

**Sobol Yuliya,***Zaporizhzhya National Technical University*

## CONTENT AND LANGUAGE INTEGRATED LEARNING

*У статті досліджуються можливості вивчення іноземної мови студентами технічних спеціальностей за умов використання іноземної мови в професійних цілях, а також як мови викладання фахових дисциплін.*

**Ключові слова:** зміст і мова комплексного навчання (CLIL), ESL моделі.

*Language acquisition potentialities due to implementation of a foreign language for professional purposes and as a teaching language in technical classrooms is being investigated in the article.*

**Keywords:** content and language integrated learning (CLIL), ESL models.

The value of multilingual skills in a modern world which is gradually turning into an indivisible global village is hard to overestimate. As mobility, both virtual and physical, has increased, communication channels from face-to-face to e-mail have become increasingly important. Much communication requires the ability to use language in both oral and written form effectively. Specialists can survive and become competitive on the global labor market if they are not restricted by language barriers in their worldwide search of employment. The demand for the technical Universities graduates with a profound technical education and good command of English is outstripping supply. It encouraged language and non-language professors of our University to implement across the curriculum model of content and language integrated learning (CLIL) in the technical university classrooms, that is teaching all the mainstream subjects in English [2; 3]. The integration of language and subject-matter instruction is no longer a new trend in ESP methodology. A collaboration of the subject specialist with the language tutor while teaching self-contained courses is supposed to be “ideal” for students’ progress [5]. This model of language acquisition became a break through traditional language lessons which seldom bring to high level of language proficiency. One of the undisputable advantages of such educational model is that substantial contact time with a target language is provided. Another, much more important advantage of subject-language integration is the need to use language for meaningfully educational and professional activities, and in such conditions language knowledge is effectively being turned into language skills. CLIL education was being practiced at our University for more than ten years and proved to be promising and attractive teaching technology.

During all these years the number of students willing to plunge into education conducted in English exceeded opportunities provided by the

University faculties in integrated education. English as a teaching language was chosen on the grounds that, on the one hand, it is believed to be a dominant "lingua franca" language, and on the other hand, the required number of non-language teachers who would enable students to acquire Bachelor's Degree appeared to be available only in English and only for such majors as "Electrical Engineering", "Material Sciences" and "Metallurgy". A number of restraining factors such as teacher availability and assessment, interconnection between language and subject-matter classes, learning materials provision, curriculum adjustment, exit assessment criteria, certification, etc. prevent rapid spread of CLIL educational model in University classrooms.

The requirement which all non-language professors had to meet was a good command of common and scientific (subject-specific) English. The experience of teaching subjects in English abroad and for non-residents of Ukraine was also taken into account while selecting non-language native professors. For two years they had been attending daily classes and upon the graduation of these language courses all attendees had to pass a final examination. Those attendees who demonstrated outstanding progress and good results at the final exam were granted a certificate of language acquisition. The other requirement obligatory for all non-language CLIL teachers was getting an approval by University language and non-language teachers of their lecture and seminar conducted in public. Upon completion of these requirements non-language teachers were officially permitted to teach in CLIL classes.

University authorities became very supportive in implementing CLIL, though the proposed form of education was a complete break away from the highly centralized, tightly controlled monolingual education universally accepted in the country. The curriculum hours allocated for CLIL classes are doubled when non-language teachers loading is calculated. University administration gives priority to publication of CLIL manuals, textbooks, teaching aids materials, subject-specific vocabularies with comments on the "false friends" terms, etc. over the rest of teaching materials in the University printing and publishing center. Thus during a decade a significant amount of teaching materials has been accumulated. The authors are given an incentive to develop new disciplines in English and create new teaching materials by raising their monthly salaries. To ensure high language level of the CLIL textbooks non-language authors collaborate closely with University language teachers and native non-language invited professors.

The language lessons for technical students involved in CLIL project are increased to 8 hours per week (compare to 3 hours per week in a conventional group of technical students). These lessons are vital for accuracy of language knowledge and language understanding, more so, for even though at CLIL classes no other language but English is found, English is used 'as a tool' and not 'as a subject-matter'. The aim of English teacher is to help students

in mastering pronunciation, reinforcing vocabulary, gaining grammar proficiency. Such language-centered approach at English lessons combined with practicing language skills at non-language lessons is a part and parcel of CLIL educational model.

In this connection it is useful to differentiate learners' competence, i. e. what they are able to do, and learners' performance, i. e. what they actually do. The interaction of competence and performance results in language proficiency. Language competence isn't built exclusively of vocabulary and grammar, but of knowledge of discourse, or how language is organized to present necessary information in a certain communicative situation. Students should learn to identify communicative situation and coordinate given in it information within the limits of the full speech environment, context of the situation. Thus, communicative competence incorporates grammatical competence and ability to cover discourse. We can hardly expect students to pass all the way from language knowledge to language skills, from language competence to language proficiency without assistance of English teacher [6].

The way people use language is different from the way people learn it. CLIL draws students into a truly communicative setting, where their language competence adapts itself to informational needs of a certain situation, linguistically and extra-linguistically. Each learner participates and interacts to the fullest in the target language and gains communicative proficiency. The statement "Tell me, and I forget. Show me, and I understand. Involve me, and I remember" holds true. And, of course, there is no better way to accurately understand and master subject-specific language and core terminology than by means of CLIL model. The researchers insist that when it concerns language proficiency it is useful to differentiate basic interpersonal conversational skills (BICS) necessary for face-to-face conversation in social settings and cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP) [4]. And they prove that it takes much longer for students to read and comprehend content area textbooks and perform cognitively demanding tasks, such as writing research papers, participating in debates, and presenting research papers than to communicate in cognitively undemanding contexts [1].

As long as the students of CLIL groups are selected as best among other willing students they compose an elite part of student body. They all are given a full guarantee contract of employment upon graduation on the industrial enterprises of our city when they are on their first year of studies. The case in itself is quite unprecedented for today.

The experience of ten years application of CLIL models in Zaporizhzhya National Technical University gives grounds to assert that these education models are exciting, highly efficient programs of language training which may be implemented here in Ukraine. Students are provided with opportunity to acquire high standard education not leaving the country and spending huge

sums of money. There are sound reasons to view CLIL as an alternative to expensive immersion models of language training abroad.

### References:

1. BROWN, C. L. Content Based ESL Curriculum and Academic Language Proficiency – [http://web. utk. edu/~tpte/scf\\_esl\\_f\\_cb. html](http://web. utk. edu/~tpte/scf_esl_f_cb. html) – The Internet TESL Journal, Vol. X, No. 2, February 2004 – <http://iteslj. org/>
2. CRAEN P. V. de. Content and Language Integrated Learning, Culture and Education and Learning Theories. – 2001 – 10p.
3. CRANDALL, Jo Ann. Content-Centered Language Learning. ERIC Digest. Clearing house on Languages and Linguistics Washington DC. –1994. –Identifier: ED367142
4. CUMMINS, J. Psychological assessment of immigrant children: Logic or institution? Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 1(2), –1980–97-111.
5. DAVIS J. R. Interdisciplinary Courses and Team Teaching: New Arguments for Learning. – Arizona: Oryx Press. –1997– 288 p. – [http://www. mlf. com/html/lib/ictt\\_xrpt. htm](http://www. mlf. com/html/lib/ictt_xrpt. htm)
6. MOHAMED ISMAIL AHAMAD SHAH. Language Learning Content – Based English as a Second Language (ESL) Malaysian Classrooms. In: Journal of Language and Learning, vol. 1, # 2, –2003. – ISSN 1740 – 4983.