CASE STUDY ON TEACHERS' TRAINING IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF CLIL MATERIALS IN JAPAN

Tiffani Blatchford
Kanda University of International Studies

ABSTRACT

Despite becoming a widespread approach towards language teaching in Europe, Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) has been slow to catch on in Asian countries, particularly Japan. This is in part due to a lack of readily available materials for teachers to use to teach CLIL and a lack of confidence among teachers to write their own materials. The purpose of this study was to investigate the main factors affecting teachers' preparedness and ability to design their own materials for CLIL lessons at a private English training institution in Japan. Data for the project was gathered by collecting information from teachers using an online survey and small focus groups. The study found that the majority of English teachers working at the institution studied had no prior knowledge of CLIL and had no training in writing CLIL-specific materials. The focus group discussions found that teachers were not familiar with teaching methodologies for CLIL in general, which hindered their abilities to both create and use materials. Most teachers displayed an interest in learning about CLIL but did not feel confident that they could design materials for lessons on their own. Findings indicate that English teachers in Japan are receptive to trying a CLIL approach in the classroom, but require increased training in CLIL pedagogy, including materials design methodologies. To increase teacher confidence and ability to teach using CLIL, institutions should implement pedagogical training programs and improved guidelines for CLIL materials design and development.

INTRODUCTION

Currently, one of the most widely-recognized approaches to language teaching is content and language integrated learning (CLIL). This approach,

Blatchford, T. (2025). Case study on teachers' training in the development of CLIL materials in Japan. *Literacies and Language Education: Research and Practice, Autumn 2025, 3-22.* English Language Institute, KUIS.

which emerged in the 1990s, has found success in many countries in Europe (Cimermanová, 2020). According to Coyle et al. (2010), "CLIL is an educational approach in which various language-supportive methodologies are used which lead to a dual-focused form of instruction where attention is given both to the language and the content" (p. 16). In recent years, many countries have tried to make the transition from traditional language-teaching approaches to CLIL, with varying degrees of success. Japan is one of the countries that has struggled with this shift. Though it is making slow progress, it lags behind its European counterparts; as one Japanese study famously said, "if CLIL in Europe is a toddler, CLIL in Japan is a new-born baby" (Ikeda et al., 2013, p. 1). However slow progress may be, studies on CLIL in Japan have shown that this method benefits learners by introducing them to authentic cultural content, developing their English skills, and improving their attitude towards language learning (Lee, 2022).

Research into CLIL suggests that materials design is one of the biggest impediments facing the implementation of CLIL, in no small part due to the lack of ready-made materials available for practitioners. It is therefore necessary that most teachers produce their own materials (Gondoavá, 2015). Unfortunately, there exists also a lack of clear-cut guidelines and criteria available for CLIL-specific materials design (Ball, 2018). In order for teachers to design effective CLIL materials for themselves, they require a clear understanding of CLIL pedagogies.

Thus, this study aims to investigate to what degree teachers working in Japan understand CLIL pedagogies and are prepared to design and develop materials for CLIL.

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

This study was conducted at an English training facility affiliated with Kanda University of International Studies (KUIS). Teachers working there are required to hold a bachelor's degree in any subject and must have a minimum of two years' experience teaching English in Japan. Lessons taught at the facility cover a variety of subjects including mathematics, science, art, and business, to name a few, meaning that they fall under the umbrella of CLIL. All materials are developed in-house and all teachers are expected to take part in lesson and materials development. The variety of teacher backgrounds and expectation to create materials in-house, particularly for CLIL lessons, is similar to the English Language Institute (ELI) at KUIS. Though lecturers in the ELI are required to hold a Master's degree in Applied Linguistics, TESOL, or a comparable subject, there is still variety in the range

of programs in which lecturers have taken part, and which may or may not have included CLIL pedagogy. As KUIS and the training facility are operated by the same parent company, Sano Gakuen Educational Corporation, teachers and students frequently move between the two; several lecturers at KUIS worked at the training facility before being hired at KUIS, and many KUIS lecturers teach classes there part-time during the summer season. Furthermore, students at KUIS are expected to take part in camps held at the training facility in their first and second years, where they receive lessons. Therefore, this study can offer valuable insights for teachers at both institutions.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Since CLIL approaches to language teaching took off in the 1990s, demand for teachers with the ability to teach CLIL, and therefore materials with which to teach, has increased exponentially. The literature on the subject up to this point seems to agree that the term *materials* can encompass anything used by teachers and learners to facilitate learning, including written, audio, or visual texts, electronic media, objects and realia, and procedures such as teacher instructions, student discussions, or live talks, among others (Tomlinson, 2011). Mishan and Timmis (2015) state that "the defining characteristic of materials is that the materials designer builds in a pedagogic purpose" (p. 3). Therefore, anything with a pedagogic purpose can, arguably, fall under the umbrella of materials.

It is sometimes necessary for teachers to write materials for themselves, particularly in instances where there are no ready-made materials available, as is often the case when using CLIL (Gondoavá, 2015). Designing their own materials allows teachers to make use of their available resources and create materials specifically catered towards their learners' educational context (Block, 1991; Howard & Major, 2004). They can consider factors such as learners' levels, interests, and learning styles and tailor materials accordingly, which is more likely to increase learner motivation and engagement (Tomlinson, 2020).

The literature on materials design and development for TESOL is plentiful, but as Coyle et al. (2010) warn us, "the danger for CLIL is that a conventional TESOL approach to materials development could focus attention only on linguistic, rather than on both content and linguistic, aspects of courses, modules and units" (p. 84). While many excellent, cutting-edge books on materials design and development exist, including those by Mishan and Timmis (2015), McGrath (2016), and Tomlinson and

Masuhara (2017), resources dealing specifically with materials design for CLIL are lacking. Major publications in the field of materials design stick to more general principles of design for language materials, while the literature specific to CLIL theory and practice tends not to pay any significant attention to the area of materials design (Tomlinson, 2020).

CLIL-Specific Pedagogy

Cañado (2016) discusses controversy in CLIL implementation, stating that "criticism has recently been leveled at CLIL due to the plethora of models or variants which can be identified within it" (p. 14). Some make a case that other approaches to language teaching such as English Medium Instruction (EMI) and Content-based Instruction are effectively the same and the terms can be used interchangeably; others (Brown & Bradford, 2017; Yasuda, 2019) argue they are different, and this lack of clarity causes confusion for teachers hoping to implement CLIL. This confusion has led to the lack of a clearly defined set of criteria for CLIL-specific pedagogy. Thornbury (2000) argues that the teaching of CLIL, or any other approach to language teaching, depends solely upon the practitioner and not the materials; however, even if this were the case, as we have seen above, the teacher would need to receive explicit training in CLIL pedagogy, including how to make use of any materials available to them.

Coyle, Hood, and Marsh's CLIL Pedagogy

Coyle et al. (2010) provide one of the most widely cited sources on CLIL theory available. Their research seems to agree with that of the critics, as they say that "if a single blueprint for CLIL were feasible, then plenty of step-by-step guides would have been available years ago" (p. 10). They agree that while CLIL shares many of the same basic theories and practices with a range of different educational approaches such as immersion, bilingual education, and content-based language teaching (CBLT), "there are some fundamental differences. CLIL is content-driven, and this is where it both extends the experience of learning a language, and where it becomes different to existing language-teaching approaches" (p. 13). Furthermore, CLIL is different from other approaches due to its integrated 4Cs framework: culture, communication, content, and cognition.

While they do discuss a clearly defined CLIL pedagogy, their overview of CLIL materials includes only a brief section on materials creation, and focuses more heavily on materials adaptation. This is again for clear reasons: one of the biggest constraints preventing teachers from making their own materials is time, and materials adaptation is an excellent alternative when faced with time pressures. Thus, most of the literature,

when it *does* discuss materials for CLIL, focuses on adaptation rather than design and creation. This only serves to perpetuate the issue; with no guidance to be found, inexperienced CLIL teachers will turn time and time again to adaptation over creation, even with a demonstrated need for teachers to create their own materials at least some of the time.

The reasons for this are understandable; CLIL is highly contextual in practice, meaning that there can be no universal set of criteria which can apply to materials design in every situation. As a result of the high demand for niche CLIL materials and the emerging literature on the topic, it is becoming clear that it is "both feasible and desirable" (Ball, 2018, p. 84) to establish a set of guiding principles and practices that can aid teachers in the production of CLIL materials.

Mehisto's Ten Criteria

The available literature makes a strong case for teachers to design their own materials in order to suit the specific context and needs of their learners and to ensure a balance between linguistic and subject content focus. This is in no small part due to the documented lack of ready-made materials available for CLIL practitioners (Gondoavá, 2015). The major set of criteria for writing CLIL materials referenced in most recent literature on the topic is Mehisto's (2012) criteria for the development of quality CLIL materials. He sets forth the following ten criteria for CLIL materials developers:

- Make the learning process and intentions visible to students.
- Systematically foster academic language proficiency.
- Foster learning skills development and learner autonomy.
- Include self, peer, and other types of formative assessment.
- Help create a safe learning environment.
- Foster cooperative learning.
- Seek ways of incorporating authentic language and authentic language use.
- Foster critical thinking.
- Foster cognitive fluency through scaffolding of:
    a) content,
    b) language,
    c) learning skills development,

  helping students to reach well beyond what they could do on their own.
- Help to make learning meaningful.

Adapted from Mehisto, 2012, pp. 17-25.

Mehisto writes that "quality learning materials do more than just communicate information. They promote critical and creative thought, discussion, and learner autonomy" (p. 16).

Ball, Kelly, and Klegg's Seven Principles

Expanding on Mehisto's original criteria, Ball et al. (2015) include a chapter in their book specifically tailored towards designing materials for CLIL. Their seven principles for CLIL materials design are:

- The text-task relationship. Learners will benefit from a clear understanding of the task and how to use the given text.
- Prioritizing the three-dimensions of content (concept, procedure, language).
- Guiding input and supporting output.
- Scaffolding and embedding (explicit and implicit language support).
- Making key language salient.
- The concept of 'difficulty' in didactic materials (making materials 'digestible' to students).
- Thinking in sequences (tasks and activities should be part of a larger sequence).

Adapted from Ball et al. (2015), pp. 181-208.

The way the principles are laid out and explained in this chapter, with each given multiple examples of real-world materials illustrating how they work, makes this arguably one of the best resources available for teachers wanting to learn about CLIL materials design in that it is easy to understand and follow.

Guidelines for Writing Language-Supportive Materials

Criteria for language-supportive pedagogy is often used in the writing of materials for EMI. While some research argues that EMI is different from CLIL and the two should not be confused, the criteria for learning materials for both are similar. According to Clegg and Simpson (2016), when learners are not proficient in the L2, a specialist pedagogy is needed in order to increase accessibility and allow better understanding and learning. This is known as a language-supportive pedagogy, and applies just as much to CLIL subject content as it does to EMI. These criteria include the following from the University of Bristol (2017):

- The text should be fairly short.
- Sentences should be fairly short.
- Sentences should not be grammatically over-complex.

- General academic vocabulary (not subject-specific) should be limited.
- Subject-specific items are either explained in the text or visualized.
- Visuals should be used to illustrate key terms.
- Cohesive devices such as headings and subheadings, bold, italics, numbering, paragraphs, and/or bullet points should be used.
- Key items may be repeated.

Adapted from University of Bristol, 2017.

Teacher Training in CLIL

Teacher training in materials development in general is a relatively new field in English language teaching, emerging in the early 2000s as a way to help teachers avoid the arduous and lengthy process of learning materials design through trial and error (Garton & Graves, 2014; Hughes, 2022; Tomlinson, 2013). Howard and Major (2004) point out that "personal confidence and competence are factors that will determine an individual teacher's willingness to embark on materials development. This will be influenced by the teacher's level of teaching experience and his or her perceived creativity or artistic skills and overall understanding of the principles of materials design and production" (p. 103).

Studies suggest teachers do not feel prepared to design CLIL materials, affecting their ability to teach CLIL lessons despite a willingness to do so (Cimermanová, 2020; Morton, 2013). Even after years of classroom experience, it is not guaranteed that teachers will have developed the skill to write good materials (Hughes, 2014). Teacher-made materials, made by teachers untrained in CLIL and lacking established criteria with which to work, tend to put too much emphasis on language tasks, forgoing understanding of the content (Coleman, 2009). This body of literature indicates a need for teacher training programs in the field of materials writing.

Pedagogical Training

Research shows there is also a need for teachers using a CLIL approach to be specifically trained in effective materials design and pedagogy for their use (Ball, 2018). Ball (2018) and Coyle (2006) both believe that the solution to the lack of clear-cut parameters and criteria for producing CLIL materials should be ensuring that teachers have a clear understanding of CLIL pedagogies, so that they may produce effective materials for a wide range of learning contexts. Their suggestion is to create a framework of fundamental principles for classroom practice in CLIL. Despite this need, there is still a lack of training programs in CLIL materials development and pedagogy

available for teachers (Garton & Graves, 2014). This problem is compounded by the fact that when it comes to developing these training programs, there appears to be a gap in the literature. While much CLIL design theory is written by experienced practitioners, it remains simply that: theory. Limited studies exist on new teachers' self-efficacy beliefs regarding CLIL materials design, all indicating teachers do not feel prepared to produce their own materials.

CLIL and Teacher Practice in Japan

Coleman (2009) writes that one of the issues facing the implementation of CLIL in Asia is the lack of quality teachers and the ability to retain these teachers. Studies reveal that teachers in Japan were found to have insufficient metalinguistic knowledge and a lack of understanding of the functional aspects of language caused by a scarcity of professional training programs (Oba, 2019). Furthermore, most teachers are unaware of the principal concepts of CLIL (Ikeda, 2013; MacGregor, 2016; Sasajima & Kavanagh; 2017). What research has been done points to a need for teachers to acquire a better understanding of how to integrate language teaching with content teaching (Oba, 2019).

The literature overwhelmingly indicates that Japan is struggling to catch up to its European counterparts when it comes to introducing CLIL, mainly due to a lack of understanding of CLIL pedagogy by teachers. The reasons for this include insufficient training, a lack of readily available CLIL materials, and an inability for teachers to create their own materials.

METHODOLOGY

Data for this study was gathered first through a preliminary survey on teachers' backgrounds, experience, and feelings on CLIL materials design. The survey was distributed to all teachers employed by the training facility at the time and received a total of 22 responses. Teachers at the facility all come from commonwealth countries; the majority of respondents were from England, while others came from Australia, New Zealand, Canada, South Africa, Jamaica, and Trinidad and Tobago. When asked about educational background on the survey, teachers indicated a variety of areas of study including journalism, literature, computer science, nutrition, film making, and finance, among others.

After the survey, focus groups were conducted to gather further qualitative data on teachers' training and understanding of CLIL pedagogy and materials writing. Nine teachers agreed to participate in the focus groups;

these were divided into three focus groups with three teachers per session. Participants in the focus groups came from Canada (1), South Africa (3), Australia (1), New Zealand (1), Trinidad (1), and England (2). Each focus group was asked to discuss 10 questions about materials design and development, which took approximately 1 hour. Transcripts were then coded to see how teacher discussions aligned with corresponding CLIL materials design criteria as discussed in the literature review.

RESULTS

Surveys

Teacher Experience in CLIL Materials Design

According to the results of the online survey, 16 (72.7%) of the respondents indicated that they had never designed CLIL materials before entering employment at the facility, while 2 (9.1%) had rarely done so (once or twice a year) and 4 (18.2%) had done so only sometimes (occasionally but not regularly). Respondents were then asked about their background and training through a series of yes or no questions (see Table 1).

Table 1 Survey questions about background and training

Survey Item	Yes	No
Do you have any TESOL/TESL/TEFL certifications?	13 (59.1%)	9 (40.9%)
Were you familiar with the term 'Content and Language Integrated Learning' before taking this survey?	9 (40.9%)	13 (59.1%)
Have you received training in CLIL materials design?	0 (0%)	22 (100%)

13 (59.1%) of respondents had experience writing CLIL materials for the institution at the time of taking the survey. When asked if respondents were familiar with the term CLIL before taking the survey, 13 (59.1%) reported that they were not. When asked if they had received any training in CLIL materials design, all 22 (100%) of the respondents answered that they had not.

Attitudes and Beliefs About CLIL

Teachers who had experience designing CLIL lesson materials were then asked a series of questions about their beliefs; a total of 20 teachers responded to this section. Most teachers slightly agreed, agreed, or strongly agreed that CLIL is beneficial for both language and content learning, with all teachers expressing an interest in teaching CLIL lessons. Despite this, 10 (50%) teachers disagreed or slightly disagreed with the statement "I feel comfortable designing CLIL lesson materials" (see Table 2).

Table 2 Teachers' attitudes and beliefs about CLIL

Survey Item	Number of Responses					
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
CLIL has positive benefits on subject content learning	0	0	0	6	11	3
CLIL has positive benefits on language learning	0	0	1	1	9	9
I am interested in teaching CLIL lessons	0	0	0	8	6	6
I feel comfortable designing CLIL lesson materials	0	3	7	3	5	2

Note. Only 20 teachers responded to this section.

Materials Design Process

The subsequent section asked respondents about their current materials design process. Table 3 illustrates that, when asked where teachers got inspiration for the materials they design, the most popular responses included "in English textbooks" (8 responses), "online" (17 responses), and "in lessons made by others" (14 responses). This indicates a lack of professional resources for materials writers to look to for CLIL materials design. The fact that 63.6% of teachers find inspiration in lessons they have seen before also indicates that teacher training in CLIL materials design may rely more heavily on the craft model (Hughes, 2022) than they should.

Table 3 Where teachers look for inspiration for CLIL materials design

Survey Item	Responses
Textbooks	8
Online	17
In lessons made by others	14
In previous self-made lessons	7
In a TESOL/TEFL training course	4
Conference presentations	1
Have never made CLIL materials	1

Focus Groups

Nine teachers agreed to participate in a focus group. As previously explained, nine participants were divided into groups of three for a total of three groups. Each focus group lasted for about an hour, with participants being asked a number of questions that looked more deeply into CLIL background, training, and materials design processes. Audio recordings of the focus groups were transcribed and analyzed qualitatively. Participants' responses to the questions were then compared with the CLIL criteria discussed in the literature review and coded into two categories: ideas aligning with Mehisto's (2012) ten criteria (see Table 4) and those aligned with additional criteria (see Table 5).

Knowledge of Mehisto's Ten Criteria

Table 4 compares Mehisto's (2012) ten criteria for CLIL materials design with how many participants mentioned said criteria in the focus groups. Criteria with 0 mentions have been highlighted in grey.

Table 4 Teachers who mentioned Mehisto's (2012) ten criteria

Criteria	**Number of Participants**
Make the learning intentions and process visible to students	2
Systematically foster academic language proficiency	0
Foster learning skills development and learner autonomy	0

Include self, peer, and other types of formative assessment	0
Help create a safe learning environment	2
Foster cooperative learning	1
Seek ways of incorporating authentic language and authentic language use	1
Foster critical thinking	1
Foster cognitive fluency through scaffolding of content, language, and learning skills development, helping students to reach well beyond what they could do on their own	3
Help to make learning meaningful	2

As illustrated, eight of the ten criteria were touched upon by at least one teacher during the course of the focus groups. When asked about their initial thoughts on CLIL in Japan at the beginning of the focus group, only one participant mentioned critical thinking. They said that they felt demotivated attempting to teach concepts like critical thinking in Japan because students do not have "opportunities to put these skills to use in real life". This may indicate that despite a knowledge of implementing critical thinking skills, teachers may be influenced by societal factors outside their control.

Additional Criteria

Table 5 compares teachers' answers to the focus group questions with additional aspects of CLIL materials design taken from the literature.

Table 5 Teachers' understanding of additional criteria

Criteria	**Mentions**
Language-supportive pedagogy/language-supportive materials should be used (University of Bristol, 2017)	2
Visual design and layout should be used to illustrate key concepts (Tomlinson & Masuhara, 2017)	3
Materials should be cognitively engaging (Tomlinson, 2020)	2

Specific training in CLIL pedagogies is needed (Ball, 2018)	5
A balance between linguistic and subject content learning must be achieved (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010).	3

Five out of nine participants agreed that specific training in CLIL pedagogies is needed. Comments from teachers included "For me, I think it's just the lack of understanding of the methodology - we are asked to make these lessons without much training," "I don't know the best ways to do it," and "I don't know the criteria for CLIL. Some of it looks like task-based learning. I don't know what the difference is. What is it?"

An over-focus on English grammar was mentioned by several participants throughout the focus groups. As one participant noted, "We are biased here. Focus on language. That's the customer's goal. The teachers want to see the students using English. They don't care if the students made a battery motor".

DISCUSSION

At the opening of the focus group, participants were asked to share their general thoughts on CLIL in Japan. This elicited insightful answers, as five people indicated that they had never heard of CLIL before. One participant said that at a previous workplace, "we had task-based learning. So that's a different methodology," and another said, "I don't know the criteria for CLIL. Some of it looks like task-based learning. I don't know what the difference is". Despite this lack of familiarity with CLIL methodology, participants seemed receptive to the idea of learning more about it and were willing to share what thoughts they had on materials design. In order to ascertain knowledge and preparedness, a reflexive thematic analysis of the focus group responses was used to help discern which ideologies and practices teachers use may align with current CLIL practices.

During the focus groups, seven of the nine participants mentioned that they felt materials writers should have knowledge or interest in the subject topic for which they were designing materials, and many expressed a wish to design materials suited to their particular background. Several participants of the focus groups also mentioned that they felt lessons could become too grammar-focused, indicating that even without specific training in CLIL, they understood that there should be a balance between subject and content focus. This aligns with Coleman's (2009) view that language teachers,

without proper training in CLIL materials design, tend to emphasize language tasks over content learning.

Generally, teachers do not seem to feel comfortable with CLIL materials design because they do not know about CLIL. We have seen in the literature on CLIL teaching methodology that teachers should strike a balance between subject matter and language focus in order for CLIL to be effective (Coyle et al., 2010). The results of the study indicate that the teachers, despite their experience as Assistant Language Teachers (ALTs) and their TESOL training, are not familiar with English teaching methodologies. Although they have a variety of educational backgrounds and may be subject specialists, and may express an interest in designing lesson materials geared toward their "strong points", they have not learned general subject-specific methodologies. When it comes to effectively implementing CLIL, teachers have to be both subject teachers and language teachers, with familiarity in both the subject and language teaching methodology. A lack of knowledge of teaching methodologies becomes a disadvantage even if teachers design and teach CLIL lessons in their subjects of expertise. Additionally, they seem to be lacking in EFL methodology, indicating that standard 100-hour TESOL certificates are not sufficient training. This may be one of the factors contributing to an unbalanced focus on grammar.

Participants expressed an awareness of language-supportive pedagogy, though many did not know the terminology for it and frequently referred to "scaffolding," "levelling," "grading," and "adjusting" materials in order to ensure learner understanding. While teachers demonstrated a knowledge of using language-supportive pedagogy whilst teaching, only three mentioned it in regards to materials design. One participant spoke of their design procedure by saying "[I] create the lesson and then see where they would need support. And then that's where I create the extra materials". Since teachers are already familiar with the core principles of language supportive pedagogy such as using more accessible teacher-talk, repetition, illustrating concepts with visuals, and helping learners understand and acquire new vocabulary items (Ball et al., 2015), it seems likely that this area of CLIL materials design would be easily taught.

It appears likely that many teachers could write materials for CLIL if they received training and had more resources and specific examples to reference. Most teachers are still developing their skills based on the "craft model" approach (Hughes 2022) wherein they learn from more experienced mentors, often based on the standards of the institution. If these institutional standards and mentors had a more universal and standardized

set of criteria to use in their training, CLIL materials design would be easier for teachers to learn.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to find out how much knowledge EFL teachers working in Japan have of CLIL materials design theory and if they are prepared to design their own materials, something which is often necessary for teachers to do as materials for CLIL are not readily available.

It is difficult for teachers to learn about CLIL and CLIL materials design because of the lack of resources on the subject, and because current TESOL courses and programs often fail to include it. Considering this, the study examined teachers' decision-making and processes when designing materials, and what training, if any, informed the choices they made. The results of these queries indicate that teachers do not have enough training in teaching methodologies for the integration of language teaching with subject teaching. Most teachers displayed a tendency to copy what they had seen done already by more experienced teachers rather than academic knowledge on teaching and materials design theory. This is likely because many English teachers in Japan receive training from the dispatch companies for which they work; these have little focus on CLIL methodologies or materials design theory, and are instead overwhelmingly based on the craft model (Hughes, 2022), where inexperienced teachers learn skills on the job from their more experienced peers.

The results of the study have shown that the craft model alone is not sufficient for teachers to learn CLIL methodologies and materials design. A possible solution may be for institutions to encourage and support their teachers in attaining additional certifications in CLIL methodologies and pedagogy. Another solution may be to require that trainers have postgraduate qualifications and can develop and execute more consistent, theory-based training programs; this way, even if the craft model becomes overused, the teachers in training positions will be able to pass down academic knowledge to new teachers and materials writers. However, implementing effective, consistent CLIL training programs would require a clear set of guidelines and criteria for CLIL materials writing.

IMPLICATIONS

The key issue is that holding a certificate in TESOL does not guarantee that the teacher will have an understanding of methodologies for CLIL teaching or CLIL materials design. In order for CLIL materials writers to flourish, they

need to receive explicit training in CLIL approaches and methodologies, as well as knowledge of the teaching methodologies in their subjects of expertise. Because institutions in Japan are receiving teaching candidates who are not trained in the relevant methodologies, it points to a serious need for these institutions to provide support. If teaching institutions were to embrace CLIL methodologies and develop and offer additional training programs for their teachers as well as support them as they become knowledgeable in their respective subject-content teaching methodologies, teachers could gain the confidence and skills to design and teach materials in CLIL.

Quality training courses cannot be implemented until a widely-recognized set of guidelines can be set by researchers in the field of CLIL and materials design. In the interim, institutions could implement their own set of standards and guidelines for CLIL materials development. Future research should also focus on designing and implementing training programs for EFL teachers in Japan on CLIL pedagogy and materials writing. With an increase in training and knowledge on the subject, it seems entirely possible that CLIL could spread across Japan in the same way it has in Europe, and that teachers could be trained to write their own materials and eventually move away from the constricting nature of commercialized English textbooks.

LIMITATIONS

The scope of the study was limited by the small number of participants. The data gathered is particular to this unique teaching context in which premade lessons are sold to students on school trips. For this reason, the findings may not be generalizable to traditional academic contexts in Japan.

FUTURE RESEARCH AND CONTEXTUAL RELEVANCE

Overall, the findings of the study suggest that teachers at the English training facility have limited awareness of CLIL pedagogy and are not prepared to write their own materials. In order for EFL teachers in Japan to gain the knowledge and skills necessary to design quality materials for CLIL, research needs to be conducted into how to develop and implement training programs for CLIL teaching and materials design methodologies. As similar studies have also concluded, this would most certainly involve creating a widely recognized set of universal guidelines in CLIL teaching methodologies and CLIL materials design upon which future training programs could be founded.

Many teachers at KUIS have similar backgrounds to those at the training facility in the study and could benefit from this information for course material development. Although teachers in the ELI are required to have an MA in TESOL or equivalent, it is entirely possible that their respective training programs put limited focus on CLIL materials design, and they may desire additional training in this area. Future research could involve developing training programs and offering opportunities for collaboration on CLIL materials between the two institutions, benefitting current and future KUIS teachers as well as the students in the ELI.

REFERENCES

Ball, P. (2018). Innovations and challenges in CLIL materials design. *Theory into Practice, 57*(3), 222–231. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2018.1484036

Ball, P., Kelly, K., & Clegg, J. (2015). *Putting CLIL into practice*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.15581/004.31.7761

Block, D. (1991). Some thoughts on DIY materials design. *ELT Journal, 45*(3), 211–217. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/45.3.211

Brown, H., & Bradford, A. (2017). EMI, CLIL, & CBI: Differing approaches and goals. In P. Clements, A. Krause, & H. Brown (Eds.), *Transformation in language education* (pp. 328–334). JALT. https://jalt-publications.org/sites/default/files/pdf-article/jalt2016-pcp-042.pdf

Cañado, M. L. P. (2016). From the CLIL craze to the CLIL conundrum: Addressing the current CLIL controversy. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Languages & Literature, 9*(1), 9–31. https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/jtl3.667

Cimermanová, I. (2020). On developing materials for CLIL. *Society. Integration. Education. Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference, 1*, 86–96. https://doi.org/10.17770/sie2020vol1.4809

Clegg, J., & Simpson, J. (2016). Improving the effectiveness of English as a medium of instruction in sub-Saharan Africa. *Comparative Education, 52*(3), 359–374. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2016.1185268

Coleman, H. (2009). Teaching other subjects through English in two Asian nations: Teachers' responses and implications for learners. In P. Powell-Davies (Ed.), *Access English EBE symposium: A collection of papers* (pp. 63–87). British Council East Asia.

Coyle, D. (2006). Content and language integrated learning: Motivating learners and teachers. *Scottish Languages Review, 13*, 1–18. https://scilt.org.uk/Portals/24/Library/slr/issues/13/SLR13_Coyle.pdf

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

Garton, S., & Graves, K. (Eds.). (2014). *International perspectives on materials in ELT.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Gondoavá, D. (2015). Selecting, adapting and creating CLIL materials. In S. Pokrivcáková et al., *CLIL in foreign language education* (pp. 151–163). Constantine the Philosopher University. https://doi.org/10.17846/CLIL.2015.153-163

Howard, J., & Major, J. (2004). Guidelines for designing effective English language teaching materials. *TESOLANZ Journal, 12*, 50–58.

Hughes, J. (2014). Do-it-yourself materials and self-publishing. *Modern English Teacher, 23*(2), 24–26.

Hughes, J. (2022). Training materials writers. In J. Norton & H. Buchanan, (Eds.) *The Routledge handbook of materials development for language teaching* (pp. 511–526). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/b22783

Ikeda, M. (2013). Does CLIL work for Japanese secondary school students? Potential for the 'weak' version of CLIL. *International CLIL Research Journal, 2*(1), 31–43. https://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:jyu-202504083138

Ikeda, M., Pinner, R., Mehisto, P., & Marsh, D. (2013). Editorial: CLIL in Japan. *International CLIL Research Journal, 2*(1), 1–2.

McGrath, I. (2016). *Materials evaluation and design for language teaching (2nd ed.)*. Edinburgh University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748694822

MacGregor, L. (2016). CLIL in Japan: University teachers' viewpoints. In P. Clements, A. Krause, & H. Brown, (Eds.). *Focus on the learner,* (pp. 426–432). JALT. https://jalt-publications.org/node/4/articles/5419-clil-japan-university-teachers%E2%80%99-viewpoints

Mehisto, P. (2012). Criteria for producing CLIL learning material. *Encuentro, 21*, 15–33. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED539729

Mishan, F., & Timmis, I. (2015). *Materials development for TESOL* (1st ed.). Edinburgh University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748691371

Morton, T. (2013). Critically evaluating materials for CLIL: Practitioners' practices and perspectives. In J. Gray (Ed.), *Critical perspectives on language teaching materials* (1st ed., pp. 111–136). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137384263_6

Oba, T. (2019). Feasibility and effectiveness of integrating content and language in English teaching in Japan. *Gakuen eigo komyunikēshon kiyō [Gakuen English Communication Bulletin], 942*, 45–66.

Sasajima, S., & Kavanagh, B. (2017, October 16). *CLIL riron to jissen [CLIL theory and practice]* [Workshop]. Tohoku University, Sendai, Japan.

Thornbury, S. (2000). A dogma for EFL. *IATEFL Issues, 153*(2), 4–6.

Tomlinson, B. (2011). *Materials development in language teaching.* Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781139042789

Tomlinson, B. (2013). *Developing materials for language teaching*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Tomlinson, B. (2020). Is materials development progressing? *Language Teaching Research Quarterly, 15*, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2020.15.01

Tomlinson, B., & Masuhara, H. (2017). *The complete guide to the theory and practice of materials development for language learning.* Wiley.

University of Bristol. (2017). *Textbook designs: A roundtable discussion on the readability of English-medium textbooks* [Unpublished manuscript]. University of Bristol.

Yasuda, S. (2019). Conceptualizing integration in CLIL: More than just learning content and language. *JALT Journal, 41*(1), 49–65. https://doi.org/10.37546/JALTJJ41.1-3