011). Autoethnography: An overview. *Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 12*(1). 273–290. http://nbn-resolving.de/urn

Fujimoto-Adamson, N. & Adamson, J.L. (2015). Teaching Your Research Area: Exploring issues using English as a Medium of Instruction in a Japanese Context. Plenary at *The English Scholars Beyond Borders 3rd Convention*, Dokuz Eylül University School of Education, Izmir, Turkey. December 4th, 2015.

Galloway, N. & Rose, H. (2021) English medium instruction and the English language practitioner. *ELT Journal, 75*(1), 33-41. doi: 10.1093/elt/ccaa063

Gibbons, M. Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P. & Trow, M. (1994). *The new production of knowledge: the dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies.* Sage.

Goodman, B. A. (2014). Implementing English as a Medium of Instruction in a Ukrainian University: Challenges, Adjustments, and Opportunities. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning, 9*(2), 130-141. DOI:10.1080/18334105.2014.11082026

Keleş, U. (2022). Autoethnography as a recent methodology in applied linguistics: A methodological review. *The Qualitative Report, 27*(2). 448–474. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2022.5131

Lasagabaster, D. (2011). English achievement and student motivation in CLIL and EFL settings. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 5,* 3-18.

Lasagabaster, D. & Doiz, A. (2016). CLIL students' perceptions of their language learning process: delving into self-perceived improvement and instructional preferences. *Language Awareness, 25*(1-2), 110-126. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2015.1122019

Lo, Y. Y. (2020). *Professional Development of CLIL Teachers.* Springer Singapore.

Lyster, R., & Mori, H. (2008). Instructional counterbalance in immersion pedagogy. In R. Fortune & D. Tedick (Eds.), *Pathways to bilingualism and multilingualism: Evolving perspectives on immersion education* (pp. 133-151). Multilingual Matters.

Martin-Beltran, M., Guzman, N.L. & Chen, P-J. J. (2017). 'Let's think about it together': how teachers differentiate discourse to mediate collaboration among linguistically diverse students. *Language Awareness, 26*(1). 41-58. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2016.1278221

Mehisto, P. (2008). CLIL Counterweights: Recognising and decreasing disjuncture in CLIL. *International CLIL Research Journal, 1*(1), 93-119.

Mehisto, P., Marsh, D., & Frigols M.. J. (2008): *Uncovering CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning in Bilingual and Multilingual Education.* Oxford: Macmillan.

Met, M. (2009). Content-Based Instruction: Defining Terms, Making Decisions. *NFLC Reports.* http://www.carla.umn.edu/cobaltt/modules/principles/decisions.html

Mulvey, B. (2016). Writing Instruction: What is Being Taught in Japanese High Schools, Why, and Why It Matters. *The Language Teacher, 40*(3), 3- 8.

Ng, P. C. L., Matikainen, T., & Glasgow, G. P. (2023). Multilingualism in Global Englishes Language Teaching: Narrative Insights from Three TESOL Practitioners in Japan. In K. Raza, D. Reynolds & C. Coombe (Eds.), *Handbook of Multilingual TESOL in Practice* (pp. 147-161), Springer Nature Singapore.

Navrot-Lis, B. (2019). *The Challenges of Content Acquisition in a CLIL Course.* Springer Nature.

Norris, J. & Sawyer. R. D. (2012). Toward a dialogic methodology. In J. Norris, R. D. Sawyer, & D. Lund (eds.), *Duoethnography: Dialogic methods for social, health, and educational research*, (pp. 9–39). Left Coast Press.

Ó Ceallaigh, T. J., Mhurchú, S. N., & Chróinín, D. N. (2017). Balancing content and language in CLIL: The experiences of teachers and learners. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education, 5*(1), 58 - 86. https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.5.1.03oce

Ohmori, A. (2014). Exploring the Potential of CLIL in English Language Teaching in Japanese Universities : An Innovation for the Development of Effective Teaching and Global Awareness. *The Journal of Rikkyo University Language Center*（立教大学ランゲージセンター紀要）*32*, 39-51.

Ottewill, R. & Drew, F. (2003). It's good to talk: Reflections on the Relationship between Language and Non-Language Learning. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 4*(2), 181-192. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787403004002006

Pinner, R. (2102). Unlocking literature through CLIL: Authentic materials and tasks to promote cultural and historical understanding. In Izumi, Shinichi, Makoto Ikeda, and Yoshinori Watanabe. (Eds.). (2012). *CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) – New Challenges in Foreign Language Education at Sophia University – Volume 2: Practices and Applications.* (pp. 91-129). Sophia University Press.

Saito, H. (2020). Gearing Teaching and Assessment Towards CLIL: Theorizing Assessment *for* Learning in the Junior High School Soft CLIL Classrooms in Japan. In M. deBoer & D. Leontjev (Eds.) *Assessment and Learning in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) Classrooms.* Springer, Cham.

Sasajima, S. (2013) How CLIL can impact on EFL teachers' mindsets about teaching and learning: An exploratory study on teacher cognition. *International CLIL Research Journal* 2 (1), 55-66.

Setati, M., Adler, J., Reed, Y., & Bapoo, A. (2002). Incomplete journeys: Code-switching and other language practices in mathematics, science and English language classrooms in South Africa. *Language and Education, 16*, 128-149.

Stigger, E. (2018). Introduction: Internationalization in Higher Education. In E. Stigger, M. Wang, D. Laurence & A. Bordilovskaya. *Internationalization within Higher Education. Perspectives from Japan.* (pp. 1- 19). Springer.

Strauss, A. L. & Corbin, J.K. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory.* Sage.

Turner, J. (2012). Academic literacies: Providing a space for the socio-political dynamics of EAP. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 11,* 17-25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2011.11.007

Van de Craen, P., Ceuleers, E., & Mondt, K. (2007). Cognitive development and bilingualism in primary schools: Teaching maths in a CLIL environment. In D. Marsh & D. Wolff (Eds.), *Diverse contexts – converging goals: CLIL in Europe* (pp. 185-200). Peter Lang.

Wingate, U., & Hakim, A. (2022). Moving beyond 'infancy': towards a cross-fertilization between EMI and EAP scholarship. *ELT Journal, 76*(4), 529-537. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccac032