

UDC 378.12

IRSTI 14.35.09

<https://doi.org/10.48371/PHILS.2025.4.79.033>

LINGUISTIC AND PHILOLOGICAL DIMENSIONS OF CONTENT AND LANGUAGE INTEGRATED LEARNING IN MULTIDISCIPLINARY EDUCATION

*Kopbay A. K.¹, Abilmansur A.K.², Zhusubalina Zh.M.³, Toibekova B.A.⁴

^{*1,3} South Kazakhstan University named after M.Auezov, Shymkent, Kazakhstan

² South Kazakhstan Pedagogical University named after O.Zhanibekov
Shymkent, Kazakhstan

⁴ Shymkent University, Shymkent, Kazakhstan

Abstract. In the era of globalization and educational internationalization, Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) has emerged as both a pedagogical strategy and a philological paradigm. CLIL unites subject-specific learning with foreign language acquisition, thereby strengthening academic competence while fostering intercultural and linguistic development. From a philological standpoint, it represents an interdisciplinary framework where language, culture, and cognition interact within the educational process.

The purpose of this study is to examine the linguistic and philological foundations of CLIL, with a particular focus on its role in developing bilingual and multilingual competencies, promoting intercultural communication skills, and safeguarding linguistic diversity. Methodologically, the research employs theoretical analysis, comparative review of existing studies, and examination of case-based classroom practices in both science and humanities education.

The findings highlight that CLIL not only supports subject learning and language acquisition but also enhances critical thinking, academic literacy, and cross-cultural competence. Results further indicate that successful implementation requires systematic teacher training, methodological adaptation of resources, and integration of digital technologies alongside authentic and culturally relevant texts. Challenges such as teacher preparedness and curriculum alignment are also discussed, emphasizing the need for institutional support.

This research contributes to the understanding of CLIL as a comprehensive educational approach that bridges philology and pedagogy. Its scientific value lies in framing CLIL as an interdisciplinary model, while its practical significance is reflected in the development of effective teaching strategies for multilingual and multicultural contexts. The study concludes that CLIL should be recognized not merely as a teaching method but as a philological paradigm that connects language, culture, and education in response to the demands of global communication and lifelong learning.

Keywords: CLIL, bilingual education, content learning, academic English, science education, humanities instruction, intercultural competence, philology, pedagogy

Introduction

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is increasingly conceptualized not only as a pedagogical framework but also as a philological paradigm that unites subject knowledge with linguistic, cultural, and cognitive development. Unlike traditional foreign language instruction, which is primarily focused on the formal properties of language, CLIL situates language acquisition within authentic disciplinary discourses such as science, history, or literature. In this sense, language functions simultaneously as a medium of instruction, an object of philological analysis, and a cultural code, reflecting the intrinsic interrelation between linguistic competence and conceptual understanding.

From a philological standpoint, CLIL transcends the practical mastery of curricular content through another language; it embodies the dynamic interaction of language, culture, and cognition in the educational process. Scholars emphasize that CLIL contributes to the development of academic literacy, discourse competence, and intercultural communication, positioning it as an approach in which the study of language extends beyond vocabulary acquisition to become a tool for meaning-making, interpretation, and negotiation of cultural values.

Coyle's 4Cs framework provides a robust theoretical foundation for this philological interpretation:

Content — the acquisition of disciplinary knowledge and concepts contextualized within authentic texts and discourses;

Communication — the development of academic discourse, linguistic precision, and pragmatic fluency across genres and registers;

Cognition — the cultivation of higher-order thinking, text analysis, and critical interpretation;

Culture — the enhancement of intercultural awareness, recognition of symbolic meanings, and appreciation of linguistic diversity as essential dimensions of global citizenship [1].

Within this framework, CLIL not only promotes subject mastery but also fosters philological competencies such as text interpretation, critical discourse analysis, and sensitivity to cultural and linguistic variation. Evidence from case studies in the humanities demonstrates that CLIL strengthens academic literacy, reflective writing, and intercultural awareness, whereas applications in the sciences highlight the role of language in constructing disciplinary knowledge and facilitating inquiry-based learning.

Nevertheless, significant challenges persist. First, the preparedness of teachers to integrate philological analysis into CLIL practices remains limited, as many educators lack advanced training in discourse studies, stylistics, or intercultural communication. Second, the scarcity of authentic multilingual resources hinders the effective implementation of text-based and discourse-oriented methodologies. Third, assessment within CLIL continues to pose difficulties, particularly in balancing the evaluation of subject-specific knowledge with the measurement of linguistic and intercultural competences. These

challenges illustrate the complexity of adopting CLIL as a fully philological approach rather than a purely pedagogical technique [2].

Despite these obstacles, research consistently demonstrates that with adequate professional training, scaffolding strategies, and the development of innovative multilingual teaching materials, CLIL has the potential to evolve into a transformative educational philosophy. By integrating philological analysis, authentic discourse, and culturally relevant content, it prepares learners for meaningful participation in multilingual and multicultural societies [3].

CLIL should be regarded not merely as a method of teaching through an additional language but as a comprehensive philological paradigm. By embedding language, discourse, and culture at the core of the educational process, CLIL aligns with the demands of global communication, academic literacy, and lifelong learning, thereby contributing to the cultivation of critically literate, interculturally competent, and linguistically versatile individuals [4].

CLIL is also informed by broader pedagogical theories, including constructivism, communicative language teaching, and scaffolding theory. These frameworks collectively emphasize the dynamic interaction between content knowledge, linguistic competence, and cognitive development.

Case study technology is very important and effective teaching method which is oriented to analyze, to solve and to discuss real lively situations. And it is used in teaching process as one of the effective methods that facilitate to develop communicative competences of students. Case study develops students' analytical, critical thinking. Case study is considered to be an approach or a method which is oriented to in-depth analysis of real-life situations [5].

Extensive research has documented the application of CLIL in science education, where learners engage with empirical processes, theoretical concepts, and experimental data in English [6]. Studies demonstrate that students develop the ability to describe experiments, formulate hypotheses, and report findings with greater precision. In this context, CLIL enhances both disciplinary competence and the ability to participate in global STEM communities [7].

Equally significant is the application of CLIL in the humanities, where interpretive, discursive, and intercultural dimensions are foregrounded. Scholars such as Dalton-Puffer and Pérez-Cañado note that CLIL in humanities fosters critical reading, argumentative writing, and cross-cultural dialogue. Learners engage with authentic literary texts, historical documents, and media discourses, thereby developing advanced language functions such as hypothesizing, comparing, evaluating, and debating. This approach positions CLIL not merely as a method of content delivery but as a philological paradigm in which language, culture, and cognition are deeply intertwined [8].

Recent scholarship emphasizes the philological orientation of CLIL, where the study of language and literature becomes central to both disciplinary and linguistic growth. In linguistics, CLIL supports the acquisition of academic terminology and analytical frameworks for describing phonetics, syntax,

semantics, and discourse structures. In literary studies, it enables students to interpret texts, identify rhetorical strategies, and construct critical arguments in English. Cultural studies within CLIL highlight the mediation of values, ideologies, and worldviews, reinforcing intercultural awareness.

The philological direction situates CLIL as an approach that transcends vocabulary learning and fosters discourse competence, academic literacy, and intercultural communication. This aligns with the broader aims of philology: to interpret texts, understand cultural variation, and reflect critically on linguistic and literary traditions.

Despite its promise, CLIL faces well-documented challenges. Research highlights three major obstacles:

Student Proficiency – Limited linguistic competence in English can impede access to subject content, particularly in disciplines requiring abstract reasoning.

Teacher Preparedness – Insufficient training often results in uneven implementation, as subject specialists may lack linguistic expertise and language teachers may lack content knowledge.

Assessment Complexity – Evaluating both disciplinary knowledge and language skills simultaneously remains problematic, with scholars calling for integrated rubrics and more nuanced assessment models.

Other limitations include the scarcity of specialized CLIL resources, especially for philological disciplines, and the cognitive overload that learners may experience when processing demanding content in a second language.

Current research points to the growing role of digital technologies in overcoming CLIL challenges. Online corpora, multimodal platforms, and AI-assisted tools offer scaffolding, access to authentic materials, and opportunities for collaborative learning. The integration of virtual archives, literary databases, and discourse analysis software has particular promise for philological CLIL, enabling students to engage with complex texts in innovative ways.

Future studies are needed to evaluate the long-term impact of CLIL, to develop context-specific adaptations, and to identify best practices in assessment. Scholars increasingly argue for systematic curricular integration, ensuring that CLIL is embedded not as an experimental approach but as a sustainable component of national and institutional education systems.

The literature affirms that CLIL is not merely a pedagogical technique but a holistic educational philosophy. Its philological orientation highlights the centrality of language, discourse, and culture in the learning process, positioning CLIL as a powerful tool for cultivating dual competence: disciplinary expertise and linguistic proficiency. By fostering critical thinking, intercultural awareness, and global academic literacy, CLIL prepares students for active participation in multilingual and multicultural academic and professional environments.

Methods and materials

This study employed a qualitative research design with a distinct

philological orientation, focusing on a comprehensive review and critical analysis of scholarly literature on Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). The corpus of materials consisted of peer-reviewed journal articles, monographs, and conference proceedings published between 2020 and 2024, with particular attention to seminal contributions by leading scholars such as Coyle, Marsh, Dalton-Puffer, and Pérez-Cañado.

The methodological framework was structured around the following stages:

Literature Review and Theoretical Grounding – identification and systematization of pedagogical and philological theories underpinning CLIL, including constructivism, communicative and discourse-oriented approaches, scaffolding, and intercultural communication theories.

Comparative Analysis – examination of CLIL applications across disciplines, with a specific focus on science (biology, chemistry, physics) and the humanities (history, literature, geography, social studies). The analysis emphasized how disciplinary discourse shapes language use and how linguistic practices mediate conceptual understanding.

Categorization of Benefits and Challenges – synthesis of reported outcomes into four dimensions: pedagogical, linguistic, cognitive, and intercultural. In addition, particular attention was given to philological competencies such as discourse analysis, academic literacy, and intercultural semiotics.

Integration of Best Practices – analysis of methodological approaches, task design, and assessment strategies presented in empirical studies, highlighting practices that promote critical reading, text interpretation, and academic writing within CLIL contexts.

The study did not involve the collection of primary classroom data but relied on secondary analysis of existing research. This methodological choice ensured a theoretically grounded and broad overview of CLIL's pedagogical and philological potential, enabling a systematic account of its benefits and challenges across disciplines.

Results and discussion

Theoretical Underpinnings of CLIL

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) represents one of the most significant innovations in contemporary pedagogy, yet its relevance extends beyond methodological efficiency into the domain of philology. It is firmly rooted in a set of interrelated pedagogical theories—most notably constructivism, the communicative approach, and sociocultural theory—that together establish its epistemological foundation.

From a constructivist perspective, knowledge is not transmitted but actively constructed by the learner through interaction with tasks, contexts, and discourse. CLIL operationalizes this principle by requiring students to engage with subject knowledge through a foreign language, thereby transforming language into both a cognitive and communicative instrument. This dual function positions CLIL as a

framework in which linguistic acquisition and conceptual development mutually reinforce one another.

For the last years case technology is becoming popular in language teaching classrooms together with fields as medicine, business, economics and politics. It is not a new thing in language learning, but it is commonly used today. The reasons of it we indicated in the research article, and tried to give its essence, practical importance, and role in language learning. It possesses several objectives in teaching as developing speaking skills, teaching to make right decisions, deeply understanding the cases and realizing their solutions, and improves language proficiency, understanding cultural context.

Equally central is the communicative orientation of CLIL, which foregrounds the view of language as a medium of meaning-making and discourse construction. Rather than treating language as an abstract system of grammar and vocabulary, CLIL embeds linguistic development within authentic disciplinary discourses such as science, history, and literature. This discourse-centered perspective situates CLIL within philology, where language is analyzed not only for its formal features but also for its functional, cultural, and epistemic roles.

Finally, Vygotsky's sociocultural theory underpins CLIL through the principle of scaffolding, whereby teachers provide structured support that mediates both cognitive and linguistic demands. In practice, scaffolding may include visual representations, guided questions, sentence starters, or staged activities. These interventions facilitate learners' engagement with complex subject matter while reducing linguistic barriers. Crucially, scaffolding is gradually withdrawn, leading to autonomy in both subject mastery and linguistic performance.

Thus, CLIL integrates multiple traditions into a holistic framework where language, cognition, and culture intersect. This makes CLIL not merely a pedagogical method but a philological paradigm in which language becomes the medium of disciplinary thought and cultural interpretation.

Science Instruction through CLIL: A Philological Perspective.

The teaching of science within CLIL contexts illustrates the profound interplay between linguistic and disciplinary knowledge. Scientific discourse is distinguished by terminological precision, logical coherence, and reliance on symbolic representation. Unlike everyday communication, it demands exactness in both cognitive and linguistic dimensions. From a philological standpoint, this underscores the need to study how scientific meaning is encoded, negotiated, and transmitted through language.

A central challenge lies in balancing conceptual complexity with linguistic accessibility. Learners are required to grasp abstract processes such as chemical reactions or biological mechanisms while simultaneously acquiring the linguistic resources to describe, explain, and interpret them. Effective CLIL instruction, therefore, does not reduce complexity but makes it comprehensible through discourse strategies: scaffolding explanations, visualizing processes, and contextualizing terminology in authentic communicative tasks.

Another defining feature is the cultivation of disciplinary academic literacy. Students must learn to operate within the genres of science—lab reports, hypotheses, data analyses—which require both linguistic precision and adherence to disciplinary conventions. CLIL situates this literacy within a foreign language, thus extending learners' capacity to participate in global scientific dialogue. In philological terms, this process exemplifies how language functions as a gateway to epistemic communities and specialized knowledge domains [9].

Moreover, CLIL aligns with inquiry-based and problem-solving pedagogies that foster higher-order thinking. Students are encouraged to formulate hypotheses, conduct experiments, and present findings through English. This dual challenge requires them not only to construct scientific knowledge but also to mediate it linguistically, thereby reinforcing the interdependence of cognitive development and language acquisition.

Scientific terminology presents a particular difficulty in CLIL due to its high level of abstraction, density, and divergence from everyday vocabulary. Without systematic pedagogical intervention, students may experience a disconnect between conceptual understanding and linguistic expression, resulting in superficial learning.

To address this, CLIL pedagogy integrates terminology development with disciplinary study through several strategies:

Anticipatory scaffolding — pre-teaching of terms using visualizations, glossaries, and interactive exercises;

Experiential learning — engaging students in experiments and requiring descriptions in English, which promotes the active use of specialized vocabulary;

Textual scaffolding — deconstructing authentic scientific texts to highlight key terms, guide comprehension, and gradually expose learners to increasing linguistic complexity;

Productive language use — requiring learners to deploy terminology in reports, oral presentations, and peer teaching, ensuring retention and transfer of knowledge.

In philological terms, this demonstrates that terminology learning is not a matter of memorization but a cognitive-linguistic process of contextualization and discourse appropriation. Students gradually internalize scientific lexis, enabling them to participate in disciplinary communication at both local and global levels.

The implementation of CLIL in science requires pedagogical approaches that are simultaneously content-driven and language-sensitive. Traditional teacher-centered methods are insufficient, as CLIL demands student engagement in authentic discourse and higher-order reasoning. Research identifies three particularly effective approaches:

Inquiry-based learning — aligning with the epistemology of science, this method encourages learners to hypothesize, experiment, and analyze, all while articulating their reasoning in English.

Project-based learning — students investigate real-world issues such as

climate change or renewable energy, integrating interdisciplinary knowledge and producing extended discourse in English.

Collaborative learning — peer discussions and group projects create authentic communicative opportunities, fostering intercultural dialogue and discourse competence within scientific contexts.

Together, these approaches exemplify the philological premise that language cannot be separated from the construction of disciplinary knowledge.

CLIL should be understood not only as a pedagogical strategy but as a philological paradigm that situates language at the center of scientific and humanistic inquiry. Through the integration of constructivist, communicative, and sociocultural principles, CLIL fosters the simultaneous development of disciplinary knowledge, linguistic competence, and intercultural awareness. In the domain of science, it equips learners to engage in global epistemic communities by enabling them to articulate, negotiate, and disseminate knowledge in English.

By emphasizing the role of discourse, terminology, and genre, CLIL transcends the boundaries of pedagogy and enters the realm of philology, where language is seen as both a tool of cognition and a carrier of cultural meaning. This reconceptualization strengthens its value as an educational philosophy for the 21st century, preparing learners not only for academic success but also for meaningful participation in multilingual and multicultural societies.

Table 1. Practical Part: Integration of Scientific Terminology and Concepts in philological direction

Philological Term / Concept	Definition (Content Focus)	Example in Context (Philology)	Language Focus (English Skill)	Activity / Task (CLIL Practice)
Metaphor	A figure of speech where one concept is described in terms of another to create meaning.	“Time is a thief that steals our moments.”	Literary vocabulary, interpretation skills	Identify metaphors in a poem and explain their meaning in English.
Discourse	Language in use within social and cultural contexts; connected texts beyond the sentence level.	“Political discourse often employs persuasive strategies.”	Academic reading, cohesion, pragmatics	Analyze a short text for discourse markers and present findings.
Linguistic Borrowing	The adoption of words or expressions from one language into another.	“Kazakh uses the word ‘телефон’ borrowed from Russian.”	Word formation, etymology, comparative analysis	Create a list of borrowed words in English/Kazakh and present their origins.
Intertextuality	The relationship between texts, where one text refers to or echoes another.	“Shakespeare’s Hamlet is referenced in modern novels and films.”	Academic writing, citation, allusion recognition	Write a short essay on intertextual references in a given text.
Register	A variety of language used in particular social or professional contexts.	“Legal register is formal and precise.”	Style awareness, vocabulary choice	Role-play different registers: casual conversation vs. academic debate.

Source: authors’ own development.

Table 2. Practical Part: Integration of Humanities Terminology and Concepts

Humanities Term / Concept	Definition (Content Focus)	Example in Context (Humanities)	Language Focus (English Skill)	Activity / Task (CLIL Practice)
Democracy	A system of government in which power is vested in the people.	“Ancient Athens is often described as the birthplace of democracy.”	Argumentation, comparative structures	Compare democracy in ancient Athens and modern states in a short essay.
Cultural Heritage	Traditions, monuments, and artifacts inherited from the past.	“The Great Wall of China is a part of world cultural heritage.”	Descriptive writing, passive voice, active voice	Describe one cultural heritage site in your country.
Renaissance	A period in European history marked by revival of art, science, and culture.	“Leonardo da Vinci was a key figure of the Renaissance.”	Past tense, historical narration	Prepare a short timeline of Renaissance achievements.
Ethics	Moral principles guiding human behavior.	“Medical ethics requires doctors to respect patient confidentiality.”	Modal verbs (must, have to, should)	Discuss ethical dilemmas in small groups using should/ must.
Identity	The sense of who a person or group is, based on culture, language, or history.	“Language plays a central role in shaping national identity.”	Abstract nouns, essay writing	Write a reflection: How does culture shape your identity?

Source: authors’ own development.

CLIL in the Philological Direction: Outcomes and Characteristics

1. Outcomes of CLIL in Philology

The integration of philological disciplines—linguistics, literature, cultural studies, and discourse analysis—within the framework of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) yields a range of multidimensional outcomes. At the foundational level, students acquire dual competence: disciplinary knowledge in philology and advanced academic proficiency in English. Learners expand their understanding of linguistic concepts such as phonetics, morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics, while simultaneously mastering the terminology required to describe and critically analyze these phenomena in English.

Equally significant is the enhancement of interpretive and analytical skills in literary and cultural studies. By engaging with authentic texts, including literary works, critical essays, and primary historical documents, learners develop the ability to identify rhetorical devices, narrative strategies, and intertextual references. This dual engagement strengthens both textual interpretation and the articulation of complex arguments in academic English.

Furthermore, CLIL-based philological instruction fosters higher-order cognitive skills. Students are encouraged to synthesize information, compare interpretive traditions, evaluate arguments, and formulate hypotheses, all of which must be expressed in a second language. This process reinforces conceptual depth while cultivating accuracy, clarity, and stylistic sophistication.

Finally, CLIL in philology advances intercultural awareness. Accessing

English-language scholarship and global literary traditions broadens learners' horizons, enabling them to situate local linguistic and cultural phenomena within an international context. This intercultural competence is crucial for developing empathy, tolerance, and global scholarly mobility.

2. Pedagogical Characteristics of CLIL in Humanities

Philological instruction through CLIL is distinguished by its reliance on interpretation, argumentation, and plural perspectives. Unlike the sciences, which emphasize empirical observation and precise description, philological disciplines demand engagement with symbolic meaning, ambiguity, and cultural values. The CLIL classroom thus functions not only as a site for knowledge transmission but also as a platform for the co-construction of meaning.

One of the defining characteristics is the use of authentic resources—linguistic corpora, literary texts, theoretical treatises, and media discourse. These materials expose students to academic reading practices, discourse analysis, and critical debates while simultaneously developing their linguistic skills. Through such resources, learners refine academic writing, paraphrasing, summarization, and argument construction in English.

Additionally, philological CLIL emphasizes advanced language functions such as hypothesizing, evaluating, contrasting, and justifying. These functions are embedded into activities including textual analysis, seminar debates, comparative essays, and project-based research. As a result, students develop both subject-matter expertise and the ability to operate effectively in academic English discourse.

3. Developing Critical and Intercultural Competence

A central pedagogical aim of CLIL in philology is the cultivation of critical thinking. Students are trained to interrogate texts not merely for their informational content but for their ideological, aesthetic, and cultural implications. By engaging with diverse theoretical frameworks—structuralism, postcolonial theory, discourse analysis—students acquire the capacity to synthesize competing perspectives and articulate nuanced arguments.

Another essential dimension is intercultural competence. Through exposure to English-language scholarship, learners encounter multiple cultural voices, interpretive traditions, and academic conventions. They become adept at recognizing how cultural backgrounds influence meaning, how global discourses shape literary and linguistic analysis, and how perspectives differ across societies. This capacity fosters intercultural dialogue, empathy, and tolerance, which are indispensable skills in global academia [10].

4. Curricular Integration and Sustainability

For CLIL in philology to move beyond an experimental or supplementary practice, it must be systematically embedded into university curricula. This requires the alignment of linguistic and disciplinary objectives, ensuring that both dimensions are addressed consistently across modules in linguistics, literature, and cultural studies.

Curricular integration also involves the articulation of clear learning outcomes, specifying expectations for subject knowledge, academic literacy, and intercultural competence. Embedding CLIL within national and international educational standards enhances its credibility and sustainability, making it a legitimate component of philological education [11].

Pedagogical strategies such as project-based learning, problem-solving tasks, and collaborative discussions can effectively merge content mastery with language development. Technology further enriches this process, providing access to digital archives, corpora, literary databases, and multimodal resources that expand students' interpretive and linguistic repertoires [12].

Taken together, these outcomes and pedagogical features demonstrate that CLIL in philology extends beyond language acquisition. It equips learners with dual competencies—disciplinary expertise in linguistic and cultural studies and advanced proficiency in academic English—while simultaneously cultivating critical thinking, intercultural awareness, and professional readiness. By embedding CLIL into the philological curriculum, universities can prepare students for meaningful participation in global academic discourse, thereby enhancing their competitiveness in both scholarly and professional contexts [13].

Conclusion

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) has emerged as a transformative pedagogical paradigm that unites subject learning with the acquisition of foreign languages, offering particular value for philological disciplines. Rooted in the 4Cs framework—Content, Communication, Cognition, and Culture—CLIL provides a comprehensive model that balances disciplinary knowledge with linguistic and intercultural competence. Its successful application across linguistics, literature, and cultural studies illustrates its versatility: in linguistic instruction, it enables students to analyze grammatical, phonological, and semantic structures in English; in literary studies, it fosters interpretation, critical argumentation, and intertextual analysis; and in cultural studies, it enhances intercultural awareness and the ability to mediate between perspectives. The findings confirm that CLIL not only enriches subject-specific outcomes but also develops the academic discourse skills necessary for participation in international scholarly communities. [14].

The dual benefits of CLIL underscore its relevance for 21st-century philological education. By engaging learners in authentic academic communication, it prepares them to navigate the complexities of a globalized and multilingual intellectual landscape. In linguistics, CLIL strengthens the ability to describe linguistic phenomena, conduct comparative analysis across languages, and present findings in English, thereby facilitating participation in international research contexts. In the humanities, it cultivates critical thinking, intercultural sensitivity, and ethical reflection, equipping learners with the analytical tools to interpret texts, discourses, and cultural realities. For policymakers and educators,

the implications are clear: integrating CLIL into philological curricula fosters a generation of students who are not only knowledgeable and skilled but also linguistically and culturally agile.

Despite its promise, CLIL implementation in philology faces significant challenges. Limited proficiency in English may hinder students' ability to comprehend theoretical concepts and engage in sophisticated analysis, while insufficient teacher training often leads to uneven methodological integration. Moreover, the scarcity of specialized resources adapted for philological subjects, coupled with the difficulty of assessing both disciplinary knowledge and language competence simultaneously, continues to pose obstacles. Addressing these challenges requires systemic institutional support, including sustained investment in teacher professional development, interdisciplinary collaboration between linguists, literature specialists, and language instructors, and the development of adaptable CLIL resources suited to philological contexts.

Future perspectives emphasize the integration of digital technologies that expand access to authentic academic materials and provide scaffolding for learners. Tools such as online corpora, multimodal learning platforms, virtual archives, and AI-driven language applications can support discourse analysis, comparative text study, and collaborative interpretation. At the same time, further empirical research is necessary to evaluate the long-term outcomes of CLIL in philology, identify context-sensitive adaptations, and establish best practices for assessment in disciplines where interpretation and argumentation predominate [15].

Ultimately, CLIL in philological education represents more than a methodological innovation: it constitutes a holistic educational philosophy. By bridging the gap between linguistic and literary content learning and foreign language acquisition, it nurtures learners who are not only academically competent but also linguistically proficient and globally engaged. In this sense, CLIL aligns with the broader mission of philological education: to cultivate individuals who can interpret texts critically, engage in intercultural dialogue, and contribute responsibly to the understanding of language and culture in an interconnected world.

Systematic integration of CLIL into philological curricula will strengthen both subject knowledge and linguistic proficiency. Establishing specialized CLIL training for philology educators, fostering collaboration between language specialists and subject experts, and investing in digital and multimodal resources will enhance accessibility and scalability. Finally, positioning CLIL as a strategic instrument for advancing global competitiveness, intercultural awareness, and scholarly mobility will consolidate its role in the internationalization of philological education.

Integrating CLIL systematically into national and institutional curricula will strengthen both subject knowledge and English proficiency. Establishing specialized CLIL training programs and fostering collaboration between subject teachers and language specialists will enhance the quality of teaching

and learning. Investment in context-appropriate CLIL materials and digital tools, such as AI, simulations, and online platforms, will ensure accessibility and scalability. Implementing innovative assessment systems that evaluate both disciplinary outcomes and language skills fairly will improve quality assurance. Finally, positioning CLIL as a strategic tool for enhancing global competitiveness, intercultural awareness, and student employability will support the internationalization of education.

REFERENCES

- [1] Banegas D. L. Teacher professional development in CLIL: Challenges and opportunities // *RELC Journal*. – 2021. – №52. – P.72–86. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220945418>
- [2] Bruner J. The culture of education // Harvard University Press. – 2016. – P.223-234.
- [3] Coyle D., Hood P., Marsh D. CLIL: Content and language integrated learning // Cambridge University Press. – 2015. – P.123-131.
- [4] Dalton-Puffer C. Content-and-language integrated learning: From practice to principles // *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*. – 2011. – № 31. – P.182–204. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S02671905110https://orcid.org/0009-2>.
- [5] Koitasova G.A., Orazbayeva A.S. Case study in foreign language teaching as an interactive method of forming communicative skills // *Bulletin of Ablai Khan KazUIRandWL, Philological sciences Series*. – 2025. – №. 73. – P.449-464. <https://doi.org/10.48371/PHILS.2025.1.76.030>
- [6] Dalton-Puffer C. A construct of cognitive discourse functions for conceptualising content–language integration in CLIL and multilingual education // *European Journal of Applied Linguistics*. – 2013. – №1. – P.1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1515/eujal-2013-0011>
- [7] Lasagabaster D., Sierra J. M. Immersion and CLIL in English: More differences than similarities // *ELT Journal*. – 2010. – №64. – P.367–375. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccp082>
- [8] Lasagabaster D. Language learning motivation and self-concept: A longitudinal study on CLIL learners // *Language Teaching Research*. – 2017. – №25. – P.1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168817692161>
- [9] Marsh D. CLIL/EMILE – The European dimension: Actions, trends and foresight potential // University of Jyväskylä. – 2002. – P.142-154.
- [10] Meyer O., Coyle D., Halbach A., Schuck K., Ting T. The pluriliteracies approach to content and language integrated learning – mapping learner progressions in knowledge construction and meaning-making // *Language, Culture and Curriculum*. – 2015. – №28. – P.41–57. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2014.1https://orcid.org/0009-24>
- [11] Morton T. Integrating content and language in multilingual classrooms: A discourse perspective // John Benjamins. – 2018. – P.36–45.
- [12] Pérez-Cañado M. L. CLIL research in Europe: Past, present, and future

// International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism. – 2012. – №15. – P.315–341. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2011.630064>

[13] Pérez-Cañado M. L. CLIL and critical thinking: Designing curricular integration // Language Teaching Research. – 2020. – №24. – P.1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818783233>

[14] Richards J. C., Rodgers T. S. Approaches and methods in language teaching. – Cambridge University Press, 2014. – P.145-149.

[15] Vygotsky L. S. Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. –Harvard University Press, 2008. – P.137-149.

ПӘНАРАЛЫҚ БІЛІМ БЕРУДЕГІ МАЗМҰН МЕН ТІЛДІ КІРІКТІРІП ОҚЫТУДЫҢ ЛИНГВИСТИКАЛЫҚ ЖӘНЕ ФИЛОЛОГИЯЛЫҚ ҚЫРЛАРЫ

*Көпбай А.К.¹, Әбілмансұр Ә.Қ.², Жусубалина Ж.М.³, Тойбекова Б.А.⁴

^{*1,3} М.Ауезов атындағы Оңтүстік Қазақстан университеті

Шымкент, Қазақстан

²Өзбекәлі Жәнібеков атындағы Оңтүстік Қазақстан Педагогикалық

Университеті, Шымкент, Қазақстан

⁴Шымкент Университеті, Шымкент, Қазақстан

Аңдатпа. Жаһандану мен білімнің интернационалдануы дәуірінде пән мен тілді кіріктіріп оқыту (Content and Language Integrated Learning, CLIL) тек педагогикалық стратегия ғана емес, сонымен қатар филологиялық парадигма ретінде қалыптасты. CLIL пәндік білімді шетел тілін меңгерумен ұштастырып, академиялық құзыреттілікті нығайтады және тілдік-мәдени дамуға ықпал етеді. Филологиялық тұрғыдан CLIL – тіл, мәдениет пен когницияның өзара байланысын бейнелейтін пәнаралық үлгі.

Бұл зерттеудің мақсаты – CLIL-дің лингвистикалық және филологиялық негіздерін талдау, әсіресе оның қостілділік және көптілділік құзыреттерін дамытудағы, мәдениетаралық коммуникация дағдыларын қалыптастырудағы және тілдік әралуандылықты сақтаудағы рөлін анықтау. Әдіснамалық тұрғыда зерттеу теориялық талдау, бар ғылыми еңбектерді салыстырмалы шолу және жаратылыстану мен гуманитарлық пәндерді оқытудағы тәжірибелік мысалдарды қарастыруға негізделген.

Зерттеу нәтижелері CLIL пәнді оқыту мен тілді меңгеруді ғана қолдап қоймай, сыни ойлау, академиялық сауаттылық пен мәдениетаралық құзыреттілікті де дамытатынын көрсетті. Сондай-ақ, табысты жүзеге асыру үшін мұғалімдерді жүйелі даярлау, ресурстарды әдістемелік бейімдеу және аутентті, мәдени тұрғыдан өзекті мәтіндермен қатар цифрлық технологияларды енгізу қажет екені анықталды. Мұғалімдердің дайындығы мен оқу бағдарламаларын үйлестіру секілді қиындықтар да талқыланып, институционалдық қолдаудың маңыздылығы атап өтілді.

Бұл зерттеу CLIL-ді филология мен педагогиканы тоғыстыратын кешенді білім беру тәсілі ретінде түсінуге үлес қосады. Оның ғылыми

құндылығы CLIL-ді пәнаралық модель ретінде қарастыруда болса, практикалық маңызы көптілді және көпмәдениетті ортаға бейімделген тиімді оқыту стратегияларын әзірлеуде көрінеді. Зерттеу қорытындысында CLIL тек оқыту әдісі ғана емес, сонымен бірге тіл, мәдениет пен білімді тоғыстыратын филологиялық парадигма ретінде қарастырылуы тиіс екендігі баса айтылады.

Тірек сөздер: CLIL, қостілді білім беру, мазмұнды меңгеру, академиялық ағылшын, жаратылыстану ғылымдарын оқыту, гуманитарлық пәндерді оқыту, мәдениетаралық құзыреттілік, филология, педагогика

ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИЕ И ФИЛОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ИЗМЕРЕНИЯ ПРЕДМЕТНО-ЯЗЫКОВОГО ИНТЕГРИРОВАННОГО ОБУЧЕНИЯ В МЕЖДИСЦИПЛИНАРНОМ ОБРАЗОВАНИИ

*Копбай А. К.¹, Абилмансур А. К.², Жусубалина Ж. М.³, Тойбекова Б. А.⁴

^{*1,3} Южно-Казахстанский университет имени М. Ауэзова

Шымкент, Казахстан

² Южно-Казахстанский педагогический университет имени О. Жанибекова

Шымкент, Казахстан

⁴ Шымкентский университет, Шымкент, Казахстан

Аннотация. В эпоху глобализации и интернационализации образования интегрированное обучение предмету и иностранному языку (Content and Language Integrated Learning, CLIL) выступает не только как педагогическая стратегия, но и как филологическая парадигма. CLIL объединяет предметное обучение с освоением иностранного языка, тем самым укрепляя академическую компетентность и способствуя межкультурному и языковому развитию. С филологической точки зрения CLIL представляет собой междисциплинарную модель, в рамках которой язык, культура и когниция взаимодействуют в образовательном процессе.

Цель данного исследования заключается в анализе лингвистических и филологических оснований CLIL, с особым акцентом на его роли в развитии билингвальных и мультилингвальных компетенций, формировании навыков межкультурной коммуникации и сохранении языкового разнообразия. Методологически работа опирается на теоретический анализ, сравнительный обзор существующих исследований и изучение практических кейсов в преподавании естественных и гуманитарных дисциплин.

Результаты показывают, что CLIL не только поддерживает предметное обучение и освоение языка, но и развивает критическое мышление, академическую грамотность и межкультурную компетентность. Кроме того, установлено, что успешная реализация требует системной подготовки преподавателей, методической адаптации ресурсов и интеграции цифровых технологий в сочетании с аутентичными и культурно релевантными текстами. Также рассматриваются трудности, связанные с готовностью учителей

и согласованием учебных программ, что подчеркивает необходимость институциональной поддержки.

Данное исследование вносит вклад в понимание CLIL как комплексного образовательного подхода, соединяющего филологию и педагогику. Его научная ценность заключается в обосновании CLIL как междисциплинарной модели, а практическая значимость проявляется в разработке эффективных стратегий преподавания для многоязычных и мультикультурных контекстов. В заключение отмечается, что CLIL следует рассматривать не только как методику обучения, но и как филологическую парадигму, объединяющую язык, культуру и образование в ответ на вызовы глобальной коммуникации и непрерывного образования.

Ключевые слова: CLIL, билингвальное образование, изучение содержания, академический английский, преподавание естественных наук, гуманитарные дисциплины, межкультурная компетентность, филология, педагогика

Мақала түсті / Стаття поступила / Received: 14.10.2025.

Жариялауға қабылданды / Принята к публикации / Accepted: 25.12.2025.

Информация об авторах:

Копбай Айша Кайратовна – магистр педагогических наук, кафедра иностранных языков, Южно-Казахстанский университет имени М.Ауезова, Shymkent, Kazakhstan, e-mail: kopbayaisha1998@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-2005-9138>

Абилмансур Асел Калдархановна – магистр филологических наук, кафедра иностранных языков, Южно-Казахстанский педагогический университет имени О.Жанибекова, Shymkent, Kazakhstan, e-mail: asselabilmansur5@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6142-1747>

Жусубалина Жанат Мейрбековна – магистр, старший преподаватель, Южно-Казахстанский университет имени М.Ауезова, Shymkent, Kazakhstan, e-mail: zhusubalinazh@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7990-6870>

Тойбекова Багдат Абдуллаевна – PhD доктор, Шымкентский Университет, Shymkent, Kazakhstan, e-mail: bagdat1984@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-3138-9623>

Авторлар туралы мәлімет:

Көпбай Айша Қайратқызы – педагогика ғылымдарының магистрі, шет тілі кафедрасы, М.Әуезов атындағы Оңтүстік Қазақстан университеті, Шымкент Қазақстан, e-mail: kopbayaisha1998@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-2005-9138>

Әбілмансұр Әсел Қалдарханқызы – филология ғылымдарының магистрі, шет тілі кафедрасы, Ө.Жәнібеков атындағы Оңтүстік Қазақстан педагогикалық университеті, Шымкент Қазақстан, e-mail: asselabilmansur5@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6142-1747>

Жусубалина Жанат Мейрбековна – магистр, аға оқытушы, М.Әуезов атындағы Оңтүстік Қазақстан университеті, Шымкент Қазақстан, e-mail: zhusubalinazh@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7990-6870>

Тойбекова Багдат Абдуллаевна – PhD доктор, Шымкент Университеті, Шымкент Қазақстан, e-mail: bagdat1984@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-3138-9623>

Information about the authors:

Aisha Kopbay Kayratkyzy – Master of Pedagogical Sciences, Department of Foreign languages, South Kazakhstan University named after M.Auezov, Shymkent, Kazakhstan, e-mail: kopbayaisha1998@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-2005-9138>

Abilmansur Assel Kaldarkhanqyzy – Master of Philology, Department of Foreign Languages, South Kazakhstan Pedagogical University named after O. Zhanibekov, Shymkent, Kazakhstan, e-mail: asselabilmansur5@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6142-1747>

Zhusubalina Zhanat Meirbekovna – Master of Pedagogical Sciences, Senior teacher, M South Kazakhstan University named after M.Auezov, Shymkent, Kazakhstan, e-mail: zhusubalinazh@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7990-6870>

Toibekova Bagdat Abdullayevna – PhD, Shymkent University, Shymkent, Kazakhstan, e-mail: bagdat1984@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-3138-9623>