ISSN: 2181-1385
Scientific Journal Impact Factor (SJIF) 2021: 5.723
DOI: 10.24412/2181-1385-2021-6-405-408

UZBEK TEACHERS' ATTITUDE TOWARDS IMPLEMENTATION OF CLIL METHODOLOGY IN PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Dilafruz Abdusobir qizi Riskhulova
Uzbekistan State World Languages University

ABSTRACT

In January of this year we organized a seminar for English teachers of primary and secondary schools, where we were planning to inform them about CLIL methodology what is earning a great popularity in European countries. While we were describing the CLIL approach and presenting its principles, some teachers expressed their opinion about the possibility of using this methodology with incredulity. It pushed us to conduct this small scale research aimed to identify the teacher`s attitude to the use of CLIL in Uzbek schools. The qualitative research was held among eight school teachers with a purpose to learn what are the teacher`s views about this method of teaching English and whether they believe in the realization of the approach in Uzbek schools context.

Keywords: CLIL, language, content, subject matter, teachers, Uzbek schools, attitude, curriculum.

INTRODUCTION

If the previous language teaching/learning methods were considered within the language classroom, now, it touches the subject/content area as well. Being launched in the mid-nineties in Europe, CLIL methodology starts gaining a wide popularity globally. CLIL students are given the opportunity to learn the curriculum content by the use of target language. The main reason for the appearance of current approach is a necessity in resources for the labor market in an internationalized society (Hillyard, 2011).

Uzbekistan is one of the countries where English learned as an additional language, which is practice is merely possible outside of the classroom. Therefore, in Uzbek context it has a significant importance to cater the use of language within the classroom. I am highly interested in implementation of CLIL methodology in our country not just as an optional technique to use, but more earnestly in its adaptation to the curriculum: involving both language and subject teachers. For this reason, I have decided to conduct this research to identify the teacher`s attitude towards adaptation of CLIL methodology in Uzbekistan.

ISSN: 2181-1385
Scientific Journal Impact Factor (SJIF) 2021: 5.723
DOI: 10.24412/2181-1385-2021-6-405-408

This small scale study tries to answer the following questions:

How well are the school teachers aware of the CLIL approach?

What are the teacher`s attitude towards incorporation of CLIL methodology as a part of curriculum?

Research background

CLIL can be adopted within the classroom by many different approaches. It has several models depending on a range of contextual factors (Do Coyle, 2005). Generally, those models might be considered either as a methodology used within the English classroom or as a totally new approach requiring the collaboration of both language and subject teacher, where children enter the classroom not only with the purpose of learning English but aiming to the subject matter. Many educators and researchers, referring to the effectiveness of CLIL, claim that universities and teacher training institutions must certify the teachers qualified to teach not EFL but content based subjects in English (Lasagabaster and Beloqui, 2014; Pistorio, 2007;).

Hyllyard (2011, p.4), who has worked as a teacher trainer in implementation of CLIL methodology across the Europe, always starts his courses with conducting the questionnaire oriented to discovering the teachers` feelings and expectations from the course. Here are real responds done by teachers of different groups:

“I don`t want to do this. I want to teach *my* subject in *my* language!”

“I`m an English-language teacher, not a science teacher.”

“The parents aren`t going to like this.”

“I`m supposed to teach music in English in September. But *how*?”

However, at the end of the course most of those who were skeptical about the effectiveness of the methodology showed the positive inclinations towards its incorporation into their classrooms.

Another research conducted among European language teachers has positive reflections about the CLIL; but, most teachers admitted the matter of linguistic competence and the ability of supporting language learning in content and balancing the use of native and target languages (Vilkancienė & Rozgienė, 2017).

Most of the teachers felt self-distrust about teaching CLIL at first; however, the researches show that in countries that implemented this methodology within their curriculum both teachers and learners have favorable attitudes towards language learning (e.g. Dörnyei, Csizér and Németh, 2013; Dörnyei and Skehan, 2003; Dörnyei, Csizér and Németh, 2006).

ISSN: 2181-1385
Scientific Journal Impact Factor (SJIF) 2021: 5.723
DOI: 10.24412/2181-1385-2021-6-405-408

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The study was qualitative aimed to identify the teacher`s opinion and their attitude towards the use of CLIL approach in Uzbek schools. The flexibility and deepness of a qualitative research is essential, as the data is going to be collected among the teachers who have different experience, background, and education.

The data collected is a questionnaire among English teachers of the primary and secondary schools. It was an open question questionnaire with three items in it. The teachers were asked to answer the following questions:

1. What is the difference between ESP and CLIL? (Teachers were provided some information about CLIL methodology, because they all admitted that they are not aware about such an approach).

2. Do you think that adapting CLIL into school curriculum will have a positive effect on students` language learning?

3. Do you think that you can teach CLIL?

Eight teachers volunteered to take part in the study; and questionnaire was taken from the teachers, the results of which will be discussed in the next part of the paper.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the questionnaire show that most teachers are not optimistic about the effectiveness of current methodology. They claim that it might be adapted only in the higher education where students already have some knowledge of English and have the eagerness to learn the foreign language (since they realize its necessity in labor market).

On the other hand, to the last question most of them answered positively, having responded that if special teacher training courses organized, teachers even feel enthusiastic about teaching CLIL.

Despite the teachers reject towards the use of the approach in the school classrooms, some of them showed inclination to use it if appropriate teacher training is conducted.

So, according to the results of the questionnaire school teachers do not agree with the incorporation of CLIL methodology in schools, for they believe that students in schools are not strongly motivated to learn the foreign language. On the contrary they assume that CLIL can successfully be implemented in the higher education.

ISSN: 2181-1385
Scientific Journal Impact Factor (SJIF) 2021: 5.723
DOI: 10.24412/2181-1385-2021-6-405-408

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this small scale research was to define the Uzbek school teachers` attitude towards implementation of CLIL methodology within school classroom. It describes the tools and methods used for the study. Also, it discusses the results of questionnaire conducted among school teachers that discourage this method`s adaptation as a part of curriculum in Uzbek schools. However, the study requires further development for it involves small number of participants and cannot be generalized.

REFERENCES

1. Hillyard, S., 2011. First steps in CLIL: Training the teachers. *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning*, *4*(2), pp.1-12.
2. Coyle, D., 2005. CLIL: Planning tools for teachers. *Nottingham: University of Nottingham*.
3. Herrarte, D.L. and Beloqui, R.L., 2015. The impact of type of approach (CLIL versus EFL) and methodology (book-based versus project work) on motivation. *Porta Linguarum: revista internacional de didáctica de las lenguas extranjeras*, (23), pp.41-57.
4. Pistorio, M.I., 2009. Teacher training and competences for effective CLIL teaching in Argentina. *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning*, *2*(2).
5. Vilkancienė, L. and Rozgienė, I., 2017. CLIL teacher competences and attitudes. *Darnioji daugiakalbystė, 2017, nr. 11, p. 196-218*.