UDK: 37.016:81

ORCID 0009-0001-2489-4921

COMPARATIVE STUDY OF CLIL IMPLEMENTATION ACROSS DIFFERENT SCHOOLS

M.D.Boynazarova,
student, Urgench state pedagogical institute
muhlisa_06@icloud.com

Abstract. *This article compares the implementation of the Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) approach across different schools. The study examines similarities and differences in teaching practices, the organization of CLIL-based instruction, and its impact on students' language proficiency and subject knowledge. Particular attention is paid to the factors that contribute to successful implementation as well as the challenges schools face during the process. The findings suggest that the effectiveness of CLIL is largely influenced by the educational context, teachers' professional competence, and the availability of appropriate learning resources.*

Key words. *CLIL, Content and Language Integrated Learning, integrated education, foreign language teaching, subject-language integration, school education, comparative study, learner competence.*

Аннотация. *В данной статье проводится сравнительное исследование внедрения и практического применения подхода CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) в различных школах. Анализируются сходства и различия в организации учебного процесса, особенности использования методики CLIL, а также её влияние на развитие предметных и языковых компетенций учащихся. Особое внимание уделяется факторам, способствующим успешной реализации данного подхода, и трудностям, возникающим в процессе его внедрения. Результаты исследования показывают, что эффективность CLIL зависит от образовательной среды школы, профессиональной подготовки учителей и доступности учебных ресурсов.*

Ключевые слова: *CLIL, интегрированное обучение, иностранный язык, предметно-языковая интеграция, школьное образование, сравнительный анализ, учебные компетенции.*

Annotatsiya. *Mazkur maqolada turli maktablarda CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) yondashuvining joriy etilishi va amaliy qo'llanilishi qiyosiy tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqotda CLIL metodikasidan foydalanayotgan maktablar o'rtasidagi o'xshash va farqli jihatlar, o'qitish jarayonini tashkil etish usullari hamda ushbu yondashuvning o'quvchilarning fan va til kompetensiyalariga ta'siri o'rganiladi.*

Shuningdek, CLILni amalga oshirish jarayonida uchraydigan muammolar va ularni bartaraf etish imkoniyatlari tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqot natijalari CLIL yondashuvining samaradorligi ko‘p jihatdan maktab sharoiti, o‘qituvchilarning tayyorgarligi va mavjud ta’lim resurslariga bog‘liqligini ko‘rsatadi.

Kalit so‘zlar: *CLIL, integrallashgan ta’lim, chet tili ta’limi, fan va til integratsiyasi, maktab ta’limi, qiyosiy tahlil, o‘quv kompetensiyasi.*

Introduction. The growing influence of globalization and the increasing demand for multilingual education have encouraged educators to seek more effective approaches to language teaching. One of the most widely discussed innovations in this field is Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), an educational approach that combines subject learning with foreign language instruction [1]. By integrating content and language objectives, CLIL enables learners to develop both academic knowledge and language proficiency simultaneously.

Despite its growing popularity, the implementation of CLIL varies significantly across schools due to differences in educational environments, teacher qualifications, curriculum design, and available resources. Therefore, examining how CLIL is applied in different school contexts is essential for understanding its strengths and limitations. This article aims to compare CLIL implementation across different schools, identify key factors influencing its effectiveness, and highlight best practices that can support successful integration of content and language learning [2].

Literature Review. Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) has attracted considerable attention from researchers and educators since its introduction in Europe during the 1990s. The approach is based on the integration of subject content and language learning, allowing students to acquire knowledge and language skills simultaneously. According to Coyle, Hood, and Marsh (2010), CLIL creates a learning environment where language serves as a tool for understanding subject matter rather than being taught as an isolated discipline [3].

Previous studies have emphasized the positive effects of CLIL on language acquisition. Dalton-Puffer (2011) argues that students participating in CLIL programs often demonstrate higher levels of communicative competence and greater confidence in using a foreign language compared to learners in traditional language classrooms [4]. Similarly, Lasagabaster (2011) found that CLIL learners generally achieve better results in language proficiency while maintaining satisfactory performance in subject content [5].

Researchers have also highlighted the cognitive benefits of CLIL. According to Mehisto, Marsh, and Frigols (2008), the integration of language and content encourages critical thinking, problem-solving, and active learner participation [6]. In addition, Pérez-Cañado (2012) notes that CLIL promotes learner motivation by

providing meaningful contexts in which language is used for authentic communication and academic purposes [7].

Despite these advantages, several challenges related to CLIL implementation have been identified. De Graaff et al. (2007) emphasize that successful CLIL instruction requires teachers to possess both subject expertise and sufficient language competence [8]. Furthermore, Banegas (2012) points out that a lack of appropriate teaching materials and professional training may limit the effectiveness of CLIL programs in some educational contexts [9].

Research methodology. This study employs a qualitative comparative research design to examine the implementation of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) across different schools [10]. The purpose of the study is to identify similarities and differences in CLIL practices, teaching strategies, and learning outcomes in various educational settings.

Data were collected from secondary sources, including scholarly articles, books, research reports, and case studies related to CLIL implementation. The selected sources provide information on schools that have adopted CLIL in different contexts and educational environments. Particular attention was paid to factors such as teacher qualifications, instructional methods, learning materials, and student performance.

The collected data were analyzed using comparative analysis. Schools were compared according to several criteria, including the extent of CLIL integration, classroom practices, teacher preparedness, availability of educational resources, and challenges encountered during implementation. This approach made it possible to identify common patterns as well as context-specific differences [11].

To ensure the reliability of the findings, information was gathered from peer-reviewed publications and recognized studies in the field of CLIL education. The results of the analysis were then organized into thematic categories to facilitate interpretation and discussion.

The methodology adopted in this study provides a comprehensive understanding of how CLIL is implemented across different schools and highlights the factors that contribute to its successful application.

Analysis and Results. The comparative analysis revealed that the implementation of CLIL differs significantly across schools due to variations in educational contexts, teacher qualifications, and available resources. Schools with well-trained teachers and adequate instructional materials demonstrated more effective integration of content and language objectives. In these schools, students showed higher levels of engagement and were able to develop both subject knowledge and language proficiency simultaneously.

The findings also indicated that CLIL classrooms encouraged active learning through discussions, collaborative tasks, and problem-solving activities. Students in

CLIL programs appeared more confident in using the target language for academic purposes than those in traditional language-learning settings. These findings support previous research suggesting that CLIL contributes positively to language development and academic achievement (Lasagabaster, 2011).

However, several challenges were identified. Some schools experienced difficulties due to insufficient teacher training, limited teaching resources, and varying levels of student language proficiency. In certain cases, teachers reported challenges in balancing content objectives with language-learning goals. These findings are consistent with the observations of De Graaff et al. (2007), who emphasized the importance of teacher competence and methodological support for successful CLIL implementation.

Overall, the results suggest that while CLIL offers considerable educational benefits, its effectiveness largely depends on institutional support, teacher preparedness, and the availability of appropriate learning materials.

Conclusion. This study compared the implementation of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) across different schools and examined the factors influencing its effectiveness. The findings demonstrate that CLIL can successfully support both language acquisition and subject learning when implemented under appropriate educational conditions.

The study revealed that schools with qualified teachers, sufficient instructional resources, and strong institutional support achieved better outcomes in CLIL programs. At the same time, challenges such as inadequate teacher training and limited learning materials may reduce the effectiveness of the approach. Despite these obstacles, the overall results confirm that CLIL remains a valuable educational strategy for promoting multilingual competence and academic achievement.

Therefore, educational institutions should invest in teacher professional development, provide access to quality CLIL materials, and create supportive learning environments to maximize the benefits of CLIL implementation. Future research may focus on larger samples of schools and explore the long-term impact of CLIL on students' academic and linguistic development.

REFERENCES

1. Content and Language Integrated Learning
   Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
2. Uncovering CLIL
   Mehisto, P., Marsh, D., & Frigols, M. J. (2008). *Uncovering CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning in Bilingual and Multilingual Education*. Oxford: Macmillan Education.

3. Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). "Content-and-Language Integrated Learning: From Practice to Principles?" *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 182–204.
5. Lasagabaster, D. (2011). "English Achievement and Student Motivation in CLIL and EFL Settings." *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 5(1), 3–18.
6. Mehisto, P., Marsh, D., & Frigols, M. J. (2008). *Uncovering CLIL*. Macmillan Education.
7. Pérez-Cañado, M. L. (2012). "CLIL Research in Europe: Past, Present, and Future." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(3), 315–341.
8. De Graaff, R., Koopman, G., Anikina, Y., & Westhoff, G. (2007). "An Observation Tool for Effective L2 Pedagogy in CLIL." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(5), 603–624.
9. Banegas, D. L. (2012). "CLIL Teacher Development: Challenges and Experiences." *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, 5(1), 46–56.
10. Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
11. Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research Methods in Education* (8th ed.). Routledge.
12. Lasagabaster, D. (2011). "English Achievement and Student Motivation in CLIL and EFL Settings."
13. De Graaff, R., Koopman, G., Anikina, Y., & Westhoff, G. (2007). "An Observation Tool for Effective L2 Pedagogy in CLIL."