

## Teachers Talking About CLIL Pedagogy: Transforming Teacher Practices Through Collaborative Autoethnography

John Adamson, Julia Christmas<sup>1</sup> and Li-hsin Tu  
*University of Niigata Prefecture, Japan*

### ABSTRACT

*This collaborative autoethnographic (CAE) study has investigated how three tertiary-level teachers of an English language lecture preparation course in a Japanese university engaged with each other over a two-year period from 2020 to 2022 regarding their approaches to the adoption of a Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) approach to syllabus design and teaching. With two new teachers based in a newly established department and the other teacher in a more established department, insights were gained through the unfolding online CAE and face-to-face discourse into their respective thoughts and motivations underpinning their pedagogical philosophies and interpretations of the CLIL approach to meet their departmental and students' requirements. Key findings revealed that teacher backgrounds and experience with CLIL, as well as institutional shifts in curriculum aims, have all directly and indirectly shaped current course design and pedagogy and revealed similarities and differences in interpretations of CLIL over time. Of significance is how the CAE itself emerged as a vital community-building forum for the teachers themselves and acted as a site for varying levels of transformation in their pedagogical practices.*

**KEYWORDS:** CAE, CLIL, transformation, pedagogy, tertiary.

---

In this study in a Japanese university undergraduate program, we explored the use of collaborative autoethnography (hereafter CAE; Chang et al., 2013) in teacher-to-teacher talk about our pedagogical practices in a content and language-integrated learning (CLIL) English lecture course. Our primary objective was to investigate the effectiveness of the CAE research methodology to develop our own teaching pedagogies. Underlying this objective, we considered how we, as teachers of varying experiences in CLIL, engaged with each other when teaching the same English lecture course. The focus here was both epistemological and pedagogical, representing for us a natural dual inquiry into how we interacted and transformed our teaching practices. As CLIL and its related concept of English medium instruction (EMI) are spreading in popularity, we argue that the pedagogies supporting CLIL and EMI remain open to the ongoing investigation to make improvements possible in local contexts. For this purpose, the CAE research method requires reflection as to its effectiveness to engage teachers in discussions of pedagogy.

This study will first outline its educational context and the backgrounds of the participants. We then move to the review of literature surrounding CAE, EMI, and CLIL before outlining our research questions. Our CAE methodology is explained before presenting our findings and discussion of CAE data alongside artifacts of classroom materials and methods. Conclusions and

---

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding Author: Associate Professor in TESOL at University of Niigata Prefecture, Niigata, Japan.  
E-Mail: [jchristm@unii.ac.jp](mailto:jchristm@unii.ac.jp)

implications regarding the use of CAE in developing CLIL instruction in our particular case will then be finally drawn.

### **Context and Participants**

Our regional university was established in 2009 and immediately adopted EMI for some content classes and CLIL on the English language program as a bridge for students wishing to undertake EMI. English lessons integrate content from the students' disciplinary studies in international studies and regional development, and international economics. The research was conducted on preparing students and content faculty for EMI (Brown & Adamson, 2012; Brown & Iyobe, 2014) and investigated the teaching/learning in CLIL classes for 1st year students (Adamson & Coulson, 2015; Adamson et al., 2019) and more recently 4th year graduation supervision (Adamson & Fujimoto-Adamson, 2021).

The most recent opening of a new field of study, international economics, in 2021 meant that new English language faculty were hired to teach CLIL classes just as in 2009 when English language faculty first started to prepare students for international studies and regional development. The new English teachers were tasked in 2021 with teaching CLIL classes and collaborated with other English instructors about practical teaching issues. This study focuses on the first year compulsory English 'lecture' preparation class to equip students with the academic and language skills for EMI classes in the well-established international studies and regional development and the newer international economics programs. Both lecture courses are geared towards English, critical thinking, and collaborative skills necessary in typical content lectures.

Three English faculty members have been engaged in this study since 2021 to explore and develop our CLIL lecture class practices. There is a stress on how we as teacher-researchers need to not simply focus on what we teach but to reflect on how we interact (Costley & Reilly, 2021) when developing our pedagogies. In our case, the “transformative” and less structured, collaborative nature of CAE (Breault, 2016, p. 778), as opposed to solo narratives, interviews, or surveys, was agreed upon as a practical means for our interactions. Furthermore, as Roy and Uekusa (2020) noted, CAE in an online format, as adopted for this study, represents a convenient way to interact during the ongoing pandemic. Two of us have extensive experience in CLIL before and during our employment at the university and one is less experienced. The two international economic faculty members started in 2021 with the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, so meetings were held online and through email correspondence with one member from the international studies and regional development field.

### **Literature Review**

Our study has a dual purpose: an epistemological reflection of CAE and an investigation into CLIL pedagogies for a lecture preparation course at the Japanese undergraduate level. We turn firstly to the literature underpinning CAE and then move on to an overview of the interrelated studies into EMI and CLIL, particularly in the Japanese tertiary context.

### **Collaborative Autoethnography**

CAE is a research method employed over time among participants to jointly narrativize experiences in spoken or written form (Denzin, 2014), which can be analyzed as a text. Lapadat (2017, p. 597) defined it as a means “to describe their autobiographical, autoethnographic, polyphonic approach to writing, telling, interrogating, analyzing, and collaboratively performing

and writing up research on personal life challenges and on negotiating personal and professional identities.” It emerged from a variety of ethnographic terms, such as “duoethnography” (Breault, 2016, p. 777) with usually two participants jointly constructing their narratives. In an overview of autoethnographic work in applied linguistics, Keleş (2022a) noted how duoethnography places more emphasis on the dialogic nature of participant interaction, whilst CAE looks more at the collaborative, community-building aspects of narrativization. Both expressions though are anchored in the interpretivist, autoethnographic research tradition, which Bochner (2013) claimed, counters the prevailing influence of quantitative, positivistic research.

Delving into the autoethnographic origins of CAE, in narrating one’s own story, autoethnography helps researchers understand their own lives more deeply (Bochner & Ellis, 2006) and, as Adams and Manning (2015) noted, its process of reflection emphasizes particularity and personal experience. Additionally important, however, is the performative function that makes connections with and evokes responses from the audience (Holman et al., 2013). In a duo- or collaborative autoethnography, Norris and Sawyer (2012, p. 22) stressed that the potential for a transformative effect requires sensitivity on the part of the participants in that “one does not impose meanings on to the other, rather, one trusts in the nature of the storytelling process, recognizing that change will emerge as deemed relevant to the other.” Teaching combined with introspective research is said to be a transformational practice (Esposito & Smith, 2006; Razfar, 2011; Smiles & Short, 2006). Undertaking research in CAE requires a commitment to self-analysis and of co-researchers. In addition, an examination of how the topic of the investigation affects us can lead to a change in the way we teach, research, and how we see ourselves and colleagues as practitioners (Aberasturi-Apraiz et al., 2020), meaning that engaging in critically reflecting about oneself and others during a CAE can inherently be a transformational practice for each team member involved (Lavina & Lawson, 2019). However, Hickey and Austin (2007) also note that the more mundane, everyday lived experiences which do not show ostensible changes in behavior should not be overlooked when investigating teacher practices.

Considering the interactive process of CAE, Breault (2016) stated that participants’ lives and experiences require regular re-evaluation in co-constructed narratives. This means the traditional solo narrative is “disrupt[ed]” (p. 778) by collaborative narrativization to create richer, more reflective narratives compared to autoethnographic accounts. This entails collaboratively retelling the past and, importantly, challenging each other to reconceptualize it. To enhance this, Keleş (2022b) stressed the exchange of personal histories so that each narrative is better understood but necessitates trust between participants. Rinehart and Earl (2016) noted that ensuing texts from CAE are typically untidy and non-linear accounts of human subjectivity and emotion. Such exchanges, despite their messiness, represent research rigor as they avoid the bias of overly focusing on one person’s worldview in solo autoethnography (Chang, 2013). However, potential shortcomings arise if participants resist challenges and present their narratives as either “parallel talk” by telling their own story without interacting with others or as “theory confirmation” (Breault, 2016, p. 782) by positioning themselves as representative of a theory without justification.

The differing types and ways of telling one’s stories in auto- and collaborative autoethnographic work vary according to data type, time focus, and authorship (Chang et al., 2013). Personal memory or recollection focuses on the past and is self-authored; for example, “snapshot writings created by researchers from memory” (p. 74). Archival materials, again focusing on the past and self-authored or by others, from pictures, diaries, and videos stimulate recall of the past. Self-observation shifts time to the present in self-authored notes or accounts about the present. Additionally, self-reflections are self-authored accounts of the past and the present and are more “free form” in nature and “less factual and more interpretive” (p. 74). Self-analyses are self-authored accounts of the past and present but follow a strict, predetermined format. Finally,

interviews focus on the past and present about those not in the research team and are written by the interviewer.

Of final consideration, collaboration among participants differs, according to Chang et al. (2013), between collaboration that which is full and partial. The former involves all members producing data, analyzing it and then writing up the research report, whereas the latter entails permutations of engagement in different parts of the research; for example, some participants may only be involved in the narrativization process, whilst others take the lead in analyzing and writing up other parts of the study. Important to whatever type of collaboration is agreement among members as to how they wish to or can contribute.

Such diverse approaches to auto- and collaborative research into educational issues can be seen in Sardabi et al. (2020), who highlighted how it could be of benefit to learning and teaching perspectives in the field of TESOL. Further recent work by Yazan et al. (2020) into the marginalization of practitioners in non-center English teaching contexts uses CAE effectively to reveal issues of identity in the profession. Interestingly, with this increased interest in autoethnography, there are calls for more methodological guidance as to how it can be conducted (Cooper & Lilyea, 2022).

## **EMI and CLIL**

The global shift towards EMI has gained increasing attention in wider Asian contexts (Kirkpatrick, 2014; Phan, 2013) and, more recently, in the Japanese tertiary context (Stigger, 2018). Several government-initiated moves to globalize Japanese universities in 2008, 2012, and 2014 projects aimed to create a workforce capable of communicating in their field globally, so universities must prepare students for such demands (Stigger, 2018). In reality, only elite universities received government funding for these projects and lower-ranking universities followed their lead to attract both domestic and international students and boost their international ranking (Kirkpatrick, 2014). Other reasons for EMI ‘at home’ in Japan are high costs of overseas study (Burgess, 2014) and reticence among the dwindling number of younger Japanese for long-term study abroad programs (Imoto, 2013).

The spread of EMI in Japan has not been consistent or government-guided, meaning universities frequently tailor-make their own EMI programs. According to Bradford (2016), only 30% of all Japanese universities offer some form of EMI, and significantly only 5% of undergraduate students (mostly Japanese, not foreign students) actually enrolled in any EMI classes (Brown & Iyobe, 2014). Takagi (2013) noted that government enthusiasm has not been matched by university faculty-level engagement. Particularly, in not only the Japanese case, but worldwide, the language needs of faculty and students are neglected the rush for universities to adopt EMI (Bamond Lozano & Strotmann, 2015).

The concept of CLIL is related to EMI and is influenced by tertiary content programs. With roots in European initiatives in the 1990s, like in Japan, to create a plurilingual workforce, CLIL programs aim to serve student linguistic needs for EMI (Mehisto et al., 2008). CLIL’s objectives are to integrate content relevant to students’ studies into language lessons, providing a real world, or authentic purpose (Coyle et al., 2010) and higher motivation in language learning (Pinner, 2012) compared to traditional language instruction. Methodologically, it adopts various ways of instruction and is effective when language and content faculty collaborate in course design (Ikeda, 2012, p. 12). CLIL has a broad range of styles ranging from mostly language-oriented lessons to those focusing on a more balanced content and language approach (Brinton et al., 1989) and, eventually, exclusively, on content instruction without attention to language issues (Met, 2009). For students whose competence in their content exceeds their language proficiency, this brings

motivational benefits (Edsall & Saito, 2012) but risks confusion among teachers and students if course foci or assessment are unclear (Mehisto, 2008). EMI and CLIL classes were reported as cognitively beneficial for students through engagement with familiar content (Lamfuß-Schenk, 2002). However, resistance was frequently noted among teachers and students who argue for the acquisition of content first in a student's L1 before moving into EMI (Stohler, 2006).

In the Japanese context, some researchers saw a new potential for tertiary language education through the positive impact of EMI and CLIL on university curricula (Ohmori, 2014; Taguchi & Naganuma, 2006). This was verified in our own university in research by Brown and Adamson (2012) who advocated that academic English programs usually geared towards preparing students for the overseas study could be refocused to preparation for localized EMI delivery. In further studies at the same university (Adamson & Coulson, 2015; Adamson & Coulson, 2015; Adamson & Fujimoto-Adamson, 2021) CLIL preparation and EMI classes were effective when the students' L1 (Japanese) was employed in bilingual, translanguaging instructional practices, especially for lower proficiency students. This local evidence base concurs with similar calls by Lasagabaster (2013) and Merino and Lasagabaster (2015) in European CLIL bilingual instruction.

In summary, the literature on EMI and CLIL stresses the adaptation of pedagogy to suit local needs. Issues of student and faculty linguistic competence may lead to resistance to the use of English in content instruction but have been countered by claims of increased cognitive focus, relevance, and motivation. Finally, considering the multiple issues at play in teaching CLIL and EMI, it is unsurprising that newer teachers embarking on such teaching may wish to interact and collaborate with those more experienced in its delivery and research. Returning to the chosen methodology of CAE in this current study, Wilmes et al. (2018) highlight its efficacy for bringing together teachers and teacher-researchers with diverse levels of experience and perspectives and allowing the collaboration to effect change on each other. Moreover, Hilton and Hilton (2017) advocate that meaningful change will not occur unless teacher experience is accompanied by opportunities for critical observation and reflection from a variety of viewpoints. Thus, the learning opportunities ensuing from CAE can be argued as matching these criteria.

## Research Questions

In light of the contextual background of our institution and participants as teachers of varying experience, and in consideration of the review of the literature into CAE, EMI and CLIL, our research questions were as follows:

1. How has the CAE methodology enabled us to interact on issues of CLIL and CAE itself?
2. What differences and similarities in pedagogical practices emerge between participants of varying experiences in CLIL?
3. What transformations in practices have emerged as a result of the CAE?

Considering the nature of these three questions, Chang et al. (2013) advised researchers engaged in CAE to consider how ensuing narratives are constructed: by interpretation or narration, the former a type of evocative narrativization in which “character building through dialogues and descriptions in well-described settings” (Keleş, 2022a, p. 450) takes precedent; the latter, more traditional approach of narration, focuses more on how narratives relate to existing theories. Our styles of narrativizing may be seen through both lenses stylistically. Fundamentally, though, our purpose was twofold: the analysis of co-constructed narratives as text representing the product of our CAE; and also, of no lesser importance, the community-building process of the CAE to enhance

our development as English lecture teachers. This broadly aligned itself with Ellis et al. (2011), where “autoethnography is both process and product” (p. 273).

## Methodology

In the research methodology of this small-scale study, we stressed the importance of learning about our own particular practices in context rather than making generalizations. As CAE is, in principle, a qualitative approach yielding data from joint narrativization, it cannot be evaluated by standard concepts of generalizability, validity, and reliability (Ellis & Adams, 2014) as the dialogic dynamic depends on and is shaped by trust over time; in this sense, it cannot be easily replicated, if indeed that is necessary. It is, however, hoped that those in other CLIL teaching contexts find resonance in our epistemological approach and observations on CLIL practice.

Our data was elicited in two forms: firstly, that from CAE interaction online about our experiences teaching CLIL lecture courses and CAE methodology over 2021-22; secondly, from classroom materials, methods, and student work in the form of shared online artifacts and recollections of non-formal, everyday verbal interaction about their use and applicability for our lessons. This latter interaction can be regarded as casual everyday narrativization (Ochs & Capps, 2001), which took place face-to-face on campus. Although not as formally co-constructed in written form as the CAE on Google Drive, this more naturally occurring pedagogy-focused discourse nevertheless represented a valuable means to discuss the artifacts and involved rounds of questioning and probing each other about what materials and methods might be effective for the lecture classes (Ochs & Capps, 2001). As this discourse was not recorded or written, it is represented in this study through jointly constructed recollections between us. We then decided to refer to ourselves by pseudonyms to maintain some anonymity.

Considering the types of narratives gathered for our CAE (Chang et al., 2013), ours was a hybrid of archival materials since we drew upon lesson artifacts, in combination with self-observation as we teach solo lessons and write our weekly diaries of each lesson taught. Furthermore, there were elements of self-reflection and recollection within the CAE because we considered past and present experiences when discussing and writing about them in a free-form style.

## Data Analysis

CAE data were analyzed according to negotiated themes, or “narrative frames” (Barkhuizen & Wette, 2008, p. 373), to help convey our narrative accounts according to our 3 research questions investigating the CAE methodology, a comparison of our pedagogies, and how our pedagogical practices have been transformed. We opted to retain our names in presenting our data rather than pseudonyms. In addition to the retention of individual names, we were operating under the premise supported by Keleş (2022a) that the inclusion of lived experiences to encourage a better understanding of the participants in CAE offers a window for self-research and can allow the reader to make a cultural or emotional connection with the authors. Thus, we include background information intended to expose the roots of our transformations, as well as the end products. In addition, thought must be paid to the treatment of each member’s voice (Keleş, 2022a). For this paper, the overall use of the third person avoids the dominance of one author over others.

Within each frame, commonly emerging sub-themes were then identified about teaching and the research methodology, termed macro-reviews (Chang, et al., 2013), from frames 1-3. Teaching artifacts of materials, methods, and student work were analyzed by the selection of those best representing each participant's teaching approach for the class and were accompanied by

comments by themselves and other participants. Of importance to address our research question 3 was that possible pedagogical transformations were noted in the CAE and comments on teaching artifacts. People are “inclined to talk about events...heard...read about...experienced directly, and those they imagine” (Ochs & Capps, 2001, p.2). It is also within the context of this imagined transformation and how the CAE engendered visions of our future, better-teaching selves that our research is presented. Finally, the discussion of the findings is provided by situating key data within the institutional, national, and wider trends of CAE and EMI/CLIL, as well as our own personal career trajectories.

## **Findings and Discussion**

Our findings are presented according to the three research questions addressing the CAE methodology, a comparison of our teaching methodologies, and the transformations in our practices as a result of the CAE undertaken over 2021.

### **The CAE Methodology**

The first research question—How has the CAE methodology enabled us to interact on issues of CLIL and CAE itself?—elicited 3 macro-review sub-themes. The first emanated from the initially written exchange of our profiles about our past backgrounds in teaching and education in general, present experiences in teaching the lecture course and CLIL, and future aspirations for the course. This stage resulted in extensive narratives and comments as we familiarized ourselves with each other and was our first engagement with the CAE methodology. Extract 1 below showed how such exchanges unfolded in an asynchronous manner from April to May 2021, with Peter’s original narrative about his past studies followed by Alison and Lisa’s responses.

#### ***Extract 1: Peter’s Past***

*My 2 years in Germany were at a university where everything was in German, so studying content through German makes me aware of some of the challenges faced by our students when studying EMI. It made me aware of how the British school system didn’t prepare me linguistically for the demands of German medium instruction. (Peter, March 24th, 2021)*

*I feel as if I missed out on that as a pure ‘French’ language learner. (Alison, April 2nd, 2021)*

*This made me want to ask how foreign language instruction in the U.K. compares to typical EFL instruction in Asia. (Lisa, May 1st, 2021)*

Further examples pointed to the discoveries made in reading each other’s past histories and how similar experiences shaped our current thinking. This was evident in Lisa’s experiences in studying International Marketing in the U.S.A. and exchanges with Peter from a similar background in extract 2 below.



***Extract 2: Peter and Lisa's Exchange***

*That seems similar to my business admin background. Over the years, I have often thought about how I try to draw upon some of the things I learned in my business studies into my present work. (Peter)*

*For me, teaching has always felt like a form of marketing: you package a product according to the needs of the market and try to appeal to your customers. (Lisa)*

This proceeded similarly for exchanges about present experiences and future aspirations. After a while, we realized how the CAE formed a basis for further explorations of our practices, as Peter commented:

***Extract 3: CAE As a Means for Further Exploration***

*Our own narratives - interwoven between us over time - give us the opportunity to share experiences of teaching our courses (maybe also sharing materials), compare our approaches and reflect upon them to improve our practices over time. (Peter)*

Alison added a pedagogically transformative theme, seen later in research question 3: "I would like to add a theme here: How does our own teaching evolve during the year as a result of our CAE dialoguing?" This signaled a shift in our realization, as Ellis et al. (2011) proposed, that the process (the CAE) was intertwined with a product (pedagogical development).

The second macro review focused on the CAE itself, where a shift became evident in our exchanges. As Peter noted, "We share the view that the CAE methodology underpins the study to the extent where it could foreground our study." This meant that we started to discuss literature related to autoethnography within the CAE itself, as seen in extract 4 below:

***Extract 4: Peter's Comments on CAE***

*I've been reading about collaborative autoethnography and duoethnography from different fields. Using CAE to share and co-construct narratives is potentially incredibly transformative for participants and, interestingly, for readers. (Peter)*

Lisa responded to Peter in extract 5, reflecting the awareness-raising benefit inherent in the collaborative benefits of CAE for us as lecture teachers (Breault, 2016).

***Extract 5: Lisa's Response***

*Just want to comment that I appreciate this whole paragraph very much, especially the meta-ness of it. (Lisa)*

This feeling among us crystallized in a shared reading of Costley and Reilly (2021), who emphasized the importance of how researchers interact about doing research. In our case, this was reflected in how we rationalized and problematized CAE. The third macro review was seen in



Alison's narrative, seen in extract 6, in which she drew parallels between our own CAE and her new faculty meeting exchanges:

***Extract 6: Likening the CAE to a Faculty Meeting***

*[Professors] spoke of their experiences at other schools, in other sectors, and with students. I learned things about colleagues regarding the future directions of EMI courses in our department. The meeting itself was very much like our ongoing CAE. (Alison)*

Alison was struck by how her faculty meeting resembled our CAE exchanges, drawing upon experiences with EMI provision and the positioning of the lecture course within their curriculum. She also cited CAE literature (Anderson & Fourie, 2015) to reinforce the role of CAE in wider fields, especially in interdisciplinary faculty meetings:

***Extract 7: CAE's Wider Role***

*Researchers in a variety of disciplines have found this approach [CAE] valuable for exploring emotionally laden issues of importance to their fields. For a community like ours the approach affords an opportunity to study experiences of information in a manner intimately bound to the local contexts of those experiences (Anderson & Fourie, 2015 para. 5).*

The community-building aspect of Anderson and Fourie's (2015) work resonated with discussions among her own faculty, especially in transparency and recognizing the emotionally laden work introducing CLIL/EMI provision at the Japanese tertiary level. It also echoed Bochner and Ellis (2006) and Adams and Manning (2015) in the acceptance of the shared individual experiences as valid research and, in Alison's case, to determine educational policy.

**Comparing our Pedagogies**

The second research question compared our pedagogical practices—What differences and similarities in pedagogical practices emerge between participants of varying experiences in CLIL? In this frame, we bring into focus the individual voices narrating teaching observations, materials, and reflections, an analysis of which unveils similarities and differences in our beliefs and approaches and fundamentally shows we share the same values and goals in teaching the lecture course yet approach those syllabus goals from differing perspectives. At first glance, the three participants of this project come from very different backgrounds and experiences in teaching and research. The surrounding circumstance under the Covid-19 pandemic from 2020 added more variables to our individual narratives as we encountered the challenge of teaching remotely in Japan for the first time.

Peter initiated the first contact with Alison and Lisa with the purpose of comparing our teaching practices. With Alison teaching 47 students and Lisa 55 over one semester, Peter taught close to 100 over two semesters, facts that fundamentally impacted syllabus design and outcomes.

In our ongoing CAE and email exchanges over the first year (2020-2021), one macro-review emerged in that our pedagogical approaches and syllabus design were initially quite diverse between the two departments and within them. An example of this difference can be seen in extract 8 below, where Peter's class did not embrace group project work due to its large size. His beliefs

were that such work was best left to smaller classes where it could be easier to monitor; this contrasted with Lisa and Alison, who actively embraced group work, illustrating the diversity of pedagogical approaches inherent in CLIL instruction (Met, 2009).

***Extract 8: First Exchanges on Pedagogy***

*Group assignment time (with Edmodo project group members). Each group will host their own Zoom meeting. (Lisa)*

*This is how I manage my classes as well. It is something I normally do in face-to-face classes, and I think it was especially important for students to be able to connect and work (and co-construct) with each other during online learning. During online Zoom sessions, students were put in breakout rooms and completed group-based tasks on Google Slides. (Alison)*

*I don't have a group work component at the moment. I leave that to my smaller classes. (Peter)*

For Lisa, who was trained to provide sheltered instruction (Brinton et al., 1989) with the goal to adjust her pedagogy for ESL learners in mainstream education in the USA, group work was a task-based approach to provide student-centered instruction for learners of different proficiency levels and for ongoing assessment. Additionally, in the exchange from which extract 8 is found, she also noted that in her lecture class, she intentionally limited top-down lecturing to no more than half of the class time to provide enough time for students to work among their small groups and present discussion results with the whole class.

One further differing aspect of teaching methodology was the role of Japanese, the students' L1. While Alison and Lisa did not discuss translanguaging specifically in their narrative entries, Peter highlighted his practice of introducing the role of Japanese gradually to his classes as lower proficiency students had struggled with the challenges of a purely L2 content focus in CLIL instruction (Adamson & Coulson, 2015; Adamson et al., 2019; Adamson & Fujimoto-Adamson, 2021). In extract 9 below, he explained his rationale for this translanguaging approach:

***Extract 9: Translanguaging***

*I want them to start doing things before and after classes like watching YouTube videos and targeted readings to activate their schemata about the topics - that can be done in English or in Japanese videos and readings. That creates a soft CLIL and translanguaging aspect to learning/teaching. (Peter)*

This aligns itself with calls by Lasagabaster (2013) and Merino and Lasagabaster (2015) to activate students' L1 knowledge base in CLIL activities and combine it with L2 acquired knowledge. One other major macro-review was how we all sought to balance content and language instruction in CLIL work. This led to several exchanges on what should be the content for a class formally titled Lecture for Academic Skills assigned to students in their first semester in the university. Peter's approach in his department's lecture course design was to frame it as a means to support his department's content themes of economy, environment, culture and health. His weekly

lecture titles included multiculturalism, population growth, Japan's international NGO activities, the Amazon Rainforest, and so on. On the other hand, Alison interpreted the course as an introduction to the terminology and concepts of world economics. A sample of her weekly lecture titles includes "The Similarities and Differences of Developed vs. Developing World", "What is HDI (Human Development Index)?" and "Trade Liberalization & Globalization" with a final project discussing the merits and demerits of the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement (TPP). These themes overlap with several of those in Peter's syllabus. In Lisa's case, after teaching the first year using the shared syllabus with Alison, she decided to redesign the course after conversations with her department's economics teachers and according to observed student needs. Accordingly, she approached the content part of the section as stated in the course title: Academic Skills, namely the skills needed for the students to cope with their academic demands. This represented her efforts to align her syllabus more with local needs, which resonates with the findings reported by Brown and Adamson (2012) when devising an appropriate syllabus for Peter's department's English program. In the following extract 10, she wrote about this conversation and outlined why it had prompted her to rewrite the course syllabus.

***Extract 10: Lecture Content***

*From our conversation, it was clear that the economics professors do not expect the students to transfer the skills from this course to their economics courses taught in Japanese. This realization freed me from worrying too much about including hard economics content. Instead, I can focus on establishing what it means to be an "academic." (Lisa)*

Her departure from the original syllabus was discussed with her teaching partner, Alison who felt the revised syllabus was not "CLIL enough", that the content part of the course felt thin and the department might not have accepted it. In response, Lisa detailed her rationale for redesigning the syllabus based on her student output and on-going reflections. Alison's response and the following dialogue between the two teachers prompted further discussion on what CLIL should look like in practice in extract 11:

***Extract 11: Content in CLIL***

*I would like to know more about why a focus on developing learner autonomy, which would include reflective work on process, media literacy, critical thinking and discussion skills aimed to prepare students for university level work, is not considered content-based, especially for this course. (Lisa)*

*What I was worried about is that someone would ask us why our syllabi are not aligned in terms of content. The strength of your convictions also made me realize that I need to rethink my own philosophical stance and balance between straight economic content/language goals to make sure I consciously add a bit more scaffolding of the "critical skills" and content from your 15-week plan that orient our kids to college academics. (Alison)*

It is also worth noting that in contrast to Peter and Alison, CLIL was a new concept to Lisa, who was used to framing her pedagogy as SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol), more often associated with primary and secondary ESL instruction in the USA. In her narrative, there was not as much discussion on CLIL as a concept specifically and it showed less awareness about where content instruction ended and where language instruction began. However, the final acceptance by both participants to be less homogenous in syllabus design could be seen as the natural outcome of CAE's transformative effect which requires sensitive negotiation and the avoidance of an imposition of values (Norris & Sawyer, 2012). This contrasted with the exchange between Peter and Alison in Extract 13 below in which both had clearer understanding about the meaning of content and its interplay with language.

***Extract 12: Content vs. Language Focus***

*The lecture on the Milgram Experiment is a slightly complex idea. When I look at a CLIL continuum, then last week and this week's themes have shifted more towards content than language. (Peter)*

*I think my lecture class focuses much more on content than language... it may be that we are both focusing on language, just in different ways. (Alison)*

Reflecting upon the similarities and differences in our pedagogical approaches, our CAE has revealed clear divergences in the formative stages of syllabus design for Alison and Lisa which mirrored their relative experiences with CLIL. In contrast, there appeared to be more congruence between Alison and Peter in syllabus design. There is in this exchange among the participants some evidence of the tension between content and language focus when designing appropriate CLIL syllabi, as highlighted by Bamond Lozano and Strotmann (2015). These observed similarities and differences were a sign of healthy criticality typically inherent in CAE exchanges (Breault, 2016; Lapadat, 2017).

**Our Transformations in Practices**

We turn finally to the third research question: What transformations in practices have emerged as a result of the CAE? This frame inspired us to look at the transformations in our own practices focusing on from where our practices stem (our experiences, values, and beliefs as teachers), and in what directions each of our practices might evolve.

Lisa's and Alison's exchanges revealed transformation began just as they were hired. Although before the timeframe of the CAE itself, this shared history became relevant as they separately and collectively reflected on the lecture course during the CAE process. At the point of hire into a newly-founded department, Lisa and Alison were instructed by the administration that "Lecture should be team-taught ... so that you can work together to get it started. The goals and materials would be also shared by your future classes." Drawing on her experiences teaching CLIL/EMI, Alison quickly drafted syllabus goals for her less experienced colleague, Lisa. They negotiated amendments to suit the limits of their one semester course, fit their teaching styles, and match the required course goals. The first macro-review in extract 13 below in this third frame was the realization after the first class that initial syllabus plans for coordination would be difficult to achieve.

***Extract 13: After the First Coordinated Class***

*After several Zoom meetings with Lisa and understanding her struggles with the content due to her differing background, I began to feel uneasy about our ability to follow the syllabus and maintain purity of content between us. In practice, we are supposed to be teaching the same material. In reality, there has likely been more disparity than similarity due to the higher and lower level of students, our differing backgrounds, and differing approaches to the course. (Alison)*

Inner discord that leads to change can occur in CAE work (Aberasturi-Apraiz, et. al, 2020), seen in the uneasy feeling, above, that Alison experienced from her examination of the course, Lisa's situation, and gaps in their backgrounds visible during the CAE. This uneasiness arose from dissonance found during narrative investigation and the decision to take different approaches indicated an altered stance toward the shared course by both teachers during this collaborative process. Furthermore, there is also discord typically inherent in initial CLIL course design as one tries to balance content and language goals (Mehisto, 2008).

In addition to how collaboration prompted transformation, the next macro-review in extract 14 by Lisa illustrated how course goals appeared to shift after the semester had commenced. In this case, Lisa's initial CLIL focus moved from preparation for economics in English to EMI as taught by non-Japanese faculty. Again, this shift reflected understanding of the needs of local students (Brown and Adamson, 2012) and how CLIL syllabus design in preparation for EMI can move between a hard and soft-focus requiring flexibility on the part of the instructors.

***Extract 14: Further Reflections***

*Before the start of this semester, I also got the chance to talk with one of the professors in our department. It became clear to me that the skills we wish to nurture in this lecture course are not hard economic content, but mainly to prepare them for the EMI courses taught by us English teachers in a manner similar to how university courses are taught in North America or the UK. (Lisa)*

Alison noted this change in Lisa's reformed syllabus in extract 15 below, to which Lisa implied that such flexibility was perhaps required to succeed in academic life.

***Extract 15: Exchanges on a Reformed Syllabus***

*The way you have turned the syllabus inside out and refocusing on the skills rather than straight economic content is brilliant, especially for the lower proficiency students. I think you are giving them what they need. (Alison)  
In many ways I feel as if I am trying to find answers to the question 'What does it mean to be an academic and what does it take to thrive in a university setting?' (Lisa)*

These reflections exemplified the premise that during a project such as this, self-reflection as “process of grounding ourselves is infused with doubt and change” (Ochs & Capps, 2001 p. 290). Lisa and Alison's interactions created more awareness of their practices and uncertainties.

The co-reflection gradually steered the two colleagues toward an inner peace with regard to changes they had already made and fostered their ability to make further changes to their individual sections of the lecture class. It can be argued that they would have initiated some discussion with fellow faculty even without the CAE. However, it cannot be known with certainty that they would have made such concerted efforts to meet or meet so regularly to be ready for self-imposed CAE deadlines. Moreover, it is certain that without the CAE, neither Lisa nor Alison would have written or read each other's writings and later been able to reflect together on their contributions during lunchtime discussions or Zoom meetings. As Holman et al. (2013) predicted, CAE tasks prompted each of them to interact and reflect more. Alluding again to the tendency to talk about events real or imagined (Ochs & Capps, 2001), the following extract 16 illustrates the next macro-review showing how a CAE engendered possible future or imagined transformation concerning syllabus design over the course.

***Extract 16: Syllabus Flow and Assessment***

*Basically, there is a pattern throughout the year of lecture listening and note-taking, writing lecture summaries and reactions, related bilingual reading and videos through to a final report. The first semester stresses lecture skills and the second moves more into a content (CLIL) focus by keeping their work in one portfolio. (Peter)*

*This is also something that I want to make sure happens this semester. I am trying to decide how to best help students archive their work in one place. (Alison)*

Throughout the sharing of documents and artifacts, Alison identified teaching practices for colleagues and herself to include in her future teaching repertoire. In other words, CAE interaction influenced how one might or would like to transform one's practices in future teaching situations.

The following macro-review showed that when searching for change, there may be a tendency to think predominantly of large and dynamic transformations. Instead, Hickey and Austin (2007) exhorted us to look at our ordinary and mundane practices which give valuable insight into the identity of participants in this type of inquiry. One instance of this occurred with Peter who has been teaching the lecture course for over a decade. An exploration of his post-teaching notes in extract 17 below reveals much self-reflection in practical and gradual shifts in his classroom practices due to disruptions caused by the pandemic.

***Extract 17: Gradual Shifts in Practices***

*I'll be doing a mixture of synchronous and asynchronous teaching and trying to simplify significantly my syllabus planned originally for face-to-face teaching. Looking back at the huge amount of emails and online marking last year in lockdown, I am trying to avoid the extra work so it's back-to-basics so as not to crowd the syllabus with unnecessary tasks. Echoing Alison and Lisa's thoughts on the class as a social space, I am concerned though that I may lose that social cohesion and excitement of gathering once a week in class. (Peter)*

Peter's words here pointed to the usefulness of the CAE in helping him adapt to the altered teaching circumstances. Our combined discussion of his notes also indicated how collaborative ethnography creates a community, as Keleş (2022a) noted, that can raise awareness of incremental changes implemented by ourselves and others to handle differing circumstances or student needs. A thorough review of the CAE data exposed no dynamic transformations in Peter's teaching practices. Yet, the notes he wrote after one of our post-semester Zoom meetings reflected his personal situation, how he saw the CAE as a "mini community of practice" where written reflections spoke to his beliefs about the supportive and transformative nature of our shared CAE. In the final macro-review for this frame in extract 18 below, in discussing literature about collaborative autoethnography, Lisa and Peter reflected on how the CAE itself acted as a means to enable transformation.

***Extract 18: Writing the CAE***

*I've added some notes on autoethnography/CAE from The Handbook of Autoethnography. It's a really good read. The work by Ellis is particularly inspiring in how autoethnography is more than a method, but a way of life.*  
(Peter)

*When writing my section, I couldn't help feeling overwhelmed with the task to curate a warehouse full of raw, unorganized materials and construct a comprehensible narrative. I have to admit I felt a little lost. Should my writing be introspective or communicative or exploratory or investigative?*  
(Lisa)

*Just revisiting this comment a long time after you posted it. The final question seems to resonate with me now after the 2021-2022 year in which I was online and then F2F. I'd say the focus for me is a combination - the introspective is a typical narrative skills/approach yet at the same time the CAE is communicative.* (Peter)

He later added that "The argument for using CAE as a means to share and co-construct narratives is potentially incredibly transformative in nature both for participants and, interestingly, for readers" (Norris & Sawyer, 2012). Furthermore, he expressed how he wished to;

*move the themes of our narratives from 'talking about teaching practice' into 'talking about the process of talking about teaching practice' and explained how in a prior CAE project this shift in dialectic focus "helped us understand not only our identities (one transformative process) but also helped to better understand the research process.* (Peter)

The above exemplifies how Peter reflected on his belief that practicing CAE is a transformative process not only for teaching practices, but for becoming a more effective researcher. On paper, Peter did not seem to transform dynamically, yet he became a facilitator of transformation by providing the research methodology and acted as a guide which enabled practical changes in the teaching practices of his colleagues. In essence, while the CAE was not personally transformational for Peter pedagogically, it did offer him a sense of belonging and a leadership role that, as previously mentioned, can effect change (Wilmes et al., 2018) and indeed made him the



impetus for others to gain experience as researchers. In this case, the shared CAE gave him a space to foster transformation in Lisa and Alison.

### **Conclusions and Implications for Pedagogy and Research**

In concluding this study, we turn to our three research questions, the first of which looked at the efficacy of the CAE itself to discuss CLIL and CAE issues themselves. Our findings, frequently asynchronous and non-linear on Google Drive, illustrated the benefit of simply becoming familiar with our respective backgrounds and motivations for the lecture course and the CLIL approach we had been tasked with. This was supplemented by the unfolding realization of the potential of the CAE to form a long-term base for pedagogical interactions between all three of us to discuss intra-departmental and interdepartmental issues pertinent to the development of our syllabi. This was recognized as “emotionally laden work” (Anderson & Fourie, 2015, para. 5), especially for Alison and Lisa undergoing at times struggles to align their syllabi with new departmental goals.

The second research question, which aimed to compare our pedagogical practices, was clearly aided by the collaborative and critical aspect of CAE (Breault, 2016; Lapadat, 2017) and the sharing of our teaching artifacts. Diverse approaches to teaching the lecture course were revealed in the feasibility of introducing group work in a large lecture-style class, approaches to translanguaging, and the alignment of course content with the students’ EMI classes. Although Alison and Peter, for whom CLIL was a more familiar concept, had created syllabi that drew more from their respective departmental EMI classes, Lisa’s syllabus was reformulated to focus more on the academic skills and strategies which would equip students for EMI study, a subtle difference which illustrated diverse understandings and approaches to CLIL provision as seen in Met (2009).

Our final research question sought to identify the pedagogical transformations resulting from the CAE. This revealed considerable evidence in Alison and Lisa’s experiences teaching the lecture course, but much less so for Peter, a point which pointed to elements of theory confirmation (Breault, 2016). On reflection, this was seen more from the perspective of how Peter drew more satisfaction from setting up the CAE as a forum for newer colleagues to transform their practices than undergo cathartic transformation himself.

Implications of this study do not suggest that the pedagogies discussed in our study related to CLIL in preparation for EMI should be regarded as definitive, or indeed representative, of other practitioners at the tertiary level who, as potential readers of this work, represent our audience (Norris & Sawyer, 2012). Instead, we feel that the longitudinal, community-building potential in CAE has a wider resonance for others engaged in CLIL work. The interactive nature of CAE, with its critical yet supportive probing of narratives, represents a forum for teacher development that is frequently missing in the rush to introduce EMI and CLIL language preparation programs at universities. Important in this process of interaction is the sharing of artifacts of teaching materials and the possibilities of transformation rather than the enforced homogenization of practices. Finally, we would also argue that the CAE as a methodological approach is one that can be discussed and shaped by the participants themselves within the CAE itself. In this sense, as Hilton and Hilton (2017) recommend, it represents for newcomers a healthy means to frame future discussions of pedagogy as it actively embraces diverse perspectives.

## References

- Aberasturi-Apraiz, E., Correa Gorospe, J. M., & Martínez-Arbelaz, A. (2020, September). Researcher vulnerability in doing collaborative autoethnography: Moving to a post-qualitative stance. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 21(3), Article 8. <https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-21.3.3397>
- Adams, T. E., & Manning, J. (2015). Autoethnography and Family Research. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 7(4), 350–366. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12116>
- 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>
- Adamson, J. L. & Fujimoto-Adamson, N. (2021). Translanguaging in EMI in the Japanese tertiary context: Pedagogical Challenges and Opportunities. In B. A. Paulsrud, Z. Tian & J. Toth (Eds.), *English-Medium Instruction and Translanguaging*. (pp. 15-28). Multilingual Matters.
- Adamson, J. L., Coulson, D. & Fujimoto-Adamson, N. (2019). Supervisory practices in English-medium undergraduate and postgraduate Applied Linguistics thesis writing: Insights from Japan-based tutors. *Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 6(1), 14-27. <https://www3.caes.hku.hk/ajal/index.php/ajal/article/view/594>
- Anderson, T. D., & Fourie, I. (2015). *Collaborative autoethnography as a way of seeing the experience of care giving as an information practice*. Paper proceedings of the Information Behaviour Conference (ISIC, Vol. 20, No. 1), Leeds, England. <http://InformationR.net/ir/20-1/isic2/isic33.html>
- Bamond Lozano, V. M., & Strotmann, B. (2015). Internationalizing higher education: Language matters. *TESOL Quarterly*, 49(4), 847–857. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43893790>
- 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>
- Bochner, A. P. (2013). Putting meanings into Motion. In S. Holman Jones, T. E. Adams, & C. Ellis (Eds.), *Handbook of autoethnography*. (pp. 50–56). Routledge.
- Bochner, A. P. & Ellis, C. S. (2006). Communication as autoethnography. In G. J. Shepherd, J. St. John, & T. Striphas (Eds.), *Communication as perspectives on theory* (pp. 110–122). SAGE Publications.
- Bradford, A. (2016). Teaching content through the medium of English: Faculty perspectives. In P. Clements, A. Krause, & H. Brown (Eds.), *Focus on the learner*. (pp. 433–438). JALT. [https://jalt-publications.org/sites/default/files/pdf-article/jalt2015-pcp\\_056.pdf](https://jalt-publications.org/sites/default/files/pdf-article/jalt2015-pcp_056.pdf)
- 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>
- Brinton, D. M., Snow, M. A. and Wesche, M. B. (1989). *Content-based second language instruction*. Heinle and Heinle Publishers.
- Brown, H. & Adamson, J. L. (2012). Localizing EAP in Light of the Rise of English-Medium Instruction at Japanese Universities. *OnCue Journal*, 6(3), 5-20. [http://www.jaltcue.org/files/OnCUE/OCJ6.3/OCJ6.3\\_pp5-20\\_FA\\_Brown\\_Adamson.pdf](http://www.jaltcue.org/files/OnCUE/OCJ6.3/OCJ6.3_pp5-20_FA_Brown_Adamson.pdf)
- Brown, H., & Iyobe, B. (2014). The growth of English medium instruction in Japan. In N. Sonda & A. Krause (Eds.). *JALT 2013 Conference Proceedings* (pp. 9–19). JALT. [https://jalt-publications.org/files/pdf-article/jalt2013\\_002.pdf](https://jalt-publications.org/files/pdf-article/jalt2013_002.pdf)
- Burgess, C. (2014). To globalise or not to globalise? ‘Inward-looking youth’ as scapegoats for Japan's failure to secure and cultivate ‘global human resources’. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 13(4), 487–507. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2014.966805>

- Chang, H. (2013). Individual and collaborative autoethnography as method: A social scientist's perspective. In S. Holman Jones, T. E. Adams, & C. Ellis (Eds.), *Handbook of autoethnography* (pp. 107–122). Routledge.
- Chang, H., Ngunjiri, F. W., & Hernandez, K-A. C. (2013). *Collaborative autoethnography*. Left Coast Press Inc.
- Cooper, R., & Lilyea, B. (2022). I'm interested in autoethnography, but how do I do it? *The Qualitative Report*, 27(1), 197–208. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2022.5288>
- Costley, T., & Reilly, C. (2021). Methodological principles for researching multilingually: Reflections on linguistic ethnography. *TESOL Quarterly*, 55(3), 1035–1047. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3037>
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Denzin, N. (2014). *Interpretive autoethnography*. SAGE Publications.
- Edsall, D., & Saito, Y. (2012). The motivational benefits of content. *OnCue Journal*, 6, 66–94. [https://jaltcue.org/files/OnCUE/OCJ6.2/OCJ6.2\\_pp66-94\\_Edsall%26Saito.pdf](https://jaltcue.org/files/OnCUE/OCJ6.2/OCJ6.2_pp66-94_Edsall%26Saito.pdf)
- Ellis, C., & Adams, T. E. (2014). The purposes, practices and principles of autoethnographic research. In P. Leavy (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 254–276). Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, C., 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:nbn:de:0114-fqs1101108>.
- Esposito, J., & Smith, S. (2006). From reluctant teacher to empowered teacher-researcher: One educator's journey toward action research. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 33(3), 45–60. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23478893>
- Hickey, A., & Austin, J. (2007). Pedagogies of self: Conscientising the personal to the social. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 3(1), 21–29. <https://doi.org/10.5172/ijpl.3.1.21>
- Hilton, A., & Hilton, G. (2017). The impact of conducting practitioner research projects on teachers' professional growth. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 42(8), 77–94. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2017v42n8.6>
- Holman Jones, S., Adams, T. E., & Ellis, C. (2013). Introduction: Coming to Know Autoethnography as More than Method. In S. Holman Jones, T. E. Adams, & C. Ellis (Eds.), *Handbook of autoethnography*. (pp.17–47). Routledge.
- Ikeda, M. (2012). CLIL no genri to shidouhou [Principles and methodologies of CLIL]. In S. Izumi, M. Ikeda & Y. Watanabe. (Eds.), *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning: New challenges in foreign language education at Sophia University: Practices and applications* (Vol. 2, pp. 1–15). Sophia University Press.
- Imoto, Y. (2013). Japan: Internationalisation in education and the problem of introspective youth. In P.-t. J. Hsieh (Ed.), *Education in East Asia* (pp. 127–152). Bloomsbury.
- Keleş, U. (2022a). 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>
- Keleş, U. (2022b). Writing a “good” autoethnography in educational research: A modest proposal. *The Qualitative Report*, 27(9), 2026–2046. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2022.5662>
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2014). English as a medium of instruction in East and Southeast Asian Universities. In N. Murray & A. Scarino (Eds.), *Dynamic ecologies: A relational perspective on languages education in the Asia-Pacific region* (pp. 15–30). Springer.

- Lamsfuß-Schenk, S. (2002). Geschichte und Sprache: Ist der bilinguale Geschichtsunterricht der Königsweg zum Geschichtsbewusstsein? [History and language: Is bilingual history teaching the royal road to historical awareness?] In S. Breidbach, G. Bach, & D. Wolff (Eds.), *Bilingualer Sachfachunterricht: Didaktik, Lehrer-/Lernerforschung und Bildungspolitik zwischen Theorie und Empirie. [Bilingual subject teaching: Didactics, teacher/learning research and educational policy between theory and empiricism.]* (pp. 191–206). Peter Lang.
- Lapadat, J. (2017). Ethics in autoethnography and collaborative autoethnography. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 23(8), 589–603. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800417704462>
- Lasagabaster, D. (2013). The use of the L1 in CLIL classes: The teachers' perspective. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, 6(2), 1–21. <https://laclil.unisabana.edu.co/index.php/LACLIL/article/view/3148/>
- Lavina, L., & Lawson, F. (2019). Weaving forgotten pieces of place and the personal: Using collaborative auto-ethnography and aesthetic modes of reflection to explore teacher identity development. *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, 20(6). <http://www.ijea.org/v20n6/>
- Mehisto, P. (2008). CLIL Counterweights: Recognising and decreasing disjuncture in CLIL. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1(1), 93–119. <http://www.icrj.eu/11/article8.html>
- Mehisto, P., Marsh, D., & Frigols M. J. (2008). *Uncovering CLIL: Content and language integrated learning in bilingual and multilingual education*. Macmillan.
- Merino, J. A. & Lasagabaster, D. (2015). CLIL as a way to multilingualism, *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 21(1), 79–92. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2015.1128386>
- Met, M. (2009). Content-based instruction: Defining terms, making decisions. *NFLC Reports*. <http://www.carla.umn.edu/cobaltt/modules/principles/decisions.html>
- 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.
- Ochs, E., & Capps, L. (2001). *Living narrative: Creating lives in everyday storytelling*. Harvard University Press.
- 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*, 32, 39–51. [https://rikkyo.repo.nii.ac.jp/?action=pages\\_view\\_main&active\\_action=repository\\_view\\_main\\_item\\_detail&item\\_id=10584&item\\_no=1&page\\_id=13&block\\_id=49](https://rikkyo.repo.nii.ac.jp/?action=pages_view_main&active_action=repository_view_main_item_detail&item_id=10584&item_no=1&page_id=13&block_id=49)
- Phan, H. L. (2013). Issues surrounding English, the internationalisation of higher education and national cultural identity in Asia: A focus on Japan. *Critical Studies in Education*, 54(2), 160–175. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2013.781047>
- Pinner, R. (2012). Unlocking literature through CLIL: Authentic materials and tasks to promote cultural and historical understanding. In S. Izumi, M. Ikeda, & Y. Watanabe. (Eds.), *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning: New challenges in foreign language education at Sophia University: Practices and applications* (Vol. 2, pp. 91–129). Sophia University Press.
- Razfar, A. (2011). Action research in urban schools: Empowerment, transformation, and challenges. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 38(4), 25–44. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23479629>

- Rinehart, R. E., & Earl, K. (2016). Auto-, duo-and collaborative-ethnographies: “caring” in an audit culture climate. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 16(3), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QRJ-04-2016-0024>
- Roy, R., & Uekusa, S. (2020). Collaborative autoethnography: “Self-reflection” as a timely alternative research approach during the global pandemic. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 20(4), 383–392. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QRJ-06-2020-0054>
- Sardabi, N., Mansouri, B., & Behzadpoor, F. (2020). Autoethnography in TESOL. In *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching* (pp. 1–6). John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0995>
- Smiles, T. L., & Short, K. G. (2006). Transforming teacher voice through writing for publication. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 33(3), 133–147. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23478898>
- Stigger, E. (2018). Introduction: Internationalization in higher education. In E. Stigger, M. Wang, D. Laurence, & A. Bordilovskaya (Eds.), *Internationalization within higher education: Perspectives from Japan* (pp. 1–19). Springer.
- Stohler, U. (2006). The acquisition of knowledge in bilingual learning: An empirical study of the role of language in content learning. *Views*, 15(3), 41–46.
- Taguchi, N. & Naganuma, N. (2006). Transition from learning English to learning in English: Students’ perceived adjustment difficulties in an English-medium university in Japan. *Asian EFL Journal*, 8(4), 52–73. [http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/Dec\\_06\\_nt&nn.php](http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/Dec_06_nt&nn.php)
- Takagi, H. (2013). The internationalization of curricula: The complexity and diversity of meaning in and beyond Japanese universities. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 52(4), 349–359. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2013.820138>
- Wilmes, S., Te Heesen, K., Siry, C., Kneip, N., & Heinericy, S. (2018). The role of critical reflexivity in the professional development of professional developers: A co-autoethnographic exploration. *Interfaces Científicas*, 7(1), 13–24. <https://doi.org/10.17564/2316-3828.2018v7n1p13-24>
- Yazan, B., Jain, R., & Canagarajah, S. (Eds.). (2020). *Autoethnographies in ELT: Transnational identities, pedagogies, and practices*. Routledge.

## Notes on Contributors

*John Adamson* is a Professor at the University of Niigata Prefecture in Japan. As Chief Editor of *EFL International Journal*, he is active in editorial work. Having received his Ed.D. from the University of Leicester, he has pursued research in autonomy, CLIL and EMI, self-access, academic writing and journal editing.

*Julia Christmas* has been teaching in Japan for nearly 30 years. She holds an MA from Temple University and has extensive experience in secondary and tertiary public and private school systems. Her main research interests are pedagogy for CLIL environments, pronunciation, and communicative-based professional development for in-service teachers.

*Li-hsin Tu's* career began as a public-school ESL teacher in New York City after receiving an MA in TESOL (K-12) from Teacher's College, Columbia University. Teaching in Japan since 2013, her research interests include L2 creative writing, CLIL, literature in language teaching, and L2 reading and writing teaching methodologies.

## ORCID

*John Adamson*, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3492-2583>

*Julia Christmas*, <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-4937-9204>

*Li-hsin Tu*, <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-7339-882X>

*Manuscript received December 7, 2022*  
*Final revision received January 14, 2023*  
*Accepted March 14, 2023*