Re-thinking English-only pedagogy through translanguaging in Japanese university CLIL classrooms: students, teachers, challenges and dilemmas

by

Kiyu Itoi

M.A., Simon Fraser University, 2019

B. Soc. Sc., Ritsumeikan Asia Pacific University, 2016

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in the
Languages, Cultures and Literacies Program
Faculty of Education

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Summer 2023

Declaration of Committee

Name:	**Kiyu Itoi**
Degree:	**Doctor of Philosophy**
Title:	**Re-thinking English-only pedagogy through translanguaging in Japanese university CLIL classrooms: students, teachers, challenges and dilemmas**
Committee:	**Chair: Suzanne Smythe** Associate Professor, Education
	Steve Marshall Supervisor Professor, Education
	Angel (Mei Yi) Lin Committee Member Professor, Education
	Roumiana Ilieva Committee Member Associate Professor, Education
	Joel Heng Hartse Examiner Senior Lecturer, Education
	Yuen Yi Lo External Examiner Associate Professor, Education The University of Hong Kong

Ethics Statement

The author, whose name appears on the title page of this work, has obtained, for the research described in this work, either:

a. human research ethics approval from the Simon Fraser University Office of Research Ethics

or

b. advance approval of the animal care protocol from the University Animal Care Committee of Simon Fraser University

or has conducted the research

c. as a co-investigator, collaborator, or research assistant in a research project approved in advance.

A copy of the approval letter has been filed with the Theses Office of the University Library at the time of submission of this thesis or project.

The original application for approval and letter of approval are filed with the relevant offices. Inquiries may be directed to those authorities.

Simon Fraser University Library
Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada

Update Spring 2016

Abstract

This study aims to explore how translanguaging pedagogy can be utilized in a language classroom that is situated within a context where the monolingual ideology is prevalent. Specifically, the study focuses on exploring both international and Japanese students' perceptions on this new type of CLIL translanguaging language course as well as the use of translanguaging in the process of meaning making and knowledge construction among students. In addition, the study focuses on exploring teachers' perspectives on translanguaging as well as their experience developing this new CLIL translanguaging course with other teachers who have diverse backgrounds.

In this qualitative case study, I use semi-structured individual interviews with students (n=12) and teachers (n=5) involved in the course and students' reflection (n=18) as the primary methods of inquiry, and my reflective journal as a supplementary data source. The data is thematically analyzed around the research questions, with reflexivity being an important aspect through analyzing data and writing up the thesis. The study explores the following research questions: 1. How do students perceive a new type of language course in which learners with diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds learn different target languages in the same classroom simultaneously? 2. How is translanguaging used in the process of meaning making and knowledge construction among students of different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, and how is it perceived by them? 3. How do language teachers develop and implement a new type of language course with other teachers who are very diverse in age, experience, linguistic resources, and who have different beliefs about language education?

The study finds that students describe complex perspectives on the use of translanguaging and potential impacting factors such as monolingual ideology and their understanding of the globalizing world. It also describes how teachers understand and develop ideas of translanguaging and their roles as teachers, as well as the potential factors that may influence their perspectives.

Keywords: translanguaging; CLIL; internationalization of higher education; language education

Table of Contents

Chapter 1. Introduction

I will begin the introduction to the thesis with some reflections on my personal journey as a learner of English, from my school days to today in my work in higher education, and the challenges I have faced. I will then provide a brief overview of the key issues surrounding English in higher education that I will address in the thesis, provide a context for the present research, including research questions, and provide the outline of this thesis.

1.1. My journey as a learner of English

English is a language that I use every day – I use it for work, study, to communicate with my friends, and to get information. I do not remember how long I have been studying English exactly for, but it has been at least 16 years since I started learning English in grade 7 at school. After 16 years of learning it, I feel like I can finally say that I am comfortable with my English. Even now, I still sometimes feel that my English is not good enough in many different contexts. I have felt embarrassed and upset at the same time when reviewers of journals made comments that seem to look down on someone like me, who uses English as an additional language. I have also felt anxious when some instructors make a comment about what I said after some pause, as if my English was difficult to understand. At the same time, I feel like my English is good enough for someone who studied English as an additional language – I can present my research in English at academic conferences, I can write papers in English, and I can communicate with people using English. However, at other times, I feel like I am still anxious about my English because it is not "perfect"—I do not, or cannot speak English like native speakers do.

English learning and teaching mean many different things to me—my struggle, profession, passion, and confusion. I struggled a lot as an English learner. I studied in an international university in Japan taking courses in English with international students whose English was, or seemed much more fluent than mine. I also studied in Finland as

an exchange student taking courses in English with local Finnish students and international students who were not only proficient in English but also confident to share their ideas in class. In those contexts, I was too scared to speak up due to the fear of being judged. I thought my English may not sound as natural as theirs, or maybe my classmates and professors may think I am stupid because I cannot formulate and share my ideas as fluently as they do. I liked learning English as it opened up many opportunities for me—opportunity to study in different contexts, opportunity to travel to different places, and more importantly, opportunity to make friends and communicate with people from different parts of the world. However, at the same time, I sometimes felt uncomfortable with my English because of the above reasons.

In university, I was in a program to get an English teaching license, and when I took a course taught by a Japanese English teacher who was teaching at a private high school, she became my role model. She got her master's degree in the U.K., and not only were her lessons very well-designed and organized, but she also conducted all the lessons in English fluently. She showed us many different lessons that she has actually done in her classes, and she was very pleased with my demo lessons because I was able to conduct the lessons all in English, like she demonstrated. I ended up doing my student teaching at the high school with her as my supervisor, and working there as an English teacher after graduation. I could have continued to work there, but I went to Canada to get my master's in Teaching English as an Additional Language (TEAL) and to improve my English. Although I had planned this even before starting the teacher training program, a random English teacher I met through my part-time job in university amplified this idea. When I told her that I wanted to become an English teacher after graduation, she told me that I should study abroad because she kept feeling deficient due to the fact that she had never studied abroad, and that she did not have the experience of using English with native speakers in her daily life. She shared her experience with me, and she told me that students look up to English teachers who have studied abroad and who have "native" like pronunciation, and she always regretted not having studied abroad. At that time, I agreed with what she said, and wanted to be an English teacher who could improve students' English with the knowledge of English education as a role model who can speak English fluently like native speakers.

However, my view of English teaching and learning has completely changed after taking courses in the TEAL program in Canada and learning about different aspects of English teaching and learning. Especially, concepts such as native-speakerism, translanguaging, English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), and multicompetence, opened my eyes. It may sound like an exaggeration, but I felt as if I was freed from all the things that were making me develop a negative identity as a deficient L2 speaker of English, and expectations of how English teachers should be, especially in a Japanese context where I was going back to teach. I started questioning whether the goals of English education were even realistic and useful in our society, and I also thought I would be reproducing people like me, if I went back to Japan and taught as expected in Japan (i.e., conducting classes all in English and forbidding Japanese, and insisting on native-like proficiency as a goal of English teaching and learning). When I was thinking about what I should do, professors from my former university visited the university in Canada where I was doing my master's and offered an information session to recruit English teachers. The professor who offered the session explained, along with many other things, that students would be learning English that they can use in a multicultural environment on campus, and also in the future. Coupled with what I experienced firsthand, the environment of the school seemed perfect for the kind of English education I wanted to offer, and I decided to work there.

However, as I worked there and interacted with my coworkers and students, I started to feel as if what I learned in the TEAL program and the kind of English education I wanted to offer were a fantasy. For instance, the majority of my coworkers were white men from the Inner circle countries (Kachru, 1985), so-called native speakers of English, and I felt the same way I did before learning concepts like native-speakerism or translanguaging that I mentioned above. I was self-conscious about speaking English in a meeting for the level I was teaching, in which I was the only female, and also the only non-native speaker out of approximately 20 teachers in the level. Moreover, when I was in another meeting with other female Japanese teachers, some native teachers would make a comment about how "native" speakers do not use such phrases after those female Japanese teachers said something. Although I understand that the native teachers may not have made such comments with negative intentions, I was bothered by those comments,

which made me uncomfortable to potentially share my ideas using the "wrong" phrases and expressions. However, at the same time, every time I go through such experience, it makes me feel more convinced that I have to try my best to change the current situation of English teaching and learning in non-English speaking countries like Japan.

I thought the first thing I could try is to raise awareness among my students that the use of L1 is not always bad, and it could be helpful for their learning. As I used L1 or let students use their L1 in class in certain situations, I felt that some students saw the benefit of it, but some were dissatisfied with the use of L1 in class. Thus, I decided to conduct a mini workshop in the beginning of the semester to have students think about the use of L1, and get a consensus of how L1 should/should not be used in the English class. Despite the fact that many students seemed to have appreciated the approach according to the evaluation sheet, there was one comment that stood out for me. The student wrote "It was unfortunate that the teacher used Japanese in class. I was even surprised that the teacher even asked us what we would think about using Japanese, and this conversation would not even have taken place if the teacher was a native speaker in the first place."

Because of these experiences, I joined a development team for a new course, which was going to be offered for both Japanese and English learners, and I taught the course as well. The course is the focus of my PhD dissertation, and details of the context of the research will be provided in the next sections. Even during the process of developing and teaching the course, and interviewing students and teachers, I am still not sure what I should do as an English teacher, novice applied linguistics scholar, and an educator who is involved in shaping students' futures, and perhaps, participating in creating the future society. Thus, this piece, my PhD dissertation, traces an ongoing process of becoming a better and more reflective researcher and educator. Even as I am writing this piece right now, I am still wondering if I should only use English in the next semester as expected by the stakeholders and students, or if there is anything else I can do to challenge this situation. Therefore, in this dissertation, my reflexivity as a teacher and novice researcher will be an important focus. I will express this reflexivity in different parts of this dissertation, and engage in the "reflexivities of discomfort" (Pillow, 2003, p. 188). In this sense, I aim for this dissertation to be something I can always look at and

come back to, and reflect on where I come from, especially when I am older and more successful as a researcher and an educator. In addition, by sharing my experience as a Japanese English teacher who works in a non-English speaking country developing and teaching an innovative new course, I would like to offer insights into challenges that language teachers may face in developing a language course which takes into account the complexity of students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds in a context largely influenced by the ideology of monolingualism (e.g., Lin, 2015). In addition, it will allow me to explore multiple layers of the challenges I have faced as an English learner, which have led me to the development and implementation of this innovative language course. By doing so, I wish to suggest implications for educators who may develop a new language program using translanguaging as a pedagogy for linguistically diverse students, and researchers who may be interested in students' and teachers' experience and identity negotiation in learning in, and teaching a new type of language course in a university environment.

1.2. English as a world language

In this section, I will provide a brief overview of different views of English and key issues surrounding English that I will address in this thesis. In today's world, with globalization, English has been used for communication between people from different backgrounds in various contexts such as for business and study, and it has become much more than just a language spoken by native speakers. Thus, there have been many alternative theoretical approaches to non-native Englishes. For example, Kachru (1985) proposed the three-circle model of World Englishes (WE), and he described how English is spoken and used based on the three circles—Inner circle, Outer circle, and Expanding circle. The Inner circle includes countries in which English is used as a native language such as the U. K., the U.S., Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. Englishes spoken and used in these Inner circle countries are often considered the norm. The Outer circle includes countries in which English is used as a second language because of reasons such as having been colonized by Inner circle countries in the past. India, Nigeria, Bangladesh, and Singapore are examples of Outer circle countries, and English has some official

status in those multilingual societies. Englishes spoken in these countries are different from the Inner circle varieties of English, and they are often described as Singaporean English or Indian English, etc. Finally, in Expanding circle countries, English is learned and used as a foreign language. Countries such as Japan, Korea, China, and European countries are included in the Expanding circle, and Inner circle varieties of English, especially British and American English, are often considered the norm when taught and learned (Kachru, 1992).

While WE focused on legitimatizing varieties of English spoken mainly in Outer circle countries, the categorization is based on geography and history, and it implies that varieties of English spoken in Inner circle countries are the "norm" for English. In addition, the three circles model does not always take into account the multilingual nature of speakers in today's world. For example, Crystal (1995) notes that this three circles model cannot always represent the reality of use of English as an international language since language use is not clear-cut. In order to provide more fluid views of language use, the concept of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) was developed drawing on WE theorizing. ELF is a "contact language' between persons who share neither a common native tongue nor a common (national) culture, and for whom English is the chosen foreign language of communication" (Firth, 1996, p. 240). In the early phase of ELF research in the early 2000s, researchers focused on linguistic aspects such as pronunciation and grammatical features of ELF, and they believed that they would be able to describe different ELF varieties based on the speakers' L1 (i.e., Japanese English or German English). One example of this is analysis of the Vienna-Oxford International Corpus English (VOICE), which identified the lexio-grammatical features of ELF based on speaking interaction amongst L2 speakers of English (Seidlhofer, 2004). However, more recently, there has been a reconceptualization suggesting that the focus of ELF communication research should be on each interaction and each community of practice rather than linguistic aspects tied to particular L1 or speech communities. Thus, as a concept, unlike WE, the focus of ELF is on the communication that takes place in a specific context, and English is separated from specific place or culture, and there is no norm of English to aspire to (Jenkins, 2015).

Although ELF takes into consideration multilingual speakers' linguistic repertoires, the main focus is often how the speakers' L1 influences their use of English. This could be problematic when looking at multilinguals' communication as English is only one of the languages that multilinguals use to make meaning of their world. Translanguaging is a concept that puts emphasis on the use of languages and signs as the nature of meaning making process among multilinguals, rather than the use of L1 to aid communication in English. It refers to "discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of their bilingual worlds" (García, 2009, p. 45). In this view, translanguaging "signals a trans-semiotic system with many meaning-making signs, primarily linguistic ones, that combine to make up a person's semiotic repertoire. Languages then are not autonomous and closed linguistic and semiotic systems" (García & Wei, 2014, p. 42). There have been increasing numbers of studies looking at translanguaging from different perspectives, and it has been incorporated into language classrooms in recent years.

A parallel body of literature has also analyzed students' use of multiple languages in higher education through the specific lenses of plurilingualism and plurilingual pedagogies. Although it is beyond the scope of this study to review the literature in detail, I will provide the definition of plurilingualism and review some empirical studies as the findings share useful insights in analyzing and making sense of my data.

Plurilingual and pluricultural competence refers to "the ability to use languages for the purposes of communication and to take part in intercultural interaction, where a person, viewed as a social actor has proficiency, of varying degrees, in several languages and experience of several cultures" (Coste, Moore, & Zarate, 2009, p. 11). Like translanguaging, plurilingualism does not divide different languages into "separate compartmentalized worlds of existence" (Lee & Marshall, 2012). One feature of plurilingual and pluricultural competence is imbalance in individual's plurilingual and pluricultural competence. This includes imbalance in proficiency in different languages and cultures, and imbalance in different skills in the languages.

Even in a European context where plurilingualism theorizing started, a monolingual standard is commonly followed in language education and boundaries between languages are defined, although plurilingual speakers normally combine

elements of different languages in communication (Cenoz & Gorter, 2013). Cenoz and Gorter (2013) argue that a plurilingual approach would be beneficial in language education as it allows students to utilize their metalinguistic awareness and their experiences as plurilingual speakers while learning the target language. Moreover, when plurilingual pedagogy is put in practice, educators and researchers can bring phenomena such as "agency, creativity, hybridity, learning, meaning making" (Marshall & Moore, 2018, p. 12) to the front.

In their qualitative longitudinal study, Marshall and Moore (2013) explored how transnational students taking an academic literacy course in a Canadian university exercise their plurilingual competence both in the formal academic English in their writing assignments and in less formal settings through social networking and texting. They found that even though the final product that students have to produce in the course, which is academic writing, is based on a monolingual English standard, students exercised their plurilingual competence creatively outside the classroom in socializing, and in class during group work in the process of producing the English texts. The authors argue that plurilingualism should be understood and seen as an asset in social and educational contexts. In addition, in their qualitative research exploring how plurilingual Chinese students use Chinese as a tool for learning at a Canadian university, Marshall et al (2019) found that the learning was enriched when classrooms offered a plurilingual space to use languages other than English as a tool for learning. Similarly, Marshall et al. (2021) found that in varying degrees, based on various aspects such as personal beliefs and ideology, instructors and students used French and other languages in their French Medium Classes.

As can be seen in the literature, in terms of the focus of my study, which is on opening up spaces for students to use languages other than medium of instruction, both plurilingualism and translanguaging offer valuable insights. In other words, they have more in common than differences. However, given the prevalence of translanguaging studies in the Japanese context, I decided to use the term translanguaging for my study. However, where relevant, I will refer to issues around plurilingualism due to similarity in analysis and context. Although educators and researchers have been incorporating translanguaging and plurilingualism in their research and practice, there has been a deep-

rooted monolingual mindset in the field of language education, which can hinder this paradigm shift. Translanguaging is a key concept of this study, and literature on it will be reviewed in Chapter 3.

1.3. Challenging a monolingual mindset

Another key issue that will be addressed in the upcoming literature review is monolingualism. This is important because of the focus of my own study and its key relevance to my work and participants' lives. Thus, I will provide a brief overview here and provide a detailed review in the next chapter.

Recently, there has been recognition that multilingual speakers learn and use languages differently from monolingual speakers, and that language should be seen as a social practice rather than an independent entity of named languages or even codes (Canagarajah, 2012). Although this "multilingual turn" (May, 2013) in how language is being theorized in the field of applied linguistics and language education has significant implications for teaching and learning English, a monolingual mindset and orientation to language teaching and learning is still deeply rooted in the society. For example, native-speakerism, which is "a pervasive ideology within ELT, characterized by the belief that 'native-speaker' teachers represent a 'Western culture' from which spring the ideals both of the English language and of English language teaching methodology" (Holliday, 2006, p. 385), still has a significant impact on English teaching and learning. This has an impact on many aspects of English teaching and learning especially in the Expanding circle countries in which English is learned and taught as a foreign language. For instance, with native speakers of English being the idealized reference and norm, non-native English teachers can develop a negative identity as an English teacher (Llurda, 2009), and non-native speakers of English can be seen as failed native speakers (Kubota, 2012). In addition, some students consider English classes conducted entirely in English superior to ones in which students' L1 are utilized (e.g., Stephens, 2006). Even though there have been models of language learning alternative to the monolingual model, this deep rootedness of monolingual ideology is still pervasive in many aspects of language

education due to monolingual disposition (Gogolin, 1994), which will be discussed in detail in Chapter 3.

1.4. Context of the research

As previously mentioned, I was involved in developing and teaching a new course at the Japanese university for which I worked. Since the university is an international university that offers bilingual education in Japanese and English, most of the students are required to be enrolled in either an English language program or Japanese language program, unless they are exempt from taking the language classes. All of the Japanese language instructors are Japanese and the majority of the English instructors are "native" speakers of English from the Inner circle countries (Kachru, 1985), with a few Japanese instructors, including myself. Although the English and Japanese programs are separate, there are a few occasions (1—3 times a semester) where instructors hold "exchange classes," in which a Japanese class and an English class have a joint lesson. In most cases, the class is divided into two parts, where half of the class is conducted entirely in English and the other half is conducted entirely in Japanese, and all the students are instructed to speak in the designated language. Instructors often say, "Please speak in English as much as possible during the English session," and vice versa. These exchange classes are normally only used as opportunities to practice the target language.

1.4.1. The English "caste" and a new course

Although the university offers a bilingual education system in the hopes of fostering "global citizens," there seems to be a strong belief among students that they must be proficient in English to attain success not only in university, but also in society in general. Some students even talk about the "English caste" that apparently exists in the university, in which the students who are proficient in English are seen as superior to and are given more opportunities than the students who are not as proficient in English. Not only was this very shocking to me, but it also made me realize that the language program needs to change. When another Japanese English instructor and I were discussing the need to do something about the situation, she mentioned that she had heard from another

teacher that some of the instructors were talking about designing a new course that is similar to the exchange class. This discussion resulted in two Japanese language instructors and four English language instructors, myself included, developing a new language course together.

Initially, some instructors wanted this course to only be a class in which students could help each other with their target language (i.e., learners of Japanese can get help from Japanese students and vice versa), like the pre-existing exchange class. Thus, the initial idea was to have two separate classes for Japanese and English, and have some sessions together throughout the semester, in which students can get help with their target language from their student partner who is either a native speaker of the target language or a proficient user of the language. However, with the apparent existence of the English caste and through remembering my own experiences of feeling insecure and deficient while learning English, I strongly felt the need for a new type of language class which does not put forth the idea that the only goal of learning a language is to become as proficient as a native speaker and, if this goal is not met, the learner is a failure. Rather, a new type of language class was needed: one in which students realize that all the languages and the varieties thereof are equally important for their learning, and that these languages and their varieties help them communicate with people from diverse backgrounds. Therefore, after stating my beliefs and dozens of discussions, the development team agreed to conduct all of the classes together instead of having separate classes based on the language stream.

1.4.2. Challenges and research questions

In the course of developing this new course, I faced many challenges, especially regarding my own beliefs about how languages should be used and taught (i.e., use of translanguaging as a pedagogy). Particularly in an environment where people, including instructors and students, have been immersed in the monolingual ideology, it was very challenging to incorporate the idea of translanguaging into a language curriculum. In addition, except for myself and another lecturer, all of the other members of the development team were either associate professors or tenured senior lecturers who were all much older and had many more years of experience. For these reasons, it was very

difficult to even suggest the idea of incorporating translanguaging into the development and implementation of the new course. However, in the end, we were able to develop and offer a new language course which employs translanguaging. Thus, through my research, I hope to offer insights into how translanguaging pedagogy can be utilized in a language classroom that is situated within a context where the monolingual ideology is prevalent so that other language programs within Japan or other non-English speaking countries can consider new types of language programs which accommodate changes in language education that utilize multilingual learners' cultural and linguistic resources. With those goals, this research explores the following research questions:

1. How do students perceive a new type of language course in which learners with diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds learn different target languages in the same classroom simultaneously?
2. How is translanguaging used in the process of meaning making and knowledge construction among students of different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, and how is it perceived by them?
3. How do language teachers develop and implement a new type of language course with other teachers who are very diverse in age, experience, linguistic resources, and who have different beliefs about language education?

To answer these questions, this study employs a qualitative case study approach (Duff, 2020), and uses semi-structured individual interviews (Richards, 2009) with students and teachers involved in the course as its primary method of inquiry. Since reflexivity is a key aspect of this research as previously mentioned, reflexive thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2020) is used for the analysis of the data.

1.5. Outline of the dissertation

This dissertation is organized into seven chapters. Chapter 1 has provided an introduction to this study, mostly on why I am doing this research and what this study and the dissertation mean to me. It has also provided a brief introduction to some of the issues involving theory and practice within the paradigm shift in the field of applied

linguistics, looking at different kinds of English used in society, and what contribution and implications this study can offer.

Chapter 2 provides an overview of the background and context of the study, focusing on English language education in Japan, where the study is situated. I will provide a brief historical overview of language education in Japan, and some of the policies by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT) regarding foreign language education and projects such as the Super Global University policy. I will then argue that the ideology of English education in Japan, and its associated discourses, may have a strong influence on shaping students' and teachers' perceptions of language education and use of different languages in language classrooms.

Chapter 3 is a review of theories and empirical studies on the three main concepts that I draw on to frame and make sense of this study: monolingual ideology in language education, translanguaging, and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). After reviewing the literature, research gaps that this study addresses are discussed.

Chapter 4 describes the research design, methodology, data generation and analysis procedures for this study in detail, as well as my own position, limitations, ethical and other related issues.

Chapter 5 and 6 are data analysis chapters. Chapter 5 explores answers to research questions 1 and 2, regarding students' experience in the course. Chapter 6 explores answers to research question 3, regarding teachers' experience in the course and perspectives on language education, which had an impact on the development and implementation of the course.

Chapter 7, a discussion and conclusion chapter, summarizes and synthesizes the data, providing answers to my research questions. I will also discuss implications of the study for instructors and researchers working in the field of applied linguistics, especially with multilingual speakers in language education. I will then discuss future directions for research. Finally, I will end the thesis with my reflection.

Chapter 2. Background and research context

In this chapter, I will provide an overview of the background and context of this study, focusing on English education in Japan, where the study is situated. I will first provide a brief historical overview of language education in Japan, and some of the policies by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT) regarding foreign language education and projects such as the Super Global University initiative. This will be followed by a review of literature exploring the influence of those policies on students and instructors. In this chapter, I will focus on providing contextual information about English in Japan. Further literature on English education in Japan which will be used in the analysis of the data will follow in Chapter 3. I will conclude the chapter by discussing the implication of the government's policies for the present study.

2.1. English in Japan

When foreign language education was introduced to the Japanese education system during the Meiji period (1868-1912), English was one of the elective foreign language courses provided in schools. However, it was virtually the only foreign language that was taught and learned in the majority of schools and, even at that time, teachers were encouraged to teach English classes in English (Erikawa, 2018). In 1922, Harold E. Palmer came to Japan from the United Kingdom (U.K.) and The Institute for Research in English Teaching was established to develop English language education in Japan. Palmer had much influence on English language education in Japan through the introduction of the oral method. The oral method focuses on developing thinking in English by first introducing English words and phrases to the learners orally without supplying the translation in the students' L1, thereby replicating how children learn their native languages (Lemieux, 1964).

After World War II, Japanese education, especially with regard to foreign language education, was influenced by the General Head Quarters (GHQ), in particular, Civil Information and Education Section (CIE) (Sugiura, 2013). Based on the request by CIE, in 1949, the Japanese government published a report on foreign language education

policies, which included the promotion of the oral method, as well as using native English speakers to teach English (Erikawa, 2018).

Thus, Japan invited people from Inner circle countries to teach English as Assistant Language Teachers (ALT) in different programs. For example, from 1969, several dozen Americans came to Japan on the Fulbright program to work as ALTs and, around the same time, British people also came to Japan through the British English Teacher Scheme (BETS) program. In 1987, the Japan Exchange and Teaching Program (JET program) began in the hopes of enriching foreign language education in Japan. For the first year, 848 "native speakers" of English came to Japan from the U.S., U.K., Australia, and New Zealand (JET, n.d.). Since its implementation in 1987, thousands of ALTs have been sent to Japan as part of the JET program. In 2019, a total of 5,234 ALTs were sent from 57 countries and, out of all of them, 2,958 were from the U.S. In addition to the U.S., the majority of the ALTs were from Inner circle countries, with 531 coming from Canada, 528 coming from the U.K., 321 coming from Australia, and 236 coming from New Zealand (JET, 2019). In other words, about 87% of the ALTs on the JET program were from the Inner circle countries. According to the English Education Reform Plan corresponding to Globalization, released in 2014, one of the goals of the new English language education policy is to develop the "ability to fluently communicate with English speaking persons" (MEXT, 2014, New English Education corresponding to globalization, para. 4) and, in order to achieve these goals, the government expanded the areas in which ALTs can be placed. Even though the concept of "English-speaking persons" is not strictly defined, considering the number of ALTs from the Inner circle countries that are part of the JET program, it is assumed that the Inner circle varieties of English, especially those spoken by educated white people, are viewed as the English model in Japan (Kubota, 2001). In other words, the monolingual ideology, including the view of white native speakers as the idealized reference, is evident in the Japanese English language education context as well. Unlike a similar program in Korea called the English Program in Korea (EPIK)—which favors hiring applicants from English-speaking countries who have certificates such as Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) or Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL), as well as those with teaching experience (Erikawa, 2018)—the main requirements needed to

apply for the JET program are a bachelor's degree and native-level English proficiency (JET Program USA, 2019). This suggests that not all ALTs have teaching certificates, experience, or knowledge of language education. In 1989, Dr Wakabayashi, who was a professor at the Tokyo Foreign Language University, published a statement against introducing ALTs to Japanese foreign language education, in which he criticized the idea that anyone can teach English as long as they are native speakers of English. In addition, he argued that the Japanese government should spend more on sending Japanese English teachers abroad to have them learn English and improve their knowledge on English education and their teaching skills, rather than spending money on hiring native speakers of English who do not have teaching experience or certificates (Erikawa, 2018). Nevertheless, Japanese learners of English tend to prefer learning English from native speakers of English, which is often associated with the concepts of Whiteness and Americanness (Kubota & Mckay, 2009). Because of this, although there has been a slight increase in the number of ALTs coming from Outer circles, such as Jamaica and the Philippines, the majority of the ALTs are still from the Inner circle countries (JET, 2019). Thus, although Japan has become more multicultural in recent years and can no longer be considered a homogeneous country in terms of race and language, teachers and students are often negotiating the native/non-native speaker dichotomy through teaching and learning (Kubota, 2022). As can be seen in the history of English language education in Japan, the monolingual ideology, including the monolingual approach to English language teaching and native speakerism, has been evident in the Japanese context throughout history.

How English has been perceived and treated in Japanese foreign language education has implications to my own teaching context. For instance, as discussed in Chapter 1, the majority of my coworkers who work as English lecturers in university are so-called native speakers of English, mostly from the U.S., and other Inner circle countries, although one instructor out of approximately 50 instructors is from the Philippines. In addition, students seem to tie whiteness to native speakers of English regardless of where they are from as discussed in the literature. For example, there was an occasion in which I conducted an online exchange class with a Japanese class, and

there was a white female student from Germany. At the end of the class, when the Japanese teacher and I opened breakout rooms on Zoom so that students could join any room and talk to any student freely, more than half of my students went to a breakout room in which the German student stayed. When I asked them why many of them went to the room, they told me that they wanted to practice English more, and that they wanted to be friends with her. Thus, favoring native speakers of English as ALTs, especially white people, seems to have influenced how Japanese learners of English perceive English.

2.2. MEXT's policy regarding foreign language education

Since the 1990s, the term *gurobaruka* (globalization) has become dominant in government and media discourse in Japan, which has resulted in an even stronger emphasis being placed on English for all means of communication. Because of this, a number of new programs and policies were implemented by MEXT. Thus, in this section, I will review some of the government policies regarding English education, namely, "The action plan to cultivate 'Japanese with English abilities'" (MEXT, 2003), "Five proposals and specific measures for developing proficiency in English for international communication" (MEXT, 2011), "The action plan to innovate the English education for globalization" (MEXT, 2013), and "The action plan to improve students' English abilities" (MEXT, 2015).

First, in 2003, a policy initiative called the "Action Plan to Cultivate Japanese with English Abilities" was released by MEXT, and included various plans, goals, and programs (Kubota, 2019). This action plan started with the following statement:

> In today's world, with globalization… mutual understanding and cooperation between countries around the world have become essential… Under these circumstances, English has played the most central role of the common international language that links people who have different mother tongues. In order for children to survive in the 21st century, it is essential to acquire communication abilities in English as a common international language (MEXT, 2003, preface, translated from Japanese by the author).

As can be seen in this statement, it seems that the Japanese government believes that English is an essential tool that Japanese people need to acquire in order to succeed in the globalized world and, as such, the government has implemented some new policies

regarding English language education, including increasing the number of ALTs and the number of English classes they provide, improving English teachers' English proficiency, conducting English classes in English, and establishing high school programs that specialize in English instruction, called Super English Language High Schools (SELHi), giving funding to them (Hashimoto, 2009; Kubota, 2019).

> Through the action plan released in 2003,
>
> certain results were achieved but the requirements for students and English teachers in terms of English proficiency and other skills were not met in full, and […] tasks and policies for English education in this country have to be revised in order to truly cultivate Japanese with English abilities. (MEXT, 2011, p. 2)

Thus, another proposal called "Five proposals and specific measures for developing proficiency in English for international communication" was released (MEXT, 2011) and the following five proposals were proposed to develop students' English proficiency:

1. [Assuring] English ability required of students – assessment and verification of attainment level
2. Promoting students' awareness of necessity of English in the global society, and stimulating motivation for English learning
3. Providing students with more opportunities to use English through effective utilization of ALTs, ICT and other means
4. Reinforcement of English skills and instruction abilities of English teachers/Strategic improvement of English education at the level of schools and communities
5. Modification of university entrance exams toward global society (p. 1)

Even though the term "global society" is mentioned in the proposal and the government acknowledges that "globalization intensifies the need for coexistence with different cultures and civilizations as well as international cooperation" (p. 2), target language is limited to English, and it seems that globalization is tied to English. The reason why English is the only focus is explained as follows:

> There are many foreign languages other than English, and they are all important in terms of communication means. However, considering that English is presently one of the major languages of international communication, this proposal is drawn up with the emphasis on strategies toward improvement of English-language skills (pp. 2-3).

Although it may be true that English is one of the major languages of international communication, limiting the focus on foreign language to only English may be problematic. This is because MEXT aims to cultivate students who have the "capability

of smooth communication with people of different countries and cultures using foreign languages as a tool" through developing primarily English proficiency so that they can communicate with "people of different countries and cultures" and get "accurate understanding of partner's thoughts and intentions based on his/her cultural and social background" (p. 3). Yet, in the next action plan called "The action plan to innovate the English education for globalization" (MEXT, 2013), the plans still include increasing the number of ALTs, conducting English classes in English in junior and senior high school, and focusing on the "communication" aspects which means speaking and listening activities. It also states that activities should be high level, such as presentation and debates in high school so that students' English meets the "global standard."

In "The action plan to improve students' English abilities" (MEXT, 2015), the basic goals have been carried on from the previous action plans, but some new goals were added. These include improving students' English abilities that would be sufficient for students who would like to work abroad or study abroad. Although it does not specify where the destination for the study or work abroad is, there are certain English scores that the government set for those students based on standardized English tests such as TOEFL. This can imply that the government assumes that students would be studying or working abroad in so-called Inner circle countries, or in environments in which everyone speaks English. In addition, this plan specifically emphasizes that students will improve their English so that they can "promote Japanese culture through English" and actively participate in "intercultural exchange programs and volunteer activities" (p. 3) for the Tokyo Olympics and Paralympics. It can be interpreted that the government assumed that people who would visit Japan or participate in those activities mentioned above would also be proficient in English, and that students would be engaged in those activities using English.

As part of the government initiative to cultivate Japanese citizens who can communicate in English in the era of globalization, some universities were selected as "Super Global Universities" and have begun a study abroad program called the "Tobitate! [Leap for Tomorrow] Study Abroad Initiative," in which universities and individuals that have potential to become *gurobaru jinzai* (Global Human Resources) receive funding. These policies may have an influence on how Japanese people perceive study abroad,

aiming to bring the following benefits "(1) developing language skills, (2) fostering cultural understanding and intercultural competence, (3) enhancing personal growth and identity and (4) increasing career opportunities" (Kubota, 2016, p. 349). Although English has been learned outside of formal education by learners of different age groups for various purposes, such as for their careers or just as a hobby (Kubota, 2019), since 2020, it has become a compulsory subject in school from Grade 3 and is being studied at school by all the students.

Considering that the majority of teachers on the JET program who are teaching in public schools in Japan are from the Inner circle countries, in addition to the fact that the MEXT is promoting English classes taught entirely in English, it can be argued that Japanese students are used to the Inner circle variety of English from a young age, informed by the native-English speakers who only use English in classes. In addition, it can be argued that the monolingual approach can have a negative impact on Japanese learners of English in terms of cultivating *gurobaru jinzai* who can communicate with other "English-speaking persons" (MEXT, 2014) who, in reality, come from different parts of the world, including people who speak English as an additional language.

These policies seem to have an influence on schools' language policies as well as how Japanese students perceive communication with people from other countries. Kubota (2018) presents 10 *genso* (myths) Japanese people have about English, which include ideas that American and British English are the only legitimate English language, language is best learned from native speakers, English is better learned in English, the purpose of learning English is to be able to use English, and that if you can speak English, you can communicate with anyone in the world. Moreover, these perspectives seem to be present in the case of the university where this study took place. For example, even though students come from approximately 90 countries with various L1s, the only two official languages for study are English and Japanese. Content courses are only offered in English and Japanese, and students are required to enter the university either in the English or Japanese stream, taking mandatory language courses in the language that is the opposite of their language stream. In addition, even outside of the school curriculum, conversations between students from different countries mainly take place in English.

2.3. Super Global University

Nevertheless, with the underlying assumption that "English links all people from diverse first-language backgrounds across the world" (Kubota, 2015, p. 59), English is seen as "an international language par excellence, deemed to be critical for work and study in the globalized society" (p. 59), and English predominates foreign language instruction not only through elementary to secondary education, but also in tertiary education in Japan. This also has a broader implication for university education: as mentioned above, the MEXT has been implementing initiatives to promote English education and to foster *gurobaru jinzai* in order to increase Japan's global competitiveness, one of which is the Top Global University Project. This project aims to "enhance the international compatibility and competitiveness of higher education in Japan" and to provide "prioritized support for the world-class and innovative universities that lead the internationalization of Japanese universities" (MEXT, n.d.). The universities selected for this project are called Super Global Universities and the project aims to achieve the following goals (Top Global University Japan, n.d.):

1. Increase the number of full-time foreign faculty members and Japanese faculty members who received their degrees from foreign universities;
2. Increase the number of international students in the total student population;
3. Increase the number of students who have earned credits at foreign universities in the total Japanese student population;
4. Increase the number of students sent abroad under inter-university agreements;
5. Increase the number of subjects taught in foreign languages;
6. Increase the number of students enrolled in degree courses conducted in foreign languages only;
7. Increase the number of students who meet the standards of proficiency in foreign languages;
8. Develop English syllabi;
9. Increase the number of Japanese students living in international dormitories; and
10. Adopt a flexible academic calendar (introduce a quarter system on a university-wide basis) (para. 3).

With the effort to internationalize higher education, Japanese universities are becoming increasingly diverse, with faculty members and students coming from different parts of the world. Also, even though one of the stated goals is to "increase the number of students enrolled in degree courses conducted in foreign language only," the majority of

the content courses conducted in foreign languages are conducted in English, and the number of schools offering English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) courses has increased. However, as discussed above, many of the Japanese students have been influenced by native speakerism and tend to prefer the standard varieties of English spoken in Inner circle countries, which can be problematic for internationalizing universities in Japan.

For example, Hino (2017) conducted a case study in different Japanese universities in which EMI courses are conducted, detailing the difficulties faced by a non-Anglophone faculty member in conducting EMI courses. An interview with a Singaporean professor revealed that he could sense that the Japanese students in his classes were uncomfortable with his Singaporean English and some even complained to the Dean, stating that they could not understand the professor's English because of his Singaporean accent. Additionally, through conducting interviews with Chinese students who were enrolled in EMI programs in Japanese universities, Tsukada (2017) found that some Chinese students experienced alienation in the sense that they were given limited attention, as they were neither Japanese nor native speakers of English. Considering the linguistic diversity that is present in the Japanese EMI context, there is a need to promote the varieties of English and the use of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) in order to include and accommodate faculty members and international students who are from the Outer circle or Expanding circle countries (Murata, 2017). In fact, the monolingual ideology pertaining to English language education in Japan can also have a negative impact on communication when English is used as a lingua franca. For instance, there have been cases of Japanese representatives who are stationed overseas and who hold high scores on the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC) looking down on local workers, predominantly Asian workers, due to their lack of proficiency in English. For example, these Japanese workers criticized the Asian workers' use of English, their accent, or incorrect grammar in their written English. This only served to cause tension between the workers (Kawashima, 2015). Therefore, the monolingual ideology does not only impact the university setting; it can also have a negative impact on Japanese students' intercultural communication after they graduate from university.

2.4. Implications of the government's approach for the present study

As discussed above, since the introduction of foreign language education, the Japanese government has implemented policies and initiatives regarding foreign language education influenced by the belief that English is the most important foreign language that Japanese citizens need to learn in order for Japan to improve itself economically and maintain its place in the globalized society. Also, many of the policies and initiatives are implemented based on the idea that English spoken in Inner circle countries by so-called native speakers is the norm, and it seems that it is assumed that non-Japanese people with whom Japanese people will be communicating for work and study will also speak such English. This monolingual ideology in language education, which will be discussed further in the next chapter, has a significant impact on many aspects of my research.

Firstly, the university in which this study took place is one of the Top Global Universities and international students from almost 80 countries study on campus. However, the mediums of instruction are limited to English and Japanese, which may mean ignoring other languages that students bring with them. In addition, due to this system being based on monolingual disposition (Gogolin, 1994), students are required to be enrolled either in the English or Japanese language program, and the language curricula are designed according to the monolingual approach to language teaching and learning. Thus, although the school has a unique environment in which half the student population comprises international students from almost 80 countries and regions, teachers are still expected to follow the monolingual standard under the English-only/Japanese-only policy. The English syllabus and the classroom rules that are given to students at the beginning of the semester state that students need to actively participate in class by "using English at all times." Finally, the government approach to favor "native" speakers of English as ALTs and present English spoken by native speakers as the norms from a young age may have a strong influence on shaping students' and teachers' perceptions of language education and use of different languages in language classrooms. Thus, in the next chapter, I will review literature on the three theoretical perspectives that guide me in the analysis of the data. I will first review literature on monolingual ideology

in language education and its influence on students and teachers. I will then review literature on translanguaging, which is the concept and pedagogical approach I brought to challenge the monolingual ideology in the present study. I will finally review literature on CLIL, which I incorporated in the design and implementation of the course in addition to translanguaging.

Chapter 3. Theory and literature review

In this chapter, I will provide theories and ideas that are relevant to my data analysis. I will first provide a background of how English is used and positioned in higher education in different contexts: in English speaking countries, non-English speaking countries, and Japan. I will then provide a review of theories and empirical studies on the three main concepts that I draw on to frame and make sense of this study: monolingual ideology in language education, translanguaging, and CLIL. I will discuss how the monolingual approach was shaped in society and has been used in language education globally and in Japan, and how translanguaging challenges such an approach as well as its utilization and implications in education settings. I will then review literature on CLIL and discuss what CLIL courses incorporating translanguaging pedagogy can offer. After reviewing the literature, research gaps that this study addresses will be discussed.

3.1. Language in higher education

With the globalization and mobility of people, educational settings have become more linguistically and culturally diverse. Although the situations vary in different educational contexts, English has played an essential role in tertiary education in both English speaking countries and non-English speaking countries. For instance, in anglophone universities in countries like Canada, where a large number of students use English as an additional language, students need to acquire academic English in order for them to engage in academic communications across the disciplines successfully (Marshall, 2020). Even though plurilingual students utilize their linguistic and cultural repertoires to navigate their learning (Marshall & Moore, 2013; Marshall et al., 2019), instructors may not always use pedagogical approaches that value and utilize students' unique linguistic and cultural repertoires in their courses for various reasons (Marshall & Marr, 2018). In addition, even in cases in which content instructors and language instructors work collaboratively in content courses offered in English to support English as an Additional Language (EAL) students, it can be difficult to provide sufficient support to the students due to power relations between the instructors and institutional

constraints (Wallace et al., 2020). Not only tertiary education in English speaking countries, but universities in non-English speaking countries also face challenges to accommodate EAL students to successfully engage in English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) courses.

Originated in response to the movement towards promoting student mobility within Europe, EMI increased rapidly across a wide range of disciplines in Europe from the late 1990s (Airey, 2016; Kirkpatrick, 2014). According to Dearden (2014), EMI is defined as the "use of the English language to teach academic subjects in countries or jurisdictions where the first language (L1) of the majority of the population is not English" (p. 4). EMI distinguishes itself from Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) in several ways. For instance, while CLIL does not specify the language of instruction, EMI makes it clear that the language of instruction is English. Also, while CLIL has an objective of developing both students' content knowledge and language proficiency, EMI does not necessarily have such an objective (Dearden, 2014). Simply put, EMI courses are content courses taught in English in non-English speaking countries, while CLIL focuses on both content and language and English is not necessarily the language of instruction. EMI is a growing global phenomenon in many parts of the world, especially in tertiary level for various reasons which include:

> a perceived need to internationalise the university in order to render it more prestigious; needing to attract foreign students because of falling enrolment numbers of home students through changing demographics, national cuts in HE investment; the need of the state sector to compete with the private sector; and the status of English as an international language, particularly in the domain of research publications (Ishikawa, 2020).

In order to enhance global competitiveness, there has also been a growing trend to offer EMI courses in Asia in the past two decades. Similar to the case of Japan, due to the government's educational reform, universities in East Asia such as Korea, Taiwan, and China, were also urged to increase the number of EMI courses offered (Byun et al., 2011; Hu & McKay, 2012; Tsou & Kao, 2017). Although EMI can be a crucial part of internationalization of higher education in Asia, there have been some challenges.

Kim et al (2017) investigated Korean engineering students' perceptions of EMI classes and L1 use in EMI classes using a questionnaire survey, and found that both

instructors and students have insufficient English proficiency to conduct successful EMI classes. Regarding the use of L1 (Korean) use by the instructor, they found that while some students were dissatisfied with the use of Korean in EMI classes, some students complained when only English was used. However, approximately 90% of the students believed that L1 should be used in EMI courses to facilitate their learning.

Kym and Kym (2014) also investigated Korean business students' perceptions of EMI classes using questionnaire methods, and found that while their level of satisfaction was relatively high regardless of their English proficiency, the level of understanding of lectures varied based on their English proficiency. While more proficient students described benefitting from EMI classes, less proficient students replied that they had a hard time comprehending and handling the content of the course. Another finding is that students' satisfaction of the EMI classes was highest when the instructor of the course was American, and lowest with Korean instructors.

Jiang et al. (2019) explored teachers' perceptions on EMI using a mix-methods design in a Chinese university. The study found that even if the instructors were capable of conducting the course in English, they prioritized the subject content due to time constraints, and English use in class was rather limited. In other words, in order to ensure students' understanding of the content, students' L1 (Chinese) was utilized in the EMI courses.

As can be seen from the literature on EMI courses in Asia, English language proficiency seems to be a crucial issue, for both students and their instructors, in EMI in non-English speaking countries, and similar issues arise in the Japanese EMI context as well. Although Dearden (2014) makes it explicit that EMI and CLIL are different, CLIL is sometimes considered as part of EMI, and there is often not as clear distinction between the two in the Japanese context (Nakabachi, 2020). There are many Japanese university students who take EMI courses hoping to develop both content knowledge and their English skills (Murata & Iino, 2017). However, there are some cases in which students find it difficult to understand the contents of the course due to insufficient English skills, and as a result, lose interest in the course and content knowledge (Kojima, 2016). In fact, according to a study conducted by Nakabachi (2020) in one of the Super Global Universities, students who could understand half the contents in their EMI courses

were around 50%, and students who understood almost everything were only about 20%. At the same time, as the number of international students studying in Japanese universities and taking EMI courses increased, the classrooms have become more diverse with international students who have high English proficiency, and Japanese students who need more support with their English. In addition, due to the shortage of instructors who can conduct EMI courses, there are many universities which are not completely ready to offer quality EMI courses (Torikai, 2020).

To sum up, EMI is considered as a crucial part of internationalization of higher education especially in non-English speaking countries including Japan. The government policies regarding globalization in Asia such as Super Global Universities promote the increased number of international students and foreign faculty members, as well as an increased number of EMI courses offered. However, the studies reviewed show that monolingual approaches do not necessarily work, especially in non-English speaking countries, where English is not the first language for the majority of students and faculty members. Not only can a monolingual ideology set unrealistic goals on students and teachers to conduct classes only in English like native speakers of English, but also it can marginalize students and faculty members that are neither native Japanese nor native English speakers. This study calls for a shift from monolingual approaches to approaches that take into consideration the complexity of language and identities brought to the classrooms.

3.2. Monolingual Approaches to Language Teaching and Learning

An important theoretical construct that I use in my research is monolingual approaches to language teaching (e.g., Lin, 2015). This is particularly relevant to my research because this construct has a strong impact on language education, especially English language education, as monolingual approaches are predominant in many contexts, including Japan (Ishikawa, 2020). I wish to challenge this ideology through this research, yet the system in which I work (i.e., a university in Japan), and the students with whom I work, seem to be strongly influenced by this monolingual ideology. Thus, in

this section, I will first discuss monolingual approaches in the global context and how they have influenced language education globally. Following this, I will discuss how monolingual approaches have been used and have influenced language education in Japan.

3.2.1. Monolingual ideology in the global context

The monolingual ideology is deeply rooted in language education around the world. The idea of monolingualism is discussed in early European literature, which reinforced the idea that "monolingualism represents an original state" (Lüdi & Py, 2009, p. 155) in the 18th century. This ideology, that one common language represents one nation, has been used in order to use the language as a symbol of national identity and a unifying force (Aikman, 2021), and remains prevalent today around the world. In this view, monolingualism is one of the main characteristics of a successful nation state and using the language is perceived as showing allegiance to the country in question. Because of this, the use of the "correct" language has been seen as claiming "solidarity with the community of all those living in the respective nation" (Gogolin, 2011, p. 230). Gogolin (1997) calls this "deep-seated habit of assuming monolingualism as the norm in the nation" (p. 41) *monolingual habitus*, which has a strong impact on today's assumption of monolingualism as a normal state.

In the context of language education, with the spread of the *direct method*, monolingual approaches to language teaching—those that emphasize the importance of the use of the target language, as well as the exclusion of the students' first language (L1) in the classroom—were widely adopted more than 100 years ago and still have a strong influence on language education today (Cummins, 2007). The direct method has its foundation in the *natural method*, which was developed by L. Sauveur, a language teacher and a founder of a language school in Boston in the 1860s and was developed into the direct method by Sauveur and Maximilian Berlitz in the United States (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). In addition, in the 1950s, the *audiolingual approach*, which was first developed as the army method, emerged (Brown, 2000). These two approaches—the direct method and the audio-visual approach—are based on the assumption that foreign languages should be taught and learned in the same manner in which children learn their

first language by listening, speaking, and inductively acquiring grammatical knowledge with no interference from other languages (Cummins, 2007). In the monolingual ideology, native speakers are seen as an idealized reference and, in English classrooms, teachers and students are encouraged and expected to "act as if they were monolingual speakers of English" (Cenoz & Gorter, 2013, p. 593). This could be problematic in EMI and CLIL classes as it can fail to recognize the cultural and linguistic diversity that students and instructors bring to the classroom.

The idea of native speakers as an idealized reference has a significant influence on English learning and teaching. As already mentioned, native speakerism is defined as "a pervasive ideology within ELT, characterized by the belief that 'native-speaker' teachers represent a 'Western culture' from which spring the ideals both of the English language and of English language teaching methodology" (Holliday, 2006, p. 385). Native speakers are considered as "people who have a special control over a language, insider knowledge about 'their' language" as they are considered "the models we appeal to for the 'truth' about the language" (Davies, 2003, p. 1). In other words, this traditional ideology regards English native speakers, particularly from Western, English-speaking countries, as owners of the English language. Because of this, even people who speak English as a first language in the Outer circle countries sometimes do not feel like they are "legitimate" speakers of English (Higgins, 2003). However, in today's world, the majority of English users are non-native speakers of English (British Council, 2013), which means that this view of Western, native-English speakers having ownership of the English language needs to be challenged.

Native speakerism undoubtedly has a strong impact on many aspects of English language teaching and learning. For instance, non-native English speaker (NNES) instructors of English often encounter linguistic and racial prejudice aimed at them, both institutionally and in their own classrooms, even though they make significant contributions to teaching by using their first-hand knowledge of learning English and their cultural knowledge (Kim & Kubota, 2012). For example, in Expanding circle countries (Kachru, 1985), white native speakers of English have a privileged status in employment (Kubota & Lin, 2009). Moreover, even some native English-speaking teachers who are not perceived as white due to their skin tone are not considered as

"native speakers," which creates complex identity issues in the field of English language teaching. In addition, this view of native speakers as an idealized reference can be problematic when, for example, NNES teachers see English spoken by "native speakers" as the ideal and subconsciously evaluate this version as superior (Holliday, 2006). Due to such a view, some NNES teachers feel inferior to native speakers and suffer from lower self-esteem than native English teachers (Llurda, 2009). Not only can this have a negative impact on their identities as English teachers, but it can also have a negative influence on the students who learn English from them, as this ideology can be reproduced through these beliefs. Through this view of native speakers as an ideal reference and the fact that native-like proficiency as a goal of language learning is often unattainable, second language (L2) users (Cook, 2007) may be positioned as "failed native speakers" (Kubota, 2012, p. 58). Nevertheless, the monolingual ideology that includes native speakers as an idealized reference is deeply rooted in society, which Lin (2015) attributes to the following factors:

1. The pedagogical ideology of teaching the target language (L2) through the target language only (or multilingualism through parallel monolingualisms);
2. The stereotyping of L1 use in the classroom as equivalent to the extensive use of L1 in the grammar-translation or concurrent content-translation approaches;
3. The one-sided application of the 'maximum input hypothesis';
4. The reported advantages of the separation strategy in some early bilingual education studies in the USA (p. 75).

The monolingual ideology is pervasive in English language teaching and learning around the world, even though it has been criticized (e.g., Cummins, 2007). Ortega (2013) argues that "the reality of bi/multilingualism is made invisible, and linguistic ownership by birth and monolingual upbringing is elevated to an inalienable right and advantage" (p. 36). In order to challenge this view of monolingualism as the implicit norm, Cook (2007) proposed the concepts of the *L2 user* and *multicompetence*. *L2* user refers to "people who know and use a second language at any level" (p. 240), and who are not evaluated according to native speaker norms. Multicompetence is "the knowledge of two or more languages in the same mind" (p. 241) and, in this view, bilingual or multilingual speakers are seen as individuals who have knowledge of multiple languages in one linguistic repertoire. In these views, the goal of language

education is not to aim to acquire native-like competence while also acknowledging the speaker's knowledge of their L1.

In fact, recent studies have shown positive outcomes of L1 use in language classrooms, which challenges the monolingual ideology. For example, use of L1 in classrooms can be effective in internalizing the differences between the L1 and L2 (Cook, 2001; Ortega, 2007), and multilinguals often link prior knowledge of language learning to new knowledge (Cenoz & Gorter, 2011). The use of L1 can also create a conducive learning environment by creating a positive atmosphere in the classroom (Dela Cruz, 2018). In addition, especially for adults and teenagers, allowing the use of L1 gives students the opportunity to show their academic abilities that they may not have been able to fully express if they were limited to their L2 (Atkinson, 1993). Yet, the monolingual ideology is still deeply rooted in society and has also been reinforced by large-scale English testing (Kubota, 2018). Thus, even though scholars and educators have been trying to challenge this dominant ideology, it still persists in many parts of the world.

3.2.2. Monolingual ideology in Japan

As discussed in Chapter 2, Japan has historically favored native English teachers since the first implementation of foreign language education, and the government's policies are largely influenced by the monolingual ideology. This monolingual ideology pertains to English language education in Japan and shapes how learners view English teaching and learning. As previously mentioned, the MEXT states that all English classes should be conducted in English, a view which is shared by many Japanese people. Moreover, "all-English" classes, which are English classes conducted entirely in English, are considered superior to English classes in which both Japanese and English are used (Iida, 2014). It is believed that "more exposure to English in the classroom is important for the improvement of English skills" (Iida, 2014, p. 3), and some students consider L1 use in English classes as a wasted opportunity in terms of listening to "proper" pronunciation and it is even considered "meaningless to have a NS [native-speaker] teacher" (Stephens, 2006, p. 16) if the native English-speaking teachers use Japanese in class. In addition, many Japanese students show a negative perception of non-native varieties of English (Matsuda, 2003), and some students are even prejudiced against

"Japanese" English which has a strong Japanese accent, and they have a strong desire to acquire native-like pronunciation (Tokumoto & Shibata, 2011).

However, some students believe that while native English teachers should conduct their conversation lessons in English, students should be allowed to ask questions in their L1 to maintain a relaxing learning environment (Burden, 2000). In addition, although there are still instructors who have this monolingual mindset in teaching and learning English, there are also instructors who have more positive perceptions of students' L1 use in the classroom (McMillan & Rivers, 2011). In this way, there has been a recognition of using students' L1 in the classrooms, and translanguaging, which will be discussed in the next section, is a pedagogical approach and a theoretical lens to explore such practices.

These are represented in my own teaching context as well. While there are some students who believe English-only classes are superior and more valuable than the classroom in which students' L1 and translanguaging are utilized as discussed in Chapter 1, there are many students who prefer to be allowed to translanguage. In addition, as the literature suggests, translanguaging and L1 use in the classroom seem to help create a relaxing learning environment (Charamba, 2020). For example, when I pose a question to the class in English, often, not many students, if any, answer. However, when I ask the same question in Japanese, some students answer. In addition, when I ask students to discuss some questions in English in groups, they tend to only say the answer. In contrast, when I tell them they can freely translanguage, they tend to bring more personal stories and rationale to their ideas. However, when I read students' reflection comments about their learning, students often write comments such as "I should push myself to speak English more" while they often also write comments like "I was able to learn more and understand better through the discussion and exchanging ideas with my classmates". Thus, it is evident that while students understand and benefit from the translanguaging pedagogy, monolingual ideology is affecting the way they perceive good language learning.

3.3. Translanguaging

In the field of language education, as discussed in the previous section, the monolingual approach has been predominant. However, due to increasingly complex social contexts caused by the movement of people in the era of globalization, there has been a shift in language education from the monolingual ideology to the more dynamic view of multilingualism (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020). As multilingual speakers have "a rich repertoire that includes not only linguistic elements but also their whole trajectories as language learners and users" (p. 304), they can learn new languages more efficiently when allowed to use resources from their existing linguistic repertoire. Herdina and Jessenner (2002) also propose that having multiple language systems influences not only the development of the L2 but also the entire linguistic repertoire, including the L1, indicating that the way multilingual speakers learn languages is different from monolingual speakers. Thus, there has been a growing body of research that supports "the deliberate, judicious use of teachers' and learners' languages and their (multilingual) metalinguistic knowledge in classrooms" (Duff, 2019). One concept that has been influential in this multilingual context is translanguaging.

Although translanguaging as a sociolinguistic phenomenon has existed throughout history, translanguaging as a concept in language education has its origin in the 1980s in Wales. In the past, although both Welsh and English existed in Wales, bilingualism was seen, by the majority of language scholars, as the addition of two languages or two separate monolingualisms with different levels of prestige. However, being bilingual themselves, Welsh scholars voiced the importance of looking at bilingualism as an integrated phenomenon (García & Lin, 2017). After the successful revitalization of Welsh in the late 20th century, the view of bilingualism changed and the idea of translanguaging emerged (Lewis et al., 2012). The original term for translanguaging, *trawsieithu* in Welsh, was coined by Cen Williams in 1994 to refer to "a pedagogical practice where students in bilingual Welsh/English classrooms are asked to alternate languages for the purposes of receptive or productive use" (García & Lin, 2017, p. 118). Although the main idea in the original understanding of translanguaging in language classrooms in Wales was the use of Welsh and English (as a form of dual

monolingualism) in the same lesson to develop both languages, with its development, translanguaging is now used and understood differently in different social and educational contexts.

García and Lin (2017) define translanguaging as "both the complex and fluid language practices of bilinguals, as well as the pedagogical approaches that leverage those practices" (p. 118). The concept reflects the "shift from monolingual ideologies in the study of multilingual education to multilingual ideologies and dynamic views of multilingualism" (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020, p. 300). Although translanguaging can be seen as similar to code-switching from the perspective of monolingual ideology, it distinguishes itself from code-switching, which is often associated with language separation, in that "translanguaging celebrates and approves flexibility in language use and the permeability of learning through two or more languages" (Lewis et al., 2012, p. 659). In addition, unlike code-switching —which focuses on the shift between different languages—translanguaging focuses on "the speakers' construction and use of original and complex interrelated discursive practices" (García & Lin, 2014, p. 22) "in order to maximize communicative potential" (García, 2009, p. 140). In short, while the monolingual approach is based on the idea that bilinguals have separate repertoires for different languages, translanguaging is based on the idea that bilinguals have one repertoire for all the linguistic resources that they have, and they use them fluidly based on the given contexts. In addition, in translanguaging, "languaging" is an important part, which refers to "an assemblage of diverse material, biological, semiotic and cognitive properties and capacities which languaging agents orchestrate in real-time and across a diversity of timescales" (Thibault, 2017, p. 82). In other words, it is "the holistic process through which we gain understanding, make sense, communicate, and shape our knowledge and experience through language" (Lewis et al., 2012, p. 656). In this view, languaging cannot be done by only using one named language, but it "goes beyond boundaries of codified languages or modalities through a dynamic and dialogic meaning-making process entangling with a collection of material, biological, semiotic, cognitive resources, and affordances deployed by the knowledge-building participants in real time or across timescales" (He & Lin, 2022, p. 148). Thus, in addition to the flexible use of

multiple languages, the processes of meaning-making and knowledge construction are also important aspects of translanguaging.

Translanguaging can be used and seen in different contexts. For example, translanguaging can be seen as a natural phenomenon in interactions among bilingual speakers. In addition, the use of translanguaging can be a part of the speakers' negotiations of their identities and meaning. Cenoz and Gorter (2017) label this phenomenon as *spontaneous translanguaging*, which means "the reality of bi/multilingual usage in naturally occurring contexts where boundaries between languages are fluid and constantly shifting" (p. 904). Li and Zhu (2013) explored translingual and multilingual identities of transnational university students who have Chinese roots but are living in the U.K. These students include new immigrants who had completed their schooling in their home countries and had come to the U.K. for university; third- or fourth-generation Chinese students born in the U.K.; and students from China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore who had received pre-university education in the U.K. at varying times. The study found that the students who have Chinese roots negotiate their identities and make meaning with other peers who also share Chinese roots. Even though they may all have Chinese roots in one way or another, they are also all different in many ways, such as their linguistic backgrounds, family environment, time spent in the U.K., and how they used and studied Chinese. In addition, even fluent English speakers used Chinese to make jokes that can only be understood by people who have knowledge of Chinese. This suggests that translanguaging is used to express these students' identities and that using a different language does not necessarily indicate a lack of proficiency in English but is rather a part of meaning making for multilingual speakers.

Moreover, translanguaging can be used in classroom settings as well. This type of translanguaging is called *pedagogical translanguaging* (Cenoz & Gorter, 2017), and it "embraces instructional strategies that integrate two or more languages" (p. 904). When pedagogical translanguaging is employed in classroom settings, it presents as "pedagogical scaffolding resources and opportunities for identity affirmation" (Li & Zhu, 2013). Also, in classrooms where translanguaging is used, "both languages are used in a dynamic and functionally integrated manner to organize and mediate mental processes in

understanding, speaking, literacy, and, not least, listening" (Lewis & Baker, 2012, p. 655). Pedagogical translanguaging is planned by the teacher in the classroom based on the planned strategies and can be separated from the spontaneous use of translanguaging that occur naturally.

The following four translanguaging pedagogy practices are interventions that can be used in the classroom: (1) enhancing metalinguistic awareness, (2) use of whole linguistic repertoire, (3) integrated language curriculum, and (4) translanguaging shifts (Cenoz & Gorter, 2021). These translanguaging pedagogy practices mean use of multiple languages in class and crosslinguistic analysis and reflection, use of multiple languages to perform various tasks such as finding sources, use of target language only, and use of multiple languages to translate the word or text that students do not know in the target language, respectively. Although pedagogical translanguaging, which is intentionally designed by teachers, is different from spontaneous translanguaging, when spontaneous translanguaging occur during class, they can be linked by the teacher to the learning process, and they can have pedagogical values (Lin & Lo, 2016). Nevertheless, translanguaging pedagogy has to be carefully designed by the teachers, and factors such as context, curriculum, and student population need to be taken into consideration (Galante, 2020a). Taking the dynamic and holistic view of translanguaging into consideration, Lin (2015) coined a term trans-semiotizing to describe the process of communication using not only multiple languages, but also other semiotic systems such as gestures, facial expressions, visuals, and sounds (Lin, 2019). A number of current studies on translanguaging also explore the use of trans-semiotizing, which will be discussed later in the chapter. Trans-semiotizing has also been used in classrooms in some studies (e.g., Wu & Lin, 2019) providing pedagogical values to multilingual students' learning.

In the case of the present study, several aspects of translanguaging were incorporated in the design and teaching of the course. First, translanguaging pedagogy which aims at enhancing metalinguistic awareness was incorporated. This was mainly done by having learners of Japanese and English together. Although instructors did not instruct students to make specific comparisons between Japanese and English, tasks were given both in Japanese and English. For example, students were tasked with a Japanese

debate and an English regardless of their target language, that is, debates were conducted twice in Japanese and English respectively. This would allow students to make comparisons between English and Japanese through engaging in the tasks. In addition, translanguaging pedagogy that emphasizes on the use of whole linguistic repertoire was also incorporated. This included both translanguaging and trans-semiotizing, and students were instructed to maximize their learning and communication among multilingual peers by using their full linguistic repertoire. However, due to the focus of the course, which is the interaction among learners of Japanese and English, translanguaging pedagogy that uses integrated language curriculum was not incorporated. Similarly, due to the focus of the course that encourages students' communication using their full linguistic repertoire as well as their relatively high language proficiency, translanguaging shifts were not utilized in the course.

3.3.1. Translanguaging in higher education

In this section, I will review literature that explores pedagogical translanguaging in higher education as the focus of my research is also situated in higher education. With regard to translanguaging in higher education, a number of authors have highlighted key factors to consider in their work. For example, some researchers highlighted the importance of translanguaging in the process of meaning-making and meaning-negotiation in EMI courses (e.g., He et al., 2016). Some researchers highlighted how monolingual ideology can play a role in the use of translanguaging by students and instructors (e.g., Goodman, 2016). Below, I will review some literature on how translanguaging is used and perceived by students and instructors who work in EAL classrooms.

Heugh et al. (2017) investigated English as an Additional Language students' translanguaging use in their writing tasks for an English for Academic Purposes course in an Australian university. The study suggested that students who have a strong proficiency in their first language can use it as an advantage and academic resource when learning something new in another language. Thus, this study determined that students could achieve better outcomes in their academic performance by making use of their translingual resources.

Additionally, in a case study conducted by Mazak and Herbas-Donoso (2015) in Spanish-medium science classrooms at a bilingual university in Puerto Rico, they found that the use of translanguaging helped develop students' bilingual academic repertoires by creating a translanguaging space in which both Spanish and English are valued and purposefully developed. Moreover, not only did the use of translanguaging allow students to activate all their meaning-making resources, including their non-linguistic resources, in their learning processes, it also challenged the "misconception of a monolingual world as the norm" and helped students develop a "positive sense of self as bilingual individuals" (p. 712).

Other studies on translanguaging in higher education also revealed positive impacts of translanguaging on students' learning. For instance, Zhou et al (2020) showed positive learning outcomes in both EAL students' spoken and written assignments by utilizing translanguaging pedagogy and removing negative affective filter and similarly, improvement on students' writing performance was observed in other studies (Carroll & Sambolin, 2016; Sun & Zhang, 2022). Specifically, Motlhaka and Makalea (2016) reported that use of translanguaging pedagogy helped students develop their voices in their writing. Furthermore, Heugh and Song (2017) also suggested that use of translanguaging pedagogy not only helped students improve EAL students' academic proficiency, but also led to improvement of their academic proficiency in their L1. Additionally, use of translanguaging pedagogy can help students' understanding of the content as well as improve their engagement and participation in class (Kao et al., 2021), and allows them to engage with the content more deeply by providing a relaxing learning environment and enhancing epistemic access to the content (Rafi & Morgan, 2022) (See (Chen, 2018; Corcoran et al., 2018; Galante, 2020b; Marshall & Moore, 2013).

In the context of Japanese universities, Yukawa (2016) examined students' translanguaging use in her English-medium seminar class. In this case study, she found that students used translanguaging for different purposes, such as aiding in comprehension of English explanations; providing emphasis and/or attracting listeners' attention; directly quoting an imaginary or real speaker who is speaking in a language that is not English; explaining something particular to Japanese culture or the particular course; and conducting an end-of-class discussion. Students who took the course had

high levels of proficiency in English, with more than half of them having studied abroad. The study demonstrated that the use of translanguaging did not occur due to insufficient L2 skills but, rather, was used to expand on students' understanding of the course content as well as to facilitate effective communication with classmates.

In addition, by comparing two groups, the first group using a monolingual approach and the second group using translanguaging pedagogy in a Japanese university, Barlett (2018) suggests that the translanguaging group retained more knowledge of the course content throughout the semester, which resulted in better test results as well as more motivation to study English. Similarly, in Turnbull (2019), by comparing two groups in a writing class— one group taught with a monolingual approach and the other with translanguaging pedagogy— the findings suggest that the translanguaging group scored higher than the monolingual group and the translanguaging group also produced more concise and well-formed essays. Additionally, the findings suggest that, by allowing translanguaging during the planning stages of their work, the students were able to negotiate and construct both meaning in their work and their identity as multilinguals.

As these studies demonstrated, translanguaging is not simply a tool to aid in students' learning in L2. Instead, it is a part of the meaning-making process that cannot be eliminated from successful communication and learning. In addition, although the understanding of translanguaging as an important aspect of meaning making and identity construction is limited in English language classrooms, a number of studies have suggested that translanguaging can play such roles. Considering the linguistic and cultural diversity involved in internationalizing universities, I would argue that the promotion of translanguaging seems to be more in line with the reality of multilingual student populations, rather than forcing monolingual approaches. Therefore, translanguaging not only accommodates students' and instructors' identities as multilingual speakers, but also brings academic benefits to the students by availing all of the resources they have to the learning process.

3.3.2. Students' perspectives on translanguaging in higher education

In this section, I will review literature on students' perspectives on translanguaging in higher education. In many studies, it was found that students use

translanguaging in classrooms to understand difficult concepts in L2 (Mbirimi-Hungwe, 2021) and negotiate meaning and co-construct a dialogic approach in the classroom (Wang, 2019). However, some studies also found that while students acknowledge their use and benefits of translanguaging in their learning, they do not necessarily have a positive perception of translanguaging use in class. For example, in their study exploring use of translanguaging in EMI classrooms and students' perspectives on translanguaging in a Puerto Rican university, Riviera and Mazak (2019) found that while students used translanguaging to express their ideas by providing deeper explanations and reasons, they did not believe it makes their learning easier. Similarly, Alzahrani (2019) explored EAL students' translanguaging use in an American university, and found that while they use translanguaging to generate ideas and understand the content, they also believed that use of L1 has a negative impact on their L2 learning. Furthermore, Kwihangana (2021) explored students' use and perception on translanguaging in a university in Rwanda, and findings suggested that while students acknowledged the benefits of translanguaging in group activities, they preferred English only classes regardless of their English level. The study also suggested that students' mixed feelings on use of translanguaging may come from a perception that English is more relevant professionally and internationally.

3.3.3. Instructors' perspectives on translanguaging in higher education

Next, in this section, I will review literature on instructors' perspectives on translanguaging in higher education. Many studies have found that translanguaging is a practice that is seen in many classrooms, and also a pedagogical approach that many teachers use. In Weng and Atatei (2022) they found that a multilingual instructor engaged in translanguaging pedagogy in EAL classroom in the U.S., using translanguaging as a way of displaying his own multilingual and multicultural identity as well as valuing those of students. In addition, findings in Fang and Liu (2020) also suggest that many of the instructors in EMI and EAL classrooms in a Chinese university recognize the effectiveness of translanguaging in deepening understanding, creating a rapport, and achieving better learning especially for students with lower English proficiency, and that the majority of the instructors have either neutral or positive attitude towards translanguaging.

There are also some cases in which instructors have conflicts between their actual translanguaging practices and their perspectives on translanguaging due to external factors. For example, in Lasagabaster (2016), EAL instructors in the U.S. shared similar views regardless of translanguaging being a part of their teaching practice. They had reservations about using translanguaging because of how bilingualism is perceived in the U.S., i.e. as an interference and a burden rather than an asset. Similarly, Serna-Bermejo and Lasagabaster (2022) found that teachers showed more negative than positive attitudes towards translanguaging use in both EMI and Basque Medium Instruction (BMI) in a university in Basque in their study using class observations, interviews, and questionnaire. Additionally, in Hillman et al. (2019) exploring instructors' use and perceptions on translanguaging in an international university in Qatar using a survey, video recordings of classes, and interviews, the findings suggest that while many of the instructors engaged in translanguaging for various pedagogical purposes in practice, they tended to report minimal use of translanguaging in their classrooms due to different ideological tensions. Also, Mazak and Herbas-Donoso (2014) found that even though instructors in EMI science class in Puerto Rico used translanguaging in their classrooms, they also believed that it is important for students to engage in science in English due to their strong ideology of English as the language of science. Similarly, Burton and Rajendram (2019) suggest that even though teachers employ translanguaging pedagogy in their classrooms, they perceive translanguaging as a temporary scaffolding to develop specific skills in English. Finally, Aghai et al (2020) also suggest that instructors in EAL courses in the U.S. have different perceptions of translanguaging: as a natural process, as a resource, and as a problem.

3.3.4. Significance of translanguaging in my study

As an English learner and non-native English teacher myself, I had developed a negative identity as a deficient speaker of English, and I never felt that I was able to fully be myself when speaking in English. However, as I learned more about language education and issues surrounding language education in my master's and doctoral courses, I came to realize that I was strongly influenced by the dominant ideology around the English language. At the same time, I learned many concepts and theories that changed my view

on language education. Among many of those, the one that struck me the most was the concept of translanguaging, which refers to the "act performed by bilinguals of accessing different linguistic features or various modes of what are described as autonomous languages, in order to maximize communicative potential" (García, 2009, p. 140). This was a completely different perspective on communication among bilinguals like myself from my previous understandings, and what resonated with me the most was that the use of translanguaging as a pedagogical tool "gives back the voice that had been taken away by ideologies of monoglot standards" (García & Li, 2014, p. 105). I certainly felt that my voice was taken away when I only had to use English to express myself, and maybe I, too, was taking away students' voices when I told my students to only speak in English in class.

Therefore, I wanted to develop a completely new language course, in which learners of Japanese and English can learn to communicate effectively using their additional language, as well as any other linguistic and cultural resources that they have. Also, considering that the nature of English and communication among people have been changing with globalization and the advancement of technology (Warschauer, 2000), I wanted to develop a course in which students can negotiate and co-create meaning and knowledge while learning critical intercultural awareness, rather than the mastery of one form of the language. Thus, in this study, I will explore how students perceive such a language course that goes against the traditional monolingual approaches to language education, and their experience in such a course. In addition, as previous literature suggests, since instructors' beliefs on translanguaging affect their view on and use of translanguaging in the classroom, this study will explore the experiences of teachers who have different backgrounds and beliefs on language education develop a translanguaging language course, within a CLIL framework, together. Thus, in the next section, I will review literature on CLIL.

3.4. CLIL

In designing and implementing the new language course in which I collected data for this study, CLIL pedagogy was incorporated along with translanguaging. CLIL is defined as "a dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used

for the learning and teaching of both content and language" (Coyle et al., 2010, p. 1). The implementation of CLIL is based on the 4Cs Framework, which focuses on the "interrelationship between content (subject matter), communication (language), cognition (learning and thinking), and culture (social awareness of self and 'otherness')" (Coyle, 2007, p. 550). Content refers to the project theme, and successful CLIL aims for learning of content and acquisition of thematic knowledge, skills and understanding (Coyle, 2005). In addition, based on Lantolf (2000) and Vygotsky (1978), Coyle (2007) argues that content learning is not simply about acquiring knowledge and skills on the subject matter, but rather, about the learner constructing their own knowledge through the content learning. Communication refers to development of language of learning, for learning, and through learning, which calls for a shift in focus from "language learning based on linguistic form and grammatical progression to a more 'language using' one which takes account of functional and cultural imperatives" (Coyle, 2007, p. 552). Cognition is also an important aspect of CLIL, and it is about allowing students to construct their own understanding of the subject matter by engaging in higher order thinking skills (Coyle, 2005). According to Bloom's Taxonomy, learning objectives are categorized and placed in a hierarchy from Lower Order Thinking Skills (LOTS) to Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS), and HOTS include producing new or original ideas and work (Bloom, 1956). Finally, culture is a crucial aspect in CLIL, not only to foster intercultural understanding, but also to discover self and for identity-construction through the understanding of otherness. By interacting with otherness, "learners can have experiences which they could not have had in a monolingual setting … [and] which are fundamental to a deeper understanding of global citizenship" (Coyle et al., 2010, p. 390). To sum up, CLIL is not simply aimed at learning language and content but is, rather, a holistic approach that encourages both the development of language knowledge and skills as well as intercultural awareness needed in the 21st century through learning content by engaging in cognitive processes and interactions with peers.

One of the distinct features of CLIL is its flexibility and its potential to be modified based on the specific context of the classroom as long as the quality of education is secured following the 4Cs (Ikeda, 2011). This flexibility of CLIL is described as a "certain in-betweenness: between being a type of programme and a

pedagogical model, between a focus on form and a focus on meaning, explicit and implicit language teaching, and systematic and spontaneous development" (Darvin et al., 2020, p. 104). One way to divide CLIL into two categories relates to its focus. First, a CLIL approach whose primary focus is language learning has been called soft CLIL, and content is used to promote the language learning. Ikeda (2021) defines soft CLIL as a "language teaching approach with heavy reliance on content where students develop their language proficiency, subject-matter understanding, and transferable multi-purpose skills while they are engaged in verbally interactive, cognitively demanding, and culturally enriched activities with their peers in the target language" (p. 17). He also describes the multi-purpose skills needed in the 21st century as "soft skills such as logical/critical thinking, knowledge activation, problem solution, creativity, communication, collaboration, cross-cultural awareness, etc." (p. 14). In contrast, in so-called hard CLIL, the primary focus is learning of content knowledge, which is normally taught by content teachers in a language that is not students' L1 (Ball et al., 2016). In addition, based on frequency, CLIL can be divided into Light CLIL and Heavy CLIL, the former referring to CLIL lessons that are taught several times in the course, and the latter referring to CLIL lessons that are offered regularly through the course. Moreover, CLIL could be divided into Partial CLIL, which refers to CLIL that is incorporated into a part of class, and Total CLIL referring to a class that incorporates CLIL in the entire lesson respectively (Ikeda, 2011).

CLIL originated in Europe in the 1990s as a part of a European language policy. Language was considered to be an important aspect of uniting the European nations promoting the mobility of students and workers, economic strength and competitiveness, and social cohesion. Thus, policy makers of the European Union promoted CLIL in many important policy documents, and CLIL programs were instituted across Europe with funding support to develop CLIL in various ways, such as material development, research, and teacher training (Georgiou, 2012).

In the development of CLIL, ideas were borrowed from bilingual and immersion programs in the U.S. and Canada, but the languages taught were not limited to English, but incorporated other European languages. However, in reality, English as a medium of CLIL is predominant in many of the non-English speaking countries (Dalton-Puffer,

2011). The CLIL programs were started mainly in Holland, Finland, and Sweden in the 1990s, and spread to all of Europe in the 2000s (Coyle, 2007). Although CLIL has been gaining popularity in Asia in recent years, it is still relatively new there. In addition, CLIL in Asian countries has been developed mostly as part of English education programs and as part of globalization policies, in which the Asian governments usually stipulate the promotion of English education (Sasajima, 2020; Yang, 2015).

For example, with the government's promotion of CLIL programs, there have been many universities which offer CLIL programs in Taiwan, and CLIL is successful in developing both students' productive and receptive competence in English based on results of language tests (Yang, 2015). Although CLIL could be a useful approach to improve students' English proficiency, it could bring challenges to teachers. For example, for teachers who do not have much experience with CLIL, positioning and negotiating their identity and roles primarily as a language teacher could be a challenge (i.e., some teachers consider themselves as a language teacher while others consider themselves as a content teacher who provides support with language) (Kim & Lee, 2020). In addition, in a case in which content teachers are assigned to teach CLIL courses due to government promotion of CLIL, native-speakerism can have negative influences on teachers. For example, non-native content teachers who teach CLIL courses may feel that they are inferior to native teachers and that they should teach their CLIL classes like native speakers (i.e., taking more laid-back classroom approach and being more friendly to students) (Bae, 2015). Although native-speakerism is pervasive in underpinning government policies on CLIL programs, findings from Chen et al. (2020) suggest that ELF perspectives should be incorporated into CLIL programs to value students' and teachers' linguistic and cultural resources.

Since the implementation of CLIL programs in Europe, the use of L1 or translanguaging had become a part of classroom practices, yet was not framed as translanguaging. In order to explore the usefulness of translanguaging for CLIL, Nikula and Moore (2019) analyzed CLIL classrooms in Australia, Finland, and Spain. The findings of this study suggest that translanguaging serves a variety of purposes, such as ensuring interaction in the classroom, helping with the learning of content and language, and creating a translanguaging space for the learners. In Karabassova and San Isidro's

(2020) study exploring teachers' perceptions of translanguaging pedagogy in Kazakhstan, it was found that the teachers considered translanguaging a tool for two purposes: to scaffold the content taught in English; and to assist with the teachers' limitations in their language proficiency while teaching in English, with the end goal of teaching the content entirely in English.

However, the use of L1 or translanguaging "is not only a way to 'scaffold' instruction, to make sense of learning and language; rather, translanguaging is part of the metadiscursive regimes that students in the twenty-first century must perform" (García, 2011, p. 147). This aspect of translanguaging is utilized in some CLIL classrooms in which translanguaging pedagogy is employed. Lin and He (2017) investigated the use of translanguaging in CLIL classrooms in a secondary school in Hong Kong, in which the teacher and the students had different home and community languages. Different home and community languages and cultures were valued in the classroom, and students were able to engage in translanguaging not only to expand on their understanding of the class content but to also showcase their multilingual identities.

In CLIL classrooms, it can be challenging for students to learn both content and language, especially when they are still developing their academic literacy and proficiency in English as an additional language. In order to ensure their development, both in content and knowledge of the language, while also utilizing students' translingual repertoire along with the other skills needed in the 21st century, Lin (2015) developed the Multimodalities Entextualisation Cycle (MEC). The MEC cycle is a curriculum genre that was originally developed for teachers teaching in CLIL and Content Based Education (CBE) settings, which consists of three stages. In the first two stages of the cycle, students are encouraged to use multimodalities such as visuals, videos, and translanguaging to learn about and engage with the topic and to make meaning; and, in the third stage, the students are expected to produce a spoken and/or written text in their target languages and genres. The use of multimedia platforms is encouraged at various stages of the MEC. Although many studies which have investigated classes in which MEC is employed have been conducted in secondary education, MEC has been utilized in higher education as well.

In a study conducted in a Grade 10 Biology CLIL class in Hong Kong, Wu and Lin (2019) explored the translanguaging and trans-semiotizing practices in the classroom. By using MEC in the lessons, the instructor demonstrated that translanguaging and trans-semiotizing can be woven throughout different stages of the lessons. Also, by translanguaging and trans-semiotizing (Lin, 2019), the teacher and students were engaged in “dynamic and dialogic flows of collective meaning-making" (Wu & Lin, 2019, p. 265) by simultaneously using all of their available resources for meaning making in every step of the process. Thus, the use of L1 was not simply used as a scaffolding but, rather, as a resource for knowledge construction.

In addition, in a study conducted in a Grade 9 multilingual CLIL class in Hong Kong, He and Lin (2021) explored the meaning-making process of multilingual students and their teacher in the classroom. The study suggests that the use of the MEC facilitated not only the students’ academic language development, but also a space for translanguaging and trans-semiotizing, which helped the meaning-making process. Moreover, not only did the use of different languages and registers, artefacts, which connected their different personal experiences in the meaning-making process helped students understand the content and improve their language skills, but it also challenged the monolingual English only policy in classrooms in Hong Kong.

Moreover, in a recent study conducted in a community college in Hong Kong, Siu and Lin (2022) explored the roles of translanguaging in the process of mastering content and language learning in an EMI course. The study suggested that MEC encouraged use of fluid and creative translanguaging and trans-semiotizing among peers to construct meaning using plurilingual and pluricultural sources. Moreover, the study suggested that the use of MEC provided emotional affordances and promoted boundary-crossing social interactions for both teachers and students who are plurilingual by allowing access to multiple resources that were produced in different languages.

3.4.1. Contextualizing the course through a CLIL lens

As described above, one of the main features of CLIL is its flexibility. In other words, any course can be called as long as the course aims to improve students’ 4Cs: content, communication, cognition, and culture. Although many CLIL courses in the

world can be straightforward in a way that contents can be school subjects such as science and social studies, and that they focus on teaching both the content and language through teaching the subject in the students' target language, it does not necessarily have to be done that way. In the CLIL course that this study explores, content is not just one subject: the contents of the course are education, environment, AI, and social issues. That is, the course aims to develop students' content knowledge in a broad sense rather than in one specific area. In addition, the course fits the criteria of soft CLIL as the course was developed and taught by language teachers. In addition, besides how the CLIL was developed and taught, the main goals of the CLIL course falls into the category of soft CLIL. As well as the improvement and learning of content and language, the course was particularly designed to improve students' multi-purposes skills such as logical thinking, critical thinking, creativity, problem solving skills, collaboration skills, and cross-cultural awareness (Ikeda, 2021). Also, as we would like to challenge the monolingual approach that is normally associated with CLIL, we decided to develop this CLIL course for students learning Japanese and English respectively. In other words, two streams of students: English learners and Japanese learners studied the same content together in the same classroom. By breaking the boundary between languages, this innovative CLIL course aimed to improve students' 4Cs by engaging them with tasks that requires HOTS with their peers who come from different cultures and working collaboratively while utilizing their multilingual resources.

3.4.2. Translanguaging in CLIL in higher education

Although there has been a growing number of studies on translanguaging in CLIL in elementary and secondary education as discussed in the previous section, studies focusing on translanguaging and CLIL in tertiary education are rather limited. Since it is beyond the scope of this study to provide a detailed review of literature on CLIL pedagogies in Japanese K-12 settings, I will review literature on translanguaging in CLIL in higher education in this section.

Translanguaging is utilized in CLIL classrooms in higher education both fluidly and strategically to help students understand the disciplinary concepts and contents which could be challenging if limited to students' L2 (Bellés-Calvera, 2021; Mazak & Herbas-

Donoso, 2015; Ting, 2020). According to Zhou and Mann (2021), advanced level EAL learners who are also highly motivated to improve both their language proficiency and content knowledge reject the traditional monolingual approach and appreciate the translanguaging pedagogy employed by the instructor.

There have been some studies exploring translanguaging in CLIL in the Japanese tertiary context as well. The studies show that translanguaging in CLIL can be beneficial in that not only can it allow students to understand the content better, but it can also increase their interest in the content (Yamauchi, 2018) and decrease their language anxiety (Capati, 2022). However, there are some cases where teachers do not engage in translanguaging pedagogy due to their limited ability with students' L1 (Capati, 2022). Although the benefit of translanguaging in CLIL has been recognized in Japan, CLIL is seen as "utilizing a different teaching method that will enhance the effectiveness of foreign language teaching" (Hashimoto & Glasgow, 2019, p. 108) and especially in the tertiary context, it is considered as a "way to teach content to students who do not have a high level of language proficiency" (p. 108). Thus, the aspect of translanguaging as a meaning-making resource is under-researched. Although there are not many studies that have explored translanguaging as a meaning-making resource, Tsuchiya (2019) explored the use of translanguaging in a group discussion between Japanese students and a Saudi student in a CLIL classroom. Through an analysis of a 40-minute discussion, the study suggests that not only did the use of translanguaging serve to regulate participation by indicating the shift between interactional talk and transactional talk during the discussion; it was also used by the students as a way for them to represent themselves as multilingual speakers who are not restricting themselves to either ELF or the use of Japanese. Moreover, the translanguaging space and meaning were simultaneously co-constructed during the discussion.

3.5. Online classes

Since the focus of this study is the use of translanguaging among students and their perception of the use of translanguaging and in a CLIL-based course, it is beyond the scope of this study to provide a detailed review of literature on online courses.

However, as the course this study explores was offered online due to the COVID-19 pandemic, in this section, I will provide a brief review of literature on online classes. The course was offered in the fall semester in 2020, and all the classes were offered on Zoom. The class was offered synchronously, which means students and teachers interacted at the same time over Zoom. Other examples of synchronous learning include tele-conferencing, live-streaming lectures, and live chatting; it has been suggested that synchronous learning can increase students' motivation by monitoring students' responses during the sessions (Hrastinski, 2008). However, in large lecture classes, some students can struggle to concentrate in class and feel less connected to their peers and instructors (Kofoed et al., 2021).

Although there could be some obstacles such as poor internet connection, synchronous online discussions for university students can provide live learning environments in which they can engage in discussions while negotiating the tasks with their classmates and instructors and expressing their emotions using emoticons (Rinekso & Muslim, 2020). Moreover, in online courses, students build rapport with other students and instructors as well as communicate in real time about the lectures by the use of messaging tools such as KakaoTalk and Whatsapp (Choi et al., 2021). In addition, collaborative work can be done efficiently in online synchronous sessions by the use of technology such as GoogleDrive (Moore, 2016).

In the field of language learning and teaching, there has been an increasing amount of research on effectiveness and usefulness of online classes, especially after the Covid-19 pandemic. In a study exploring 60 EFL learners in high schools in Indonesia, Nuryanto (2021) found that students perceived that Zoom is an user-friendly online learning platform that encouraged them to work collaboratively with their classmates sharing their ideas comfortably. Also, Zhao (2010) suggests that text chat and video conferencing can be effective tools for cross cultural communication, by allowing students from different cultural backgrounds to negotiate meaning with each other as well as facilitating their second language acquisition. One feature of Zoom, breakout rooms, is advantageous for improving interaction between students and for group work activities (Lee, 2021; Mohamed, 2020); however, conversation can take place more slowly or it can be difficult for instructors to monitor all the students compared to in-person settings

(Cavinato et al., 2021). In addition, other features of Zoom, such as chat box or shared screen are utilized by the teachers and students to facilitate their learning (Kohnke & Moorhouse, 2022; Moorhouse et al., 2021; Mu'awanah et al., 2021; Wong, n.d.). Moreover, despite the availability and slow speed internet connection in some cases, Suadi (2021) reported that university students in his study considered that they have improved their language skills and reduced shyness in their interaction with peers in an English class utilizing Zoom and Whatsapp. Finally, in Lee's (2021) study, majority of the students in an English communication class in a university in South Korea showed positive responses towards the use of Zoom in terms of improving and practicing their communicative English skills, some stating that it was not much different from face-to-face classes.

It may be worthwhile to mention that studies on online education conducted during the Covid-19 pandemic, described as emergency remote teaching, refer to a forced, obligated situation, unlike distance education which "has always been an alternative and flexible option for learners" (Bozkurt & Sharma, 2020, p. ii). Thus, online classes during the pandemic are rather a temporary alternative to face-to-face classes, while distance education was developed when "resources, platforms and teaching methods were carefully considered and took time to develop and curate" (Yates et al., 2021, p. 61). To sum up, the studies conducted during the Covid-19 pandemic suggested that although there could be some challenges conducting language classes online, especially via Zoom, instructors and students benefitted from the technology and were content with the interaction between instructors and peers that Zoom offered, considering the situation.

While there are various methods of delivering online courses, due to the pandemic and university policies on offering language courses, the course for this study was offered synchronously online, and students may have been used to online learning as the course was offered in the fall semester in 2020, and all the classes were held online since the spring semester in 2020. Nevertheless, the instructors of the course tried to make the online class more engaging and effective by the use of small group works and use of technology such as Google Jamboard, Google Drive and Google forms.

3.6. Research gap

Through the review of literature, it became clear to me that there are many misalignments surrounding language education: misalignment between theory and practice, between government policy and paradigm shift in language education, and between instructors and students' perceptions on translanguaging and their actual practices. Although CLIL courses have been increasing in many Asian countries, in Japan, especially in higher education, CLIL and EMI are used interchangeably, namely, as a means to teach content in English. However, the "cognition" and "culture" aspects of CLIL, which are closely related to students' meaning making process, are still under-researched, although the concept of translanguaging employed in CLIL contexts can enhance those aspects, while ensuring students' linguistic gains by the use of the MEC cycle.

In addition, even though there has been a paradigm shift in language education, government policies still tend to be based on a monolingual approach including native speakerism. Even though studies have highlighted the actual practices and benefits of translanguaging in language classrooms, strong monolingual ideology is still pervasive as seen in the "all-English" policies, which has a negative influence on how instructors and teachers perceive translanguaging in the classroom. Additionally, despite the increased diversity in educational contexts, many studies on translanguaging and CLIL to date have primarily investigated language classrooms in which the majority of the students share the same L1 and/or learn the same language. Lastly, although one important aspect of translanguaging is the process of meaning making, studies reviewed in this chapter have suggested that it is mostly only understood and used as a scaffolding to learn the target language and should not be used if/when the students are able to navigate their learning only using their target language.

The present study aims to provide a new perspective on language education by exploring a dual language based CLIL course in which students with various linguistic and cultural backgrounds learn two languages simultaneously and translanguaging is used and encouraged not only as a scaffolding tool but also to a large extent as a process of meaning making. Through exploring instructors' experiences developing and

implementing this new language course and their perspectives on translanguaging as well as how students engage with and perceive the translanguaging pedagogy, this study will attempt to shed light on how language education can move forward in narrowing the gap between theory and practice and accommodating the cultural and linguistic diversity in and outside classrooms. As this is a new type of language course in that it was developed by both English and Japanese language instructors, incorporating translanguaging pedagogy while students from various linguistic and cultural backgrounds study their respective target languages, the course can offer new insights that neither L2, CLIL, nor dual language education research could offer.

Chapter 4. Methodology

4.1. Introduction

This chapter describes the methods and methodology of this study, which employs a qualitative case study approach (Duff, 2008), using interviews, students' portfolios, and reflective journals. Below, I first describe the research design in relation to the research questions. I then discuss the methodological approach as well as the research context and recruitment of participants. Then, I describe the method of data generation via interviews, portfolio, and reflective journals. I also describe how the interviews were conducted and how research journal pieces were written, and describe the data analysis procedures. I proceed to discuss reflexivity in qualitative research and discuss the complexity of my own position as a researcher and teacher who developed and taught the course. Finally, I discuss ethical considerations of this research.

4.2. Overview of the study and research design

The study explores students' and instructors' experience in a Translanguaging Dual Language (TDL) course that was developed and offered in an international university in Japan. It was a unique and innovative course in several ways –it was a language course developed by a collaborative effort of Japanese and English language instructors, and it was the only dual-language based course in the language curriculum. The course also distinguished itself from other language courses as the pedagogy drew from translingual practices of all the students across the entire course, who came from different parts of the world, including but not limited to Thailand, India, Australia, Korea, the U. S., and Japan. In addition, as it was an advanced-level elective course, students' cultural and linguistic backgrounds varied (i.e., some students who were enrolled in the Japanese stream were L1 Japanese speakers who grew up in different countries, and there was a student who was an L1 speaker of both English and Japanese enrolled in the

English stream). The details of the participants and the course will be given later in the chapter.

I worked with five other instructors of English and Japanese to develop this course, and a Japanese language teacher and I, an English language teacher, co-taught the course together. The goals of the study are to explore how this innovative language course was perceived by the students, what kind of difficulties students faced in taking the course, and difficulties teachers faced in developing and teaching the course, so that I can offer directions and suggestions for the future of language education that can accommodate the communication needs/challenges/situations students will face in the 21st century. The research questions this study explores are as follows:

1. How do students perceive a new type of language course in which learners with diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds learn different target languages in the same classroom simultaneously?
2. How is translanguaging used in the process of meaning making and knowledge construction among students of different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, and how is it perceived by them?
3. How do language teachers develop and implement a new type of language course with other teachers who are very diverse in age, experience, linguistic resources, and who have different beliefs about language education?

Research question one and two primarily involved student interviews, portfolios, and my reflective journal as supplementary data. Research question three involved teacher interviews and my reflective journal. For the data analysis, as reflexivity is an important aspect of my thesis, I employed reflexive thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2020) by reflecting on my own practices and imagining participants' experiences when conducting interviews, analyzing data, and writing the thesis.

4.3. Methodological approach and my own positionality as a researcher

Before I discuss the specific research approach to this study, I shall discuss my own positionality as a researcher. Research paradigms could be seen from three different

perspectives: positivist, interpretive, and critical, which constitute "a set of beliefs, theories, empirical methodologies, and communication practices shared by a community of researchers that provides the standards and norms for inquiry within that paradigm" (Lin, 2015). According to the positivist paradigm, the only true knowledge is that which allows "positive verification of empirical data through the experimental method (or by inference through inferential statistical analyses)" (p. 25) and researchers are positioned as subjects of knowledge separate from the researched. On the other hand, an interpretive paradigm aims to produce knowledge that helps to gain understanding of how and why people are doing what they are doing from their perspectives. Researchers interpret the meanings given by the participants "through interpretive analysis, drawing on the same set of sociocultural interpretive resources shared by the researcher and the researched," and the researched are often positioned as the "object of description and analysis" (p. 25). Lastly, in a critical research paradigm, the focus of research is not just describing and understanding the phenomena, but rather, changing society and the world. In this paradigm, both the researcher and the researched are "subjects of knowing and enter into a dialogue on equal footings" (p. 26). In my case, although the ultimate reason and purpose why I am doing research is to bring about changes in the world, at least in terms of how languages are perceived, used, and learned and taught, I am not completely sure if I currently fit into the critical research paradigm. This is mainly because as much as I wish to make the above changes, I do not necessarily feel that I have an institutional position that would allow me to challenge social inequities and promote change in those areas. Thus, I would better fit into the interpretive paradigm, and I present knowledge based on my interpretation, from a more critical pragmatic perspective (Benesch, 2000).

To explore the research questions and develop a detailed understanding of students' and teachers' experiences in the TDL course, a qualitative research approach was chosen rather than a quantitative one. Quantitative research aims to produce data that is "systematic, rigorous, focused, and tightly controlled, involving precise measurement and producing reliable and replicable data that is generalizable to other contexts" (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 34). Qualitative research can seek to "produce an in-depth exploration of one or more sociocultural, educational, or linguistic phenomena" and "participants' and researchers' own positionality and perceptions with respect to the phenomena" (Duff,

2006, pp. 73-74). As mentioned earlier, since the course is innovative and unique, this study does not intend to offer generalizability, but rather offers a particular account of students' and instructors' experiences and perceptions in the specific context of the course.

Thus, the study particularly takes a qualitative case study approach, which focuses on "'bounded' singular nature of the case" emphasizing the "importance of the context" (Duff, 2008, p. 19). This "bounded" nature is closely related to the unit of analysis, which is an important aspect of case study. The unit of analysis in case study can be "*one* particular program or *one* particular classroom of learners" (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015, p. 39). Moreover, case study is suitable when research questions require exploring the phenomenon and in-depth description of the phenomenon (Yin, 2009). In short, case study focuses on a particular case which is situated in a particular context. In the case of my research, I focus on a particular classroom, a particular group of students who studied in the TDL course with classmates from diverse backgrounds, and a particular group of teachers who were involved in developing and implementing this innovative language course.

Having its origins in areas including sociology, psychology and linguistics (Duff, 2008), case study research has played an important role in the field of applied linguistics especially in second language acquisition (SLA) and L2 education in the 1970s in development of theory, teaching methods, and research (Duff & Anderson, 2016). In contrast to realist or positivist research, the majority of current qualitative case study research in language education is interpretive, social constructivist, and sociocultural in nature, focusing on the various ways in which learning and performance are mediated, performed, and understood. In this view, reality and meaning are considered to be co-constructed through dynamic interactions with others and the broader social, material, and symbolic world. The research aims to understand the "meanings underlying human knowledge, thought, and action, sometimes but not always by also explicitly seeking the insights and perspectives of case study subjects (participants) themselves or others they engage with" (Duff, 2014, p. 236).

Case study can also "offer evidence to support new models or theories, or to refute existing ones" and has "an important pedagogical function in educational contexts

to teach principles of applied linguistics or to create 'stories' of learners or contexts that may help the public understand issues" (Duff, 2020, p. 145). Through this study, I aim to present detailed stories of participants in the course, including instructors and students, to provide a rich account of how this new model of language education worked in this particular context. In particular, I am interested in exploring how translanguaging pedagogy is perceived by the students, and how students engage in communication using translanguaging in a linguistically diverse classroom where two groups of students learn respective target languages.

In case study research, it is very important and helpful for the researcher to clarify their role in the research process, and especially when the researcher is also the instructor of the course, it helps readers to contextualize the case (Duff, 2008). In the case of this study, since I was one of the course developers and the instructors of the course, my own experience and beliefs about language learning and teaching had an impact on the development and implementation of the course. Moreover, I am aware that those experience and beliefs may influence how I view and interpret the data. Thus, I took a reflexive approach, and thereby critically engaged with the interconnectivity between myself and the participants, the power relationship, the data, and the methods that I use in interpreting and presenting my findings (Mills et al., 2010). In particular, I wrote a reflective journal after each lesson taught, reflected on the reflective journal during the data analysis, and reflected on the analysis and presentation of my data as I wrote my thesis. In addition, my reflexivity is weaved in throughout the thesis as discussed in Chapter 1.

In addition, in qualitative research including case studies, triangulation using multiple perspectives and sources of data is useful in exploring the complexity of the case (Duff, 2006; Merriam & Tisdell, 2015). Thus, I use different sources of data for this study, which include qualitative interviews with students and teachers, portfolios created by students as part of the assessment, and a research journal that I have kept during the development and implementation of the course. As I was one of the instructors who was teaching the course, I wrote a research journal after each lesson instead of taking in-depth field notes during class, so that I could focus more on teaching. Interview data will be

used in Chapters 5 and 6, the portfolios created by students will be used in Chapter 5, and the research journal I wrote will be used in Chapters 5 and 6 for analysis.

4.4. Research Context

I conducted qualitative semi-structured individual interviews with 12 students who took the Translanguaging Dual Language (TDL) course, and five instructors who were involved in the development and implementation of the course, and follow-up interviews with three of the students. In addition, I also analyzed additional portfolios of six students whom I did not interview. It was a new elective language course which was developed by a collaborative effort of six Japanese and English language instructors including myself, working in the language center at a multicultural university in the Southern part of Japan. Below, I will describe the university and the course in details.

4.4.1. The University

As stated earlier, the university is selected as one of the Super Global Universities and offers a multicultural environment. Students come from almost 90 countries, including but not limited to Korea, China, Indonesia, Bangladesh, Mongolia, U.S., Uzbekistan, Kenya, and Norway, and about 50% of the students are international students. The university offers a bilingual education in Japanese and English, and all students choose between Japanese or English as the medium of instruction upon enrolment, regardless of whether they are domestic or international students, and their L1.

Depending on the language they choose for the medium of instruction, they are either Japanese or English basis stream students. The Japanese basis stream means that they are required to take most of the content courses in Japanese, and standard track English classes. Although the majority of the Japanese basis stream students are domestic Japanese students, there are some international students as students choose which stream they wish to enroll in, as long as they meet the language requirement. Conversely, students who choose English basis stream are required to take most of the content courses in English, and standard track Japanese classes. Similarly, the majority of the English

basis students are international students; however, there are some Japanese students who are enrolled in the English basis stream.

Students are only required to complete their language courses in the standard track, but after they complete the standard track courses, they are allowed to be enrolled in any advanced language elective course. There are a variety of elective courses offered within the language program, such as English for journalism, English for business, Japanese for business and Japanese culture. All the advanced language elective courses are taught either in Japanese or English.

4.4.2. The Course

Four English language instructors and two Japanese language instructors volunteered to join the development team, and worked for about one year to develop a new joint language course. The idea of the course initially started from a casual conversation between a Japanese language teacher and an English language teacher, to develop an exchange class in which Japanese learners and English learners meet occasionally to help each other with their tasks (e.g., checking essay for grammar or conversation practice in a target language). Although this was just a casual conversation between the two people at that point, one of the English language teachers who was working on a project on translanguaging with me and the other English language teacher heard about the idea, and relayed it to us. We all were very interested in the idea of having a course that is exchange based (instructors can have a few exchange sessions with an opposite language class during the semester in their standard track courses, but there was no course in which Japanese and English learners study together throughout the semester). We therefore approached the English language teacher who had the idea to let us join the development of the course. After a couple of meetings, we decided to work on the development of the new course together, and another Japanese language teacher, who was also interested, joined, and the development project officially started.

This was a very unique course since it was the only dual-language based class in the language curriculum, and it was informed specifically by translanguaging pedagogy, unlike other courses which were taught either in Japanese or English. All the six instructors were involved in all parts of the development, from creating the curriculum

including selection of topics and grading methods, to choosing and creating materials. However, only I, an English instructor, and a Japanese language instructor co-taught the course in the first round of offering the course, and another English instructor and another Japanese teacher co-taught it in the second round the next year.

For administrative reasons, we had to open two separate courses for a Japanese stream and English stream. However, we had all the classes together except for the first orientation day, and it ran as one course for both Japanese basis and English basis stream students. Initially, the course was open for a maximum of 30 students in each stream (i.e., Japanese and English), but only 33 students in total (23 Japanese stream students and 10 English stream students) were enrolled in the course. There were various possible reasons, but two major reasons were the course name and restrictions on who could be enrolled in the course. Due to university policy on offering a new course, this course had to use pre-existing course names, which were something like "English Project" and "Japanese Project," and could not include what the course was about. Moreover, as the course was new, students who did not read the syllabus carefully would not have known what the course was about, and may have assumed it was what the "English Project" and "Japanese Project" courses were in previous semesters.

Another possible reason could be the restrictions on who could be enrolled in the course. Due to policies in the language curriculum, for the English stream course, only English basis students who were either exempt from, or finished the Japanese standard track classes, or Japanese basis students, who took lower-level advanced elective courses previously, were able to be enrolled in the course. Therefore, some students contacted me to ask about the course and showed interest in taking the course, but they were unable to take the course as they had not taken lower-level advanced English classes. There are not many Japanese basis students who take the lower-level advanced English class after completing the standard track to begin with; therefore, the number of students who were eligible to take the English stream course was limited. As mentioned above, since this course was new, there were some administrative restrictions.

Nevertheless, the 33 students who took the course were not only linguistically, but also culturally and ethnically diverse. For the Japanese stream, students were from many different countries, including Korea, China, India, Australia, Thailand, Vietnam,

and Japan. For the English stream, the majority of students were from Japan, but there were students who were from Korea and the U. S. This was because of the system at the university which allows English basis stream students who have completed or who are exempt from the standard track Japanese to take advanced track English courses. Although they all were either exempt of taking the advanced level courses or had completed the advanced level courses in their respective language basis, their linguistic levels varied. For example, there were some Japanese students in the Japanese stream course, and their spoken Japanese was fluent, but they were more comfortable using English academically as they went to international schools overseas. In addition, in the English stream course, the majority of the students were Japanese students who grew up in Japan, and some had gone on an exchange program in their high school. There were Korean students too, and one of them was a Japanese basis, and the other was an English basis student. Thus, there was an inherently great cultural and linguistic diversity in the classroom.

The course, which was offered on Zoom synchronously, started with an orientation day in the respective language stream, but had all the classes together for the rest of the semester. Each class was 95 minutes long, and the class was offered twice a week, for 14 weeks. I led the class once a week in English and the other teacher led the other class in Japanese. However, during discussions, students were encouraged to freely translanguage as they see fit, to maximize their communicative potentials (García, 2009). With regard to language use in the classroom, the translanguaging pedagogy does not tidily fit into a dual language perspective. A key feature of dual language education is the teacher using two languages to teach both native speakers of English and a partner language (e.g., English and Spanish in the U.S. in secondary education) (e.g., Billy & Garriguez, 2019; Jong et al., 2020). However, in the TDL course, the use of two languages is markedly different. First, the majority of the students are not native speakers of the target language that the other language stream students were learning in the course. In addition, unlike dual language education which is "designed to help all students learn through two languages to develop bilingualism and biliteracy" (Christian, 2016), the TDL course was designed to help students learn their target language as well as enhance their

ability to use and value their own and peers' cultural and linguistic resources through the use of translanguaging.

4.5. Participants and Their Recruitment

Given my specific interest in students' perspectives and experience in a particular course, I recruited participants for my research using purposeful sampling, which involves selecting individuals who have experience and knowledge about a particular case that the research addresses (Patton, 2005). The research was introduced orally in the middle of the semester to all students taking the course during the class. All students taking the course were invited to participate by an email sent after class, and were asked to express their interest by replying to the email message. Students were told that the interviews would take place at the end of the course after students had completed and submitted all of their course work to be assessed. They were also told that interviews may occur before the finalization of the grades in the university's grading system due to delays that may occur; however, no changes in grades would be made as a result of participation or non-participation. There were three ways students could participate in the study: to have their work analyzed, to be interviewed, or both.

Those expressing an interest were invited to virtually meet with me outside of class time to ask any questions. However, as the consent form was attached to the email, if they wished to give their consent via email without meeting me to ask questions, they could do that, too. All the students who were interested sent back their consent form to me without meeting me virtually outside of class. In addition to students, a teacher of the course was invited via email to an interview after the semester.

Six students gave their consent to have their work analyzed, and 12 students gave their consent to participate in the interview as well as have their work being analyzed. The 18 students not only varied in their year at university, ranging from 1st year to the final year, but they also came from different countries such as Korea, Japan, Indonesia, Vietnam, Mongolia, China, India, Bangladesh, and India. The teacher, who was a Japanese female, also gave her consent to be interviewed. I conducted individual interviews with all of them after the semester was over and conducted a follow-up

interview with three of the students about three months later to ask about their experiences after taking the course.

Although initially not planned, the course was offered again in the following year. I realized that the research would be able to provide richer perspectives if I interviewed other instructors who taught the course as well as the two other teachers who were involved in the development of the course. Thus, I contacted all the teachers who were involved in the development and implementation of the course, and they gave their consent to participate in my research.

Table 1 below describes the general profile of the participants for the interview. In order to maintain anonymity, I asked my participants to pick a pseudonym and used their pseudonyms in the study. As for the teachers, as the teachers who were involved in the development of the course are limited in number and easily identifiable, I will not include details about each participant, for example, providing pseudonyms, describing gender, and stating teaching background. Instead, I will simply refer to teacher participants as teacher 1, 2, 3, etc. Due to the small number of teacher participants, when referring to teachers, I am not revealing gender and will use she for everyone to maintain anonymity.

Table 1. Summary of student participants

Pseudonym	Country of Origin	Status during the semester	Language class	Gender	Interview	Follow-up interview
David	Korea	4th year student	English	M	Yes	Yes
Naoki	Japan	2nd year student	English	M	Yes	
Emily	Japan	2nd year student	English	F	Yes	Yes
Mika	Japan	4th year student	English	F	Yes	
Sky	Japan	1st year student	English	F	Yes	
Tooru	Indonesia	1st year student	Japanese	M	Yes	
Wendy	Vietnam	3rd year student	Japanese	F	Yes	

Rita	China	3rd year student	Japanese	F	Yes	
Lucy	Mongolia	4th year student	Japanese	F	Yes	
Jenny	India	3rd year student	Japanese	F	Yes	
Ayane	India	3rd year student	Japanese	F	Yes	Yes
Anita	India	3rd year student	Japanese	F	Yes	
Christina	Australia	2nd year student	Japanese	F		
Tran	Vietnam	3rd year student	Japanese	F		
Aki	Thailand	4th year student	Japanese	F		
Kenny	Indonesia	4th year student	Japanese	M		
Simon	Bangladesh	3rd year student	Japanese	M		
Takuya	Japan	2nd year student	Japanese	M		

4.6. Generating the Data

4.6.1. Interviews

Interviews are widely used in qualitative research as they "provide in-depth information pertaining to participants' experiences and viewpoints of a particular topic" (Turner, 2010, p. 754). In qualitative interviews, Brinkmann & Kvale (2015) present two metaphors of the interviewer—as a miner and as a traveler—based on the epistemological conception of the interviews as a "process of knowledge collection" or as a "process of knowledge construction" (p. 57). In a miner approach, the knowledge is viewed as being there waiting for the interviewer to dig and uncover. Conversely, in a traveler approach, knowledge is viewed as co-constructed through interviewing. Not only does the interviewer learn about the participants' experiences through interviewing, but interviews may also lead to new knowledge through the interviewer's interpretation of the narrative,

which may even change the interviewer's original perspectives. I acknowledge that I cannot completely separate my own perspectives from my participants' experiences and perspectives, and I also wish to learn more about how language education can move forward through this project. Thus, I take a traveler approach in my data generation and analysis process.

Two common types of interviews are focus group and individual interviews. Focus group interviews can have a few participants at the same time and can be advantageous in that more information can emerge through interaction among participants (Creswell, 2012). Although individual interviews can be time-consuming, they are ideal for participants "who are not hesitant to speak, who are articulate, and who can share ideas comfortably" (p. 218). While students were familiar with their classmates, as I wanted to ask not only about their experiences in the course, but also about their previous experience with their language learning, I chose individual interviews to hear more about their personal stories. In addition, as the interviews were conducted online, it seemed easier to have individual interviews to avoid difficulties in taking turns. Moreover, as classes were offered online due to the COVID-19 pandemic, students were in different places in the world with different time zones, making it easier to schedule individual interviews with each participant.

Individual interviews can be categorized depending on the degree of structure in them as structured, unstructured, and semi-structured interviews. In structured interviews, the researcher prepares a list of questions, and strictly follows them in the interview. While this controlled interview can ensure that all the participants cover the topic well, there is only a little space and flexibility in how the interview is conducted as the researcher normally records the answer based on a coding scheme. On the other hand, in unstructured interviews, the researcher normally only prepares a few opening questions, and allows flexibility in the direction of the interview with minimum interference by the researcher. Lastly, in semi-structured interviews, the researcher prepares a set of questions, but the interviewee is encouraged to elaborate on their answers in an exploratory manner, and this allows interesting developments based on the participant's responses. It is suitable for cases in which the researcher has some understanding of the phenomenon and can develop broad questions beforehand but does not want to use a pre-

made coding scheme, which may limit the "depth and breadth of the respondent's story" (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 136). Thus, semi-structured interviews can "allow for the interview to develop in unexpected directions" (Richards, 2009, p. 186) while still focusing on the topics and questions that need to be covered. Since I wished to gain understanding of the students' experiences in the course on specific points, such as what they learned in class and what was challenging in class, but also allow flexibility in the interview to gain an in-depth understanding of each student's story, I chose semi-structured interviews.

Thus, with students and a teacher who gave their consent to be interviewed, I conducted semi-structured individual interviews after the course was over. This was intended to develop understanding of their general experience in the course. The primary topic of discussion was their overall experience in the course, such as what they learned in the course, and what was challenging. However, before the interview, I read student participants' written reflections on the course in their portfolios and asked them about what I found interesting or unique. The writing samples provided were from a reflection of their learning in the course done as a part of the end-of-course portfolio. Students were asked to create their own e-portfolios at the end of the course, including their autonomous learning throughout the course, such as reflection on each topic covered in class, and the final reflection contemplating on their overall learning in the course.

As students were all in different places within and outside of Japan, as mentioned, I conducted individual interviews with the participants via Zoom at their convenient time. VoIP, such as Zoom and Skype, is a "system which provides users with a way to send voice and video across the internet via a synchronous (real-time) connection" (Lo Iacono et al., 2016, p. 1) and has become an important tool for conducting interviews. Although it could be difficult to build rapport when the researcher and participants do not know each other, or to conduct an interview when the participants are unfamiliar with VoIP (Archibald et al., 2019; Lo Iacono et al., 2016; Merriam & Tisdell, 2015), since the course was conducted via Zoom and the researcher and the participants already had built rapport over the semester, there seemed to be no problem in this regard.

In terms of the depth of details shared in the interview, although there may be some concerns that it can be difficult for the participants to share emotional and personal

accounts in an online setting, Jenner and Myers (2019) found that there was a little difference in the information shared between in-person and online interviews. It was rather a matter of whether the interview was conducted in a public space or in a private space that influenced the amount of "sharing of deeply personal experiences" (p. 165). In addition, technical problems can be a problem when conducting interviews via VoIP (Archibald et al., 2019), and this was the case for one particular interview. There was a student who lived in Indonesia, and for the interview, the internet got disconnected several times, and we had to turn off the video for a few minutes. However, we were used to this situation as his internet was unstable throughout the semester, and the process of switching to an audio only interview and to switch back to with video on went smoothly.

In order to understand how participants applied what they had learned in the course in their lives, I conducted follow-up interviews with three participants who agreed to have a follow-up interview. The duration of the interviews varied, but they were mostly between approximately 30 minutes to an hour. I conducted all the students' interviews in English since I was mostly communicating with participants in English in class but told them that they can use other languages too if some things can be better explained in other languages. For the teacher interviews, I conducted interviews in Japanese with Japanese teachers (both Japanese and English language instructors) as we had been communicating in Japanese, and in English with English teachers. In the findings section, I will state that it is translated by the author when interview excerpts or narrative excerpts shared by teachers or students were originally shared in Japanese and were translated to English. Thus, if not stated, it should be assumed that excerpts were presented in English.

As the interviews were all conducted on Zoom, for the student interviews, Zoom automatically generated interview transcripts. However, I listened to the interview, and for the parts that Zoom did not recognize well and the parts that were in Japanese, I edited the transcripts. For teacher interviews, in order to save time, I used a transcription service. As I will not be focusing on the details of the linguistic and textual features, I did not change grammatical errors or any "non-standard" use of English.

4.6.2. Reflexivity

In qualitative research, reflexivity is an important methodological tool in various ways. It is often used to validate and legitimize the research (Gabriel, 2015). Reflexivity involves an "ongoing self-awareness during the research process which aids in making visible the practice and construction of knowledge within research in order to produce more accurate analyses of our research" (Pillow, 2003, p. 178). It also involves contextual intersecting relationships between the participants and the researcher, such as race, socio-economic status and cultural background, and a researcher's position as an insider and/or outsider as well as their own positionality in relation to their study (Dodgson, 2019). By engaging in reflexivity, researchers can decenter "the researcher self and truthfully and ethically represent the other through reflecting on our underlying assumptions about the self and other" (Kubota & Miller, 2017, p. 142). These also help the reader understand the context as well as relevance and possible applicability of the research findings to their own context (Dodgson, 2019). As all writing is positioned within a stance that the researchers bring with their experiences, biases and values, yet can be interpreted differently by the readers, the concept of reflexivity is very important in presenting the data (Creswell & Poth, 2016).

However, claiming reflexivity has become rather a common practice in qualitative research, and Pillow (2003) suggests that researchers should engage in "reflexivities of discomfort" (p. 188) rather than a simple "confessional act" (p. 177). The uncomfortable reflexivity refers to a reflexivity that "seeks to know while at the same time situates this knowing as tenuous" (p. 188). This involves being open about unfamiliar and uncomfortable aspects that came up during the process of research. By engaging in reflexivity of discomfort, reflexivity can move beyond simply claiming researcher's subjectivity to a more powerful methodological tool that can challenge both the researcher and reader to "analyze, question, and re-question her/his own knowledges and assumptions" (p. 189). In order to engage in reflexivities of discomfort, as discussed in this chapter, I first wrote reflective journal entries after each lesson taught, reflected on the reflective journal during the data analysis, and reflected on the analysis and presentation of my data as I wrote my thesis. Through the process, I encountered uncomfortable aspects, such as questioning my own beliefs about language learning and

teaching as I engaged in interviews, reflections, and analysis of data. However, by being honest about those uncomfortable aspects, my reflexivity is weaved in throughout the thesis as discussed in Chapter 1.

4.6.3. Reflective journals

The reflective journal that I wrote during the development and implementation of the course has two purposes. One is as an alternative to field notes. As I was teaching the course and was not able to fully focus on taking field notes by observing the class, I took notes in class while teaching about the points I found interesting and reflected on them after class. The second is as an autoethnographic account. Autoethnography is "an autobiographical genre of writing that displays multiple layers of consciousness, connecting the personal to the cultural" (Ellis & Bochner, 2000, p. 739). In his autoethnography, Canagarajah (2012) states that "this narrative is not solely about me. There are transferable implications for teacher identities for members of other professional communities, both in the center and the periphery" (p. 262). In other words, autoethnography is not simply an account of one person, but could represent a shared experience by multiple individuals in a particular community. In addition, when autoethnography is used in qualitative research in education, it can help "examine intricacies and contradictions, gaps and omissions, overlooked and under-documented aspects of educational experience" (Gannon, 2020, p. 324). Moreover, researchers can engage in reflexivity through autoethnography to "see the fragility, slipperiness, partiality and temporariness in all attempts to construct meaning" (Choi, 2016, p. 76). Thus, I used the autoethnographic reflective journal as one of the methods to explore multiple layers of the challenges I have faced as an English learner, which have led me to the development and implementation of this course.

Although this autoethnographic reflective journal can bring valuable aspects to my research, I am also aware that doing research as an "insider" can be problematic. Using autoethnography to reflect on her ethnographic work, Ilieva (2014) stated that one can be biased "in making assumptions about the possible "findings" of one's ethnographic research as an "insider" within a community" (p. 60). This is also an important aspect for my research as the "insider" status I have as a former English learner

like my participants may influence how I interpret my data. Thus, I adopted a reflexive approach through uncovering my own experience and assumptions in autoethnography as well.

Nevertheless, given that my experience and beliefs about language learning and teaching are likely to have influenced any part of this research, starting from the development of the course to analysis of the data, I would like to acknowledge them, and bring them to the front, rather than having them in the background. By doing so, I wish to present a rich detailed account of teachers' as well as the students' experiences in this new unique language course. Therefore, I used as an autoethnographic piece a research journal that I have kept during the development of the course, and written after each lesson as a way of reflecting on the class based on the field notes I took in class while teaching the TDL course.

4.7. Data analysis procedures

In this study, thematic analysis, specifically, reflexive thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2020) was used for analysis of interviews, students' portfolio, and reflective research journal. Since reflexivity is an important part of my thesis, I chose reflexive thematic analysis for the data analysis. Thematic analysis is widely used in qualitative research and is an effective method as the analysis can provide and explore "the perspectives of different research participants, highlighting similarities and differences, and generating unanticipated insights" (Nowell et al., 2017, p. 2). Within an interpretive paradigm, thematic analysis can highlight the social, cultural, and structural context that can influence the experiences of individuals through the co-construction of knowledge between researchers and participants in dialogue (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Rather than a simple organizational tool to classify and label data, thematic analysis is a process that allows the research to "construct themes to reframe, reinterpret, and/or connect elements of the data" (Kiger & Varpio, 2020, p. 3). In particular, reflexive thematic analysis embraces "qualitative research values and the subjective skills the researcher brings to the process," and should be understood as a "situated interpretative reflexive process" (p. 333-334). The researcher interprets the data "through the lenses of their particular social,

cultural, historical, disciplinary, political and ideological positionings" and they "edit and evoke participant 'voices' but ultimately tell their story about the data" (p. 339). Thus, the process of reflexive thematic analysis involves "reflecting, questioning, imagining, wondering" and "retreating" (p. 332).

4.7.1. RQ1 and 2

The first and second research questions that I address in this research are:

- How do students perceive a new type of language course in which learners with diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds learn different target languages in the same classroom simultaneously?
- How is translanguaging used in the process of meaning making and knowledge construction among students of different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, and how is it perceived by them?

For the first and second research questions, I undertook a reflexive thematic analysis of the interview data and students' work in the portfolio according to six phases highlighted by Braun and Clarke (2006). Following the six steps below allows researchers to reflect on their beliefs and understanding through going back and forth between the phases.

First, I listened to the interview recordings while checking the transcripts, read the transcripts through, and pre-coded by taking notes on quotes and highlighting parts that struck me (Saldaña, 2013). For this phase, I used the comment function in the word document and highlighted phrases and took notes.

After that, I approached initial coding using "structural coding," which is a "question-based" code and "initially categorizes the data corpus to examine comparable segments' commonalities, differences, and relationships" (Saldaña, 2013, p. 84). In this phase, I generated codes such as "initial expectations," "what they learned," "skills that were improved," "challenges faced in group work," "students' perceptions towards using multiple languages," "difference from other language courses," and "participation and engagement". For this phase, I used NVivo 12 to generate codes.

For the next phase, I conducted "subcoding" to "detail" and "enrich" (p. 77) my initial codes. For example, I generated subcodes including "time constraint" and "difficulty working with group members" for "challenges faced in group work," and "dilemma" and "monolingual approach" for "students' perceptions towards using multiple languages." For this phase, I also used NVivo 12 to organize the codes.

With the initial codes, I then used thematic analysis to analyze my interview data. I searched for themes that capture "something important about the data in relation to the research question and represents some level of patterned response or meaning within the data set" (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 82). In this phase, I searched for potential themes "collapsing or clustering" (Braun & Clarke, 2012, p. 63) codes. After that, I grouped the codes using a large piece of paper and re-arranged them using mapping to illustrate the relationships between different themes and reviewed them. Finally, I defined and named the themes, added quotes that are related to the themes and organized the map.

4.7.2. RQ3

The third research question that I address in this research is: How do language teachers develop and implement a new type of language course with other teachers who are very diverse in age, experience, linguistic resources, and who have different beliefs about language education? For this research question, I undertook a reflexive thematic analysis of the teacher interviews and my research journal. I followed the same steps as I took for thematic analysis for RQ1 and 2. I coded the teacher interview transcript and my research journal respectively, and looked for themes.

4.8. Researcher positionality

When conducting research, the researcher's positioning is an important aspect to take into account. Although insiders have easier access to research participants and sites, analysis could be biased due to the difficulty in distancing themselves from the accounts of participants. On the other hand, outsiders can have difficulty understanding the nuances of the phenomenon being analyzed (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1996), for example, the everyday lived experience of students in my study. Thus, researchers need

to take a "marginal position," positioning themselves between "familiarity and strangeness" (p. 112). However, this could be difficult in some cases, and Brayboy and Deyhle (2000) argue that one cannot be objective when they are a member of the group researched, and "claiming objectivity can work against gaining accurate understandings and lead to dishonest and unethical positions" (p. 165). Thus, engaging in reflexivity on their own positionality as well as its potential influence on the study is crucial for researchers.

In my case, as mentioned above, I was an instructor of the course. My roles as a teacher of the course and a researcher may have both been useful and limiting. This insider status has allowed me to develop a general understanding of the course well and build rapport with the participants. However, perhaps, this understanding may have been a little less than if classes had been offered in person, although I saw the students twice a week virtually for four months. My interactions with them were limited compared to if classes had been in person, as I would give instructions in class, and send students to breakout rooms for the most part so that they could work in groups. I would visit the breakout rooms during class, but I was not able to spend a long time to get to know the individual students. Nevertheless, this insider status helped me to build rapport with the participants to an extent, and it also allowed me to recruit participants easily. However, although interviews were conducted after the semester was over and grades were finalized, the mere fact that I was an instructor of the course inevitably created a particular power dynamic between the participants and myself, which may have influenced what and how the participants shared their experiences with me.

My positionality also relates to the multiple identities that I bring to this research. I see myself as a former English learner and a current user of English. I have studied English and have developed a negative L2 identity. I never felt competent nor confident to speak English because of the monolingual ideology. However, after learning about various concepts and theories about language learning and teaching, I started to see myself as a competent user of English. Now, I see myself as an agent of change. I am an English teacher and an emerging applied linguist who is trying to challenge the monolingual ideology so that students who will be building the future can learn to respect themselves as well as others regardless of their cultural and linguistic backgrounds, and

level of fluency in some languages. This has influenced the way I conducted the interviews, too. My belief towards the use of language is that individuals should use their full linguistic repertoire when communicating with others, the interlocutors should respect it, and both parties should negotiate and create meaning together. This is the approach I took in teaching the course, and I also took the same approach in the interviews. I conducted the interviews primarily in English, mainly for convenience, but told the participants to feel free to use other languages too, when they see fit. Thus, most of the participants used Japanese and English during the interview, although to a varying degree.

Lastly, as previously mentioned, I aspire to be an agent of change, and I designed, developed, and taught the course with my hope to challenge the monolingual ideology in language education. Thus, I acknowledge that my role as a researcher as well as the curriculum developer and the instructor of the course may have an influence on the knowledge constructed through this research.

4.9. Ethical Considerations

As the data collection took place in an undergraduate course in which I was an instructor, great care was taken not to make potential participants feel obliged to participate in the study. For example, I only briefly mentioned in class that they would receive an email about a study I was working on, and told them to take a look if they were interested. Also, in order to minimize the risk of making potential participants feel the fear of getting academically negative consequences, the interviews were conducted after the final grades were submitted. Moreover, in order to maintain confidentiality, all the identifying information such as names of the course, participants, and institution were omitted or changed. All the above was explained to the participants, and I received ethical approval from both the university I am doing my PhD at, and the one I work for. First, I submitted my application documents to the university's ethics review board in Canada and got ethics approval. After it was approved, I submitted my application documents including the ethics approval I got to the university I worked for in Japan. I

then shared information about my research with the students after I got ethics approval from both universities.

It was explained to participants that they would be free to withdraw from all or any stages of the research at any time and their confidentiality would be guaranteed at all times. In case that interviewees wished to withdraw, their interview data would be destroyed at any time prior to the beginning of the dissemination process. Finally, although there is no direct benefit to participants, I hope that through the interview, participants would have been given another opportunity to reflect on their learning in the course, and how they can move forward with their studies. In addition, findings will be of interest to teachers and educators teaching students with diverse backgrounds.

4.10. Conclusion

In this chapter, I have discussed the research design, recruitment of participants, methods of data generation, and data analysis for the study. By answering the research questions, this study will explore the experience of teachers developing and co-teaching a unique dual language course, and how students perceive such an innovative language course.

In the next chapters, I will analyze the data. In Chapter 5, I will focus on students' experience, exploring research questions 1 and 2. In Chapter 6, I will focus on teachers' experience, exploring research question 3.

Chapter 5. Findings: student experiences

This chapter attempts to answer two of my research questions in relation to students' experience in the course:

- How do students perceive a new type of language course in which learners with diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds learn different target languages in the same classroom simultaneously?
- How is translanguaging used in the process of meaning making and knowledge construction among students of different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, and how is it perceived by them?

5.1. Students' perceptions towards a new CLIL course

First, in this section, I will discuss findings in relation to students' perception towards this course in terms of the style of the course —a CLIL based course that values students' cultural and linguistic diversity. As discussed in previous chapters, both the literature and my own experience suggest that Japanese students tend to link English with English spoken in so-called inner circle countries, and tend to ignore or forget that English is spoken by people who have various linguistic and cultural backgrounds. In addition, literature suggests that CLIL is perceived simply as a means to develop students' English skills in Japan (e.g., Murata & Iino, 2017; Nakabachi, 2020). Moreover, this course is very unique in that students from two different language streams study together and engage in collaborative work and meaning-making. Thus, this question is very important in exploring students' perspectives in a new type of course that is very different from what they have been used to. For this section, I will focus on analysing students' portfolios. As previously mentioned in Chapter 4, 18 students out of the 33 students who took the course gave their consent to have their portfolios analyzed. The online portfolio consisted of reflection on each unit covered in class, and final reflection on the entire course. As the final reflection contained representation of students' learning in the course, which included their perceptions of what they have learned in such a

unique course and their understanding of the CLIL translanguaging course, I decided to use it as data; data were coded and analyzed following the steps that were explained in Chapter 4 based on the research questions.

In order to provide students with an authentic learning experience, five topics related to business and social science (two departments at the university) were chosen. Throughout the semester, students went through five units addressing the following five different topics: education, environment, big data, AI, and social issues, and each unit consisted of students producing new ideas with their group members. For the education unit, students presented on their ideal university education, and for the environment unit on their original eco-friendly product. For the big data, AI, and social issues units, they had debates on given topics. In addition, in designing the course, the MEC cycle (Lin, 2015) was incorporated. This means that in the first two phases in which students learn about the topic and develop their understanding while communicating with other members, translanguaging was encouraged to allow them to engage with the topic and meaning making. However, as the third stage in the MEC cycle is intended for students to produce spoken and/or written texts in their target language, the students were instructed to make a presentation or have a debate in their target language.

Prior to the main units, as the majority of the course work and activities were based on collaborative group work with students with diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds, instructors thought it would be crucial to offer students opportunities to think about and learn what constitutes good group work, and how they should approach it. Thus, prior to the five units covered in class, a mini unit called Cultural Awareness Activity workshop was offered in order to raise students' critical intercultural awareness regarding anti-racism, and potential issues that students may encounter working with students from different backgrounds. They created role-play videos explaining culturally sensitive approaches when working with diverse classmates for the mini unit. This method of delivery of the course (i. e., a lot of group work, project-based and student-centered learning) seemed to have been perceived positively, and all the students who participated in this study through interview and providing their written portfolio stated that it has contributed to their learning positively.

In my analysis in this chapter, when I introduce a student, I will introduce their contextual information in relation to their target language when I first present an excerpt from each participant. In addition, in a data section, I aim to present a balanced range of student perceptions, including those which raised questions about the pedagogical approach. As discussed in Chapter 3, one of the main features of the CLIL approach is the 4Cs Framework, which includes: Content, Cognition, Communication and Culture (Coyle, 2007). In the case of this study, most of the students mentioned their personal growth based on those four aspects. The majority of the students mentioned that they initially took this course in the hope of learning the target language, but they ended up learning much more. According to the student interviews, they initially took the course mainly to improve their target language by communicating in the language and some mentioned that they wanted to make friends with people who were in the opposite language stream. However, Jenny, a Japanese learner from India, stated in her portfolio as follows:

> After this semester, I can happily express that this class has not only improved my speaking, but also helped me to improve in many other areas. This class definitely exceeded my expectations in terms of developing bilingual, presentation, debate, and intercultural communication skills. Through this class, I was able to develop my creativity, writing, presentation, public speaking, and debating skills. This class offered the entire package in one class. We became entrepreneurs, philosophers, social workers, data scientists, journalists, and scientist, journalist, and all in both languages. (Jenny, portfolio, translated by the author)

As the excerpt suggests, the CLIL course was able to cover the 4Cs, Content (i.e., presentation, debate, writing, public speaking, debating skills, and various roles such as entrepreneurs and social workers,) Cognition (i.e., creativity,) Communication (i.e., being bilingual,) and Culture (intercultural communication skills). By offering the "whole package," the CLIL course was able to provide students with opportunities for their overall personal growth in addition to the improvement on their language skills. Thus, below, I will first discuss findings regarding student participants' perception of the course based on the 4Cs: Content, Cognition, Communication, and Culture. As these 4Cs are key goals of the curriculum, they are important to consider. In addition, I will discuss findings regarding the integrated learning aspect of CLIL, which is not a part of 4Cs but is an important aspect that came up during the analysis of the data. Then, I will discuss

findings regarding student participants' perception on translanguaging. After I present data groups, I will analyze them at the end of each section.

5.1.1. Content

In this section, I will discuss students' personal growth through taking the CLIL based course in terms of their perceived development in content knowledge. In this course, as discussed previously in this chapter, students learned topics related to the two majors that the university offers, which means they learned about topics both related to, and not related to their major. This allowed students to explore topics that were unfamiliar to them, leading to broadening their interest and perspectives. Rita, a student from China whose target language is Japanese, described her experience as the following:

> As I studied a variety of topics, my thinking changed rapidly. I used to be interested only in the field of business and wanted to study more intensively what was useful for my major. However, in this class, I became more and more interested in sociology as I learned content related to sociology, such as the education system and gender inequality. Not only that, but I realized that these contents would broaden my horizons and help me learn more about my major. Furthermore, I have gained a deeper understanding of this world from every topic. (Rita, portfolio, translated by the author)

As the excerpt suggests, by learning about topics outside of her major, Rita learned more about her own major from different perspectives, and also expanded her academic interests.

Not only did students broaden their perspectives and interest in different and unfamiliar topics through this course, but they also expressed that their actions in their daily lives changed. For example, Jenny, a Japanese learner from India stated:

> I have come to observe social issues around us and learn and critically evaluate interesting facts about Big Data and AI in this technologically advanced world. (Jenny, portfolio, translated by the author)

Similarly, Ayane, a Japanese learner from India stated:

> I used to ignore the Terms of Service, but now I read them before agreeing to them. I know it's long, but it's better to read it. If you don't read it, there is a good chance that you will be deceived. (Ayane, portfolio, translated by the author)

Moreover, some students stated that their learning of different topics was deepened, affecting their actions outside of the course not only by engaging in the topic and contents offered by the instructors, but also by learning with their classmates who brought various perspectives. For example, Simon stated:

> Discussing and debating with classmates with different ideas and values was a stimulating experience in every class and helped me to learn more about myself at the same time. Through the assignments and debates, we discussed a variety of topics, but I was particularly impressed with the topic of AI. As technology continues to develop, I had the opportunity to seriously think about whether the time will really come when knowledge can be replaced by AI, but experience and wisdom can be replaced by AI. (Simon, portfolio, translated by the author)

Similarly, Tran, a Japanese learner from Vietnam stated:

> I learned a lot of knowledge about a variety of different topics. In the first two topics, not only did I gain a deeper understanding of education and environmental issues, but I also found it very interesting and creative to hear my classmates' ideas on how to solve them. On the other hand, the topics of Big Data and AI have also given me the opportunity to do a lot of research, listen to opposing group speeches, and learn a variety of useful facts and knowledge. For example, until I heard the opposing discussion groups, I really didn't know that technology had advanced to the point where AI could understand people's emotions and interests. And especially as a marketing student, this topic made me realize that it could be a useful tool for building marketing strategies, so I decided to investigate it further in the future. (Tran, portfolio, translated by the author)

As stated in their portfolio, students engaged in the topics both by doing research on the topics themselves and learning from their classmates. Looking through the lens of Content in the 4Cs, students' written reflections suggest that the course helped them learn both thematic knowledge and understanding (Coyle, 2005), and construct their own knowledge about the content (Coyle, 2007). Moreover, the learning which occurred in the CLIL course did not stay in the class, but it went beyond the course and influenced their lives outside the classroom.

5.1.2. Cognition

Next, I will discuss students' personal growth through taking the CLIL based course in terms of their perceived development in their cognition. In the 4Cs framework,

cognition is an important aspect to consider in helping students to construct their own understanding of the subject matter (Coyle, 2005) through engaging in HOTS (Bloom, 1956). As the excerpts in the previous section suggest, students engaged in a lot of research regarding the topics constructing their own understanding of the topic, and through tasks offered, such as debates and presentations, they also critically engaged in the topics by hearing other students' perspectives and new knowledge that their classmates provided. For example, as Jenny stated that she has "come to observe social issues around us and learn and critically evaluate interesting facts" about the topics provided, the learning offered in the course did not only offer them new information, but also provided them with tools to construct their own understanding, taking the learning further.

In addition, some students used the knowledge they previously had about some topics to improve their learning in the target language. Anita, a Japanese learner from India stated in her portfolio as follows:

> In high school I was part of the debate club. I always debated often with people about social issues. So naturally, I was interested in debating in Japanese and the differences between debating in English and Japanese. This topic was especially eye-opening to me because I did not know much about domestic violence in Japan. (Anita, portfolio, translated by the author)

Moreover, Anita wrote that she was always extremely nervous to the point where she would freeze when speaking in Japanese due to her perceived lack of vocabulary and fear of speaking Japanese prior to taking this course. However, through learning about different topics and using Japanese with what she was good at (i.e., debating) with the help of other group members, she became more confident.

As excerpts in previous sections and excerpt from Anita's portfolio suggest, students engaged in course content by using their previous knowledge that they had learned in their stronger language or through learning from their classmates. This highlights an important aspect of plurilingualism, namely, mediation. Mediation is an important part of students' cognition; facilitating access to knowledge, co-constructing meaning, allowing a pace for creativity, and using different languages to understand course content are all mediation strategies for improving cognition (North & Piccardo, 2016).

5.1.3. Communication

In this section, I will discuss findings regarding students' improvement of their target language in the CLIL based course. According to the student interviews, all the students stated that they felt that their target language improved. In addition to speaking skills, many students stated that their vocabulary improved because they were required to do a lot of research on the various topics that regular language courses do not normally cover. This was mentioned in student portfolios too. For example, Kenny stated:

> I had to do a lot of research in Japanese, so I read many Japanese articles and learned more words and phrases. I was able to use them in debates and gained more confidence in my Japanese language skills. (Kenny, portfolio, translated by the author)

In addition to the language skill itself, students stated that they have expanded their knowledge of the topics while learning about the topics in their target language. Simon stated:

> Some of the many topics included words I did not know and at times it was like studying a subject. The word "Big Data" was one of them. Before taking this course, I did not know what big data was, but now I know a lot about it. The debating topics and assignments that we were given not only helped me improve my Japanese, but also broadened my knowledge. (Simon, portfolio, translated by the author)

Moreover, the style of the course, which incorporated groupwork and translanguaging seemed to have helped students' learning of the target language as well. Christina stated:

> When we were discussing difficult topics such as the environment, I sometimes looked up words I didn't know or asked group members about them, so I think I was able to communicate fairly smoothly even though it was sometimes not 100% Japanese. (Christina, portfolio, translated by the author)

The aspect of translanguaging, and dual-language focus was mentioned by many other participants both in the interviews and portfolio, and it will be discussed in detail in the next section. To sum up, the students' written reflections suggest that all three aspects of Communication in CLIL, which are language of learning, for learning, and through learning were improved through taking the course. In addition, the positive written accounts of students suggest that the course was able to help students develop their target language by shifting the focus from "linguistic form and grammatical progression to a more 'language using' one" (Coyle, 2007). Moreover, this finding suggests that even in a

course that does not focus on the linguistic form and grammar, students perceived that they developed their skills in the target language, and it confirms that a new type of course that does not have any lessons on grammar or linguistic forms can be seen by students as an effective course for improving students' target language.

5.1.4. Culture

I will now discuss findings in relation to students' improvement in the course in terms of Culture. Many students mentioned that they improved their collaborative working skills through taking this course. For example, Mika, an English learner from Japan, wrote in her portfolio as follows:

> I firstly aimed to improve English skill in this class, however what I learned is not only English language skill, but also how to cooperate with members, making my own study plan, and so on. (Mika, portfolio)

In addition, Rita, a Japanese learner from China stated in her portfolio:

> As the teacher said, this class is not only about language learning, but also about helping each other, learning and growing in cooperation with others. In the process of working with classmates of different personalities and abilities, there were of course times of difficulty, but I also found more and more ways to work efficiently with my group members. (Rita, portfolio, translated by the author)

This was mentioned by Tooru, an Indonesian Japanese learner as well:

> I learnt about what to watch out for when communicating, what to say when you don't hear the other person well or how to talk about opposing views or sensitive topics in a discussion without making the other person feel uncomfortable. (Tooru, portfolio, translated by the author)

Even though the mini workshop to help students raise awareness about working with classmates who have diverse background was offered once, students were given opportunities to reflect on their learning after each topic, and through the reflection, it seems that students developed their skills to better work collaboratively with others. Aki, a Japanese learner from Thailand stated:

> The language barriers and communication misunderstandings were natural, as each student had different strengths and learning experiences, and the classes were online. However, in order to overcome these problems, the teachers guided us to arrange a time for greeting and talking in the group before each group work session, and to encourage students to talk to each other. These times of chit-chat before the work began were very useful for me. (Aki, portfolio, translated by the author)

In addition to improving her skills to work collaboratively with others, she stated that the course also helped her reflect on herself and improve herself. She stated:

> Learning the work process helped me to understand myself and others. Furthermore, it gave me the opportunity to review areas in which I needed to improve, which was useful for self-analysis. (Aki, portfolio, translated by the author)

The improvement in self-assessment skills was mentioned by other students too and will be discussed in the next section.

In the CLIL approach, Culture is an important aspect to consider, and Culture does not simply mean learning about different cultures, but also understanding otherness (Coyle et al., 2010). Excerpts from students' portfolio suggest that not only did they learn how to collaboratively work with their classmates who have different cultural and linguistic backgrounds, but also how to work with others who have different "personalities," "abilities," "experiences," and "strengths." In addition, CLIL aims to foster students' discovery of self and to facilitate identity-construction through the understanding of otherness (Coyle et al, 2010), and the following excerpt suggests that this was achieved in the course. Simon, a Japanese learner from Bangladesh stated:

> Discussing and debating with classmates with different ideas and values was a stimulating experience in every class, and at the same time helped me to learn more about myself. (Simon, portfolio, translated by the author)

Through interacting with and learning with/from classmates who come from different backgrounds, Simon learned different ideas and values, which resulted in discovering more about himself.

The data excerpts above raise important issues, such as ability to engage with otherness and diversity, the ability to question assumptions about one's own culture, and the ability to reduce gaps between otherness through mediation between people from different cultures, in the promotion of pluriculturality (Beacco et al., 2016).

5.1.5. Integrated learning

Lastly, I will discuss findings regarding students' learning in the course in terms of the integrated learning aspect of CLIL. In a CLIL context, for CLIL course to be successful, there needs to be "progression in knowledge, skills and understanding of the content,

engagement in associated cognitive processing, interaction in the communicative context, the development of appropriate language knowledge and skills as well as experiencing a deepening intercultural awareness" (Coyle, 2007, p. 552). As demonstrated in the previous sections, students developed their skills based on the 4Cs through taking the course. However, what is crucial about the CLIL approach is that all the 4Cs: Content, Cognition, Communication, and Culture are integrated with each other, and students deepen their learning not only in those 4 separate areas, but through the integration of all the aspects. The following excerpts demonstrate how students developed their skills by taking the course through the integration and interaction of the 4Cs. David, who is a Korean learner of English, was able to gain self-confidence in using English through developing various skills, overcoming his "trauma in English." In his portfolio, he stated:

> I have a trauma in English, so I have not been taking any English class so far. That is why I took this class to recover from my trauma for the last semester. As a result, I swear that I'm really glad I took this class. Because I was able to become more confident in English. Moreover, except language skill, I was able to learn a lot of things because the class contents included topics that need logical and critical thinking. Furthermore, cooperation with people who have all different languages and cultures also necessary when we have to do something as a group. (David, portfolio)

In his interview, David talked about his trauma in English, and he said he was avoiding taking any English courses. However, by simultaneously learning and using both English and Japanese, which is his stronger language, he gained confidence with his English, and overcame his trauma. In the case of Takuya, as he grew up in other countries, even though he is Japanese, he said he tended to think negatively about his Japanese as it was not very fluent, and he was anxious about doing group work and debates with domestic students. However, in his portfolio, he stated:

> I realized that the way we communicate with each other changes depending on the country and culture, even if we are the same people. For example, I felt that while the international students all shared their opinions and ideas, the domestic students tended not to join in the conversation unless someone asked them to speak. Therefore, as someone who speaks both languages to a certain extent, I took on the role of standing in between and talking to the domestic students or commenting on their opinions to liven up the conversation. Through these experiences, I was able to develop many skills such as problem solving, leadership, teamwork, language skills, and communication skills. Furthermore, I was able to gain self-confidence by actually demonstrating these acquired skills in group work. (Takuya, portfolio, translated by the author)

In the case of David, through learning Content (i.e., topics), while engaged in topics that require his Cognition (i.e., logical and critical thinking) by interacting with different Cultures (i.e., cooperation with people who have all different languages and cultures), he also improved his Communication (i.e., English speaking skills), which he had trauma with. In other words, when it was only about English, he was not able to improve it due to his trauma, but through the integration of learning of other skills, including his strengths (i.e., strong Japanese skills and leadership skills), he was able to improve his English as well. Similarly, by being someone who bridges the communication between Japanese learners and English learners, through the learning of Content, Takuya improved his Cognition (i.e., problem-solving skills), Culture (i.e., teamwork and leadership skills in intercultural environment), and Communication (i.e., language skills). Furthermore, Takuya discovered more about his identity as a bilingual speaker, rather than an imperfect speaker of Japanese, through the integrated learning of all the aspects of 4Cs.

To sum up this section, the new CLIL course successfully achieved the goal of CLIL, which is to develop students' skills through integrated learning. Unlike how CLIL is perceived in many contexts in Japan, which is simply as a method of teaching English, students' responses to the course suggested that it was much more than just improvement of their linguistic skills. However, through the integration of 4Cs, they learned not only the target language, but also new content knowledge, and ability to collaboratively work with people from different backgrounds, resulting in discovering more about the self through learning with and from otherness. In addition, by engaging in tasks and improving their skills, students also improved the skills needed in their academic and future working lives such as critical thinking, problem solving, creativity, communication, collaboration, and cross-cultural awareness, as evident in students' written reflections.

5.2. Translanguaging use in the classroom

In this section, I will share findings regarding students' use of translanguaging, and their perception of translanguaging in the dual-language course. For this section, I

will mainly use students' interview data. Data were coded and analyzed following the steps that were explained in Chapter 4 based on the research questions.

5.2.1. Use of translanguaging in the classroom

First, I will discuss students' use of translanguaging in the classroom. I will first discuss participants' use of semiotic resources, followed by discussion on use of different languages. It should be noted that in interviews with students, there was no specific mention of the term trans-semiotic resources. However, in presenting the data in this section, I frame students' interview data around the term trans-semiotic resources, even though students were unfamiliar with the term and did not use it themselves.

Use of trans-semiotic resources

First, according to student interviews, all the students stated that they used trans-semiotic resources to communicate with their group members and complete the group works. The various trans-semiotic resources included gestures, YouTube videos, pictures, articles, Google translate, and chat function of Zoom.

Even though the course was conducted online, students' interview accounts suggested that they used gestures to communicate with their group members, which helped them understand each other better. However, according to some students, although the groupwork was done in small groups, there were some students who did not turn their camera on, and it was hard to communicate with them as they could not see their reactions.

In addition to gestures, YouTube videos were used in various ways. They were used when students did not understand particular concepts or words. Additionally, they were used when other students from the opposite language stream did not know the meaning of a word to help them understand. Also, sometimes, pictures were used in conjunction with YouTube videos. This was done especially when students were trying to explain what they had in mind when creating something new. For example, in the environment unit, students were required to come up with an eco-friendly product to solve a particular environmental issue of their choice, and they needed to explain

something that other students may have had no idea about. In this unit, many students mentioned that they and their group members used YouTube and pictures, especially when they explained about something from their country. For example, Wendy, a Japanese learner from Vietnam, mentioned that she remembered when her Mongolian group member showed a picture and an article explaining a product in Mongolia to suggest something similar. In addition, Naoki, an English learner from Japan also mentioned that his Thai group member showed them a picture of a postcard from Thailand to explain her ideas of an eco-friendly product, and he also showed a postcard from Japan to add to her idea.

In addition, the chat function of Zoom was used in various ways to help students communicate with their group members efficiently. For example, students stated that it was used to exchange articles to help each other understand the concepts together. In addition, when Japanese learners did not know *kanji* (Chinese characters), Japanese speakers typed them so Japanese learners could copy and paste them to Google translate. Moreover, some students stated when they had difficulties understanding the discussion in English, English speakers typed what was being discussed in the chat so that they could read it and follow the discussion.

The finding echoes previous research on language learning on Zoom, that students utilize various functions of Zoom to facilitate their learning (e.g., Moorhouse et al., 2021). In addition, use of semiotic resources, trans-semiotizing was utilized in students' meaning-making process in many parts of the course as an important part of their collaborative learning (e.g., Wu & Lin, 2019) and this was the same in an online format of the class. Rather, the online format of the class helped students utilize all the available semiotic resources (i.e., gestures, YouTube videos, pictures, articles, Google translate, and chat function of Zoom) in a timely manner by using the functions of Zoom.

Use of different languages

In this section, I will use students' interview accounts as well as my reflective journal to explore how translanguaging was used in the meaning-making process. In terms of the language use in the classroom, it was reported that in most of the cases, for the tasks that students were required to do in a particular language (i.e., sharing summary assignment

that they were required to do in their target language and initial group discussions in class), students followed the instruction and engaged in the tasks based on the language of the day (i.e., Japanese day and English day.) However, all the students who participated in the interviews stated that the use of language depended on the composition of the group. In addition, groups were changed in each unit, and they stated that the use of languages and frequency of the use of the main language (i.e., Japanese or English) differed based on the group. For example, the majority of participants stated that the stronger language for the majority of group members was used in navigating their group work. In other words, when the group had more Japanese speakers, Japanese was used, and in a group with more English stream students, English was used. Nevertheless, all the participants stated that it was never only one language that was used in the group work, but rather, languages were used fluidly. This fluid use of language in the meaning-making process can be observed in my reflective journal entry:

> What was interesting to me was how freely students switched between languages. One group I observed/joined was working on the Japanese part first. Everything was in Japanese, like from reading the question to discussing the ideas to writing down the ideas. International students were explaining something in Japanese, and the Japanese student was writing down what she says in Japanese, but it was translated into a natural Japanese phrase. And naturally, the Japanese student asked other students 「口調ってわかる？ [Do you understand tone of voice?]」 and one student didn't understand, but another international student said 「トーンオブボイスって言うのかな[I suppose it's toone obu boisu.]」. So she was trying to explain to the other international student the meaning in English words with Japanese pronunciation. Another thing that was interesting to me was that when the Japanese student wrote down 「見下すような態度を取らない[Not to be condescending]」 from what they have talked about, one international student said 「見下すはなんですか[What is condescending?] 」 so, I made a gesture, like hand going down from my eye level, and she was like ahh and she understood and she wrote it down in her notes as it was a new expression for her. I witnessed the moment of learning through a natural interaction using multimodality. It was very interesting. (Author, reflective journal #1)

The dynamic nature of the students' language use, and the extent to which the diverse student body was assisting their learning can be seen in this reflective journal entry. What can also be observed in the journal is how the students use their full linguistic repertoire to help each other to learn regardless of their L1. In addition, in the example of a student explaining a Japanese word, using the English words "tone of voice" with the Japanese

pronunciation, “toonobu boisu,” we can observe that the students did not use one form of the language, but multiple forms of languages to communicate with each other. In addition, when I explained the Japanese word to the student who had asked the meaning of it, I did not use spoken language but a gesture instead, which she understood, learning a new word. This suggests that both translanguaging and trans-semiotizing were utilized by instructors and students in their flow of meaning-making (Wu & Lin, 2019).

Moreover, in addition to Japanese and/or English, most of the participants reported that they used their first language to gather information on the topics. Not only did it help them understand the topics better, but it also helped them understand the topic from broader perspectives as Wendy stated:

> I also used Vietnamese to find information, because when you find it, like I live in Vietnam and I'm Vietnamese so, it is more useful for me to search in Vietnamese for information and also my teammates, they come from different countries, so they also searched about their country information so like, we have a lot of information from different countries. (Wendy, interview)

Similarly, David used three of his available languages: Korean, English, and Japanese to find information. He stated:

> So, for me, like I can speak, I can understand, Japanese and English and Korean, right? So for the content for our task, we need more 正確な情報[accurate information] and a lot of resources right? So I tried to find as much as possible, I can use three languages. (David, interview 1)

In addition, Rita, a Japanese learner from China stated that she used Chinese when communicating with another member who shared the same first language. This was reported by Emily, an English learner from Japan who was in the same group, that they would exchange articles in Chinese with each other on a debate topic that they were working on, and sometimes messages were exchanged in the chat in Chinese as well. When asked how she felt when Chinese, an unfamiliar language, was used by the other group members, she said:

> Isolation. でもまあ、いいディベートができるならいいかなって。そんな感じかな。[But I thought, well, if we can have a good debate, why not? That's how I felt.] (Emily, interview 1)

This implies that even if they may not be bothered too much when a linguistic resource which is not shared by all the group members is used, it could marginalize others who do

not share the same resource even if it could be beneficial for some students, and/or the group.

These excerpts together bring a very important point that requires our attention and consideration as classroom teachers. While the excerpts suggest that students used multiple linguistic and semiotic resources to construct their academic knowledge (e.g., Marshall et al., 2019) and draw on their multilingual/multicultural resources to contribute to mutual meaning making (e.g., He & Lin, 2021), this can potentially make students who do not share the same L1 feel isolated when not done with careful instructions. In other words, translanguaging and trans-semiotizing strategies were employed by students. Firstly, they were utilized when communicating with the other students. In these contexts, it was seen to be beneficial. However, in some cases, using these strategies was seen to work negatively. One such example is when students who shared the same L1 were working with students who did not share the same L1. In such context, collaborative meaning-making suffered.

5.2.2. Students' perceptions towards translanguaging

As discussed previously in this chapter, students communicated with each other using all their available recourses: translanguaging and various semiotic resources. In the following sections, I will discuss students' perceptions of translanguaging in the classroom using students' interview accounts.

Initially surprised then satisfied to learn two languages

First, I will discuss students' first impression of the course that incorporated translanguaging as a pedagogy. As mentioned in Chapter 4, due to administrative reasons, this new language course had to use a course name that was used in previous years for a different course. Thus, some students who did not read the syllabus carefully took the course thinking it would be a different kind of course. In addition, even if the students enrolled in the course understanding the concepts of this new course, some students did not have a good understanding of what it actually looked like. For example, as previously mentioned earlier in the chapter, even in a case where they knew that the

course will be conducted with the other language stream class, many students took this course in hopes of improving their speaking skills in the target language by communicating with students in the other language stream. In other words, the majority of the students took this course without knowing that translanguaging would be encouraged in class. However, overall, all the students stated that they liked the fact that they were encouraged and able to use various linguistic resources in the class.

Especially, as English was an additional language for most of the Japanese language stream students, they seemed to have enjoyed the fact that they were able to use and improve their English as well. Ayame stated:

> When I took this course, I was expecting the use of more Japanese, but after this course, I was satisfied because, I was able to improve in some parts in English, also because, since English is not my first language and I think most like 80 to 90% of the people in this class didn't have English as their first language, so they also learned something from that. (Ayame, interview 1)

Jenny explained it was as if she was "getting another package," and stated:

> It was like an added bonus thing because I signed up for Japanese debates, but I'm getting English debates as well. (Jenny, interview)

Rita also stated that as she was back in China due to Covid-19 and did not have a lot of opportunities to communicate with people in Japanese and English, she had felt that her competence in both languages had decreased compared to when she was on campus in Japan. Thus, she enjoyed the fact that she was able to learn in both Japanese and English. Also, Wendy, who perceived herself as a quiet learner in previous language courses, stated:

> I don't talk that much, maybe I didn't talk at all, so in this class we have to be active and to be ready to discuss and talk with your groupmates, so I think it is like a great chance to use English frequently and to practice my Japanese. (Wendy, interview)

Similarly, Tooru said he was happy when his group members wanted to mainly use English as he also wanted to improve his English skills, and even though speaking in Japanese was more comfortable for him, he tried to force himself to talk in English whenever he got a chance. As a reason, he stated:

> There's actually no opportunities where I can use English unlike Japanese where I could just go to Japan and speak it. I am familiar with Japanese as I was in a language school, and I also have a part time job in the convenience store. (Tooru, interview)

As can be observed in the students' accounts, for Japanese learners who used English as an additional language, the "added bonus" of communicating in English was perceived positively and a good opportunity to improve their English skills, which can be a rare opportunity for them. Although there may have been Japanese EAL students in the course who questioned the pedagogy, there were no such explicit mentions in the interviews and the final reflections in portfolios. It may be possible that since the final reflection was part of their assignment, students may not have wanted to express something that went against the pedagogy in the classroom. However, in addition to Tooru, based on my work in the course, I would speculate that students were mostly content with the approach, and that those who were not completely satisfied with the pedagogy faced some dilemmas, which will be discussed later in the chapter.

In addition, the advantage of learning new skills such as debating in both languages was mentioned by some other students, too. For presentations, students were instructed to speak mainly in their target language for their part, but for the debates, students were required to do the debate on the same topic twice: once in English, and another time in Japanese. This was because instructors thought it would be complicated to have multiple languages in one debate considering the nature of debate. However, this was perceived positively by the students. Lucy stated that she learned from the Japanese stream students by listening to their part and comparing it to the English one. By doing so, she learned new phrases and how they conduct the debate in Japanese.

Moreover, students in the English language stream also stated that they enjoyed the fact that the course allowed them to communicate in both languages. To sum up, although most students initially took the course not knowing that translanguaging would be encouraged, they perceived it as helpful for their learning, and appreciated the opportunity to learn and communicate in two languages. This adds to the research on language classrooms as research to date focuses mainly on language classrooms that center on teaching one language (i.e., English language class). The positive responses by students about a language course where students can learn two languages simultaneously while having a main target language suggest that students realize the importance of not only one language but that they also improve their plurilingual competence (Coste, Moore, & Zarate, 2009).

In the following sections, I will discuss how translanguaging was used and perceived by the students in the course using again data from student interviews.

Translanguaging as a practice for a real-world communication

First, some participants considered communication using translanguaging as a practice for a real-world communication. All the participants reported that they improved communication skills as well as interpersonal skills, including how to work with people who come from various linguistic and cultural backgrounds through taking this course. In addition, some students stated that they consider the "bilingual" communication as a useful skill in the future. Jenny stated the course:

> …actually helped us to be more bilingual like we can now understand what those words in English are in Japanese and what these words are in English. So whenever like necessary time comes, so we can use both of them in the right situation. (Jenny, interview)

Similarly, Lucy stated that by being encouraged to speak in both languages,

> I can really say what I think in both English and Japanese. It helped me grow. (Lucy, interview)

In addition to "bilingual" communication, students learned the importance of using semiotic resources in communication. Naoki also stated:

> …communicating with people who don't use Japanese is really hard but now I can somehow do this, so thanks to this course…using gestures or using examples, or something like that is really effective. I've learned this from this course. (Naoki, interview)

As can be observed from students' excerpts, they understand that they will be in situations in which they need to use their available linguistic resources in future communications, and they value the practice that they got in the course. This suggests that even though a monolingual standard is commonly followed in language education (Cenoz & Gorter, 2013), students themselves understand the needs and importance of plurilingual and pluricultural competence (Coste, Moore, & Zarate, 2009) in the globalizing world, and the importance of meaning making not only using translanguaging, but also trans-semiotizing.

Translanguaging as a necessary tool to fully express themselves

In addition, students' interview accounts suggested that translanguaging was used as a tool to fully express themselves. The majority of students stated that communication would not have been as efficient and effective if they were limited to use only the target language, and they would not have been able to fully express themselves. For example, Naoki said the use of translanguaging was to lighten the communication (Naoki, interview). As a reason, Jenny stated:

> If we are only forced to speak in Japanese, communication wouldn't have been as efficient because we don't think in Japanese, we think in English (Jenny, interview)

A similar comment was made by Ayame who stated:

> Like our main tasks were the presentation, then debates right? So, to make that happen, we actually need to communicate in our convenient language, I think, because if I just use Japanese, I think it will be a bit difficult to make the result happen. So I think English is necessary to use to communicate well with the group mates, and the Japanese person also needs to communicate in Japanese to say his or her opinion to the fullest. (Ayame, interview 1)

Similarly, Lucy stated:

> If it was only in Japanese, it would feel like it's a lot of pressure. (Lucy, interview)

Additionally, Lucy said she was able to improve her arguments and what she was going to say in debate in English first, which allowed her to develop a stronger understanding and arguments on the topic compared to if/when she was forced to do all the tasks in Japanese. Similarly, Sky, an English learner from Japan, also stated that she was scared to do the debate in English. When asked how she felt when she had to debate both in Japanese and English, she stated:

> It was very good for me, because it was the first time for me to do the debate. So, I could understand Japanese more easily and then do the English. So when I tried to do the English version, I already knew about the content, the information. So, no worries, it was very good for me. (Sky, interview)

David also expressed his strategy of using translanguaging to fully express himself when the contents were difficult:

> So I use mainly Japanese because, like our content is very complex right. My English was not enough to convey in detail in English. So I'm sorry for that, but I use Japanese mainly, but of course I tried to use English too. So after Japanese, I spoke English with main word, keyword. So, and using gestures and I use mainly the dictionary. (David, interview 1)

As demonstrated in the excerpts, David used multiple linguistic and semiotic resources to express himself in the group discussions.

Similar to David's experience, some participants stated that they were able to develop both their fluency in their target language and knowledge on the topic by thinking in their comfortable language first, translating their thoughts to the target language, sharing them with their group mates, and re-translating them together to get the right words, phrases, and more ideas. Moreover, participants expressed that when one was not able to make things clear in their target language, others, regardless of their language stream, would try to help and they would come to an understanding together as a group.

In addition to when they try to express themselves, participants' interview accounts suggested that translanguaging played a big part when understanding their group members. For example, Lucy stated that sometimes she could not understand what her group members were trying to say when they explained things in English. She stated:

> I think the language barrier affects a lot, but when some people are speaking Japanese, I can clearly understand what they're going to say and I'm thinking oh they're smart. (Lucy, interview)

This implies that some students could have been perceived as someone who may lack intelligence if they were not given opportunities to express themselves using their full linguistic resources. Naoki expressed his experience in the beginning of the course as follows:

> Maybe most of the time, I cannot express myself, I cannot express my opinions by using English so when that happens, I often use Japanese. And some of the students, at that time, the leader could speak both of

> the languages fluently, so I said what I wanted to say to her, and she translated Japanese to English. So, at the first place of this course, I'm not confident. I'm not good at speaking English actually. I can do other things like reading, listening, and writing. But I cannot speak English so, I cannot participate in their, I mean so like the teammates' conversation because they speak so fast. (Naoki, interview)

As the excerpt suggests, he would have missed out on the opportunity to express his ideas and participate in the discussion if he was restricted to use the target language only. However, because the course encouraged students to freely translate to facilitate their learning, they used their own available resources and their group members' resources to communicate with each other, as Jenny explained "Everyone's language level somehow complemented each other" (Jenny, interview).

Together, the responses above show that participants used all the available linguistic and semiotic resources—their target language, stronger language (or L1 for Japanese students), their L1, gestures, and dictionary—during the meaning-making process, the first two stages of MEC (Lin, 2015), and fully expressed themselves as well as fully understanding their group members. This meaning-making process could not have been possible if limited to their target language; as described by David and Jenny, their target language skills were "not enough to convey detail" and "communication wouldn't have been as efficient." In addition, even if students were not confident to fully express themselves in the beginning, by allowing translanguaging, students acted as mediators like Naoki's group leader, and they all participated in the meaning-making process and co-constructed knowledge. Moreover, translanguaging seems to have prevented some students who are not as proficient in their target language from being positioned as an incompetent member, as stated by Lucy: she could "clearly understand what they're going to say" and she realized that her group members were "smart". If not allowed to translanguage, they may have not been able to express themselves and may have been potentially perceived as not competent, or even been left out from the discussion. This was described by Naoki when he stated that the discussion took place so fast that he could not understand what was going on.

Additionally, during the first two stages of MEC, students learned new knowledge by using different languages. As Sky stated, during complex tasks like debating, she

would understand the steps and procedures in Japanese, which is her L1 first, and would transfer the knowledge when doing debates in English. In other words, by using translanguaging, she was able to engage in difficult tasks which would have been challenging if limited to target language. This echoes findings from previous literature that translanguaging helps students understand the complex concepts and contents which could be challenging if they are limited to their target language (e.g., Bellés-Calvera, 2021). Moreover, the responses suggest that students perceived using translanguaging and trans-semiotizing in the first two stages of MEC as a necessary tool to fully engage in the final stage of MEC, the entextualization. Ayame's response that, in order to make the debate happen, which is the main task of the unit, English (her stronger language) was necessary, and it would have been difficult to fully engage in the debate if she was limited to Japanese (her target language), makes this point. This suggests that translanguaging and trans-semiotizing were necessary tools to improve her target language. To sum up, students utilized translanguaging and trans-semiotizing in their tasks, and they also consider them as necessary tools to fully express themselves as well as understand their group members.

Translanguaging as a way of being a contributing member

Many students mentioned that translanguaging allowed them to contribute to their group members in a way they feel more helpful and comfortable. For example, Emily stated:

> なんか Japanese day は今日 Japanese day だから、ちょっと気が楽。[Like, I feel less stressed on a Japanese day because today is a Japanese day.] でも、English day はすごい anxious っていうか、nervous for me だったんですよ。…Ugh I have to speak English, I didn't know they can understand my English, とかで、nervous でした。[But, I felt so anxious or, it was nervous for me, like ugh I have to speak English, I didn't know they can understand my English, and I felt nervous.]…When English day, I feel like I'm so bad とか。My skill is low とかなんですけど、In Japanese day, I can teach you!みたいな感じでした。[But, When English day, I feel like I'm so bad or my skill is low. But in Japanese day, I was like, I can teach you!] (Emily, interview 1)

This implies that by being offered a day and opportunities to participate using her stronger language, Emily was able to demonstrate her strength in the group work and establish herself as a competent member of the group. She explained how she was able to contribute to her group by stating:

> In preparing English debate, I only found some articles in Japanese and translating and write some memo, but in Japanese debate, I can find many articles, and I can check the grammar mistakes とか。I feel like I can contribute and 役に立ってる [being helpful] for my group. (Emily, interview 1)

Similarly, Wendy stated:

> Like Japanese students, they always support me in Japanese so like I, I have a chance to support them back in English. They also are not good at English, so we just try to support each other. (Wendy, interview)

Thus, by being offered a space in which translanguaging was encouraged, students were able to offer help as well as receive help, and be contributing members of the team. Additionally, Naoki expressed different emotions he felt when using two languages in class:

> I felt good when I'm doing the Japanese debate because my mental was not so good when I had that English debate because I couldn't do anything, almost do nothing in that English debate, so when we were doing the Japanese debate, I was the main weapon for that. So that felt good. (Naoki, interview)

As demonstrated in the excerpts, students could develop a positive identity as a learner and a contributing member of the team by being encouraged to use translanguaging. In other words, if they were not offered such opportunities, they could have developed a negative identity as a learner.

The finding echoes previous research that translanguaging not only removes affective filters to use and improve the target language (e.g., Zhou et al., 2020), but also helps students develop a positive identity as bilingual speakers (e.g., Mazak and Herbas-Donoso, 2015). Both Emily and Naoki described feeling "nervous," "anxious," and "mental was not so good" when they had to use English, but by having a space in which they were welcomed and encouraged to use Japanese, their L1, they felt that they were "the main weapon" for the group

and they could “contribute” and “help” their group members. In other words, by learning in a translanguaging space, students were able to develop positive identity as bilingual speakers instead of developing a negative identity as an English speaker who can only “write some memo” and “almost do nothing” for the group due to the “low” English skills.

Translanguaging as a tool to help transition

In the student interviews, all the students in the English language stream stated that they were not confident to speak in English prior to taking the course. For example, David had a trauma with English from his past experience to the point where he described as “when I hear English like my head like be white, I cannot understand everything” (David, interview 1). Naoki also shared his experience in other English courses as follows:

> So the biggest problem is that most of the students in the course were Japanese and so, and, of course, most of them have experience studying abroad. So I'm not one of them, so I'm kinda depressed when I speak English in the course. (Naoki, interview)

This comparison between people who have studied abroad being superior and people who have not studied abroad as not being confident was made by Emily too, who was also not confident about her English. However, Sky, who studied in Australia during high school, also stated that she took this course because she was not confident to speak in English and wanted to practice more.

Although participants were not confident to speak in English at the beginning of the course, they all stated that they gained confidence to speak in English and, communicate with people from different backgrounds. As previously mentioned in the chapter, Naoki was not able to express himself in English in the beginning; however, by expressing himself in Japanese first with the help of another student who was able to bridge the conversation by translating to English, he said that he gradually became comfortable and started sharing his ideas in English more. In addition, being able to communicate in both languages seemed to have made students feel more at ease to communicate with each other. Sky stated:

> We used both English and Japanese, so it was really fun to talk with them. Also, by talking more relaxes me. (Sky, interview)

Moreover, many of the participants stated that by being a more competent speaker in one of the languages, seeing students in the other language stream try to speak in their target language and offering help in the language to these students, they became more comfortable using their target language. For example, David stated:

> I think I was very inspired when I see the people who are trying to speak Japanese and I felt like it was motivate motivation to try more. I found for myself like if the person who trying to speak Japanese then, that time I'm trying to understand as well. So I found myself that time so like if I if I tried to speak English, then I thought, like they will do it will try to understand me too right. So, after that, like, I want to I like to try to speak English, even though I'm not good at English. (David, interview 1)

Similarly, Sky stated she felt more comfortable speaking in English by seeing international students also try to use Japanese and said:

> Talking with the international students made me more confident to talk, a lot of international students in English and making more friends. So, that was very helpful to improve my confidence. Talk and talk and talk and not afraid to discuss the difficult contents and not think about everyone not understanding what I'm trying to say or opinions. Everyone patiently tried to understand me, so as a result of that, I'm not worried or afraid. (Sky, interview)

As demonstrated in the excerpts, in a classroom in which students were able to freely translanguage, they experienced different positions in the classroom dynamics (i.e., someone who is more competent in one language), which allowed them to experience how other students may perceive them when using their target language. As a result, they gained more confidence and motivation to speak in their target language.

The findings shed light on many issues surrounding English education Japan. For example, as Naoki stated "most of them [Japanese students in the course] have experience studying abroad. So I'm not one of them, so I'm kinda depressed when I speak English in the course." Japanese students tend to have the idea that people who have studied abroad have good English skills and people who have not do not (e.g., Kubota, 2016) and this often prevents students from speaking in English. However, as observed in excerpts by David and Sky, this anxiety was broken when students learning Japanese tried to speak Japanese in a non-judgmental environment. As a result, it seems that

students were able to feel more at ease and motivated to practice and improve their target language.

Translanguaging as a dilemma

As introduced earlier in this section, the MEC was integrated into the lessons. Exploring the language use in the classroom using MEC is particularly important as little research has been done on the use of MEC in tertiary classrooms even though it could be useful in breaking the monolingual standard in language education (Siu & Lin, 2022). Following the MEC, students were instructed to use their target language in the final stage of MEC (i.e., presentation and debate), as well as certain tasks in the lesson to ensure adequate opportunities for students to use and practice the target language. Other than that, students were encouraged to use translanguaging, but were instructed to engage in certain tasks in the language of the day (i.e., in English day, students were instructed to engage in in-class discussions mainly in English and vice versa).

Although all the students reported that they improved their skills in the target language (and another language for Japanese language stream students) in many areas such as speaking, listening, vocabulary, communications skills as previously discussed in the chapter, the majority of them also stated that limiting the language use to the target language only would have helped them with the improvement of their target language more. While some students stated that they were completely satisfied with the language use in the course, many of the students expressed their regret and dissatisfaction with the target language use. They stated that even though the target language was used in parts of the class in which there was an instruction as to which language to use, in group work and discussions, the language of communication tended to be the convenient language for everyone in the group. While they used translanguaging for various purposes as discussed earlier and perceived it as a necessary tool for their learning and meaning making, they seem to believe that for the sake of their "language learning," a stronger monolingual policy would have been helpful. For example, Wendy stated:

> It's really helpful because I can learn both English and Japanese in this course. But yeah you know, like in the class, we still can speak English so maybe the opportunity to speak Japanese is not that much. We all know that if you don't understand Japanese, you can just talk in English

> and Japanese students, they know that, like they still can speak Japanese. There's no strict rule about like "you have to use this language". Sometimes it's not good for the Japanese communications skill. (Wendy, interview)

Similarly, Sky stated:

> I feel like I shouldn't use Japanese because I took the English basis (Japanese stream) course. But it's really fun to talk with international students in Japanese because they were really good at speaking Japanese and like we used both English and Japanese languages so… (Sky, interview)

Additionally, Rita, after acknowledging that use of translanguaging has both advantages and disadvantages, stated:

> In order to improve our Japanese skills, so it's better for international students, not to speak English. Especially in the class, like if outside of the class like while messaging and so on, like I guess it might be fine, but especially in the class like we should just stick to our like opposite-based language. (Rita, interview)

While the majority of the participants reported that they followed the language that they were instructed to use for activities in class, in group discussions and debate, the language choice tended to be based on the composition of the group (i.e., when there are more international students, they tend to use English more, or when there are more proficient Japanese learners, they tend to use Japanese). In addition, participants reported that when the topics were more complicated, they would use their stronger language more in research and group work to get a better understanding of the topic. While they reported that this had helped them with improving their knowledge on the topic and target language as discussed previously in the chapter, they also seem to have perceived it negatively. Mika stated:

> … like using Japanese it helped me to like say what I want to say the like fully, but at the same time, like once I talk in Japanese, I have to say, become hesitate to speak in English because talking in Japanese is more easier and I think the more they understand like when I talk in Japanese because most of group members were fluent in Japanese so like um, using Japanese it's easy for me, but at the same time it's more like, 楽してる。[I am taking the easy way out] (Mika, interview)

Similarly, David stated:

> I can speak Japanese also right. So, like, I sometimes I went away to speak English or when I have to say, specific detail information or like when I, we are running out like when we are busy, then that time I

> speak Japanese right, so it was very 自分に甘かった, [I gave in to temptation] right, that time so like, I could improve more. (David, interview 1)

As evident in how they described the use of their stronger language as "楽してる[taking the easy way out]" or "自分に甘かった[giving in to temptation]", they seem to perceive the use of their stronger language as a sign of lack of effort and/or a sign of lack of proficiency in their target language. Thus, in order to prevent that, many of the students mentioned that it may be better if they were forced to stick to one language like in other language courses, and Mika even suggested the following:

> Like sometimes like teacher can come in, if they find that they speak a different language, teacher can say like please use Japanese or English. (Mika, interview)

As demonstrated, although students stated that they improved their target language while developing their knowledge by the use of the MEC cycle, they felt the dilemma of using additional linguistic resources thinking that they are cheating during their language learning experience.

These senses of "guilt" may result from the monolingual ideology that is pervasive in both language education worldwide and in Japan. For example, students reported their perceived improvement in their target skills as well as content knowledge and how translanguaging and trans-semiotizing aided the improvement; however, some also responded that "There's no strict rule about like 'you have to use this language," "Sometimes it's not good for the Japanese communications skill," and "In order to improve our Japanese skills…we should just stick to our like opposite based (target) language." These responses echo the monolingual ideology and *genso* about language education (Kubota, 2018; Lin, 2015) that teaching through the target language only with maximum use of English would be better. As a result, even though students understood the benefits of using translanguaging and trans-semiotizing in their meaning-making process and knowledge construction as well as their language learning, some still felt guilty about using their L1 or other linguistic resources that were not their target language: "楽してる。[taking the easy way out]" or "自分に甘かった [giving in to temptation]".

5.3. Conclusion

This chapter provided findings regarding students' perceptions on a new CLIL translanguaging course, and the use of translanguaging in the course. First, based on students' written texts in the portfolio, it could be argued that the CLIL course achieved the goals of CLIL, that is, to develop students' skills in the 4Cs: content, cognition, communication and culture. In addition, through learning in the 4Cs framework and the integrated learning, students appear to have considered that they improved their overall ability as learners discovering more about themselves. This confirms that this type of new CLIL course seems to have played a role in improving not only students' linguistic abilities, but also content knowledge and the ability to work collaboratively with others from various backgrounds. This can be seen as being in contrast to how CLIL is typically perceived in Japan—a means to teach and learn English. Moreover, in the process of their learning, translanguaging played an important role; it was used as a necessary tool for students to fully express themselves, a way of being a contributing member, and a tool to help transition. In other words, translanguaging was a crucial part of the student participants' meaning-making and knowledge construction in class, which improved their learning in the 4Cs. This data confirmed a line of literature that translanguaging in CLIL can go beyond scaffolding instruction in the target language, and become an important aspect of students' meaning making, knowledge (co-)construction, and an opportunity for students to develop their multilingual identities (Lin & He, 2017; Wu & Lin, 2019). However, the data also sheds light on challenges that come with employing translanguaging pedagogy in a context in which monolingual English-only policy in language classrooms is still pervasive. While students acknowledged the importance of translanguaging in their learning, some students also expressed a dilemma: that they felt that they were not fully committed to their learning due to the fact that they used translanguaging. This suggests that monolingual ideology in Japanese society and myths about English education remain pervasive (Kubota, 2016) and that they shape how students may perceive "effective" and "good" language classes. In the next chapter, I will discuss findings in relation to teachers' perception towards the course.

Chapter 6. Findings: teachers' experience

This chapter attempts to answer my third research question in relation to teachers' experience in the course: How do language teachers develop and implement a new type of language course with other teachers who are very diverse in age, experience, linguistic resources, and who have different beliefs about language education? It is an important point to explore as teachers' views on language learning and teaching affect their pedagogy in the classroom (Borg, 2003). In addition, addressing this question can bring valuable insights into what kinds of challenges teachers face when developing a new type of course (i.e., a translanguaging CLIL course for both Japanese and English learners who have different linguistic and cultural backgrounds) with other teachers who have diverse backgrounds and how those involved negotiate their positions and views on language. As discussed in Chapter 4, since the teachers who were involved in the development of the course are limited in number and easily identifiable, I will simply refer to teacher participants as teacher 1, 2, 3, etc. When referring to teachers, I am not revealing gender and will use she when referring to all teacher participants to maintain anonymity.

6.1. Teachers' perception towards their roles in the course

First, in this section, I will discuss findings in relation to teacher participants' perceptions towards their roles in the course. According to teacher interviews, it seems that teachers perceived their roles in the course either as a facilitator, a provider of "right" knowledge about the language, or both. I will begin by analyzing data related to the first type, facilitator, and then the second type, a provider of knowledge, and finally, both facilitator and a provider of knowledge.

6.1.1. Teachers' role as a facilitator

According to the teacher interviews, three teachers who were involved in the development and implementation of the course perceived themselves as more of a

facilitator, rather than someone who prepares everything and provides knowledge to students. When asked about her roles in class, Teacher 5 stated:

> I don't think learning is about having a teacher teach you. Until now, we had textbooks, and we studied within those textbooks.... But I think it is not the case that the teacher gives you everything you need, but that you have to make up for what you lack. The teacher is one of the resources, so to a certain extent, I can set up a path for taking various steps. Teacher is a resource, but we need to tell students that it is up to them how they learn from the teacher.
> (Teacher interview, translated by the author)

The excerpt suggests that Teacher 5 understands her position as a teacher, which should involve guiding students with learning. However, Teacher 5 does not believe that students should be given everything in class; in other words, the teacher should not be the only one who teaches the content in class. Teacher 4 shared a similar view, describing teachers' roles as follows:

> I think it would be best if we could share with the students how to find a way to express what they want to express, how to find a way to express it in the target language, how to examine something, tools, and so on. I think it would be best if we can practice and support students in finding ways to find what they want to say, or write, or talk about, even after the class is over.... I think everyone's interests are different... I'd rather students find out for themselves than for us to decide for them.
> (Teacher interview, translated by the author)

This excerpt shows that the teacher does not consider herself as someone who prepares and provides everything that students need to learn. Rather, she acknowledges that what students need and are interested in may differ, and teachers should provide students with the tools and skills that students will be able to use to deepen their own learning on their own.

Additionally, when Teacher 2 was asked about why she decided to join the development team of the course, she shared her reason as:

> Why I really wanted to do the course is because before we started developing it, we liked the idea of having students control a lot, like the students were kind of in charge of how they were graded. They were in charge of the topics they were talking about. They were in charge of their roles during discussions. So, I think the autonomy that was sort of naturally built into the course was also very exciting. And I wanted to facilitate that. (Teacher interview)

In addition, when asked about her experience in the new CLIL course compared to the regular language classes at the university, Teacher 2 reflected on her experiences as follows:

> Like my intermediate English course is very, very kind of strictly focused on, you got to use these phrases. When you discuss, you got to use this vocabulary. When you're talking about this topic, like, it's so kind of structured versus this exchange class, which is so open. (Teacher interview)

However, when asked about what she does as a teacher in the new CLIL course, Teacher 2 described her roles in the course as follows:

> You provide them with the choice. You provide them with the door they have to walk through it, you know what I mean. It's up to them. (Teacher interview)

Together, the responses above show that the teachers perceive their roles in the course mainly as facilitators who give students guidance rather than prepare everything for them. Not only does this apply to the language teaching and learning aspects of the course, but also other aspects of the course, such as topics covered, how students participate in class, and how they are graded in the course. Traditionally, in East Asian education culture including Japanese, teachers are often seen as providers of knowledge from which students learn (Tweed & Lehman, 2002), and this is evident in Japanese classrooms even today. However, some of the teachers who participated in the development and implementation of this new course had different beliefs and approaches to teaching that go against the traditional education culture. In other words, these teachers seem to put emphasis on fostering learner autonomy, which involves students taking charge of their own learning including "planning, the selection of materials, monitoring learning progress and self-assessment, arguably focused on the mechanics of day-to-day learning management" (Holec, 1981, p. 8). Additionally, by placing importance on the role of the learner in the learning process, the teachers in question seem to consider themselves as facilitators of learning, who help students in "providing an appropriate climate and suitable resources to support the students," rather than being "drill sergeants" or "lecturers of knowledge" (Dörnyei & Muir, 2019, p. 727).

To sum up the section, teachers considered this course as a new course that has different characteristics to other courses in the language program, and in this course, they emphasized the importance of giving students choices about their learning rather than preparing everything for them. Additionally, the teachers consider themselves as one of the resources of students' learning, which they are in charge of, based on students' interest and level, and that teachers should be facilitators that navigate students' learning.

6.1.2. Teacher's role as a provider of "right" knowledge

Another role of teachers that was described by teachers in the teacher interviews is being a provider of "right" knowledge (i.e., correct grammar, native-like pronunciation etc.) After a number of discussions, the development team of the course agreed that we would not provide everything to students related to their language learning like regular language classes would, such as a vocabulary sheet which contains 10-20 target vocabulary words, or written assignments which require students to practice writing using certain phrases and grammar points. Instead, we decided to provide students with a blank vocabulary sheet on which they can add new vocabulary they have found by doing research on the topics. When reflecting on the experience in the interview, Teacher 1 shared her concern about this type of class and her view on language teachers' roles:

> Students probably want some input from us and, again, it's a language class. They should involve some input from the teacher… I was also concerned about where the language input was coming from as well and where the teachers were giving enough support or whether they're completely relying on the other students to be the teachers because they're not perfect language users either. The Japanese students, maybe, but from the English-based students, they're not necessarily perfect language users. (Teacher interview)

The excerpt suggests that Teacher 1 sees teachers as the main source of input, and the "perfect" language users who can provide students with the "right" language input (i.e., correct grammar, native speaker-like pronunciation, correct use of vocabulary etc.) In addition, it can be implied that she sees the Japanese students as "perfect" language users, but English-based students who speak English as an additional language as not perfect language users. In other words, in her view, native speakers of English are "perfect" language users, but non-native speakers of English are not perfect language users. Thus,

it suggests that teachers, who can provide students with the "correct" knowledge about the language, should provide students with language input. In addition, in her view, it seems that teachers are expected by the students to provide the input that they need.

The excerpt shared by Teacher 1 suggests that there may be a strong dichotomy between native speakers and non-native speakers in her view on language, which corresponds to "an ideal speaker–listener, in a completely homogeneous speech community who knows its language perfectly" (Chomsky, 1965, pp. 3-4). This can be seen in many parts of the excerpt such as "input" and "perfect" language users. For example, according to Gass (2017), in interactionist approaches to language acquisition, input is a crucial element of the language acquisition process for non-native speakers. In this sense, input is seen as what native speakers provide to non-native speakers (i.e., speak naturally and modify their speech if they are not understood by non-native speakers). This way, non-native speakers also learn and modify their speech based on the input to get their ideas across to their native speaking interlocutors. In this view, people who give input or teach are native speakers, and people who learn are non-native speakers. Thus, it may be based on this view that Teacher 1 was concerned about English-speaking students who are not native speakers of English not being "perfect" English users. This also conforms with Flores and Rosa's (2022) statement that what is considered to count as right language in the society is seen and heard from the "white listening subject" (p. 3), an idealized native speaker of English. In addition, the finding echoes a major finding from Marshall and Walsh Marr (2018) that instructors tended to dichotomize students into native speakers and non-native speakers, regardless of the diverse linguistic backgrounds students had. Moreover, this dichotomy between native speakers and non-native speakers may suggest that the goal of language learning is to acquire a native-level proficiency. However, it conflicts with the nature of the classroom and language use in the society in which people from various backgrounds use English as an additional language as ELF, and use translanguaging as they see fit for their learning and communication purposes.

6.1.3. Teachers' role as both facilitators and providers of knowledge

According to the interview with another teacher, teachers' roles were perceived as both facilitators and providers of knowledge. When Teacher 3 was asked about what is needed and important in language education, she first described the current advancement of technology, such as translation tools, and skills needed in relation to the advancement:

> For example, when using DeepL to translate Japanese into English, if the Japanese sentence is not correct, strange English may be produced, and to translate the English into proper English, knowledge of English is required, right? Therefore, I think that language education is necessary to cultivate these skills. I think it would be better to retain the role of language education that enables students to think in their native language, to make sentences in their native language, and then to make proper sentences in a foreign language. (Teacher interview, translated by the author)

The response suggests that she believes that teachers should play the role of providing students with skills to produce "proper" language to some extent. However, when asked about how much control teachers should have over students' learning, such as preparing and providing vocabulary sheets or phrase lists, Teacher 3 shared her experience in the development of the course:

> I was thinking when [one of the development team members] came out with the vocabulary list, they were serious, like I guess there are people like that. It's pretty much like [the instructor] is a teacher who cares about form. And the vocabulary list was really like, oh, this, this, and this, as well? I thought, "Oh, but it's language education, so they might have to have that kind of thing." But then I thought, "Well, it would be better to teach a strategy where if there is something you can't say, you write it down in a notebook and look it up later, and then try to use it. (Teacher interview, translated by the author)

Together, the excerpts suggest that although Teacher 3 acknowledges and values the aspects of language education to improve students' skills to produce "proper" language to an extent, she also does not believe that it is necessary to prepare everything for them. Similar to Teacher 1, the first excerpt referring to "strange English" or "proper English" may suggest that Teacher 3 also has the native-like proficiency as one goal of language education. Moreover, using students' first language to think first so that they can produce "proper" sentences in their target language may also be based on the monolingual view on language, which conflicts with a view on language that see students' plurilingual

competence as a single, whole competence (Beacco & Byram, 2007). However, unlike Teacher 1 who believed that all the input should be provided by the teacher, Teacher 3 believed that some part of learning and teaching should be handed over to students. That is, teachers should rather provide learning strategies to students so that they can use them to improve their own language skills. In other words, in her view, language teachers are providers of knowledge about language to some extent; however, they are also facilitators who help students navigate the improvement of their own learning.

6.2. Teachers' perceptions towards translanguaging

Next, in this section, I will discuss teachers' perceptions towards translanguaging. It will be seen that, according to the teacher interviews below, translanguaging was perceived as a sign of lack of linguistic ability, a sign of laziness, a natural phenomenon in communication, or a tool of expressing multiple identities. Below, I will explain each theme with excerpts from the teacher interviews.

6.2.1. Translanguaging as a sign of lack of linguistic ability

The first perception of translanguaging that was shared by the teachers refers to translanguaging as a sign of lack of linguistic ability. As translanguaging was a controversial topic among the development team members, it was discussed in the teacher interviews in depth as well. When discussing students' language use in class, Teacher 1 stated:

> ...they've switched to their first language which indicates that they can't say that in their target language" (Teacher interview)

This suggests that in her view, students switch between languages due to lack of sufficient linguistic ability in the target language. A similar view was shared by another teacher when discussing the language use in the classroom. When asked what she does when students speak in their non-target language, Teacher 2 said:

> I'd pick out like Japanese conversational phrase, like なんて言ったらいいかな [how should I put it] or something like that. Because students often do that like when they're thinking of what to say in English, they say, な

> んて言ったらいいかな [how should I put it], they would say that. And it's just like, it doesn't mean anything. What I'll do is I'll stop the class like, "Hey, I heard someone use this phrase. Does anyone know how to use it in English?" And so, I'll write the English on the board and like, okay, great. Now you know how to use that phrase. (Teacher interview)

What seems clear from their responses is that the teachers assume that students switch to another language when they lack the vocabulary or phrases in the target language. It seems that both Teacher 1 and 2 view students' linguistic resources as "fixed and discreet entities" (Taylor & Snoddon, 2013, p. 440), rather than holding a holistic view of language as part of one whole competence. This is based on a traditional view of code-switching that speakers should switch between separate languages for language use to be accepted as valid, and each language should be used monolingually, dating back to Weinreich (1953). The excerpts imply that the teachers consider students' translanguaging simply as code-switching, despite the fact that many students are already proficient in multiple languages. There may be cases in which students switch to another language due to the fact that they did not know particular words or phrases in their target language; however, there may be also some cases where students deliberately chose to use their L1 or another language. Yet, based on the teachers' responses, it seems that the teachers do not consider the possibility that students intentionally used translanguaging to construct meaning and communicate in a suitable way in the situation (e.g., García & Lin, 2014).

6.2.2. Translanguaging as a sign of laziness

Another perception of translanguaging that was shared by teachers refers to translanguaging as a sign of laziness. The majority of the teachers involved in the development of the course had barely heard of translanguaging, and it was difficult for teachers to come to a consensus on the use of translanguaging in class. The discussion was carried on at the teacher interviews too, and Teacher 1, who was more skeptical about the usefulness and importance of translanguaging, shared her understanding of translanguaging as follows:

> [When students use their L1] that seems like you're just avoiding. It gives you an excuse not to try to say what you want to say in the target language (Teacher interview)

It is clear from the excerpt that in her view and understanding, translanguaging is not a choice made by a student, but rather a sign of laziness that students do not want to put their effort in learning and using the target language. This echoes findings from Escobar and Dillard-Paltrineri (2015) that some teachers see translanguaging as having the potential to create a habit of laziness. In addition, another teacher who was more open about students using their L1 or additional linguistic resources seemed to believe that although students can choose to use their non-target language, it will not be good for their learning. Teacher 2 described her stance as:

> I can't force you to use English if you don't want, and it's going to hurt you in the end I think, if you don't try to use it as much in class (Teacher interview)

The responses suggest that some teachers believe that maximum use of the target language is a crucial aspect of language learning in classroom and using linguistic resources except for their target language is a sign of laziness and unwillingness to learn the target language. Of interest here is that, while Teacher 2 is more open to the idea of translanguaging in class, it seems that she still believes that using the target language only is ideal. That is why although teachers "can't force" students to use the target language only, if students use translanguaging for their learning, "it's going to hurt" them in the end. This may come from negative views of multilingualism implying that use of L1 interferes with the learning of the target language. In addition, it seems that the instructors have been influenced by the monolingual ideology in language teaching and learning that if students want to improve their target language, they should use only the target language in the classroom. This confirms findings from previous studies that some instructors see translanguaging as a problem which hinders students' learning of English (Aghai et al., 2020; Lasagabaster & Doiz, 2016). Also, while CLIL classes, even in "soft CLIL" classes like this context, aim to improve the content knowledge as well as include a relatively stronger focus on the language learning, it seems that some teachers do not consider translanguaging as a potential tool to learn the content better, but the only focus seems to be the negative effects translanguaging may have on target language learning.

6.2.3. Translanguaging as a natural phenomenon in communication

However, other teachers shared a different view on translanguaging in their interviews, which acknowledges translanguaging as a natural part of communication. When asked about their views on language use in the classroom, Teacher 3 shared her doubt about limiting the language of communication in class to target language only:

> If what they want to say is not conveyed well [in the target language], but the other person understands it even if they use a language other than the target language, I wonder if it makes sense to force themselves to use only the target language in that situation. (Teacher interview, translated by the author)

The response suggests that Teacher 3 questions the target-language-only policy in the classroom and implies that use of multiple languages can be more effective and helpful even in a language classroom. In addition, Teacher 3 shared her view on translanguaging reflecting on her experience as a learner and user of multiple languages:

> I had many inconveniences in communicating as a learner of foreign languages all my life, and then I realized that I was pretty good at communicating. Some of the things I was good at were using Chinese, English, and Japanese, depending on the person I was communicating with, and I knew this from experience, but I couldn't put it into words, so when you said it, I thought, "Oh, yes. (Teacher interview, translated by the author)

As implied in the excerpt, it seems that Teacher 3's views on translanguaging as a language teacher and language learner herself may differ. However, she explained that as she discussed the concept of translanguaging with me and learned about it, she realized that what she was doing in her multilingual communication was basically translanguaging. The responses of these teachers about translanguaging use in the classroom and their views on it, may indicate that their experience as multilinguals may have an impact on their stance in the classroom. In addition, Teacher 4's response suggests that she considers the classroom as a site of meaning-making and knowledge construction among the students and teachers, rather than simply a site of learning the target language through the use of target language only.

6.2.4. Translanguaging as a tool of expressing multiple identities

Lastly, another view on translanguaging, which involves seeing it as a tool of expressing multiple identities, was shared by Teacher 4. When discussing limiting the use of language in class to target language only, she described her thoughts on monolingual policy as:

> I don't think how students perform and express themselves in their target language in class is a reflection of their personality or their views on academic matters. If a student is not good at Japanese, but has something to say, or has a more cheerful personality in other languages, etc., then banning the use of non-target languages completely may prevent the student from performing in the target language, or lower his/her motivation to learn it. If this is the case, is it a good idea to only push the target language too much? (Teacher interview, translated by the author)

Teacher 4 questions the target-language-only policy in language classrooms as policies that may ruin the whole point of learning another language, which is to expand students' overall ability including their linguistic ability. While other views on translanguaging mentioned above, such as translanguaging as a sign of laziness or lack of linguistic ability, look at the use of translanguaging negatively, this view on translanguaging looks at it more positively. In other words, in this view, translanguaging is considered as a necessary part of communication for multilingual students to fully express themselves. This aligns with the view of translanguaging that sees translanguaging as an important part of meaning-making for bilinguals (e.g., García, 2009) and identity affirmation (e.g., Li & Zhu, 2013).

6.3. Potential factors impacting teachers' perceptions of translanguaging

In this section, I will discuss findings regarding potential factors that affect teachers' views on translanguaging. From the teacher interviews, it seemed that different views on use of translanguaging may come from the participants' own experience as a language user, and how they normally communicate with people, or how they understand

the communication between multilinguals. Thus, below, I will discuss teachers' views on language that may have had an impact on their perceptions on translanguaging.

6.3.1. Monolingual world as the norm?

The first potential factor that may affect teachers' perspectives towards translanguaging is how they understand language use in society. In the teacher interviews, teachers who have experience learning and using multiple languages in their lives were more open to the idea of incorporating translanguaging pedagogy, while maintaining the aspect of language education that teaches students "proper" language. In other words, they understand different roles and types of language and communication that may be appropriate and effective in different contexts, and consider that "proper" use of language and translanguaging both have their own places. On the other hand, another view of language was shared by one teacher in the interview. When asked why they do not think translanguaging is appropriate in the language classroom, Teacher 1 described her reasons as follows:

> They need to know the target language and they need to know how to say what they want to say in the target language at some point probably if they're going to use English in their careers... It doesn't have to be perfect, but you at least need to be able to do it because, otherwise, what's the point of the language if you can only half use it. You don't have to be perfect at it but if you can't be who you want to be or say what you want to say, then it's only half at all, isn't it? (Teacher interview, February 3, 2022)

The response implies that Teacher 1 assumes communication in English would occur with monolingual speakers of English with whom students would have to communicate only in English. Moreover, it suggests that in her view, communication that incorporates translanguaging is only "half" using the language, and even if students cannot communicate in English "perfectly", they still should be using only English. In other words, in Teacher 1's view, "perfect" communication occurs between monolingual speakers who can communicate everything in one language. In a monolingual view of language use, for an interaction to be considered valid, the speaker should produce language that is complete, not partial, and meaningful (Haugen, 1953). In addition, in such a view, for language use to be considered valid, even multilingual speakers should

completely switch between languages without mixing them. That is, each language should be spoken monolingually (Weinreich, 1953). However, multilinguals draw linguistic and semiotic resources from a single holistic repertoire, and it can be rather difficult for them to engage in "one-language-at-a-time processing" (Ortega, 2019, p. 32), as the resources get co-activated in the communication process. Thus, while Teacher 1 was concerned about the use of translanguaging in language classrooms based on the monolingual view of language and world, it may be different from the social reality, in which many people have and utilize multiple linguistic and semiotic resources for communication.

6.3.2. Teachers' firsthand experience of translanguaging

Another potential factor that may have influenced teachers' views on translanguaging is their firsthand experience using translanguaging. In the teacher interviews, teachers shared their experience in the development of the course, and they all mentioned how they felt about working on the project using both Japanese and English. The responses below show different experience with translanguaging, which may have resulted in different perspectives on translanguaging. Teacher 2 described her experience working in the multilingual team using translanguaging firsthand as below:

> …being in a situation where using Japanese is highly encouraged sort of broke me from this anxiety level, but it also helped me experience it. So, I can sort of relate to my students a little bit better, I think, which is possibly – not possibly – probably changed my approach to language use and language management in the classroom. (Teacher interview)

Teacher 2 also stated that she used to play the role of "English police" who would tell students to use English whenever she heard Japanese in class. However, after experiencing translanguaging firsthand in the development and implementation of the course, she stated that she became more open to allowing translanguaging in class, and she changed her pedagogical approaches. This echoes the finding from Caldas (2019) that teachers changed their perspectives on translanguaging after learning about, and seeing

the benefits of translanguaging firsthand. However, Teacher 1, who has more negative views of translanguaging in classrooms, described her experience as follows:

> It was tiring because running a meeting in two languages and I'm trying to like take notes and things at the same time and try and take on everyone's ideas and respond, my brain was doing too much. Translanguaging experience, it was quite tiring for me. (Teacher interview)

Although Teacher 1 did not specifically mention the relationship between her firsthand experience of translanguaging and her perception of it, it may be possible that her experience negatively affected her perceptions on translanguaging use in the classroom. In addition, since the beginning of the course development up to the time of the interview, she constantly questioned the effectiveness of translanguaging, and it is possible that her negative firsthand experience using translanguaging amplified her idea that a monolingual approach is more effective than using translanguaging in a language classroom. However, it may be worthwhile to mention that while Teacher 2 used her L2 when communicating with other members as well as listening to them use the language, Teacher 1 did not use her L2 and only listened to other members speaking in the language. Thus, while she explained her experience with translanguaging in the excerpt, it should be noted that she did not directly engage in translanguaging communication herself. Therefore, the differences in Teacher 1 and 2's perspectives on translanguaging after they experienced it may be a result of their firsthand experience with translanguaging.

6.4. Experience of developing the course with teachers from various backgrounds

Finally, in this section, I will discuss findings regarding teachers' experience developing and implementing a new language course with colleagues who have diverse backgrounds. I will use teacher interviews as well as my own reflection from the reflective journal. According to the teacher interviews, teachers involved in the development and implementation of the course perceived their experience as an

opportunity to learn how the other language stream operates and an opportunity to change their view on language education. I will first discuss their experiences, and I will then discuss the challenges faced during the development of the course. Finally, I will discuss how teachers coped with working with others who have diverse backgrounds in developing the new course.

6.4.1. Opportunity to learn how the other language stream operates

All the teachers described their overall experience developing the new course as positive, and one of the things that was mentioned by them was learning about how the other language stream operates. In the language program, as discussed in previous chapters, although there are a few "exchange classes" a semester in which Japanese and English classes have a joint lesson, the Japanese and English language programs are separate programs, and curricula are completely separated. In other words, even though the instructors' office is shared, there are few opportunities for Japanese and English teachers to work together. However, Japanese and English teachers worked together on developing and implementing the new course, and all of them stated that it was a great opportunity to learn how the other language stream operates. For instance, an English teacher described her experience working with Japanese teachers as:

> After all, it was probably the first time for me to study or work with Japanese language teachers. I learned a lot, a new experience. I think I felt that the way of working was different. I felt that working with English teachers is faster-paced, and that Japanese teachers take a little more time to think about the process. I think English teachers are more like, "Let's give it a try." (Teacher interview, translated by the author)

This difference in time and process that each language program takes was mentioned by other teachers too, and a Japanese teacher explained:

> The difficult thing was that the conversation went on and on and on with other teachers' opinions, and I would get lost. I felt that what I was thinking was different from what the other teachers were thinking, but when they kept saying things like, "That's good," I sometimes wondered what I should do. To be honest, there were times when I wanted to stop and think things over. But I don't know. I think it was a great experience for me to be able to work with English teachers. We didn't know much about each other's courses, so. (Teacher interview, translated by the author)

As the responses suggest, although there may be some frustration and challenges that each teacher felt during the process due to the differences in the culture of working in different language streams, they all saw the process as an important and unique experience.

6.4.2. Opportunity to change their view on language education

In addition, the majority of the teachers described that the experience of developing the course brought positive changes to their teaching and view of language education. The teachers mainly discussed changes in their view on students' autonomy and language use in class. Teacher 3 stated:

> We let the students decide many things and let them take responsibility on their learning. And the presentation team, including you, were very creative in your efforts to prepare mechanisms to make the students do the work, and to make it easy for them to navigate their learning. I was surprised and learned that it was OK to leave so much responsibility to the students. (Teacher interview, translated by the author)

This change in her view on different teaching approaches may have to do with how other teachers perceived the objectives of language education, and Teacher 4 described her view on language education as follows:

> I used to be very conscious that teaching Japanese language itself was my job, but when I started working here, one of the teachers told me that Japanese language education at this university is not only about teaching the Japanese language, but also about educating university students. I think this was the moment when my thinking about Japanese language education changed a little. I was able to see the importance of independent learning, student autonomy, and the university's vision in creating courses and designing classes, and I gradually became more interested in these aspects than in the language teaching itself. At that point, I got involved in the development of the new course. If I had done the same thing at the beginning, I might have tried to create a different course, but now, I am thinking about how to make the course more focused on the students talking with each other and reflecting on their learning, rather than me controlling how they should learn in the course. That's why, I think I made some suggestions to make the course more focused on the students' discussion, rather than on my control. (Teacher interview, translated by the author)

As described in the response, Teacher 4's view of language education had been changed to focus more on students navigating their own learning by working with other students, which aligns with the goals of CLIL. This is different from the traditional view on language education, which focuses on students' language development itself, which had an impact on how the teachers designed this new course. A similar view was shared by Teacher 5, who described her view on collaborative learning, stating her main interest as follows:

> Collaborative learning is my main interest at the moment, so I have studied a lot about it. Collaborative learning is not just group work. It's about creating something new together, something you couldn't come up with on your own, and that's what I like about collaborative learning. I think this is a class where you can make the most of that quality, and I hope that students will realize that. I hope that the students will realize that the collaborative learning process does not end with group work, presentations, and debates, but rather with new learning and awareness that comes from working with people from various backgrounds, something they could not do alone. And for that, reflection is very important. (Teacher interview, translated by the author)

These responses together suggest that teachers who focused more on the collaborative learning and students learning through reflecting on their own learning positively influenced other teachers who were initially not aware of those aspects of learning, and they began to change their views on language education as well. This view on language education also aligns with the goals of CLIL, which aims to promote learner autonomy as well as student interaction through collaborative work (Vázquez & Ellison, 2013; Vázquez & Rubio, 2010). However, it seems that there was a disagreement on certain points. For instance, when discussing the tasks in class, particularly, students' reflective portfolio, Teacher 1 stated:

> Interviewee: Maybe that's more valuable [compared to tests] because then you're seeing students using certain vocab items. If they're not using them correctly then you can maybe at least point that out to them. You can see what they're doing with them or, again, if there's a word which might have been more appropriate, it's an opportunity for you to teach them, in other word. However, I don't think in the project course that so much detail is going into checking the student's work, was it? I'm not sure. Maybe not. It felt like you were just reading and then like, "Okay, they've done it." It wasn't giving much feedback. I think students want feedback, and I think it's our job to give them feedback on anything they produce. You don't have to give feedback on everything but give some feedback. I think that's

> a really important part of our job, basically…They are there to learn the language and improve their language skills. It's not just about producing. It's also trying to develop. I think there should be more feedback if there wasn't that kind of feedback in the course. I got the sense that there wasn't that much.

Interviewer: You mean feedback on language use itself, right?

Interviewee: Yes.

The response suggests that to Teacher 1, feedback means feedback on the language use, and it also indicates that language teachers should focus on giving students feedback solely on the language itself. In other words, it looks like in Teacher 1's view, autonomous learning or what students learn through collaborative work and reflection on their studies are not important aspects of language education. In addition, in her view, guiding students' overall learning is not language teachers' job. This contradicted with the views on learning that were shared above, which put importance on promoting students' autonomous learning and collaborative learning. Teachers who had such views, including me, saw the importance of students' engagement with the reflection process, and this activity was not considered to be about using certain vocabulary or phrases. However, for Teacher 1, it seems that all the tasks and activities offered in a language course has to be about improving students' language skills, meaning not making grammatical mistakes or choosing appropriate language in her view.

Although teachers came together to develop the new language course with their own views on language education and teaching, according to the teacher interviews, they also seem to have changed their views on language teaching through developing the course. For example, Teacher 3 described how she came to see translanguaging as an acceptable pedagogy while working on the project:

> In the field of translanguaging, I got my stereotypes destroyed…Like, it's okay to use different languages depending on the situation or the person. I think it was after meeting you that I became able to make such recommendations, like, "It's okay to speak in a suitable language according to the occasion, while keeping an eye on the understanding of the people around you.... Really, now that I think about it, it seems obvious to me that I should change the language depending on the occasion, but maybe it was through talking with you and working on projects together that I came to take that kind of thinking for granted after all. (Teacher interview, translated by the author)

During the project, I had a lot of opportunities to share ideas about the notion of translanguaging and how it has been researched and used in different teaching contexts. What Teacher 3 explained in the excerpt is an important aspect of communication between multilinguals, individuals acting as mediators to aid communication between speakers who are unable to understand each other due to lack of common language or shared cultural perspectives (North & Piccardo, 2016). The response above suggests that Teacher 3 came to develop understanding of communication between multilinguals. To sum up, while not in all the cases, by learning about this new concept, translanguaging, and reflecting on their own experience of using multiple languages and beliefs about language education, some teachers seem to have changed their views and approaches on language teaching.

6.4.3. Challenges to negotiate power in the development team

Although all the teachers described their experience developing the new course with a diverse team positively, all of them also shared some challenges they faced. One of them was regarding differences in their positions. As previously discussed, teachers had various backgrounds not only in terms of linguistic and cultural backgrounds, but also in terms of age, position, and experience. According to teacher interviews, it seemed that teachers understood where they stood in the team and tried to negotiate their beliefs and approaches to language teaching and their positions. For instance, one teacher who was in the same situation as I was – relatively young, less experienced, and lower in position, described how she understood how she was positioned and what she thinks was expected of her as follows:

> You and I sort of joined the project as like underlings, meaning, like kind of lower on the hierarchy of power and control. So, I knew that our opinions would be heard and listened to and respected. But I also knew that there was more of an objective that we couldn't really affect too strongly with our opinions. I recognized my place in the process was someone to help assist the development of materials and possibly the flow of certain activities or, you know, discussions or presentations, things like that. So, I was happy to assist with that. (Teacher interview)

The excerpt suggests that this teacher understood her position as more of an assistant rather than an equal member and understood that she had less power in the team. On the

other hand, a teacher who is older and had more experience described her experience in the course development in the following excerpt:

> You and [another younger teacher] are very enthusiastic, so you're pumping ideas out all the time and that's good. I wanted you to think the idea right through like how is that going to work? You'd come up somewhat at times with an idea but I wasn't sure you'd thought it right through. What is that really going to be in this course? …Again, maybe, it's hard to know until you've done it. You have to just try it out once and see. Some things, just because I'm older, I think, "Well, yes, but I need to know. I wonder exactly what that is." It wasn't always clear, and I wasn't sure it was clear to, like you sometimes, like exactly what this is going to be. That was sometimes challenging. (Teacher interview)

In the interview, this teacher talked about what she thought did not make much sense, which included translanguaging and reflective journals. During the interview as well as in the development process, she expressed her doubt and lack of knowledge/understanding on translanguaging. In addition, as other teachers' excerpts suggested, the importance of students' learning through reflection was shared by other teachers who were more experienced than I was. However, according to the interview, pedagogy or approaches that the more experienced and older teacher was not aware of were simply considered as ideas that were not "thought through." This suggests that for this particular teacher, new approaches to teaching that she was not aware of shared by young teachers like me seemed to be perceived as invalid while I was just considered as an "enthusiastic" young teacher who lacks experience. In sum, according to the responses from the teacher interviews, it seemed that younger teachers like me and another colleague were not perceived as equal members in the team, but rather, as people who did not know what they were doing due to lack of experience.

This finding supports Wallace et al.'s (2020) finding that power dynamics were shaped and negotiated based on various differences such as in employment status and rank when teachers collaborate in developing and implementing CLIL courses. In addition, the authors' findings suggested that teachers' agency differed depending on who the collaborative partners were (i.e., limited-term contract and tenured). Although there was no direct mentioning in the interviews, motivation in joining this development team may have also had an influence on how teachers

acted in the team. While I did not have a desire to get a tenured position at the university, the other young teacher did, and this may have had an impact on their actions (i.e., doing the assigned tasks as a contributing assistant to be seen as a potential addition to the tenured track faculty team). In addition, the excerpts in previous sections suggest while I was seen as a competent member providing new insights on language education (i.e., translanguaging pedagogy, CLIL perspectives) by some teachers, I was just seen as a naïve young inexperienced teacher by another teacher. Moreover, while the experienced teacher perceived herself as a knowledgeable teacher who knew a lot about language education especially language acquisition, she was perceived by some teachers as someone who did not have an understanding of different pedagogical approaches. Thus, the findings of this study also suggest that power dynamics were constantly negotiated between the collaborating members. In addition, it can be argued that within the power dynamics that unfolded, some teachers' self-perceptions and the perceptions of others of them did not always match.

6.4.4. Challenges to develop a course with teachers who share different linguistic backgrounds

Another challenge that was shared by the teachers was about language use during the development of the course. Some teachers shared their frustrations and difficulties that they faced due to the language barrier among the team members. For example, Teacher 5, who tended to speak in Japanese in meetings described how she was feeling as follows:

> [One of the teachers] probably didn't understand it when we were speaking in Japanese very well, so I felt sorry. But I am not confident enough to explain my ideas and thoughts in English, and I felt I wouldn't be able to convey it, so I ended up using Japanese. When someone says something in English, I can generally understand it, but when it comes to communicating my thoughts and ideas, I prefer to use Japanese. (Teacher interview, translated by the author)

Although in her case, it was fine for her to understand all the contents discussed both in Japanese and English, there were cases where some teachers felt lost due to the language

barrier. One teacher shared her frustration during the meetings as the following excerpt suggests:

> At times, it was tricky. I can understand most of what was going on. It's quite difficult for me to contribute in Japanese. My ability isn't good enough but also confidence thing. I don't mind speaking to Japanese people in Japanese somehow, but if I know I'm speaking in front of other non-native speakers who are way better than me, I feel more embarrassed… It's a weird thing. I'm not sure why that is, but I need to get over that. (Teacher interview)

This excerpt shows this teacher's frustration towards the language barrier that she faced in working in a multilingual team, and implies that she did not have a very positive translanguaging experience. As previously discussed, this may have an influence on her view on translanguaging in the classroom. Teacher 4, who had more positive—or neutral view on translanguaging use in the classroom, described her experience in the following excerpt:

> I thought it would be better if I could reply in English, but I had been speaking in Japanese because I was staying in my comfort zone. I think it was burdensome to [two English speaking teachers]. I think I was spoiling myself. But since we were a small group, I was able to confirm what I heard in English but didn't understand clearly, and I let go of the parts that I didn't think I needed to understand. If I had to explain all my thoughts and ideas in English, I might not have been able to convey them well, so I think it was helpful that we were able to explain complicated things in a way that was easy for us. We are a group of people who have listening ability in another language to some extent. (Teacher interview, translated by the author)

The response suggests that she perceived the translanguaging experience—communicating in a comfortable language and understanding each other even if it was not "perfect"—positively. The excerpts above together suggest that even in a similar situation in which members used translanguaging in meetings, teachers' perceptions varied; some teachers felt stressed or somewhat confused with the use of translanguaging, while some teachers found it convenient. Coupled with the previous comment by another teacher that their view on translanguaging changed to a more accepting manner after experiencing translanguaging firsthand, the responses from the teacher interviews would suggest that teachers' firsthand experience of using translanguaging may affect their view on translanguaging in class.

6.4.5. How teachers coped with different views on language education in development and implementation of the course

As demonstrated thus far, teachers had various views on language education, such as roles of teachers, goals of language education, use of translanguaging, and went through some challenges as well as positive experiences in the development and implementation of the new course. In this section, I will discuss how they coped with those challenges and difficulties while working with teachers who have diverse backgrounds.

According to some teachers, one way that they coped with those challenges was to listen to other teachers' opinions, but not necessarily follow everything when they actually teach. For instance, one teacher discussed various things that she did not agree with in the discussion, such as explicitly teaching various "cultures" to students in class, teaching language explicitly, and preparing and providing all the materials to students. When asked how she dealt with those things, Teacher 4 stated:

> I wondered if it would be better to leave a little more to the students. I felt that it would be better than us setting the scope, so in the end we probably didn't do any of that. In the classes this semester that [the other teacher] and I were in charge of. So I don't think there is a single material that we have prepared that says, "make sure you all read this". (Teacher interview, translated by the author)

The excerpt suggests that some teachers, including Teacher 4, exercised their own agency to choose and decide what they thought made more sense, or helpful and effective for students' learning. This was the same in my own case when I taught the course with another teacher, during which we would have meetings, and after reviewing what was prepared by the team, we selected and added what made most sense to us.

Another way that was used by teachers to cope with the different ideas on the team was related to the power dynamics in the team. As discussed in the previous section, a teacher who was also a full-time lecturer and relatively young like me understood her position in the team and seemed to have suppressed her opinions and views when possible. On the other hand, a teacher who was relatively old and had more experience stated that she did the opposite. One teacher said:

> I've developed courses before. Maybe for some group, it was the first time to even put a course together, so you want to be able to do that.

> You won't actually be like, "I'm doing this work." If I say, "No, we're doing this," and if I have too much control, that's maybe not a good thing. That is also something I was trying to remind myself of…(Teacher interview)

The excerpt suggests that the teacher understood the power dynamics in the team and gave younger teachers chances to try what they wanted even if she did not agree with them. Together with the other teacher's comment, it suggests that teachers negotiated their positions and power by both experienced teachers and less experienced teachers understanding each other's position.

6.5. Conclusion

This chapter has provided findings regarding teachers' perceptions towards translanguaging and their experience developing a translanguaging CLIL course with a multilingual team of teachers who teach Japanese and English respectively. First, based on the teacher interviews, the findings of this study suggest that teachers' perspectives on translanguaging may be influenced by multiple factors: their firsthand experience with translanguaging, interactions with other teachers, and their views on language education. When teachers had a positive firsthand experience with translanguaging, even when they initially used a monolingual approach to language teaching, or did not know about the concept of translanguaging, their perceptions on translanguaging changed positively in the process of developing this new course. This led to changing their classroom practices such as becoming more open to students' use of translanguaging in class, and viewing translanguaging as an important aspect of their learning and a natural part of communication. However, when teachers could not be engaged in communication using translanguaging in the development of the course or did not have a positive experience with the use of translanguaging, even after they learned the concept of translanguaging, their negative views of it did not change. The findings conform with Caldas's (2019) finding that teachers who understood the benefits of translanguaging through learning about the concept, tying it with their own experience as bilinguals, and seeing the benefits firsthand in the classroom agreed that they would use translanguaging as a teaching strategy in their classrooms in the future. Additionally, the findings of the current study

add to the literature by suggesting that even when instructors are introduced to the concept of translanguaging with the benefits explained to them, they may not change their perspectives on using translanguaging in their classrooms if they are unable to see the benefits of it firsthand or undergo positive translanguaging experience firsthand. In turn, this lack of recognition of the benefits of translanguaging could also reinforce the idea that translanguaging is ineffective in language classrooms.

In addition, teachers' perception towards this type of new CLIL course depended on their interests and beliefs on language education. Some teachers who were interested in collaborative learning or autonomous learning, which align with the goals of CLIL courses (Vázquez & Ellison, 2013;Vázquez & Rubio, 2010), tended to have a positive view of translanguaging, seeing translanguaging as an important aspect of achieving such types of learning. These teachers tended to view the classroom as a site of knowledge co-construction among teachers and students (e.g., He & Lin, 2022). However, teachers who had a traditional view of language education saw translanguaging as an obstacle, which prevents students from developing their target language skills. In their view, it seemed that the goal of language learning is to achieve a native-like proficiency, and a view of multilingual speakers' linguistic repertoire as a whole was missing (Ortega, 2019).

Finally, the findings shed light on potential challenges that teachers may face when developing a course in collaboration with other teachers who vary not only in linguistic and cultural backgrounds, but also in age, position, and ranking. In the development of the course, power dynamics played a role in what gets considered valid and important. Sometimes, when young teachers had more knowledge or different perspectives, it was considered as not knowing sufficietly about the theories of language acquisition or lack of experience. However, this was not always the case, and the power dynamics were shaped and re-shaped, and negotiated between different individuals in line with specific contexts. In the next chapter, I will summarize and synthesize the findings of the study both from students' and teachers' perspectives.

Chapter 7. Conclusion

This study aimed to explore how translanguaging pedagogy can be utilized in a language classroom that is situated within a context where the monolingual ideology is prevalent. Specifically, the study focused on exploring both international and Japanese students' perceptions on this new type of CLIL translanguaging language course as well as the use of translanguaging in the process of meaning making and knowledge construction among students. In addition, the study also focused on exploring teachers' perspectives on translanguaging as well as their experience developing this new CLIL translanguaging course with other teachers who have diverse backgrounds.

In this qualitative case study, I used semi-structured individual interviews with students and teachers involved in the course and students' reflection as its primary methods of inquiry, and my reflective journal as a supplementary source as data sources. The data was thematically analyzed around the research questions, with reflexivity being an important aspect through analyzing data and writing up the thesis. The study has explored the following research questions:

1. How do students perceive a new type of language course in which learners with diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds learn different target languages in the same classroom simultaneously?
2. How is translanguaging used in the process of meaning making and knowledge construction among students of different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, and how is it perceived by them?
3. How do language teachers develop and implement a new type of language course with other teachers who are very diverse in age, experience, linguistic resources, and who have different beliefs about language education?

In this concluding chapter, I will first sum up and synthesize the findings of this study by summarizing important contributions regarding the research questions. I will then discuss implications of the study. Finally, I will discuss the limitations of the current study and directions for future research and end the chapter with my personal reflection.

7.1. Discussion

7.1.1. Students' perceptions of the new CLIL course

Chapter 5 explored the first and second research questions:

1. How do students perceive a new type of language course in which learners with diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds learn different target languages in the same classroom simultaneously?
2. How is translanguaging used in the process of meaning making and knowledge construction among students of different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, and how is it perceived by them?

First, in terms of the CLIL aspect of this course, the findings suggest that the main purpose of CLIL, which is to help students develop their skills through integrated learning, was successfully attained. Students' responses to the course revealed that it was much more than just a means of enhancing their linguistic abilities in contrast to how CLIL is viewed in many contexts in Japan (e.g., Sasajima, 2020), where it is merely a means of teaching English. By incorporating the 4Cs, students were able to learn not only the target language but also new content knowledge and the ability to work cooperatively with people from different backgrounds. As a result, they were able to learn more about themselves by engaging with and learning from others. Additionally, as shown in the written reflections of the students, by participating in tasks and developing their skills, students also enhanced the abilities necessary for their academic and future professional lives, such as critical thinking, problem solving, creativity, communication, collaboration, and cross-cultural awareness. Furthermore, the unique aspect of this new course, in which students with diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds learn Japanese and English simultaneously, the course promoted pluriculturality (Beacco et al., 2016) and mediation (North & Piccardo, 2016) among students, allowing them to use all available linguistic and semiotic resources and learn about different cultures and ideas of their own and their peers. This helped students engage with otherness and diversity as well as content and linguistic knowledge, resulting in improvement in students' skills as described above.

7.1.2. Use of translanguaging and students' perceptions of translanguaging

In terms of translanguaging use in the classroom, the findings of this study suggested that both instructors and students utilized translanguaging as well as various trans-semiotic resources such as gestures, YouTube videos, pictures, articles, Google translate, and chat function of Zoom in the classroom. Translanguaging was simultaneously used in all groups; however, the use of languages depended on the composition of the group, and this changed as the groups changed throughout the semester, too. While the majority of participants stated that the stronger language for the majority of group members was mainly used in navigating their group work, they also stated that languages were used fluidly and it was never only one language that was used in the group work. In addition, students used their L1 for accessing more information and gaining accurate information in preparation for challenging tasks such as debate and presentation.

Furthermore, various semiotic resources were utilized for meaning-making and knowledge construction among students. Not only were YouTube videos used when students themselves or their group members did not understand particular concepts or words in their target language, but they were also utilized when students explained and conveyed the image in their mind that other students may have had no idea about. This was mainly done when they were creating something new, such as an eco-friendly product to solve a particular environmental issue. As students came up with ideas related to what they have in their own cultures, YouTube videos and pictures were used to make meaning with their group members who had little or no idea about their cultures. This confirms the findings of some previous studies that students use a variety of linguistic and semiotic resources to build their academic knowledge (e.g., Marshall et al., 2019) and their multicultural resources to contribute to the mutual meaning-making process (e.g., He & Lin, 2021). In addition, it also confirms the findings from a previous study that translanguaging and trans-semiotizing are utilized fluidly in the process of meaning making in the classroom (Siu & Lin, 2022; Wu & Lin, 2019).

Finally, regarding students' perceptions of translanguaging in the classroom, although all the participants stated that translanguaging helped them with their improvement of both content knowledge and language skills to varying degrees, some of

them shared their reservations about using translanguaging in a language classroom. For example, some students used words such as “楽してる[taking the easy way out]” or “自分に甘かった[giving in to temptation]”, or in some cases, students explicitly shared their reservation such as “I feel like I shouldn't use Japanese because I took the English basis (Japanese stream) course.” In contrast, the positive responses from the participants about a language course where they can learn two languages while having a main target language suggested that learners understood the value of not only one language but also that they enhanced their plurilingual competence (Coste, Moore, & Zarate, 2009). In addition, translanguaging played a significant part in students’ learning process; it was used as a necessary tool for students to fully express themselves, a way of being a contributing member, and a tool to help transition. In other words, translanguaging was an essential aspect of the student participants' meaning-making and knowledge construction in the classroom, which enhanced their learning in the 4Cs. Furthermore, some participants considered communication using translanguaging as a practice for real-world communication. This suggests that even though a monolingual norm frequently frames language education (Cenoz & Gorter, 2013), students themselves understand the needs and importance of plurilingual and pluricultural competence (Coste, Moore, & Zarate, 2009) in the globalizing world as well as the significance of meaning making using both translanguaging and trans-semiotizing. This data supported a body of literature suggesting that translanguaging in CLIL can go beyond scaffolding instruction in the target language and become a crucial part of students' meaning-making, knowledge (co-)construction, and an opportunity for them to cultivate their multilingual identities.

However, the data also sheds light on challenges that come with using translanguaging pedagogy in a context where monolingual English-only policies are still predominant in language classrooms. While all student participants recognized the value of translanguaging in their learning to varying degrees, some expressed concerns and a dilemma: they felt that they were not fully committed to their learning because they used translanguaging. This echoes the monolingual ideology and *genso* (misconceptions) about language education (Kubota, 2018; Lin, 2015) that teaching only through the target language would be more effective. As a result, some students felt guilty about using their L1 or other non-target language resources even though they understood the advantages of

translanguaging and trans-semiotizing in their meaning-making process, knowledge construction, and language learning. This suggests that monolingual ideology and myths about English education are still prevalent in Japanese society (Kubota, 2016), and they influence how students perceive "effective" and "good" language classes.

7.1.3. Teachers' perceived roles in the course

Chapter 6 explored the third research question: How do language teachers develop and implement a new type of language course with other teachers who are very diverse in age, experience, linguistic resources, and who have different beliefs about language education? As previously discussed, the course was developed by Japanese and English teachers who have different backgrounds in many ways: age, teaching experience, cultural and linguistic backgrounds, and views on language education, which may have influenced how they perceived the roles of teachers in the course, and how they perceived the use of translanguaging in the course. In addition, the experience of developing and implementing the course also influenced their views on language use and teaching as well.

First, in terms of teachers' roles in the course, some perceived their roles to be a facilitator; others perceived their role to be a provider of "right" knowledge about the language. Moreover, others described a dual role as both facilitators and providers of knowledge. Teachers who perceived their roles in the course as facilitators considered the course as a new course that had different characteristics to other courses in the language program, and they emphasized the importance of giving students choices about their learning rather than preparing everything for them. Unlike how teachers are perceived in many East Asian educational cultures, including Japanese, which is as providers of knowledge from which students learn (Tweed & Lehman, 2002), these teachers seem to put emphasis on fostering learner autonomy (Holec, 1981) and considered themselves as facilitators of learning, who help students by providing support and resources (Dörnyei & Muir, 2019). As stated, another role of the teacher was described in the teacher interviews, which is as a provider of "right" knowledge, such as correct grammar and native-like pronunciation. The findings of the study suggested that there may be a strong dichotomy between native speakers and non-native speakers in this view on language

(Chomsky, 1965) and non-native learners are seen as objects that receive input of correct use of language by the native interlocutors (Gass, 2017). In addition, the findings conform with Marshall and Marr (2018) that instructors may dichotomize students into native and non-native speakers regardless of the diverse linguistic backgrounds of students. Because of this, the roles of teachers in the course may have been perceived as providers of "right" knowledge of language, as students should learn the target language from teachers who are native speakers or near native speakers. Finally, there was a case in which a teacher valued students' autonomy and believed that teachers should perform more as facilitators of students' learning, while also believing that helping students learn the "proper" language, that is, native-like proficiency, was important. In this case, although the teacher believed that translanguaging, or the use of L1, should be allowed in the classroom, it was to help students develop "proper" (i.e., grammatically correct) sentences in the target language. This could also be due to a monolingual view on language, which contrasts with a view on language that sees students' plurilingual competence as a unified, holistic competence (Beacco & Byram, 2007).

7.1.4. Teachers' perceptions towards translanguaging

Next, in terms of teachers' perceptions towards translanguaging, translanguaging was perceived as a sign of lack of linguistic ability, a sign of laziness, a natural phenomenon in communication, or a tool of expressing multiple identities. Some teachers perceived translanguaging as a natural phenomenon in communication or a tool of expressing multiple identities, considering the classroom as a site of meaning-making and knowledge construction among the students and teachers. This aligns with a line of literacy that sees translanguaging as an important part of meaning-making for bilinguals (e.g., García, 2009) and identity affirmation (e.g., Li & Zhu, 2013). However, it was also perceived negatively by some teachers. Some teachers perceived translanguaging as a sign of laziness, which echoes findings from previous studies that some instructors consider translanguaging as a problem which hinders students' learning of English (Aghai et al., 2020; Lasagabaster & Doiz, 2016). In addition, some teachers perceived translanguaging as a sign of lack of linguistic ability, considering the use of translanguaging by students due to their lack of ability to express themselves in the target

language. In this view, students' use of translanguaging was simply understood as a form of code-switching. The findings of the study suggest that some teachers did not consider the possibility that students intentionally used translanguaging to construct meaning and communicate in a suitable way in a given situation (e.g., García & Lin, 2014).

7.1.5. Aspects which may have influenced teachers' perspectives on translanguaging

The findings of this study, moreover, suggest that teachers' different views on translanguaging may have derived from how they understand language use in society. According to the teacher interviews, teachers who had personal experience learning and using multiple languages were more in favor of the idea of incorporating translanguaging pedagogy, while maintaining the aspect of language education that teaches students "proper" language. That is, they recognize the various roles and types of language and communication that may be appropriate and effective in various contexts, and they believe that "proper" language use and translanguaging both have their place. In contrast, one teacher described communication using translanguaging as only "half" using the language, and stated that students should be communicating in English only rather than using translanguaging even if they cannot communicate in English "perfectly." This is based on a monolingual view of language use that dates back to historical views that consider valid interaction to be done in a language that is complete, not partial, and meaningful (Haugen, 1953), and that communication should occur monolingually, and different languages should be used separately (Weinreich, 1953).

In addition, teachers' firsthand experience of translanguaging also seemed to have influenced their views on translanguaging. Although some teachers were initially not familiar with the concept of translanguaging, by learning about it and experiencing it firsthand while developing the course with teachers with different linguistic backgrounds, they changed their views on translanguaging. This confirms the findings from Caldas (2019) that after becoming familiar with translanguaging and experiencing its advantages firsthand, teachers' perspectives on translanguaging shifted and they considered translanguaging as a useful tool in their classrooms in the future. However, the findings of the current study add to the literature by suggesting that even after being introduced to

the idea of translanguaging and having its advantages explained to them, instructors might not change their minds about allowing translanguaging-friendly classes if they have not had the opportunity to experience its advantages for themselves.

Teachers' perception towards this type of new CLIL course depended on their interests and beliefs regarding language education. Some teachers who were interested in collaborative learning or autonomous learning, which are goals of CLIL courses (Vázquez & Ellison, 2013; Vázquez & Rubio, 2010), tended to have a positive view of translanguaging and saw translanguaging as a crucial component of achieving such types of learning. These educators saw the classroom as a site of knowledge co-construction between teachers and students (e.g., He & Lin, 2022). On the other hand, translanguaging was viewed as an obstacle by teachers who had a traditional view of language education, thus preventing students from mastering their target language. According to them, the goal of language learning appears to be to achieve native-like proficiency, and the view that multilingual speakers' linguistic repertoire was a whole was lacking.

7.1.6. Teachers' experiences developing a language course with other teachers with various backgrounds

Finally, the findings of the current study also highlight possible difficulties that instructors may encounter when creating a course with colleagues who have different linguistic and cultural backgrounds as well as varying ages, positions, and rankings. While all the teachers had a positive experience working with other teachers with diverse backgrounds, including teachers teaching a different language, power dynamics had an impact on the course's development in terms of what was deemed important and valid, supporting Wallace et al.'s (2020) findings. When young teachers had more knowledge or different perspectives, it was sometimes interpreted by colleagues as a lack of knowledge about language acquisition theories or a lack of experience. However, this was not always the case, and in some cases, teachers changed their views and approaches to language education by learning about the concepts and approaches through working on the development of the course. Thus, power dynamics were shaped and reshaped, as well as negotiated between different individuals in different contexts.

7.1.7. Summary of findings

Bringing together the findings of both students and teachers' perspectives, two major common features became evident: influence of monolingualism and ambivalence. First, through the analysis of students' written portfolio, and students and teachers' interviews, it became clear that their perceptions towards translanguaging were largely influenced by the monolingual ideology. For example, students' comments such as "楽してる[taking the easy way out]" or "自分に甘かった[giving in to temptation]" about using their non-target language in class, or "I feel like I shouldn't use Japanese because I took the English basis (Japanese stream) course" indicate that they have a negative feeling towards using their multilingual resources in a language classroom. This can be a reflection of monolingual ideology and *genso* (myths) about language education (Kubota, 2018; Lin, 2015) that teaching only through the target language would be superior than classes that incorporate translanguaging pedagogy.

In addition, teachers' perspectives on translanguaging such as translanguaging as a sign of lack of linguistic ability or a sign of laziness could be a reflection of monolingual approach to language teaching, which encourage and expect students to "act as if they were monolingual speakers of English" (Cenoz & Gorter, 2013, p. 593). Moreover, teacher's perspective that considers communication using translanguaging as only "half" using the language, or that communication should be done in English only even if it was not done "perfectly" rather than using translanguaging are based on the monolingual ideology. In monolingual ideology, valid communication is considered to be done be done in a language that is complete, not partial, and meaningful (Haugen, 1953), and to be occurred monolingually, and different languages should be used separately (Weinreich, 1953).

However, another common characteristic of students and teachers' perspectives is the ambivalence. Students who stated that they were satisfied with the course due to their perceived improvement of both content knowledge and language skills as well as other skills such as critical thinking skills, collaborative working skills, and intercultural communication skills, they still showed their dilemma of using their L1 as described above. This happened within the same students: in some ways, they stated that

translanguaging was effective and helpful, and would not have been able to use the target language as comfortably and freely as they did; however, in some ways, they stated that they may have improved their target language if they were forced to use their target language only. Similarly, although some teachers stated that they changed their approaches to use of translanguaging in their classrooms after learning about and experiencing translanguaging firsthand, considering the effectiveness of translanguaging, they described translanguaging as not effective for improving students' target language. Thus, both teachers and students shared this sense of ambivalence towards the use of translanguaging in the classroom.

7.2. Implications of the study

By exploring both students' and teachers' experiences and perspectives on a new and unique CLIL language course where students learn two languages simultaneously while utilizing translanguaging and trans-semiotizing in a context in which monolingual ideology is still predominant, this study has illustrated possibilities and challenges for the future of language education. Thus, in this section, I will discuss some implications for classroom teachers and educators who advocate translanguaging.

7.2.1. Implications for classroom teachers

This study has demonstrated how pedagogical translanguaging could enhance students' learning in a CLIL course developing students' skills in the 4Cs: content, cognition, communication and culture. By being allowed to use translanguaging, students were not only able to develop their linguistic abilities and content knowledge, but also the ability to work collaboratively with others from various backgrounds. As understood by some of the student participants, ability to use their full linguistic and semiotic resources rather than one specific language with people from various backgrounds is one of the crucial skills in today's society and workplaces. Also, as the study has demonstrated, students benefitted from being able to use their full linguistic and semiotic resources in communication and their learning not only in terms of improving the target language, but also negotiating their identities as bilinguals and contributing members in the classroom.

However, as discussed in the previous sections, ideology that language should be learned through the maximum use of the target language only prevented students from fully appreciating their ability to use various linguistic and semiotic resources for communication. Many students felt that they were not fully engaged in the language learning, even though they actually did engage and seemed to improve both content and linguistic knowledge. In order to prevent this, classroom teachers should first create a welcoming and encouraging classroom environment where students feel that their unique linguistic and cultural backgrounds are welcomed and valued. After creating such a learning environment, teachers may explicitly explain the concept of translanguaging and its value in communication among multilinguals in today's society, and benefits of translanguaging for students' language and content learning. This may gradually break the monolingual ideology that surrounds language learning, by which students are influenced. By doing this, students may be able to imagine their future communication with people from various backgrounds, instead of seeing English as the only language that will be used in communication, and may be able to open their eyes to different views on language use, such as ELF and translanguaging. This way, students may be able to see translanguaging more positively and feel guilt-free about using their own linguistic and cultural backgrounds for their learning. As a result, they may also be able to develop more positive identity as multilingual speakers.

7.2.2. Implications for educators who advocate translanguaging

The findings of this study also offer implications for educators who advocate translanguaging. An increasing number of studies have demonstrated the benefits of translanguaging in language classrooms in various aspects (e.g., Bellés-Calvera, 2021; Mazak & Herbas-Donoso, 2015; Ting, 2020). However, this present study has illustrated how it can be challenging to incorporate translanguaging in a language course, especially when an instructor is working with other teachers as a team, and is not able to control the language use in the course. As demonstrated in the study, it is possible that many teachers are still not familiar with the concept of translanguaging, even though it has become more common, and simply do not know the benefits of translanguaging. As this study has shown, it is possible that some teachers may find the concept of translanguaging useful

and helpful by learning about it, resulting in changes in their approaches to language learning. Thus, it is crucial to first raise awareness among coworkers or at conferences to share more information about translanguaging. However, some teachers may be strongly influenced by the ideology surrounding English learning that use of the target language only is more effective. However, this study has demonstrated that when teachers have a positive firsthand experience with translanguaging, it is likely that their perception on translanguaging will be more positive. Yet, the study has also illustrated that when they have a negative firsthand experience with translanguaging, it can reinforce the idea that trasnlanguaging is ineffective. In order to prevent this, when offering workshops or having colleagues learn about or experience translanguaging firsthand, it may be helpful to be aware of different linguistic abilities that teachers have, so that they can feel comfortable to use translanguaging even if they feel that their L2 skills are not high enough to use it for communication. This way, there is a chance that some instructors who initially oppose the idea of using translanguaging in language classroom may change their perspectives.

7.3. Limitations of the current study and directions for future research

While this research shed light on unique experiences of students and teachers who were involved in taking and designing and/or teaching an innovative course that aimed to improve not only students' target language, but also 4Cs and skills that they will need in the 21st century by bringing translanguaging pedagogy to the fore, it also has some limitations.

First, due to the Covid-19 pandemic, all the processes involved in this study except for the initial stage of planning the course – implementation of the class, meetings among teachers, students' group work in and outside of class, and interviews – were carried out online. While the study was able to offer clear findings regarding students' use of trans-semiotizing, such as easily sharing the screen to show pictures and videos to convey what they had in mind, or typing in the chat when some students in a group

seemed to be left out by not fully understanding the group discussion, it is also true that some participants mentioned that they felt that the communication may have been different if the discussions and group work were done in person. Thus, future research could be carried out in in-person settings.

In addition, while my own reflective journal allowed me to offer a teacher's own perspective in different stages (from the beginning of the creation of the course to reflection after hearing other teachers' and students' perspectives), focusing more on my role of a researcher could have possibly further enriched the current findings. Although there were aspects that the study was able to offer because of my own position as both a teacher and researcher, there could be certain areas that were overlooked as a result. For example, as I needed to teach the course, I was not able to fully focus on taking detailed field notes while visiting all the breakout rooms on Zoom. Therefore, future research could be conducted in a manner that the researcher is not a teacher teaching the course themselves.

Moreover, another limitation of the study pertains to the unbalanced number of students studying Japanese and English respectively in the case study. As this was a new course and the advertisement of the course was not well done, and some students who were interested in the course were not allowed to take the course due to the course registration restrictions (i.e., only students who had completed the standard track courses were allowed to register), there were far fewer English learners (n=10) than Japanese learners (n=23). As some participants who were English learners mentioned that sometimes it was difficult to use English when they were the only English learners in groups of 4 or so, this may have had an impact on the language use in group work. Thus, future research could look into a course that has a fairly balanced number of students who are studying two respective languages.

Finally, this research was conducted within the field of language learning, and findings of the study shed light on complexities that emerged due to the ideology surrounding language education. For example, some participants had reservations about using their L1 or other linguistic resources even though they saw the benefits of it in improving both their target language skills and communication with peers as well as understanding the content. In addition, some teachers were also against and/or doubtful

about the use of L1 in a language classroom even though improvement of the target language was not the only objective of the course. Therefore, future research could be carried out beyond the scope of the field of language education to explore the differences and similarities in students and teachers' perspectives on use of translanguaging and trans-semiotizing. For example, researchers can look at the use of translanguaging and students' perspectives on the language use in a course that is designed mainly for improving students' intercultural communication skills outside of language courses.

With the change of society that has been becoming globalized, language education is at a turning point, characterized by a shift from the traditional monolingual approach to approaches that value and utilize students' full linguistic resources. It is therefore essential for researchers in applied linguistics to continue to design innovative studies that explore the complex processes and factors involved to improve outcomes for the future of language education.

Personal reflection

Before I conclude the dissertation, I would like to dedicate this final section to a reflection on my experience leading up to conducting this research, how my relationship with participants changed and evolved during the study, how I changed and developed as a teacher, and how all of this may have affected knowledge production.

I was always passionate about teaching English since I decided to become an English teacher when I was in high school. However, as I underwent various experiences with English, my motivation and goals of teaching English changed. When I first decided to be an English teacher, my motivation was to improve English education in Japan, so that I could contribute to helping Japan become more globalized and keep its place in the globalizing world. Looking back, my goals back then aligned with the goals that MEXT has, such as producing Japanese citizens who can speak English like native speakers and communicate with people from different countries in English with confidence. However, after experiencing feeling deficient due to a perceived lack of proficiency in English in different educational contexts, coupled with learning about different views and concepts about language education in the master's program, my goal as an English teacher changed. I started to feel that I need to change English education so that people do not need to feel deficient just because they do not use English like native speakers, and that

they would learn how to communicate with people from different backgrounds respecting their own and others' linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

However, it did not take a long time for me to realize how strong native speakerism is in Japan and how this ideology about English education affected teachers and students' views on language education. In order to challenge this, I decided to develop a new type of language course with other teachers and conduct research on it. During the development of the course, I was motivated and happy that I got an opportunity to develop a unique course that was different from the conventional language courses in which students are forced to use only the target language and to see students from the opposite language stream as if they are tools to learn the "native" pronunciation and expressions from. I was excited to create a course where students would be engaged with authentic materials, while also engaging in academic communication where they would learn how to communicate and work together with people from various linguistic and cultural backgrounds. At first, in the meetings, I always shared my opinions about different approaches such as benefits of translanguaging, importance of students' autonomy in learning, and using authentic materials rather than using a textbook about "culture" to teach culture. Often times, it was the teacher who was in a coordinating role of the course who had opposing opinions, and we often had discussions on those ideas. Other teachers also shared ideas and opinions, but I did not feel that everyone shared their opinions completely, and sometimes I wondered what they really thought.

In the end, we agreed on incorporating translanguaging in our course, and I was fortunate to teach the course in the first round with another Japanese language teacher. With her, I had meetings every week about the class, and exchanged emails about lesson plans. It seemed that we shared many similar beliefs about language education, and the semester went smoothly although there was a lot to figure out as we taught, with the course being completely new. Students also seemed to be very engaged with the new approach to language learning, and I observed a lot of translanguaging use in their group work and became even more convinced that it is an important aspect of their learning as well as meaning making among them, which should be more valued in language classrooms. However, because of my previous experience with students who preferred a monolingual approach and due to discussions about translanguaging with other teachers

during the development of the course, I was not completely sure if this approach was "right" or how students perceived it.

After I finished teaching the course, I conducted interviews with students and teachers, where I got to learn various things that I was not aware of while developing it and teaching it during the semester. For example, during the development meetings, sometimes I wondered if other teachers did not have a lot to say about tasks, such as creating and handing vocabulary sheets to students with words that teachers selected. However, during the interviews, several teachers told me that they completely agreed with me and appreciated that I convinced the other teacher that we should not prepare such tasks. I also learned that some teachers sometimes did not completely understand what was going on due to language barriers, or that these teachers simply wanted to take time to think rather than exchanging ideas and deciding what to do on the spot. Moreover, I learned for the first time that most of the teacher participants shared my view on language education that students should learn to communicate with others using linguistic or semiotic resources that they have, and that students should learn how to learn on their own rather than being handed everything by the teachers. On the other hand, I also learned that I was not seen as an equal member because of my age and lack of experience teaching, which influenced how one of the teachers perceived my ideas as if I was just sharing ideas without "thinking through." Also, by engaging in the interviews, having conversations with teachers and students about use of translanguaging and roles of language education, analyzing the data, and writing up the thesis, I became confused again about what my roles are and what language education is for.

While reflecting on my own beliefs, conversations I had through interviews with the participants, and on how I interpreted data, it felt as if I was so lost that I was not sure how I should write up my thesis, or why I started this research in the first place. In addition, while writing up this thesis, I presented my research at several conferences, where I got to get feedback and questions from teachers who taught in different contexts. By engaging in those conversations, I asked myself many times what the goals of language education should be, or what I should and can do as a teacher and a researcher. I learned through the interviews that translanguaging was perceived helpful by the students for both their content and language learning, but they also felt a dilemma because of the

monolingual ideology surrounding language education. Some teachers asked me how I was sure that students improved their language skills and whether I conducted some experiments to measure their actual improvement of language skills. This made me question whether my analysis of data was even appropriate. However, because of this, I became aware that my view on language education does not depend on things that can be measured by numbers. To me, how much vocabulary students learned or how accurate their sentences became do not matter as a teacher. By engaging in this research, I realized that what I care about and value is that students learn about themselves and those who are around them by learning new things in the classroom. My role as a teacher is to make sure that language does not get in the way, that is, to make sure that students with different language levels and linguistic backgrounds feel comfortable through using their full linguistic and semiotic resources for communication instead of feeling embarrassed or deficient. Also, my responsibility is to create a learning environment where students understand that meaning is co-constructed among those who are involved in the communication, and does not have to happen in one, or "perfect" or "correct" language.

I learned through this research that I could have some influence in raising awareness by engaging in conversations with people around me. Through the interviews, I learned that some teachers changed their views and approaches to language teaching, and they started incorporating translanguaging in their classrooms. In addition, I also learned that students learned not only about themselves, but also about others and the world through taking this course, which made me feel relieved and accomplished. However, I still feel lost. After all, I work in an institution and while what I care about and value about language education may be important, what the school and students expect of an English teacher seem to matter as much, or perhaps more. As much as I learned what I value as a teacher, I also learned that I stand, and am placed at a point where different interests intersect: government's goals, program coordinators' expectations, students' expectations, and ideologies about language education. I struggled a lot while working on this research by finding misalignment between what was expected of me, and what I would like to do, which resulted in changing jobs. I am now going to work at a different university, and my title will change from an English lecturer to an international education lecturer. I am not sure if this will change how people perceive me

and what they expect of me; I would like to stay true to my beliefs about education and make an impact on people around me. This PhD dissertation is an ongoing process of becoming a better and more reflective researcher and an educator, and even though this dissertation ends here, my journey as an emergent applied linguist who wishes to contribute to a better society will continue.

References

Aghai, L., Sayer, P., & Vercellotti, M. L. (2020). Effects of Teachers' Language Ideologies on Language Learners' Translanguaging Practices in an Intensive English Program. In Z. Tian, L. Aghai, P. Sayer, & J. L. Schissel (Eds.), *Envisioning TESOL through a Translanguaging Lens: Global Perspectives* (pp. 345–362). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-47031-9_16

Andrea Lee. (2021). Breaking through Digital Barriers: Exploring EFL Students' Views of Zoom Breakout Room Experiences. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics*, *21*(null), 510–524. https://doi.org/10.15738/KJELL.21..202106.510

Archibald, M. M., Ambagtsheer, R. C., Casey, M. G., & Lawless, M. (2019). Using Zoom Videoconferencing for Qualitative Data Collection: Perceptions and Experiences of Researchers and Participants. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *18*, 1609406919874596. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406919874596

Bae, Y. (2015). The Influence of Native-speakerism on CLIL Teachers in Korea. In A. Swan, P. Aboshiha, & A. Holliday (Eds.), *(En)Countering Native-speakerism: Global Perspectives* (pp. 75–90). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137463500_6

Ball, P., Kelly, K., & Clegg, J. (2016). *Putting CLIL into Practice: Oxford Handbooks for Language Teachers*. Oxford University Press.

Benesch, S. (2000). Critical Pragmatism: A Politics of L2 Composition. In *On Second Language Writing*. Routledge.

Billy, R. J. F., & Garriguez, C. M. (2019). Dual Language: A Combined Dual Language Framework for Implementation: A 90/10 and 50/50 Model Design. *English Language Teaching*, *12*(10), 108. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n10p108

Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, *36*(2), 81–109. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444803001903

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2012). Thematic analysis. In *APA handbook of research methods in psychology, Vol 2: Research designs: Quantitative, qualitative, neuropsychological, and biological* (pp. 57–71). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/13620-004

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2020). *One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis?* https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238

Brayboy, B. M., & Deyhle, D. (2000). Insider-Outsider: Researchers in American Indian Communities. *Theory Into Practice*, *39*(3), 163–169. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip3903_7

Brinkmann, S., & Kvale, S. (2015). *InterViews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*. SAGE Publications. https://vbn.aau.dk/en/publications/interviews-learning-the-craft-of-qualitative-research-interviewin

Byun, K., Chu, H., Kim, M., Park, I., Kim, S., & Jung, J. (2011). English-medium teaching in Korean higher education: Policy debates and reality. *Higher Education*, *62*(4), 431–449. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-010-9397-4

Caldas, B. (2019). To switch or not to switch: Bilingual preservice teachers and translanguaging in teaching and learning. *TESOL Journal*, *10*(4), e485. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.485

Canagarajah, A. S. (2012). Teacher Development in a Global Profession: An Autoethnography. *TESOL Quarterly*, *46*(2), 258–279. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.18

Cavalli, M., Coste, D., Egli Cuenat, M., Goullier, F., & Panthier, J. (2016). *Guide for the development and implementation of curricula for plurilingual and intercultural education* (J.-C. Beacco & M. Byram, Eds.). Council of Europe Publishing.

Cavinato, A. G., Hunter, R. A., Ott, L. S., & Robinson, J. K. (2021). Promoting student interaction, engagement, and success in an online environment. *Analytical and Bioanalytical Chemistry*, *413*(6), 1513–1520. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-021-03178-x

Cenoz, J. & Gorter, D. (2013). Towards a plurilingual approach in English language teaching: Softening the boundaries between languages. *TESOL Quaterly*, 47, 591–599. doi: 10.1002/tesq.121

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2021). *Pedagogical translanguaging*. Cambridge University Press.

Charamba, E. (2020). Translanguaging: Developing scientific scholarship in a multilingual classroom. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *41*(8), 655–672. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2019.1625907

Chen, F., Kao, S.-M., & Tsou, W. (2020). Toward ELF-Informed Bilingual Education in Taiwan: Addressing Incongruity Between Policy and Practice. *English Teaching & Learning*, *44*(2), 175–191. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42321-020-00055-1

Chen, L. (2018). The Enactment of Academic Language Policy in the International University: A Mixed-Methods Investigation. *Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository*. https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/5247

Choi, J. (2016). *Creating a Multivocal Self: Autoethnography as Method*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315641416

Choi, J.-J., Robb, C. A., Mifli, M., & Zainuddin, Z. (2021). University students' perception to online class delivery methods during the COVID-19 pandemic: A focus on hospitality education in Korea and Malaysia. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education*, *29*, 100336. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhlste.2021.100336

Chomsky, N. (n.d.). *ASPECTS OF THE THEORY OF SYNTAX*.

Christian, D. (2016). Dual Language Education: Current Research Perspectives. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *10*(1), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2016.1118666

Corcoran, J., Gagné, A., & McIntosh, M. (2018). A Conversation about "Editing" Plurilingual Scholars' Thesis Writing. *Discourse and Writing/Rédactologie*, *28*, 1–25. https://doi.org/10.31468/cjsdwr.589

Coyle, D. (2007). Content and Language Integrated Learning: Towards a Connected Research Agenda for CLIL Pedagogies. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *10*(5), 543–562. https://doi.org/10.2167/beb459.0

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed). Pearson.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2016). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. SAGE Publications.

Darvin, R., Lo, Y. Y., & Lin, A. M. Y. (2020). Examining CLIL through a Critical Lens. *English Teaching & Learning*, *44*(2), 103–108. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42321-020-00062-2

Dodgson, J. E. (2019). Reflexivity in Qualitative Research. *Journal of Human Lactation*, *35*(2), 220–222. https://doi.org/10.1177/0890334419830990

Dornyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methodologies*. Oxford Univ Pr.

Dörnyei, Z., & Muir, C. (2019). Creating a Motivating Classroom Environment. In X. Gao (Ed.), *Second Handbook of English Language Teaching* (pp. 719–736). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-02899-2_36

Duff, P. (2008). *Case Study Research in Applied Linguistics*. Taylor & Francis.

Duff, P. A. (2014). Case Study Research on Language Learning and Use. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *34*, 233–255. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000051

Duff, P. (Patsy), & Anderson, T. (n.d.). *Case study research—2016*. Retrieved May 30, 2022, from https://www.academia.edu/9682074/Case_study_research_2016

Ellis, C., & Bochner, A. (2000). Autoethnography, Personal Narrative, Reflexivity: Researcher as Subject. *Handbook of Qualitative Research (2nd Ed.)*, 733–768.

Fallas Escobar, C., & Dillard-Paltrineri, E. (2015). Professors' and Students' Conflicting Beliefs about Translanguaging in the EFL Classroom: Dismantling the Monolingual Bia. *Revista de Lenguas Modernas*, *23*. https://doi.org/10.15517/rlm.v0i23.22355

Fang, F., & Liu, Y. (2020). 'Using all English is not always meaningful': Stakeholders' perspectives on the use of and attitudes towards translanguaging at a Chinese university. *Lingua*, *247*, 102959. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2020.102959

Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (n.d.). Undoing Competence: Coloniality, Homogeneity, and the Overrepresentation of Whiteness in Applied Linguistics. *Language Learning*, *n/a*(n/a). https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12528

Gabriel, Y. (2015). Reflexivity and beyond – a plea for imagination in qualitative research methodology. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, *10*(4), 332–336. https://doi.org/10.1108/QROM-07-2015-1305

Galante, A. (2020a). Pedagogical translanguaging in a multilingual English program in Canada: Student and teacher perspectives of challenges. *System*, *92*, 102274.

Galante, A. (2020b). "The moment I realized I am plurilingual": Plurilingual tasks for creative representations in EAP at a Canadian university. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *11*(4), 551–580. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2018-0116

Gannon, S. (2020). Autoethnography in education. *Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education*. http://www.elgaronline.com/view/edcoll/9781788977142/9781788977142.00038.xml

García, O. (2009). *Chapter 8 Education, Multilingualism and Translanguaging in the 21st Century*. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691910-011

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). Translanguaging and Education. In O. García & L. Wei (Eds.), *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education* (pp. 63–77). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765_5

Gass, S. M. (2017). *Input, Interaction, and the Second Language Learner* (2nd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315173252

He, P. E., & Lin, A. M. Y. (2021). Translanguaging, Trans-semiotizing, and Trans-registering in a Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Science Classroom. In A. Jakobsson, P. Nygård Larsson, & A. Karlsson (Eds.), *Translanguaging in Science Education* (pp. 143–171). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-82973-5_8

He, P. (Emily), & Lin, A. M. Y. (2021). Translanguaging and Trans-semiotizing Approaches to Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL): Innovating With the Multimodalities-Entextualization Cycle (MEC). *JACET International Convention Selected Papers*, *1*, 55. https://doi.org/10.50943/jacetselectedpapers.1.0_55

Hrastinski, S. (n.d.). *& Asynchronous Synchronous E-Learning*. 6.

Hu, G., & McKay, S. L. (2012). English language education in East Asia: Some recent developments. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *33*(4), 345–362. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2012.661434

Ikeda, M., Izumi, S., Watanabe, Y., Pinner, R., & Davis, M. (2021). *Soft CLIL and English Language Teaching: Understanding Japanese Policy, Practice and Implications*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429032332

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

Ishikawa, T. (2020). Complexity of English as a Multilingua Franca: Place of Monolingual Standard English. In M. Konakahara & K. Tsuchiya (Eds.), *English as a Lingua Franca in Japan: Towards Multilingual Practices* (pp. 91–109). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-33288-4_5

Jenner, B. M., & Myers, K. C. (2019). Intimacy, rapport, and exceptional disclosure: A comparison of in-person and mediated interview contexts. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *22*(2), 165–177. https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2018.1512694

Jong, E. J. de, Yilmaz, T., & Marichal, N. (2020). Multilingualism-as-a-Resource Orientation in Dual Language Education. In *Dual Language Education in the US*. Routledge.

Kiger, M. E., & Varpio, L. (2020). Thematic analysis of qualitative data: AMEE Guide No. 131. *Medical Teacher*, *42*(8), 846–854. https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2020.1755030

Kim, H. K., & Lee, S. (2020). Multiple Roles of Language Teachers in Supporting CLIL. *English Teaching & Learning*, *44*(2), 109–126. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42321-020-00050-6

Kofoed, M., Gebhart, L., Gilmore, D., & Moschitto, R. (2021). *Zooming to Class?: Experimental Evidence on College Students&Apos; Online Learning During Covid-19* (SSRN Scholarly Paper No. 3846700). https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3846700

Kohnke, L., & Moorhouse, B. L. (2022). Facilitating Synchronous Online Language Learning through Zoom. *RELC Journal*, *53*(1), 296–301. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220937235

Kubota, R. (2016). The social imaginary of study abroad: Complexities and contradictions. *The Language Learning Journal*, *44*(3), 347–357. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2016.1198098

Kubota, R. (2022). Introduction to Language Learning, Teaching, and Reclamation in Japan: Diversity, Inequalities, and Identities. In M. Mielick, R. Kubota, & L. Lawrence (Eds.), *Discourses of Identity: Language Learning, Teaching, and Reclamation Perspectives in Japan* (pp. 1–14). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-11988-0_1

Kubota, R., & Miller, E. R. (2017). Re-Examining and Re-Envisioning Criticality in Language Studies: Theories and Praxis. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, *14*(2–3), 129–157. https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2017.1290500

Lasagabaster, D., & Doiz, A. (2016). *CLIL experiences in secondary and tertiary education: In search of good practices*.

Lee, A. R. (2021). *Breaking through Digital Barriers: Exploring EFL Students' Views of Zoom Breakout Room Experiences*.

Lin, A. M. Y. (2015). Researcher Positionality. In *Research Methods in Language Policy and Planning* (pp. 21–32). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118340349.ch3

Lin, A. M. Y. & Lo, Y. Y. (2016). Trans/languaging and the triadic dialogue in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) classrooms. *Language and Education*, 31, 1–20. doi: 10.1080/09500782.2016.1230125

Lo Iacono, V., Symonds, P., & Brown, D. H. K. (2016). Skype as a Tool for Qualitative Research Interviews. *Sociological Research Online*, *21*(2), 103–117. https://doi.org/10.5153/sro.3952

Macaro, E., Curle, S., Pun, J., An, J., & Dearden, J. (2018). A systematic review of English medium instruction in higher education. *Language Teaching*, *51*(1), 36–76. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000350

Marshall, S., & Moore, D. (2013). 2B or Not 2B Plurilingual? Navigating Languages Literacies, and Plurilingual Competence in Postsecondary Education in Canada. *TESOL Quarterly*, *47*(3), 472–499. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.111

Marshall, S., Moore, D., & Himeta, M. (2021). French-Medium Instruction in Anglophone Canadian Higher Education: The Plurilingual Complexity of Students and Their Instructors. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics / Revue Canadienne de Linguistique Appliquée*, *24*(1), 181–204. https://doi.org/10.37213/cjal.2021.29345

Marshall, S., & Walsh Marr, J. (2018). Teaching multilingual learners in Canadian writing-intensive classrooms: Pedagogy, binaries, and conflicting identities. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *40*, 32–43. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2018.01.002

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2015). *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation* (第 4 版). Jossey-Bass.

Moore, C. (2016). The Future of Work: What Google Shows Us About the Present and Future of Online Collaboration. *TechTrends*, *60*(3), 233–244. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-016-0044-5

Moorhouse, B. L., Li, Y., & Walsh, S. (2021). E-Classroom Interactional Competencies: Mediating and Assisting Language Learning During Synchronous Online Lessons. *RELC Journal*, 0033688220985274. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220985274

Mu'awanah, N., Sumardi, S., & Suparno, S. (2021). Using Zoom to Support English Learning during Covid-19 Pandemic: Strengths and Challenges. *Jurnal Ilmiah Sekolah Dasar*, *5*(2), Article 2. https://doi.org/10.23887/jisd.v5i2.35006

North, B., & Piccardo, E. (2016). Developing illustrative descriptors of aspects of mediation for the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR): A Council of Europe project. *Language Teaching*, *49*(3), 455–459. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444816000100

Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic Analysis: Striving to Meet the Trustworthiness Criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *16*(1), 1609406917733847. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847

Nuryanto, M. (2021). Fostering Success and Motivating EFL Learners Using Zoom Meeting: A Synchronous Learning Strategy. *Anglophile Journal*, *1*(2), 1. https://doi.org/10.51278/anglophile.v1i2.174

Ortega, L. (2019). SLA and the Study of Equitable Multilingualism. *The Modern Language Journal*, *103*(S1), 23–38. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12525

Patton, M. Q. (2005). *Qualitative Research*. American Cancer Society. https://doi.org/10.1002/0470013192.bsa514

Pillow, W. (2003). Confession, catharsis, or cure? Rethinking the uses of reflexivity as methodological power in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *16*(2), 175–196. https://doi.org/10.1080/0951839032000060635

Richards, K. (2009). Interviews. In J. Heigham & R. A. Croker (Eds.), *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics: A Practical Introduction* (pp. 182–199). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230239517_9

Rinekso, A. B., & Muslim, A. B. (2020). Synchronous online discussion: Teaching English in higher education amidst the covid-19 pandemic. *JEES (Journal of English Educators Society)*, *5*(2), Article 2. https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v5i2.646

Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (2nd ed). SAGE.

Serna-Bermejo, I., & Lasagabaster, D. (2022). Translanguaging in Basque and English: Practices and attitudes of university teachers and students. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *0*(0), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2022.2086984

Suadi, S. (2021). *STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE USE OF ZOOM AND WHATSAPP IN ELT AMIDST COVID19 PANDEMIC | SALEE: Study of Applied Linguistics and English Education*. http://ejournal.stainkepri.ac.id/index.php/salee/article/view/212

Thibault, P. J. (2017). The reflexivity of human languaging and Nigel Love's two orders of language. *Language Sciences*, *61*, 74–85. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2016.09.014

Tsou, W., & Kao, S.-M. (2017). Overview of EMI Development. In W. Tsou & S.-M. Kao (Eds.), *English as a Medium of Instruction in Higher Education: Implementations and Classroom Practices in Taiwan* (pp. 3–18). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-4645-2_1

Tweed, R. G., & Lehman, D. R. (2002). Learning considered within a cultural context: Confucian and Socratic approaches. *American Psychologist*, *57*(2), 89–99. https://doi.org/10.1037//0003-066X.57.2.89

Vázquez, V. P., & Ellison, M. (2018). Examining teacher roles and competences in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). *Linguarum Arena: Revista de Estudos em Didática de Línguas da Universidade do Porto*, *4*(0), Article 0.

Wallace, A., Spiliotopoulos, V., & Ilieva, R. (2020). CLIL Collaborations in Higher Education: A Critical Perspective. *English Teaching & Learning*, *44*(2), 127–148. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42321-020-00052-4

Warschauer, M. (2000). The Changing Global Economy and the Future of English Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, *34*(3), 511–535. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587741

Wong, J. O. (n.d.). *A Pandemic in 2020, Zoom and the Arrival of the Online Educator*. 18.

Yang, W. (2015). Content and language integrated learning next in Asia: Evidence of learners' achievement in CLIL education from a Taiwan tertiary degree programme. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *18*(4), 361–382. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2014.904840

Yates, A., Starkey, L., Egerton, B., & Flueggen, F. (2021). High school students' experience of online learning during Covid-19: The influence of technology and pedagogy. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, *30*(1), 59–73. https://doi.org/10.1080/1475939X.2020.1854337

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. SAGE.

Zhao, Y. (2010). *Communication Strategy Use and Negotiation of Meaning in Text Chat and Videoconferencing* [Cleveland State University]. https://etd.ohiolink.edu/apexprod/rws_olink/r/1501/10?clear=10&p10_accession_num=csu1278398160