Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), Internationalization of the Curriculum, and the Future of Higher Education Internationalization: Lessons from Japan

Thatcher A. SPERO

Abstract

As neoliberal policies have become dominant under contemporary globalization, higher education has gained increasing attention from governments around the world due to its potential contributions to a nation's economic productivity and international competitiveness. As a result, higher education internationalization has been strategically targeted by policies aimed at achieving this objective, and in non-Anglophone countries (especially in Asia) this has led to aggressive expansion of Englishization and English-medium instruction (EMI) specifically. However, even as internationalization continues its multi-decade march towards the center of the higher education policy agenda in every country around the world, some scholars have come to question the economic model of internationalization that has become pervasive. This has led to calls for more critical forms of higher education internationalization, whereby these institutions take on an ethical responsibility to make positive contributions to the global community. Since the future of higher education internationalization in the 21st century is expected to be primarily in non-Anglophone countries, these circumstances beg the question of how higher education institutions in these countries can begin to depart from their current forms of internationalization that are largely limited by being English-centric and aimed at raising global competitiveness. One way this might be achieved is by developing more comprehensive internationalization through innovations in the internationalization of the curriculum. This article examines one such innovation at Waseda University in Japan, where the EMI-based School of International Liberal Studies (SILS) has developed its Area Studies and Plurilingual-Multicultural education program (APM) that employs Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) for its teaching. Utilizing a Participatory Action Research (PAR) approach, the faculty researchers/participants in this study uncover findings which lead us to argue that CLIL can provide a pragmatic avenue

for departing from an English-centric model of internationalization while advancing the internationalization of the curriculum and internationalization at home, and thus promoting more critical forms of internationalization in non-Anglophone countries in the present and future.

Key words: Higher Education Internationalization, Internationalization of the Curriculum, Content and Language Integrated Learning, English Medium Instruction, Global Citizenship Education

Introduction

The uses of the university and internationalization … in neoliberal times

In 1963, Harvard University Press first published *The Uses of the University*, a collection of lectures by the then acting President of the University of California, Clark Kerr. In this germinal work, Kerr（1982）aimed at historicizing the transformation of the university over time as it adapted to meet the demands brought upon it by the particularities of its surrounding social context in each ensuing age. His conclusion was that the university of the late 20th century was a "multiversity", a fragmented collection of communities through which a multitude of stakeholders must simultaneously be served both within the campus boundaries and beyond them in the national society within which these institutions were embedded. The inevitable result, Kerr claimed, was that the central role played by universities in processes of knowledge production and transmission in the burgeoning knowledge economy of his day compelled these institutions to exist solely for the purpose of meeting such demands. In other words, according to Kerr, the *raison d'être* of universities from that time forward was not to lead as a spirited embodiment of high moral ideals for the flourishing of humanity, but instead to operate as an amoral mechanism to do the bidding of powerful stakeholders with vested interests in the institution's host national society. The logic was simple- it was not for the university to assert its own agency in an effort to manifest a more ideal future but instead to pragmatically adapt in reaction to the current social circumstances.

Of course, historically speaking, universities throughout time have always adjusted their missions to answer the demands of socio-cultural,

political, and economic realities of their time in ways that have impacted the sorts of activities that are prioritized（Scott, 2006）. The case of higher education internationalization is emblematic of this, since over the past seven decades these activities have become less incidental, compartmentalized, and institutionally stimulated, while instead becoming more deliberately strategic, comprehensive, and stimulated by national government policies, and morphing over time from a focus on international understanding for peace, to international exchange for national security and foreign policy, and eventually to economic competitiveness（de Wit & Altbach, 2021）. From an analytical perspective, it can be said that there are four distinct categories by which higher education internationalization is rationalized: political, economic, academic, and socio-cultural（de Wit, 2002）. However, as neoliberalism took hold in the end of the 20th century as the most significant force shaping society（Harvey, 2005）and became implicitly associated with the dominant forms of globalization that arose in that period（Mittelman, 2004）, the values and objectives applied to educational policy and practice were drastically altered（Torres, 2008）. Consequently, the neoliberal "technical-economic instrumentalist" approach to education（Marshall, 2011）, which treats education as a mere tool for economic productivity and international competitiveness in a globalized world, became the default "commonsense" （Gramsci, 1971）logic which resulted in economic models for higher education internationalization（i.e. those based primarily in economic rationales）becoming increasingly dominant over the past three decades.

English hegemony and shifting patterns in higher education internationalization today

Thus, against the backdrop of the rise of the global knowledge economy and in response to pressures brought on by an inexorable intensification of neoliberal globalization and its exigencies, higher education and especially its internationalization have garnered increasing attention amongst policymakers at the global, national, and local levels. This is particularly the case in developing and largely non-Anglophone countries in the Asian, Middle Eastern, African, and Latin American regions, where massive growth portends that the future of higher education internationalization is shifting towards. The result of this momentous shift is that new patterns of higher education

internationalization flows of mobility, strategies, rationales, approaches, and activities are forming as these regions' countries and their higher education institutions evolve into competitors, equal partners, and key actors (Deardorff et al., 2012). Notably, around the world, the countries of these regions (but especially those in Asia) have begun aggressively promoting policies towards "Englishization" (i.e. the use of English as a lingua franca in place of local languages) and specifically the teaching of content areas in English (AKA "English-medium instruction" or "EMI") to help their higher education institutions meet strategic internationalization goals (Rose & McKinley, 2018). This English-centric model of internationalization has provided a pathway for non-Anglophone countries to engage in cross-border educational exchanges that were previously inaccessible to them due to linguistic barriers. For instance, a country like Japan can be viewed as prime example of such circumstances. In Japan, neoliberalism has steadily advanced for decades and come to dominate both the politics and economics of the country (Suzuki, 2015) while leading the government to become preoccupied with cultivating and attracting "global human resources" (*global jinzai*) to support the economic productivity and competitiveness of the nation (Yonezawa, 2014). Consequently, higher education internationalization specifically has been strategically targeted to help achieve such aims (Yonezawa, 2011), leading Japanese universities to face manifold pressures to internationalize (Vickers, 2018) and to be encouraged by top-down national government policies to achieve this by pursuing Englishization and EMI education (Hashimoto, 2017). In fact, in Japanese popular culture, engaging in internationalization itself is almost implicitly assumed to involve using English and encountering "Western" culture and people. However, it can be said that the English-centric model of internationalization at Japanese universities, which reflects the Japanese government's conception of globalization as an English-centered process (Davidson & Liu, 2020), is an inherently limited model. If the higher education institutions in other non-Anglophone countries where internationalization is rapidly expanding follow the same course that Japan has to date, then the likely outcome is that the politico-economic and socio-cultural realities of today's neoliberal globalization will simply be reproduced in the future. Therefore, in this moment of historical change that some scholars have dubbed "the end of internationalization" as we know it (Brandenburg & de Wit,

2011), important questions are brought to the forefront about higher education in the 21st century, especially regarding its sociological role in the global community.

Re-imagining higher education internationalization in the future

Obviously, there are those (like Clark Kerr did) who insist that the role of the university in contemporary times is simply to react to the conditions of its time, but there are many others (e.g. Counts, 1932) who emphasize the necessity for schools to play an active counter-hegemonic role as agents for social progress. The study described in this article is informed by the spirit of the latter, which is a position forged in critical awareness of the significant role of schools in processes of cultural and social reproduction (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990). Thus, we do not simply concern ourselves with the question of how higher education internationalization can be improved to assist higher education institutions and their host countries to be more internationally competitive under neoliberal globalization (and thus reproducing top-down globalization's existing hierarchies of structures and relations). Instead, we are driven by an impulse of *pragmatic optimism* that asks how higher education internationalization that is unavoidably embedded within the current conditions of neoliberal globalization can take on more critical forms to act as an active social agent for bottom-up globalization. Returning to Clark Kerr, his ideas about the uses of the university were controversial even in their own time, but in the current global age they are even more dubious. Today, the global breadth of complex problems facing humanity as well as the global interconnectedness and consciousness that might help us take them on are more advanced than they have ever been in human history, and this has led to a rising call from scholars for the re-imagination of higher education and the ways that its internationalization can contribute positively to the entire global community. However, this raises the important pragmatic question- how might this be practically achieved?

Higher education internationalization itself is a contested concept. It is variously defined and includes a multitude of facets. Perhaps the most commonly cited definition today is provided by Jane Knight (2004) who has described it as "the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education"

(p.11). However, in contemporary times the most visible markers of higher education internationalization are those associated with mobility of, for example: students, teachers, scholars, programs, courses, projects, and policies. Knight (2006) describes these activities collectively as "internationalization away" which is a component that is interwoven with the activities of its counterpart component, "internationalization at home" (IaH) (i.e. those activities aimed at developing international/intercultural understanding and skills for *all* students on campus *irrespective of their engagement with physical mobility*). Over time, a concern with harmonizing these components has led to calls for more "comprehensive internationalization", which John Hudzik (2011) explains is "···a commitment, confirmed through action, to infuse international and comparative perspectives throughout the teaching, research, and service missions of higher education. It shapes institutional ethos and values and touches the entire higher education enterprise" (p.6). Consequently, increased attention has come to be paid to the "internationalization of the curriculum" (IoC), considered by many scholars to be the most indispensable element of both comprehensive internationalization and internationalization at home, which Betty Leask (2015) describes as "the incorporation of international, intercultural and/or global dimensions into the content of the curriculum as well as the learning outcomes, assessment tasks, teaching methods and support services of a program of study" (p.9). However, around the world to date, efforts to prioritize comprehensive internationalization, the internationalization of the curriculum, and internationalization at home still tend to be eclipsed by preoccupations with the more visible activities associated with internationalization away.

Examining higher education internationalization in Japan: Possibilities for internationalization of the curriculum and CLIL

Knowledge of these concepts is certainly pertinent to an examination of higher education internationalization in Japan. In Japan, it has been noted that higher education institutions are prone to treat internationalization as an "add on" (Ota, 2018, p.103), rather than as a dimension that is infused throughout research, teaching, and service activity missions across campus. Although Japan has aggressively pursued policies of Englishization and expanded its EMI programming to internationalize, the top-down nature of these policies and their inherent politico-economic rationale leads to more emphasis being

placed on internationalization activities that can be evidenced by numbers (i.e. those activities which are defined as "internationalization away"), which has significant impacts on real practices (Brown, 2014). Since activities associated with internationalization at home and internationalization of the curriculum are not easily measurable nor essential for competition with other domestic higher education institutions, they are unlikely to be prioritized (Ota, 2018). The assumption may be that international/intercultural learning will occur naturally, but studies have shown that EMI students in Japan tend to remain segregated in isolated communities[1] (Burgess et al., 2010) and concerted focus on intercultural learning is generally insufficient (Bradford & Brown, 2017). Moreover, there are linguistic and cultural challenges (Bradford, 2016) that can impede international/intercultural communication and learning, as well as prevent sufficient academic development in content areas that might lead to deep and critical thinking skills (Bradford & Brown, 2017). Consequently, even though there are possibilities for EMI to be an important tool in helping Japanese higher education institutions to develop more comprehensive forms of internationalization by internationalizing their curriculum and advancing internationalization at home that can facilitate the international/intercultural learning of both domestic and international students (Takagi, 2017), such an outcome is unlikely to occur without more deliberate pedagogy. Thus, some scholars (e.g. Davies, 2017) have begun to focus their attention on the ways that the deliberate linking of linguistic and content learning can be leveraged to achieve "deeper" internationalization, such as by adopting Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL).

Utilization of the CLIL approach potentially offers unique opportunities for the deepening of internationalization in non-Anglophone countries like Japan. According to Coyle et al. (2010), CLIL can be defined as "a dual-focused educational approach in which an **additional language**[2] is used for the learning *and* teaching of both content *and* language" (p.1). As they explain, CLIL draws on theories of cognitive development, general learning, and language learning to interweave language education and subject education

---

[1] Burgess et al. (2010) call this "*dejima*-ization" in reference to Dejima island where the Dutch were confined for trading in Japan's isolation period (*sakoku*) of the past

[2] Coyle et al. (2010) note, "An additional language is often a learner's 'foreign language', but it also may be a second language or some form of heritage or community language" (p.1)

in a pedagogy that is content-driven while making use of a variety of language-teaching approaches, ultimately creating a synergy that enhances the educational outcome potential of each respectively. In practice, this entails an application of the "4Cs Framework" for lesson delivery that attends to the interrelationship of "content (subject matter), communication (language learning and using), cognition (learning and thinking processes), and culture (developing intercultural understanding and global citizenship)" (p.41). Fundamentally, CLIL pedagogy rests on sociocultural constructivist learning theory commonly associated with Lev Vygotsky (1978), which focuses on facilitating learning through dialogic student-centered social interactions within a "zone of proximal development" that provides scaffolding support along with cognitive challenges just beyond the learners' current content, language, and cognitive capacities. Significantly, it is said that CLIL pedagogy is uniquely suited for the cultivation of global citizens because of its potential to develop student capacities for cultural awareness (including cultural metacognition), intercultural understanding, intercultural dialogue, critical thinking, and deep learning that can be applied to problem solving in unfamiliar contexts (Coyle et al., 2010). Consequently, there is significant potential value of utilizing CLIL in non-Anglophone countries to support more critical forms of internationalization while specifically advancing internationalization of the curriculum and internationalization at home.

Studying CLIL's contributions to the internationalization of the curriculum at one university in Japan: Moving beyond an English-centric model of internationalization

This study seeks to explore the ways that higher education institutions in non-Anglophone countries can produce forms of internationalization that extend outside of the common English-centric model that is currently dominant. Towards these ends, we are interested in examining the unique contributions that the CLIL approach might provide. Locating our study at one university in Japan and with an eye on the promotion of more comprehensive internationalization, we ask: what insights can be gained from teachers who are applying the CLIL approach at this university with regards to the contributions that CLIL can make to the internationalization of the curriculum and internationalization at home? Ultimately, it was our desire to

approach our inquiry from an empirical rather than just a theoretical perspective which necessitated the particular methodology and methods that we applied in this study.

This study is based on our examination of an experimental program at Waseda University called the Area Studies and Plurilingual-Multicultural education program（hereafter "APM" or "the APM Program"）, which was created in the School of International Liberal Studies（hereafter "SILS"）in 2017 as part of the Top Global University project. Founded in 2004, SILS is arguably the most well-known and successful English-medium instruction program in Japan, and its core curriculum is premised upon interdisciplinary liberal studies with a special focus on language studies and area studies to help develop its students' global understanding and competence. However, over time there has been a growing desire within SILS to come up with new forms of programming and teaching to produce innovative forms of internationalization that build on and move beyond the opportunities afforded by the original, albeit quite successful, English-centric model. The APM Program, one in which area studies and the CLIL approach are combined for the study of non-Anglophone linguistic and cultural communities, is one such initiative. In this program that focuses on four different languages（Chinese, French, Korean, Spanish）, faculty with content expertise（not language education expertise）are tasked with applying the CLIL approach in their pedagogy to simultaneously develop their students' language and content knowledge/capabilities. Four faculty members who were teaching courses each in their own respective language/content areas were joined by a fifth faculty member with language education expertise to form a team of researchers/participants for this study. Together, we, the researchers/participants, developed a Participatory Action Research（"PAR"）study design to leverage our first-hand experiences with teaching these courses and interacting with the students who attended them in order to gain insights into the outcomes of these courses and ways to further improve them. For three full semesters, the team met once a week while classes were in session to share experiences and reflections relating to the APM courses that were being taught. The discussions held during these sessions and the notes that recorded our developing insights formed the basis for our collective findings in this article. However, the individual experiences and insights of each of these teachers

have been illustrated in more detail elsewhere in this Waseda Global Forum No. 19 Special Issue ("International education in Japanese universities: Plurilingualism beyond English").

Overall, our collective inquiries in this study resulted in eight key insights relating to what we believe are indications of the APM Program's real and potential contributions to developing more comprehensive internationalization at Waseda University by helping to facilitate internationalization of the curriculum and internationalization at home. These include: 1) the broadening of international opportunities for faculty and students, 2) the expansion of access to international/intercultural learning for all students, 3) the diversification of students' international/intercultural experiences, 4) the complexification of students' understandings of culture, 5) the development of students' cultural awareness, 6) the pluralization of students' conceptions of international and national community, 7) the deepening of students' sense of belonging to international and global communities, and 8) the stimulation of students' interest in and motivation to pursue international/intercultural experiences. Based on these findings, we conclude that more attention to pedagogical approaches (such as is demonstrated by the deliberate combination of CLIL and area studies in the APM Program) can provide opportunities for universities in non-Anglophone countries (like Waseda University) to move beyond the narrow English-centric model of internationalization that currently prevails. Moreover, we argue that this possibility provides a pragmatic avenue for such universities to engage in global citizen development and thereby embrace their own role as institutional global citizens, which can be viewed as a step in the direction of bringing about more critical forms of internationalization in the present and into the future.

Methodology & Methods

This study is grounded in a critical research approach, one which is premised upon an objective to promote progressive social transformation, and thus which departs from "traditional" assumptions about the roles of research and researchers (Weis & Fine, 2004). In this case, we employed the methodology of Participatory Action Research (PAR) because of its dual capacity to serve our goals of both short-term and long-term transformation. Short term, it was our

objective to better understand the unique educational benefits and challenges of combining CLIL with area studies of non-Anglophone linguistic and cultural communities so that the target program (i.e. APM) itself could be further improved to facilitate deeper international/intercultural learning. Long term, it was our objective to gain insights into the ways that combining CLIL with area studies of non-Anglophone linguistic and cultural communities might contribute to more comprehensive internationalization by facilitating the internationalization of the curriculum and internationalization at home at Waseda University and other universities like it in non-Anglophone countries. Importantly, we sought to bring about such change not through utopic imagination alone, but through developing new knowledge and action within the existing current world conditions. This pragmatic approach was informed by an acute cognizance of the common pitfall of critical educational studies to indulge in "romantic possibilitarian" (Whitty, 1974) rhetoric, which according to Michael Apple (2000, p.29) is when "the language of possibility substitutes for a consistent tactical analysis of what the balance of forces actually is and what is necessary to change it." As Apple points out, "while the construction of new theories and utopian visions is important, it is equally crucial to base these theories and visions in an unromantic appraisal of the material and discursive terrain that now exists." Therefore, our research should be viewed as an unromantic inquiry into the actions that can be taken within the "gritty realities" of today to contribute to the manifestation of real change towards more utopian visions of higher education internationalization in the future.

The use of Participatory Action Research methodology has gained popularity in the education field due to its explicit design to produce change. Rejecting the assumptions of a positivist research paradigm, PAR embraces a democratic approach to knowledge construction by way of collaboration while blurring the line between the researcher and researchee (Pain et al., 2011). The process of PAR is generally described as an iterative process involving a cycle of four main steps: plan, act, observe, reflect. In the case of this study, the four faculty researchers/participants teaching APM courses in Chinese, French, Korean, and Spanish played the role of both researcher and researchee. For three semesters between the Fall of 2020 and the Spring of 2022, our team of researchers/participants met in a weekly focus group in which we would reflect on our APM course teaching experiences and plan for the

ensuing week. After respectively each acting out a plan and observing the results in the ensuing week's lessons, we would reconvene in our focus group to collectively reflect further and make plans to repeat the cycle. The empirical data upon which this study's findings is grounded in the discussions that occurred during these weekly focus group meetings, but it should be noted that these discussions were also informed by the formal and informal interactions, informal surveys, and informal interviews that each of the faculty researchers/participants drew from in order to ascertain insights into the direct perspectives of APM students themselves. From this process of collaborative data collection and analysis a number of patterns emerged which were deemed to relevant to answering the specific research question（s）proposed in this article. Those patterns will be outlined and discussed in the remainder of this work.

Findings

The analysis of data gathered throughout this study led to the identification of eight key insights into the ways that combining CLIL with area studies of non-Anglophone linguistic and cultural communities contributed to internationalization of the curriculum and internationalization at home beyond the current English-centric model. Those contributions include: 1）the broadening of international opportunities for faculty and students, 2）the expansion of access to international/intercultural learning for all students, 3）the diversification of students' international/intercultural experiences, 4）the complexification of students' understandings of culture, 5）the development of students' cultural awareness, 6）the pluralization of students' conceptions of international and national community, 7）the deepening of students' sense of belonging to international and global communities, 8）the stimulation of students' interest in and motivation to pursue international/intercultural experiences. Each of these will be explained further below. In this section, for ease of grammatical consistency and clear presentation of findings, we will refer to our research team members from a third-person perspective as "researchers/participants".

1）*The broadening of international opportunities for faculty and students*

The study's faculty researchers/participants themselves embody this initial insight. Although they each possessed sufficient English proficiency for engagement in this study, they also reported that they were not confident in their ability to teach their respective subjects entirely in English. Moreover, three out of the four reported that their Japanese language ability was entirely insufficient for them to be able to use it as a medium of instruction when teaching their subject, so being able to be employed as a CLIL and area studies teacher for their own individual linguistic and cultural communities offered them more opportunity to be internationally mobile for work. In this case, it was thanks to the APM Program that these researchers/participants could even be in Japan in the first place and teach in a Japanese university, where their presence alone was a crucial first step in broadening the international opportunities of the students attending the university.

According to the faculty researcher/participants, their students too reported that involvement in their combined CLIL and area studies courses offered a wider set of pathways for international mobility. In fact, they noted how many of their students said they chose their APM course because it was one of the few available at the university that could help them build the necessary linguistic and cultural skills needed for studying internationally in a non-Anglophone country. In the case of students who did not want to be language studies or area studies majors but to primarily study other subjects instead, they noted how APM courses offered an opportunity that would not have otherwise been available for them to work towards studying abroad in their desired non-Anglophone country. These examples are emblematic of some of the myriad ways a program like APM is able to broaden the opportunities for students at universities in non-Anglophone countries beyond those afforded by an entirely English-centric internationalization model.

2）*The expansion of access to international∕intercultural learning for <u>all</u> students*

As it was indicated above, many of the students who joined the APM courses did not necessarily have sufficient English language proficiency nor the desire to study so that they could be involved in Anglophone linguistic

and cultural communities. Moreover, they did not necessarily have the desire to commit to an entire program of language studies or area studies, and if they did sign up for a course focused on their particular lingua-cultural community of interest the course was likely to be taught by a Japanese professor and populated almost entirely by more typical domestic Japanese students. In contrast, APM course teachers taught their subjects from a non-Japanese perspective and the populations of these courses were more diverse. Some of the registrants were more typical Japanese domestic students, others were possessed of mixed heritage or some previous experiential connection to the lingua-cultural communities represented in the APM Program, and still others were those of various backgrounds who just had some mild interest in one of these communities. In other words, the students who attended APM courses were not necessarily typical candidates for studying outside of Japan, nor were they a population that would be likely to interact with international faculty or students at their university in Japan. Therefore, the APM courses offered these students an opportunity for international/intercultural learning that may have otherwise not been accessible.

3）*The diversification of students' international/intercultural experiences*

As the preceding insights explain, many of the APM Program students had otherwise limited opportunities for international mobility and international/intercultural experiences. However, even the ones that ostensibly had these opportunities did not necessarily get a chance to encounter widely diverse international/intercultural experiences because of the overwhelming dominance of the English language in the world today. As it was previously noted in in this article, for most domestic students at a Japanese university, the default image of having an international/intercultural experience presupposes the study/use of English and an encounter with so-called "Western" people, and Japanese universities themselves have increasingly adopted internationalization models that are defined by shifts towards Westernization and Englishization. In contrast to these circumstances, this study's researchers/participants noted how their APM Program students expressed their appreciation for the fact that these courses offered a rare alternative space where neither Japanese nor "Western" cultural perspectives governed the social field and shaped the

possibilities of communication. For some APM students, it was reported by them that this simply meant that they could have international/intercultural encounters with a more diverse population beyond those tied to the Anglophone linguistic and cultural community. There were also students who emphasized to the researchers/participants how novel and liberating it was to have a space where they could communicate with others whose cognition was not necessarily embedded within the values, assumptions, and beliefs that are infused within the Anglophone lingua-cultural community. In other words, APM courses were an opportunity for students to have international/intercultural experiences beyond the scope of those afforded by the English-centric model of internationalization that currently prevails. Moreover, the linguistic and cultural skills that students developed in APM courses provided the tools these students needed to have international/intercultural experiences beyond these courses（through study or daily life）that were not exclusively limited to the Anglophone lingua-cultural community but instead included a more diverse scope of linguistic and cultural communities.

4）The complexification of students' understandings of culture

By employing a typical CLIL approach in which culture plays a central role in the learning process, the researchers/participants in this study offered their APM course students an opportunity to reflect deeply on the concept of culture itself and to understand it with more nuance. In fact, all of the researchers/participants confirmed that leading students to understand the fluidity and hybridity of culture itself was one of the primary objectives that shaped their respective pedagogies. They did this by various techniques, including cultural comparisons and critical analyses of national cultures. According to the researchers/participants, this facilitated two important educational outcomes relating to their students' understandings of culture. First, they asserted that they witnessed how students were able to better recognize the heterogeneity of their own national culture and to see this culture as a dynamic rather than a static phenomenon. Second, they confirmed their observations that students who had gained a more nuanced understanding of their own national culture were subsequently more capable of applying that to national cultures other than their own. Ultimately, by dispelling essentialized versions of their own national culture and the culture of other nations

combined with more intellectual awareness of the ways that culture can bias cognition, students seemed to the researchers/participants to gain a capacity for higher level critical thinking about hegemonic influence of culture on their own subjectivity and ways of interpreting the world.

5）*The development of students' cultural awareness*

As previously listed insights have revealed, APM Program students have access to an educational space where neither Japanese nor "Western" cultural perspectives govern the social field and shape the possibilities of communication. According to what was reported to researchers/participants in this study, the circumstance allowed students more leeway to cognize and express their thoughts within a broader range of possibilities. Moreover, it was also noted that developing more complex understandings of culture helped APM Program students to question the singular veracity and superiority of their own culturally-determined ways of perceiving and thinking about the world. According to this study's researchers/participants, the combined effect was that their APM course students were able to develop enhanced cultural awareness because what might have otherwise been unsayable, unthinkable, and unchallengeable was suddenly possible to be expressed and collectively negotiated through discussion by class members from diverse backgrounds. Specifically, researchers/participants highlighted two key areas of growth in their students: 1）increased cultural awareness relating to the self and one's own culture, and 2）increased cultural awareness of the culture of "others". In the opinion of these researchers/participants, their APM course students came to be able to dispel stereotypes of their own and other cultures and to develop a higher degree of reflexivity.

6）*The pluralization of students' conceptions of international and national community*

According to the accounts of faculty researchers/participants in this study, one of the cumulative results of the various learning outcomes of the APM courses noted to this point was that the students developed more pluralized conceptions of their own national community. As it was previously mentioned in insight #3 above, understanding the complexities of culture itself seemed to help these students to dispel their preconceived notions of the

homogeneity of their own national cultures. Indeed, this study's researchers/participants reported to have observed their students gain a capacity to deconstruct the monolithic conceptions of their own national culture as they engaged in course activities that forced them to recognize the multicultural and hybrid dimensions of that culture. Interestingly, this phenomenon had two distinct pathways depending on the particularities of class and student(s). According to the researchers/participants, in some cases, it was the examination of and comparison with another national culture and the realization of that culture being neither monolithic nor homogenous that led certain students to be able to apply that same understanding to their own national culture. In other words, their more nuanced understanding of the pluralities that exist in the national culture of some "other" gave them the capacity to have a more nuanced understanding of their own national culture. In contrast, there were other cases reported by the researchers/participants in which students first developed insights about the plurality of cultures that exist within their own national culture and then were able to project that same understanding onto the national culture of others to also see them in less singular and essentialized ways.

Another interesting and related observation by the researchers/participants in this study was that the aforementioned understandings gained by their APM students relating to the national culture of themselves and others could also be projected onto the international community. To this point, they noted the accounts of many of their students who claimed to implicitly associate internationalization with Westernization. Importantly, they confirmed that this conception of internationalization presupposed a monolithic and homogenous "Western" culture. However, the researchers/participants in this study claimed that they observed many of their students taking the more nuanced understandings of national culture gained in their APM courses and projecting it onto "Western" culture. Consequently, by recognizing the plurality of cultures that exist within "Western" culture, it became possible for the students to recognize that internationalization itself is an expression of a global culture that is composed of a wide plurality of cultures. Moreover, the researchers/participants observed that some students who were able to come to see the "international" cultural elements that had contributed to the formation of their own national culture over time could

subsequently dispel the false national-international dichotomy that they had previously taken for granted. In other words, by seeing how their own national culture was actually composed of multiple international elements, it was revealed to them that international culture was also composed of multiple national elements.

7) *The deepening of students' sense of belonging to international and global communities*

Building on the pluralization of students' conceptions of international and national community, researchers/participants in this study affirmed that many of their students were subsequently able to develop a deeper sense of belonging to both the international and global communities. Researchers/ participants reported that for some students from non-Western countries who previously conceived of globalization and internationalization solely as processes of hegemonic Westernization that did not include their own country or (by extension) themselves as active social agents, coming to see the plurality of cultures composing the global/international community made them feel more legitimate and empowered belonging to it. Importantly, the researchers/participants came to recognize that this sense of belonging reported by their students had two important dimensions. One involved the students' *collective* identity associated with their home country, but another pertained to the students' *individual* identity (which in some senses transcended their nation-state belonging). In other words, this phenomenon could not only be described as an extension of the realm perceived to be relevant to one's national identity, but in fact indicated the development of a cosmopolitan identity that extended beyond international community belonging to transnational community belonging determined by one's humanity. What students reported to the faculty researchers/participants with regards to this increase in dual-dimensional belonging to and identification with the international and global communities was that it subsequently impacted their sense of investment and rights within as well as their responsibilities to others in these communities.

8) *The stimulation of students' interest in and motivation to pursue international/intercultural experiences*

The final key insight highlighted by researchers/participants in this study was the way that APM courses apparently raised their students' interests in and motivations to further engage in international/intercultural experiences. This outcome was directly confirmed by my many students. On the one hand, this phenomenon can easily be viewed as a cumulative result of each of the independent outcomes noted in the eight key insights described heretofore, since it is clear that each of these outcomes had some interrelationship of subsequence or antecedence with others, with the combined result of these processes being a disposition of interest and motivation that can be reasonably predicted to persist beyond the end of the students' APM course experiences. In fact, there were plenty of students who reported their own recognition of this being the case for themselves. However, these individual outcomes should also be viewed as semi-autonomous since it was observed by the researchers/participants that in any given student these outcomes manifested and interrelated in different patterns and with varying overall results. For example, while it is undeniable that the expansion of access to international/intercultural learning for *all* students (i.e. insight #2) is likely to lead to the diversification of students' international/intercultural experiences (i.e. insight #3), this did not necessarily seem to result in the deepening of every such students' sense of belonging to international and global communities (i.e. insight #7) or even guarantee the stimulation of these students' further interest in and motivation to pursue international/intercultural experiences (i.e. insight #8). In the end, each outcome was noted to be context and subject specific. Nevertheless, it should be emphasized that the overwhelming conclusion of researchers'/participants' collective observations in this study was that essentially each one of their students demonstrated some pattern of combined interrelationship between multiple if not all of the outcomes described here in this article.

Discussion

Returning to the original questions of our study, a clearer picture has emerged from the findings described in this article. Here, we will recap. We asked, how can universities in non-Anglophone countries begin to move

beyond a narrow English-centric model of internationalization? While the answer to this question is inevitably context-specific and must be multi-pronged, we suggested that original applications of the CLIL approach might offer one part of the solution. Therefore, we focused our attention on a more specific question and asked, how can CLIL assist universities in Japan with this endeavor by facilitating internationalization of the curriculum and internationalization at home? In order to answer this question, we looked at an innovative approach at Waseda University where CLIL was combined with area studies in its pioneering APM Program. From our vantage point as both researchers and practitioners "at the coalface", we were afforded a unique opportunity to study this program to glean insights that might be useful in considering its contributions to the development of more comprehensive internationalization within the institution by facilitating the internationalization of the curriculum and internationalization at home. What we found was there were multiple contributions, including: 1）the broadening of international opportunities for faculty and students; 2）the expansion of access to international/intercultural learning for all students; 3）the diversification of students' international/intercultural experiences; 4）the complexification of students' understandings of culture; 5）the development of students' cultural awareness; 6）the pluralization of students' conceptions of international and national community; 7）the deepening of students' sense of belonging to international and global communities; 8）the stimulation of students' interest in and motivation to pursue international/intercultural experiences. Now, this discussion section will build off these findings to put them into an even broader context.

There is no doubt that the current English-centric model for internation-alization in non-Anglophone countries limits the possibilities for international/ intercultural learning. However, the conundrum remains that without English it is very difficult for universities in non-Anglophone countries to facilitate international/intercultural opportunities in the first place. Acknowledging such, this article departs from much of the work in its field because it does not indulge in either naïve endorsement nor cynical polemic against higher education internationalization itself nor the role of English in it. In fact, the reproduction of epistemological and economic inequalities rooted in deep socio-historical origins （Shultz, 2015） to which higher education

internationalization and English hegemony contribute（e.g. Stein et al., 2016）is all taken as a given in this work. Nevertheless, we have elected for a position of pragmatic optimism, with a resolve to avoid the pitfalls of "romantic possibilitarianism"（Apple, 2000; Whitty, 1974）by taking a sensible approach to examining the possibilities of developing more critical forms of internationalization in higher education not within some ideal utopian conditions but instead within the challenging context of existing circumstances. In a sense, this echoes the stance of Antonio Gramsci, who is often credited with living by the credo: "pessimism of the intellect; optimism of the will".

What the findings of this study show is that there is real opportunity to develop a model of higher education internationalization in non-Anglophone countries that complements and extends beyond the exclusively English-centric model that currently dominates. One opportunity it highlights is the model of combining CLIL and area studies to facilitate access to non-Anglophone linguistic and cultural communities, thus fundamentally broadening the space in which international/intercultural learning can occur to include more participants and more types of participation. For obvious reasons, this is important in a place like Japan where the number of Japanese students studying abroad has experienced negative or near-zero growth since 2004（Hiroshima, 2020）while at the same time Japanese universities continue to "superficially" introduce international aspects（Ota, 2018, p.103）. However, this is a crucial matter globally too since access to international mobility is still limited to a very small portion of the population in every country around the world. Another opportunity that is illustrated by this study is the practice of applying deliberate pedagogical forms to ensure that international/intercultural learning objectives are achieved in non-Anglophone universities. Although not all courses at these universities can or should be taught primarily with the CLIL approach, using a CLIL-inspired or CLIL-ized pedagogy in certain courses, such as the ever-popular English-medium instruction courses, can have positive academic and socio-cultural outcomes（Moncada-Comas, 2021）. This relates to the third opportunity that is demonstrated by this study, which is the practical utility of the CLIL approach to help these universities move beyond mere rhetorical commitments to global citizenship education or the provision of global citizenship education that might be constrained by an exclusive English-centered approach to international/intercultural learning

（Mellet & Detey, 2021）. Since we know that language learning offers a unique opportunity for the enhancement of cosmopolitan citizenship education（Osler & Starkey, 2015）, it makes sense to capitalize on this connection by strategically designing curriculum and practices towards these ends. Beyond the research presented in this article, future research should further explore the opportunities that exist to internationalize the curriculum and facilitate internationalization at home through co-curricular and extra-curricular opportunities too.

This article began with a reference to Clark Kerr, and his controversial assertion that the role of the university in modern society is not to lead as a spirited embodiment of high moral ideals for the flourishing of humanity, but instead to operate as an amoral mechanism to do the bidding of powerful stakeholders with vested interests in the institution's host national society. However, it is here that we should be reminded of the words of T.S. Eliot, who is credited with stating: "It is in fact a part of the function of education to help us escape, not from our own time --- for we are bound by that --- but from the intellectual and emotional limitations of our time". In fact, Kerr's position contains a normative assumption about the sociological purposes of universities which is elided by the logics of neoliberalism and its "technical-economic instrumentalist" approach to education（Marshall, 2011, p.11）which prevail in the current age, but it is important to remember that this position as well as its underlying assumptions and logics are far from indisputable. Contrary to the "commonsense"（Gramsci, 1971）of the current age, it is not a forgone conclusion that education is primarily useful as a tool for economic productivity and international competitiveness. The spirit of liberalism that was born of Enlightenment Age thinkers like René Descartes and which composes the foundation upon which the modern university is founded is one that explicitly demands a separation of these institutions from the hegemonic influences of church and state who wish to utilize them in their respective political agendas. In fact, from a historical perspective, the university has been one of the most important incubators for the promotion of ideals and networks that nourish and manifest the humanist ethic that is the lynchpin of what we refer to today as modernity. We should never forget that this modernity and the internationalism that arose from it in the 20th century to counterbalance the destructive forces of state-led nationalism are owed in

no small part to the commitment of universities to embody and cultivate cosmopolitan identities around the world.

It is with this in mind that we should interpret more recent claims of "the end of internationalization" (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011) as an exhortation for non-Anglophone universities to recognize and embrace the invaluable socio-cultural role they play as *agents* of globalization (not mere passive reactors to it). These urgings are based in the knowledge that throughout history universities have had to take on various roles in society in response to the socio-historical demands of the times (Scott, 2006). Undeniably, the neoliberal forms of higher education internationalization that have arisen as a default in response to the global proliferation of neoliberal dominance of the past several decades (de Wit & Altbach, 2021) have had their moment. However, today, as the signs of neoliberal decline continue to mount (Bebbington, et al., 2010) while illiberalism, nationalism, and movements for de-globalization are on the rise, there are questions about the sustainability of the neoliberal university moving forward (Davies et al., 2006). The modern university is based on the three pillars of research, teaching, and service, but under neoliberalism teaching is subordinated to research and the ideal of the socially responsible university has been perverted by a set of values that "tends to equate 'service to industry' with 'service to society' and 'economic relevance' to 'social relevance'" (Rhoads & Torres, 2006, p.315). Still, although the age of neoliberalism has led to the commodification of higher education and bolstered the "commonsense" view that these institutions primarily exist for the provision of private goods and economic productivity, there are in fact crucial contributions for global public good(s) that universities are uniquely positioned to make within the current milieu (Marginson, 2011; Santos, 2010). Therefore, embracing this social responsibility to the world community to act as global citizens themselves and foster the cultivation of global citizenry amongst their students is what some scholars believe should be a central aim for higher education institutions engaged in internationalization now and in the future (Deardorff et al., 2012). The worldwide attention that is already increasingly being placed on global citizenship education in recent years by various types of institutions is laudable and higher education internationalization can support these endeavors even further through its facilitation of global and intercultural learning (Gacel-Ávila, 2005), but this can only be achieved with more

deliberate attention placed on internationalization of the curriculum. Specifically in the case of higher education institutions in non-Anglophone countries, this should mean treating an English-centric model for internationalization as a steppingstone rather than and end goal in itself.

Conclusion

The lessons provided to us from Japan through this study are clear. There is real opportunity to develop a model of higher education internationalization in non-Anglophone countries that complements and extends beyond the exclusively English-centric model that currently dominates. Admittedly, such a development will not assuage the fears of higher education internationalization's most cynical critics, but it will be a step in the direction of progress. Higher education internationalization can take on more critical forms in the future, but manifesting this future requires an unromantic analysis of the conditions of the present while remaining optimistic and taking strategic pragmatic action. As Paulo Freire, the late great critical educator reminds us- "The future isn't something hidden in a corner. The future is something we build in the present."

References

Apple, M. W. (2000). Can critical pedagogies interrrupt rightist policies?. *Educational Theory*, *50*(2), 229-254.

Birch, K., & Mykhnenko, V. (Eds.). (2010). *The rise and fall of neoliberalism: the collapse of an economic order?*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society and culture.* Sage.

Bradford, A. (2016). Toward a typology of implementation challenges facing English-medium instruction in higher education: Evidence from Japan. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *20*(4), 339-356.

Bradford, A., & Brown, H. (Eds.). (2017). *English-medium instruction in Japanese higher education: Policy, challenges and outcomes.* Multilingual Matters.

Brandenburg, U., & de Wit, H. (2011). "The End of Internationalization". *International Higher Education, 62*: 15-17.

Brown, H.G. (2014). Contextual factors driving the growth of undergraduate English-medium instruction programmes at universities in Japan. *The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *1*(1): 50–63.

Burgess, C., Gibson, I., Klaphake, J., & Selzer, M.（2010）. The 'Global 30' Project and Japanese higher education reform: an example of a 'closing in' or an 'opening up'?, *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *8*:4, 461-475.

Counts, G. S.（1932）. *Dare the school build a new social order?* The John Day Company.

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

Davidson, R. & Liu, Y.（2020）. Reaching the world outside: cultural representation and perceptions of global citizenship in Japanese elementary school English textbooks. *Language, Culture and Curriculum 33*（1）, 32–49.

Davies, M.J.（2017）. The case for increasing CLIL in Japanese universities. *Ritsumeikan Journal of Language and Cultural Studies, 28*（3）, 195-205.

Davies, B., Gottsche, M., & Bansel, P.（2006）. The rise and fall of the neo‐liberal university. *European Journal of Education*, *41*（2）, 305-319.

Deardorff, D. K., De Wit, H., Heyl, J. D., & Adams, T.（Eds.）.（2012）. *The SAGE handbook of international higher education*. Sage.

De Wit, H.（2002）. *Internationalization of higher education in the United States of America and Europe: A historical, comparative, and conceptual analysis*. Greenwood Publishing Group.

De Wit, H., & Altbach, P.（2021）. 70 Years of internationalization in tertiary education: Changes, challenges and perspectives. In H. van't Land, A. Corcoran, & D-C. Iancu DC.（Eds.）, *The Promise of Higher Education*（pp.119-125）. Springer.

Gacel-Ávila, J.（2005）. The internationalisation of higher education: A paradigm for global citizenry. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *9*（2）, 121-136.

Gramsci, A.（1971）. *Selections from the prison notebooks*（Q. Hoare & N. Smith, Trans）. International Publishers.

Harvey, D.（2005）. *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press.

Hashimoto, H.（2017）. Government policy driving English-medium instruction at Japanese universities: Responding to a competitiveness crisis in a globalizing world. In A. Bradford & H. Brown（Eds.）, *English-medium instruction in Japanese higher education*（pp. 14-31）. Multilingual Matters.

Hiroshima University, Research Institute for Higher Education（2020）. Statistics of Japanese Higher Education: https://rihe.hiroshima-u.ac.jp/en/statistics/synthesis/

Hudzik, J.（2011）. *Comprehensive internationalization: From concept to action.* NAFSA.

Kerr, C.（1982）. *The uses of the university*. Harvard University Press.

Knight, J.（2004）. Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *8*（1）, 5-31.

Knight, J.（2006）. *Internationalization of higher education: New directions, new challenges*. IAU.

Leask, B.（2015）. *Internationalizing the curriculum*. Routledge.

Marginson, S.（2011）. Higher education and public good. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *65*（4）, 411-433.

Marshall, H. (2011). Instrumentalism, ideals and imaginaries: Theorising the contested space of global citizenship education in schools. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 9*, no. 3-4: 411-426.

Mellet, X., & Detey, S. (2021). Global citizenship education in Japanese higher education: From French political training to a plurilingual and multicultural approach to social justice in a CLIL setting. In S. Wiksten (Ed.), *Centering global citizenship education in the public sphere* (pp. 143-156). Routledge.

Mittelman, J.H. (2004). *Whither globalisation?: The vortex of knowledge and ideology*. Routledge.

Moncada-Comas, B., & Block, D. (2021). CLIL-ised EMI in practice: Issues arising. *The Language Learning Journal, 49*(6), 686-698.

Osler, A. H., & Starkey, H. W. (2015). Education for cosmopolitan citizenship: A framework for language learning. *Argentinian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 3*(2), 30-39.

Ota, H. (2018). Internationalization of higher education: Global trends and Japan's challenges. *Educational Studies in Japan, 12*, 91-105.

Pain, R., Whitman, G., Milledge, D., & Lune Rivers Trust. (2011). *Participatory action research toolkit: An introduction to using PAR as an approach to learning, research and action*. Durham.

Rhoads, R. A., & Torres, C. A. (2006). *The university, state, and market: The political economy of globalization in the Americas*. Stanford University Press.

Rose, H., & McKinley, J. (2018). Japan's English-medium instruction initiatives and the globalization of higher education. *Higher Education, 75*(1): 111-129.

Santos, B. D. S. (2010). The university in the twenty-first century: Toward a democratic and emancipatory university reform. In M.W. Apple, S.J. Ball, & L.A. Gandin (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of the sociology of education* (274-282). Routledge.

Scott, J. C. (2006). The mission of the university: Medieval to postmodern transformations. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*(1), 1-39.

Shultz, L. (2015). Claiming to be global: An exploration of ethical, political, and justice questions. *Comparative and International Education, 44*(1).

Stein, S., Andreotti, V., Bruce, J., & Suša, R. (2016). Towards different conversations about the internationalization of higher education. *Comparative and International Education, 45*(1), 1-18.

Suzuki, T. (2015). After neoliberalism?: The curious non-death of neoliberalism in Japan. *Asian Journal of Social Science, 43*(1-2), 151-177.

Takagi, H. (2017). Development of English-medium instruction as a key for internationalizing curricula. In A. Bradford & H. Brown (Eds.), *English-medium instruction in Japanese higher education: Policy, challenges, and outcomes* (pp.53-69). Multilingual Matters.

Torres, C. A. (2008). *Education and neoliberal globalization*. Routledge.

Vickers, E. (2018). Editorial: "Internationalising" Japanese education: contradictions, challenges and opportunities. *Educational Studies in Japan: International Yearbook 12*,

1-7.

Vygotsky, L.S.（1978）. *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*（M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Trans & Eds）. Harvard University Press.

Weis, L.M., & Fine, M.（2004）. *Working method*. Routledge.

Whitty, G.（1974）. Sociology and the problem of radical educational change. In M. Flude & J. Ahier（Eds.）, *Educability, schools, and ideology*（pp.112-137）. Croom Helm.

Yonezawa, A.（2011）. The internationalization of Japanese higher education: Policy debates and realities. In S. Marginson, S. Kaur, & E. Sawir（Eds.）, *Higher education in the Asia-Pacific: Strategic responses to globalization*（pp. 329-342）. Springer.

Yonezawa, A.（2014）. Japan's challenge of fostering 'global human resources': Policy debates and practices. *Japan Labor Review 11*（2）, 37-52.