



NEW EDUCATIONAL MODELS IN TEACHING FOREIGN LANGUAGES FOR SPECIFIC PURPOSES AND THEIR EFFECTIVENESS

G.X. Askarova

An English language teacher at the Institute of information-communication technologies and military signals of the University of Military security and defense of the Republic of Uzbekistan and Uzbekistan State World Languages University.

Abstract. The article provides a comparative analysis of the Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) methodology and other approaches to the interdisciplinary integration of a foreign language and a subject: EMI, ESP, CBI, and language immersion. The research was carried out to reveal their similarities and differences, to determine the possibilities of practical use. The main task of CLIL is to reorient the goals and objectives of teaching foreign languages from purely linguistic tasks to subject-specific ones. The authors analyze the similarities and differences of these areas. An attempt is made to give an answer to the question why the ideas of subject-language integrated learning, which is actively used in the foreign education system, are not widely used in the system of Kazakhstani education.

Keywords: Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), Content-Based Instruction (CBI), language immersion English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI), English for Specific Purposes (ESP).

Аннотация. В статье представлен сравнительный анализ методологии содержательно-языкового интегрированного обучения (CLIL) и других подходов к междисциплинарной интеграции иностранного языка и предмета: EMI, ESP, CBI и языкового погружения. Исследования проводились с целью выявления их сходств и различий, определения возможностей практического использования. Основная задача CLIL - переориентировать



цели и задачи обучения иностранным языкам с чисто лингвистических задач на предметные. Авторы анализируют сходства и различия этих направлений. Предпринята попытка дать ответ на вопрос, почему идеи предметно-языкового интегрированного обучения, активно используемые в зарубежной системе образования, не находят широкого применения в системе казахстанского образования.

Ключевые слова: английский язык для специальных целей, английский как средство обучения, интегрированное обучение предмету и языку, методика погружения и обучения через содержание, языковое погружение.

Introduction. The conceptual basis for reforming the system of Kazakhstani education is a competence-based approach, which implies the desire to achieve a balance between learning and self-education, to transfer relevant knowledge to students, to develop skills and form skills that are in demand by the real conditions of life and professional activities of a person [5, p. 132]. In connection with the globalization and internationalization of society the increases the importance of knowledge of foreign languages (primarily English) at a level that would allow them become full-fledged members of the international scientific, business, and cultural community. At the same time, even a good command of a foreign language for everyday communication is often not enough for the free orientation of specialists in the information of the industry market, specialized literature, effective communication with business partners from foreign countries.

Only the study of a foreign language for professional purposes gives a university graduate the opportunity to participate in professional intercultural communication, becomes a key factor in the formation of professional and communicative competencies and, in general, a socially successful, competitive, professional personality [5, p. 133]. An effective methodology that ensures the formation of professional and foreign language competence is “subject-language integrated learning” (Content and Language Integrated Learning - CLIL), which is one of





the methods of interdisciplinary integration of a foreign language.

Materials and methods

The research methodology is based on theoretical (analysis, synthesis, comparison) methods. The main results are in well-reasoned scientific conclusions about the similarities and differences in pedagogical approaches to interrelated teaching of foreign languages and professional Kazakh and foreign scientific schools. The term “subject-language integrated learning” (CLIL) was introduced into the educational environment in the 1990s. by a group of researchers from European countries [1, p. 243] to designate the methodology for the simultaneous study of an academic discipline and a foreign language through the use of a foreign language as a means of studying the content of the subject. Since then, the CLIL method has gained popularity in the education system of many countries; the European Commission recommends the use of CLIL technology, its effectiveness has been proven by the research of many specialists in the field of education.

Despite the widespread use of the term CLIL itself, discussions about the essence of this approach, the search for its specificity in comparison with other teaching methods continue. Some authors take a categorical position, believing that the variety of definitions of CLIL makes it impossible to identify the key characteristics of this technique, which would make it possible to distinguish it as truly original and independent technique.

The author of the work agrees with those researchers who do not consider CLIL as a radically new approach, since a foreign and a second language have long been used to teach various disciplines in the system of secondary and higher education [6, p. 31]. Nevertheless, no one should understand CLIL as a kind of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) or equalize the concepts of CLIL and English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI), as some authors do (see, for example: [7, p. 8]). Here are some arguments supporting our point of view.





Firstly, although in practice the majority of educational programs using subject language integrated learning are implemented on the basis of English, which, at first glance, turns CLIL into CEIL (Content and English Integrated Learning), in general, the CLIL method is broader than ESP or EMI., since it can be implemented on the basis of other languages.

Secondly, CLIL is a convergence of subject content and language categories, which allows us to consider subject-language integrated learning on a par with the named methods; however, CLIL is distinguished by numerous special didactic methods of providing integrated learning (fusion), which carry a novelty of the approach. For example, problem learning, collaborative learning, presentation skills, role-playing games, mind mapping exercises, etc. are recognized as elements of novelty.

Thirdly, the ESP methodology is aimed mainly at teaching a foreign language directly, while the content aspects are of secondary importance [6, p. 31]. ESP programs are aimed at the formation of students' linguistic competence; therefore, the central link of its application is the improvement of foreign language communication skills, while the knowledge of terminology, grammar and discourse peculiarities inherent in the professional sphere should be assessed [7, p. 10]

CLIL has an ambivalent focus on both a special component and a foreign language, while EMI is not at all a method of teaching a foreign language: it is the use of a foreign language as a means of studying subjects [6, p. 31]. Since the ESP methodology is intended for learning a language, the teachers do not set the task of forming a logically structured and consistently revealing the topic of educational material (it is assumed that the student already has knowledge of the subject and only needs to clothe it in a new form in a foreign language).

EMI, on the contrary, assumes a sufficient level of foreign language proficiency by students and concentrates on the content of a special academic subject, almost



without paying attention to the language component. The CLIL methodology also has overlaps with the core ideas of the Content-Based Instruction (CBI) method of language immersion and subject-based learning. CLIL helps to eliminate the shortcomings of each of these approaches and to integrate language teaching with the content of a special discipline. [7, p. 12].

Immersion in the language environment significantly speeds up the process of mastering a foreign language, while learning something new not about the language, but about a specific subject, increases the motivation of students. In addition, as with the use of CBI, language and discipline teachers when using the methodology of subject-language integrated learning often work together [8, p. 83], directing their efforts towards solving common problems. Therefore, some researchers (for example: [Vyushkina, 2015; Cenoss, 2014]) believe that the terms CLIL and CBI have the same content, while others indicate an important difference between them. CLIL is used in classrooms where a non-linguistic subject is studied, and CBI is a method of teaching a foreign language based on subject-related material [2, p. 213].

Thus, the integrated subject-language approach covers situations of teaching a non-linguistic subject “through the environment” of a foreign language. CLIL is a method of teaching content through foreign language and teaching foreign language through content. CLIL assumes a dual unity of subject content and language teaching. Thus, language is used as a means of learning content, and content, in turn, is used as a resource for learning a language [9, p. 506].

In the process of using CLIL methodology, students are given the opportunity to study one or more academic disciplines in a foreign language. At the same time, it is not assumed that students are able to speak a professional foreign language before starting to study a specialized subject. They learn the language at the same time as the special subject [7, p. 10]. In the context of CLIL, a language serving as a means of instruction can be either a foreign, or the second state, or the language of a national minority



[4, p. 485]. Typically, the language of instruction is a foreign language that is rarely or never used in a social context outside the classroom. Classroom lesson form the main, and often the only, environment in which students can use the language.

[3, p. 75].

Conclusion

As a result, CLIL has both similarities and differences in comparison with other methods that use a foreign language in the process of obtaining subject knowledge. It should be noted that the variety of approaches to differentiating the methods of integrating the language and academic disciplines is largely due to the peculiarities of the use of terminology in different regions. CBI represents American experience and is comparable to ESP; the emergence of the term CLIL is associated with European countries, but recently this approach has become widespread outside Europe and is used in a wide international context. In our opinion, the task of a clear separation of methods and their definitions has no significant practical value. More important is the possibility of using a combination of methodological and methodological elements of various approaches in the interdisciplinary integration of a foreign language and professional disciplines of higher education in order to achieve the planned learning outcomes and form the required competencies of students, depending on the characteristics of specific educational situations.

REFERENCES

1. Cenoz J., Genesee F., Gorter D. Critical Analysis of CLIL: Taking Stock and Looking Forward. *Applied Linguistics*, 2014, Vol. 35, Issue 3, pp. 243-262.
2. Dalton-Puffer C., Llinares A., Lorenzo F., Nikula T. You Can Stand Under My Umbrella: Immersion, CLIL and Bilingual Education. A response to Cenoz, Genesee & Gorter (2013). *Applied Linguistics*, 2014, No. 35 (2), pp. 213–218.



3. Filipovich I.I. Predmetno-ryukovoe integrirovannoe obuchenie. Novyi shag v razvitiu kompetensii. [Content and language integrated learning. The new approaches to competence development]. *Nauchnyi vestnik*, 2015, № 4, pp. 74-78. (Rus)

4. Grigorieva K.S., Yakhina R.R. K voprosu primeneniya bilingvalnyh tehnologii v prosesse obucheniya angliiskomu yazyku v vyssei shkole. [On the use of bilingual technologies in the process of learning English the language in high school]. *Vestnik RUDN. Seriya: Informatizatsiya obrazovaniya*, 2017, Vol. 14, Issue 4, pp. 484-492. (Rus)

5. Isaeva E.V. Formirovaniye terminologicheskoi kompetensii na angliiskom yazyke: fundamentalnaya informatika i informatsionnye tehnologii. [Formation of English terminological competence: Fundamental informatics and information technologies]. *Evrasiiskii gumanitarnyi jurnal*, 2018, Issue 3, pp. 132-136. (Rus)

6. Popova N.V., Kogan M.S., Vdovina E.K. Predmetno-ryukovoe integrirovannoe obuchenie (CLIL) kak metodologiya aktualizatsii mejdissiplinarnykh svyazi v tehnichestkom vuze. [Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) as actualization methodology of interdisciplinary links in technical university]. *Vestnik Tambovskogo universiteta. Seriya: Gumanitarnye nauki*, 2018, Issue 173, T. 23, pp. 29- 42. (Rus)