# IMPLEMENTATION OF CLIL (CONTENT AND LANGUAGE INTEGRATED LEARNING) IN PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICE

**Amonova A.M**

*Samarqand davlat chet tillari instituti, Ingliz tili o'qitish*
*metodika kafedrasi o'qituvchisi,*
*amonovaaziza08@mail.ru*

**Mamadiyorova S.M**

*Samarqand davlat chet tillari instituti, Ingliz filologiyasi va*
*tarjimashunoslik fakulteti 3-bosqich talabasi,*
*sevinchmamadiyorova04@gmail.com*

**Annotation:** *In this article, we examine how Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is being implemented in contemporary pedagogical practice. Our research focuses on several areas that, in our view, remain insufficiently explored — particularly micro-scaffolding techniques used by teachers, the orchestration of multimodal input during lessons, and the ways CLIL is adapted to local curricula in Uzbek general education schools. While many previous studies emphasize the theoretical benefits of CLIL, we concentrate on classroom-level processes: how students manage cognitive load, how their autonomy develops, and how subject content interacts with language learning in real practice. Based on our findings, we offer practical, context-sensitive recommendations for teachers, curriculum developers, and education policymakers in Uzbekistan.*

**Keywords*:*** *CLIL, pedagogical practice, scaffolding, multimodality, curriculum adaptation, Uzbekistan, bilingual education.*

**Аннотация:** *В данной статье мы анализируем особенности внедрения предметно-языкового интегрированного обучения (CLIL) в современной педагогической практике. Наше внимание сосредоточено на аспектах, которые, по нашему мнению, остаются недостаточно изученными: микроскаффолдинг, использование мультимодального ввода на уроках, а также адаптация CLIL к локальным учебным планам общеобразовательных школ Узбекистана. В отличие от работ, акцентирующих внимание главным образом на теоретических преимуществах CLIL, мы рассматриваем процессы, происходящие непосредственно в учебном классе — распределение когнитивной нагрузки, развитие автономии учащихся и взаимодействие между предметным содержанием и языковым развитием. Результаты исследования позволяют предложить практические рекомендации для*

_____

*учителей, разработчиков учебных программ и представителей образовательной политики Узбекистана.*

**Ключевые слова:** *CLIL, педагогическая практика, скэффолдинг, мультимодальность, адаптация учебных программ, Узбекистан, билингвальное образование.*

**Annotatsiya***: Ushbu maqolada biz CLIL — mazmun va til integratsiyalashgan ta'limning amaliyotda qanday joriy etilayotganini tahlil qilamiz. Tadqiqotimiz davomida nazariy jihatlar ko'p marotaba yoritilgan bo'lsa-da, biz hali yetarlicha o'rganilmagan tomonlarga alohida e'tibor qaratdik. Xususan, o'qituvchilar dars jarayonida qo'llaydigan mikro-skaffolding usullari, multimodal materiallarni uyg'unlashtirish strategiyalari hamda CLILning O'zbekiston umumiy o'rta ta'lim maktablari o'quv dasturlariga moslashtirilish jarayoni tahlil qilindi. Avvalgi adabiyotlarda CLILning nazariy afzalliklari ustuvor bo'lgan bo'lsa, biz o'quv jarayonining o'zida — o'quvchilarning kognitiv yuklamani boshqarishi, o'z-o'zini boshqarish ko'nikmalarining rivoji va fan mazmuni bilan til o'rtasidagi real o'zaro ta'sir — kabi jarayonlarni o'rganishga urg'u berdik. Tadqiqot natijalari o'qituvchilar, o'quv dasturi ishlab chiquvchilar va ta'lim siyosati vakillari uchun amaliy tavsiyalarni taqdim etadi.*

**Kalit so'zlar:** *CLIL, pedagogik amaliyot, skaffolding, multimodal ta'lim, o'quv dasturi adaptatsiyasi, O'zbekiston, ikki tilli ta'lim.*

**Introduction**

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) has become a globally recognized pedagogical approach promoting dual-focused instruction, where learners acquire subject content and a foreign language simultaneously (Coyle, Hood & Marsh, 2010). Despite its increasing popularity across Europe and Asia, CLIL research in Central Asia—especially in Uzbekistan—remains limited and largely conceptual. Most existing studies describe CLIL's advantages but rarely address the micro-level mechanisms required for its practical and sustainable implementation in real classrooms.

In the Uzbek education system, where English has been declared a priority subject, CLIL is seen as a promising methodology to enhance both linguistic competence and subject-matter understanding. However, teachers face challenges such as lack of bilingual materials, insufficient training, and limited methodological guidance. Moreover, empirical research exploring how CLIL interacts with multimodal learning, task sequencing, and scaffolded instruction in Uzbek classrooms is still underdeveloped.

This study aims to fill this gap by examining less-investigated aspects of CLIL implementation, including micro-scaffolding strategies, cognitive load balancing,

translanguaging moments, orchestrated multimodal input, and localized adaptation of CLIL lesson planning. The article presents innovative insights useful for both Uzbek educators and the broader CLIL research community.

**Literature Review**

Research on CLIL generally revolves around four major pillars: content, communication, cognition, and culture (Coyle et al., 2010). Earlier studies emphasize CLIL's role in improving motivation (Dalton-Puffer, 2007), academic vocabulary development (Mehisto, 2012), and subject comprehension through language immersion (Marsh, 2002).

However, several underexplored dimensions exist:

➢ Micro-scaffolding in CLIL classrooms:

Mehisto (2008) discusses scaffolding broadly but does not detail micro-level teacher moves such as real-time paraphrasing, multimodal input switching, and interactional recasts during complex content tasks.

➢ Cognitive load in CLIL environments:

Sweller's Cognitive Load Theory (1994) highlights challenges of dual processing, but few studies analyze how CLIL teachers manage intrinsic and extraneous loads, particularly in multilingual contexts.

➢ Translanguaging as a CLIL tool:

García (2009) notes translanguaging as a strategy for bilingual learning, but its integration with CLIL lesson sequencing in Central Asian classrooms remains unexplored.

➢ Localized curriculum adaptation:

Most CLIL manuals are European (e.g., Eurydice Report, 2006) and do not address contexts where English proficiency is not yet uniformly established among teachers and learners.

➢ Multimodal orchestration:

Kress (2010) proposes that meaning-making in modern classrooms relies on visual, verbal, and kinaesthetic modes simultaneously, but few CLIL studies observe how teachers intentionally shift among these modes to support both content and language.

The present research aims to address these gaps through an analysis of CLIL implementation in Uzbekistan and by proposing a model of micro-scaffolding and multimodal adaptation suitable for developing educational environments.

**Methodology**

Research Design:

This study uses a qualitative descriptive design supported by classroom observations, teacher interviews, and document analysis from three general education schools in

Samarkand region (Grades 5–8). While small-scale, the data offer insights into real teaching practices often missing from CLIL literature.

Participants

12 subject teachers (biology, geography, mathematics, ICT)

6 English teachers collaborating in CLIL projects

180 students aged 10–14 involved in CLIL-integrated lessons

Data Collection Tools

1. Semi-structured interviews with teachers about CLIL challenges and strategies.

2. Classroom observations focusing on teacher scaffolding, multimodal input, and translanguaging occurrences.

3. Analysis of lesson plans designed with CLIL 4Cs model.

Data Analysis

Thematic analysis was applied following Braun & Clarke (2006). Data were coded into five categories:

- micro-scaffolding moves
- multimodal input strategies
- translanguaging patterns
- teacher–student interaction
- curriculum adaptation mechanisms

**Results**

1. Micro-Scaffolding is the Core of Effective CLIL

Findings showed that teachers unconsciously used micro-scaffolding such as:

paraphrasing complex terms into simpler English

switching to diagrams or gestures immediately when students appeared confused

offering sentence starters during content discussions

chunking instructions into micro-steps

These strategies significantly reduced students' cognitive overload.

2. Multimodal Input Orchestration

Teachers employed multimodal materials such as:

labelled diagrams

short bilingual glossaries

dual-language anchor charts

hands-on models (especially in biology and geography)

Multimodal rotation (visual → verbal → kinaesthetic) increased comprehension, especially among weaker language learners.

3. Translanguaging Moments Support Content Mastery

Teachers allowed strategic switching between English and Uzbek/Russian:

for clarifying key concepts

for group discussions

for checking understanding before assessment

This approach made content accessible while maintaining English exposure.

4. Curriculum Adaptation Challenges

Teachers faced the lack of:

CLIL textbooks

subject-language learning outcomes

assessment rubrics aligned with CLIL objectives

Thus, they adapted materials by:

simplifying texts

creating bilingual vocabulary lists

integrating Bloom's taxonomy into English-medium tasks

5. Teachers Need CLIL-Specific Training

Teachers noted that traditional professional development does not teach them how to balance content difficulty with language demands. They requested training in:

dual-focused lesson planning

scaffolding techniques

multimodal material creation

assessment of integrated learning outcomes

**Discussion**

This study highlights several rarely addressed aspects of CLIL implementation.

Micro-Scaffolding as a Missing Component in CLIL Theory

While CLIL literature frequently praises scaffolding, it lacks analysis of real-time teacher moves. Micro-scaffolding emerged as the strongest predictor of lesson success. This finding aligns with Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development theory but extends it into CLIL-specific contexts.

Cognitive Load Must Be Actively Managed

CLIL creates an increased cognitive burden due to simultaneous processing of content and language. Effective teachers balanced this load by sequencing tasks from low-language to high-language demands. Previous studies did not address this practice systematically.

Translanguaging as a Legitimate CLIL Strategy

Contrary to earlier English-only recommendations, translanguaging supports learning and reduces anxiety. This is especially important in Uzbekistan where English proficiency varies widely.

Localized CLIL Requires Context-Sensitive Models

Imported European CLIL lessons fail in Uzbek classrooms if not adapted. Therefore, this article proposes a localized model:

The Uzbek CLIL Micro-Implementation Model

- ✓ Input clustering (visual + bilingual + verbal)
- ✓ Micro-scaffolding cycles
- ✓ Translanguaging checkpoints
- ✓ Cognitive load sequencing
- ✓ Integrated assessment rubrics

This model may guide future teacher training and curriculum development.

**Conclusion**

The implementation of CLIL in pedagogical practice requires more than theoretical knowledge. This research reveals that micro-scaffolding, multimodal orchestration, and strategic translanguaging play central roles in successful CLIL lessons, especially in developing contexts like Uzbekistan. The insights gained offer practical and theoretical contributions, suggesting that CLIL should be reconceptualized not only as a macro-method but also as a micro-interactive pedagogy.

Future studies should expand to longitudinal research and experimental designs to measure learning outcomes more systematically.

## References

1. Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101.

2. https://www.tiladabiyot.uz/media/Til_va_adabiyot.uz_13-son_3.pdf

3. Dalton-Puffer, C. (2007). Discourse in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) Classrooms. John Benjamins.

4. Eurydice. (2006). Content and Language Integrated Learning at School in Europe. Brussels: Eurydice European Unit.

5. https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/content-and-language-integrated-learning-clil

6. Kress, G. (2010). Multimodality: A Social Semiotic Approach to Contemporary Communication. Routledge.

7. Marsh, D. (2002). CLIL/EMILE – The European Dimension: Actions, Trends and Foresight Potential. European Commission.

8. https://www.redalyc.org/journal/3057/305764767004/html/

9. Mehisto, P. (2012). Excellence in Bilingual Education: A Guide for School Principals. Cambridge University Press.

10. Sweller, J. (1994). Cognitive Load Theory. Learning and Instruction, 4(4), 295–312.

11. Vygotsky, L. (1978). Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes. Harvard University Press.

12. Cinganotto, L. (2016). CLIL in the Italian Education System. Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning, 9(2), 374–400.

13. Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning. Cambridge University Press.

14. García, O. (2009). Bilingual Education in the 21st Century. Wiley-Blackwell.

15. Mehisto, P. (2008). CLIL Counterweights: Recognising and Decreasing Disjuncture in CLIL. International CLIL Research Journal.