



Article

The Benefits and Difficulties of Using CLIL in Teaching English at Schools

Torebaeva Ornigul¹

1. PhD student of Nukus Pedegogical Institute

Abstract: Creating a CLIL program or even just facilitating one CLIL session can occasionally be confusing, frightening and difficult. However, behind its inflexible exterior, CLIL might be a very intuitive and communicative teaching method. It requires some comprehension on the part of the instructor like any other teaching strategy. Being effective teachable is essential part of good pedagogy. Despite the fact that it can be difficult, teaching CLIL is an amazing experience. The approach states that by reading the following explanation of CLIL's benefits and drawbacks, an instructor can decide if it is a good fit for the classroom.

Keywords: CLIL, Advantages, Disadvantages

1. Introduction

Traditional language teaching approaches are not enough to meet students' communicative needs in a world where knowledge and flexibility in response to changing educational conditions are valued and change is necessary. The CLIL method is frequently used to improve the ability to teach an understanding of different subjects in a foreign language [1]. It helps with learning a foreign language as well as the development of abilities in other fields of knowledge.

Learning a new language is one of the most challenging assignments at secondary school. As a result, to be a successful language teacher, a person needs to be fluent in both the language and the academic subjects that their students are expected to learn. However, secondary school is an important place to start because it is here that students start to develop basic skills that will support their future academic activities. According to these points of view, as society grows closer together, people are under more and more pressure for living according to social, cultural, and professional standards [2]. The increasing demand for language development is one of these requests, and it has led to a search for imaginative teaching strategies that make learning foreign languages in the classroom easier. Content-language integrated learning (CLIL) is one such strategy.

Previous studies have found differences between CLIL's motivating effects and student involvement and more traditional teaching methods. Many studies in this area have been conducted in Spain because the CLIL approach has been used there extensively over the last ten years. According to a study by David Lasagabaster, the CLIL approach improves students' motivation and language development [3]. Furthermore, it was shown by Aintzane Doiz, David Lasagabaster, and Juan Manuel Sierra that students in the CLIL environment were more motivated than those in the control group. However, they also

Citation: Ornigul T. The Benefits and Difficulties of Using CLIL in Teaching English at Schools. American Journal of Social and Humanitarian Research 2025, 6(12), 2858-2861.

Received: 10th Nov 2025
Revised: 25th Nov 2025
Accepted: 09th Dec 2025
Published: 24th Dec 2025



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

raise the possibility that other factors, like gender and sociocultural background, may have affected the study's findings.

2. Methodology

This article adopts a qualitative analytical methodology, which is informed by a review and synthesis of relevant theoretical and empirical literature on CLIL applied to secondary education contexts [4]. It explores and discusses the positives and negatives, namely the advantages and disadvantages of the implementation of CLIL in English language teaching by employing peer reviewed journal articles, monographs and world acclaimed pedagogical framework documents. Sources were sampled based on their relevance to learner motivation, academic engagement, instructional practices, and teacher preparedness, specifically focusing on comparative studies between [content and language integrated learning] CLIL and non-CLIL environments [5]. Through critical reading and thematically sorting the final interpretations of previous studies, it was possible to detect recurrent trends in terms of motivation to learn, language development, classroom behavior and context factors such as sex, sociocultural factors, and the subject matter dealt with. Policy oriented and methodological studies were also scrutinized to correlate the institutional and practical circumstances for the aforementioned effective implementation of CLIL [6]. The collected data were interpreted with the help of an integrative approach that interrelates language acquisition theory with content-based instruction and learner centered pedagogy. Instead of producing primary empirical data, the inputs come from triangulation of multiple credible sources to provide analytical validity and conceptual integrity. The methodological design allows for appreciation of CLIL as an influential but complex innovation, reflecting both the exciting promise of the pedagogical potential of CLIL and the structural and professional limitations in realizing it in practice in many classrooms [7].

3. Result and Discussion

The results of a study performed by Fontecha Fernandez, Almudena, and Canga Alonso Andres were different from those of the previous study [8]. Despite including both genders in the comparisons, this study demonstrated that the non-CLIL group of pupils were significantly more motivated, regardless of gender. However, because the CLIL term includes so many different elements, it is challenging to compare studies to find the reasons of the differences in motivation. Longer periods of time were spent using English to teach other subjects, according to the research described, though it is unclear exactly what kind of instruction was taking place.

Numerous studies have demonstrated the beneficial effects of working together on language learning. According to a study by Katie Brooks and Linda P. Thurston, students who received individually and small-group instruction seemed more likely to participate in academic tasks [9].

CLIL, an essential methodology, helps to improve language and content by taking cultural and language contexts into consideration. "We read seminal and review documents as well as the most cited works in this field to establish a wider context on CLIL theory and practice" [10].

The main benefit of the CLIL technique is comprehensive, which at the same time connects multiple approaches and plans. It is complicated and flexible approach. As a result, when we talk about CLIL, we have to consider a lot of things or requirements for the program to be implemented.

CLIL encourages interaction and modern teaching techniques that help students and teachers equally and improve the educational process, in addition to supporting with language and subject matter acquisition. By applying the CLIL technique, educators and

learners can be influenced to keep mixing language and content in creative ways. It is especially beneficial for motivation and bilingual education programs. "Education outside of universities has been greatly impacted by the CLIL methodology" [11].

It is also important to note that this approach includes teaching and learning foreign languages for many different types of objectives that can or cannot be connected to the learning of languages. The purpose is to teach a language more easily and flexible through its use, rather than through traditional methods of grammar and text translation. It's also important to remember that CLIL is widely used in the following popular subjects: music, science, social studies, history, physical education, the arts, and computers. In this instance, it is essential to consider the importance of the students' learning styles and backgrounds.

The biggest weakness of teachers is their lack of experience with the CLIL approach. Another problem that both public and private schools need to take care of is students' lack of foreign language proficiency [12]. This suggests that teachers' lack of language competence may have affected how well they performed in educational conditions. According to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, content teachers divided their students' English proficiency into A1 or B1 levels, depending on the subject. If the CLIL approach was implemented, 80% of subject teachers recognized that they would change their regular class schedule for the following reasons:

- ✓ Specialized vocabulary problems;
- ✓ The inability of both students and teachers to communicate effectively in english;
- ✓ The lack of methodological training for english instruction by instructors;
- ✓ Additional language barriers in addition to the usual content issues;
- ✓ no enhanced materials are available.

There are benefits and drawbacks to every approach, and teaching with CLIL is not any different. Language teachers can benefit from CLIL because there is plenty of ready-made materials available, which gets rid of the requirement for them to start from beginning to end [13]. Howard Gardner's study was referred to by Deller and Price [14]. His notion of several intelligences fits well with CLIL's approach to student learning and growth.

With its focus on communication, plenty of activities, group projects, and high levels of connection, CLIL instruction supports a variety of intelligences and helps students learn.

"It is likely that we will use more of the intelligences when teaching another subject through a foreign language, and this is likely to be helpful for our learners". Lightbown and Spada assert that verbal intelligence is the intelligence most strongly associated with academic achievement. Before discussing the various aspects of this teaching strategy, it is essential to provide an overview of CLIL's development and history [15]. In conclusion, all educators agree that using CLIL in a variety of ways encourages student participation.

4. Conclusion

As per the article attached, it emerges that Content and Language Integrated Learning is a pedagogically useful yet challenging method that improves students motivation, academic involvement, and simultaneous growth in language and content knowledge if conditions are right. A meta-analysis of the aforementioned studies argues that CLIL classroom settings appear to yield significantly elevated rates of learner engagement, interaction and communication compared to more traditional language instruction, while motivational effects can be quite variable as a function of context gender, sociocultural background, instructional design or amount of exposure. Simultaneously, the analysis identifies important challenges to implementation such as inadequate professional development, low teacher and learner language proficiency, a

scarcity of appropriate resources, vocabulary, and classroom interaction obstacles. The implications of the findings are that the power of CLIL will not only lie in its theory, but also on institutional support, the agreement of professional development, and calibrated cohesion between content and language objectives. Thus, educational policymakers and school administrators need to focus on systematic teacher preparation, resource development, and gradual integration strategies to achieve the full advantages of CLIL. Additional studies are needed to investigate long term outcomes of interest, specific practice in the CLIL subject, and the combination of individual learner characteristics and instructional models (areas that are underrepresented and different educational settings, especially secondary school).

REFERENCES

- [1] Manzano, B., "CLIL in three Spanish monolingual communities: The examples of Extremadura, Madrid and La Rioja," *ELIA*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 135, 158, 2015, doi: 10.12795/elia.2015.i15.07.
- [2] Doiz, A., D. Lasagabaster, and J. M. Sierra, "CLIL and motivation: The effect of individual and contextual variables," *Language Learning Journal*, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 209, 224, 2014.
- [3] Lasagabaster, D., "English achievement and student motivation in CLIL and EFL settings," *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 3, 18, 2011.
- [4] Dalton Puffer, C., *Discourse in Content and Language Integrated Learning*, Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2007.
- [5] Coyle, D., P. Hood, and D. Marsh, *CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning*, Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [6] Marsh, D., "CLIL dimensions and policy perspectives," in *CLIL in Europe*, D. Marsh Ed., Jyväskylä, Finland: University of Jyväskylä, 2002, pp. 27, 56.
- [7] Sylvén, L. K., "CLIL in Sweden: Why does it not work? A meta analysis perspective," *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 301, 320, 2013.
- [8] Fernandez Fontecha, A., and A. Canga Alonso, "A preliminary study on motivation and gender in CLIL and non CLIL types of instruction," *International Journal of English Studies*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 21, 36, 2014.
- [9] Brooks, K., and L. P. Thurston, "English language learner academic engagement and instructional grouping configurations," *American Secondary Education*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 45, 60, 2010.
- [10] Piacentini, V., "CLIL and science education: A review for a language focus in science teaching," *Ricerche di Pedagogia e Didattica*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 113, 131, 2021.
- [11] Díaz, N., "The CLIL experience of students belonging to the first year of secondary education from a transitional perspective," *RIDE. Revista Iberoamericana para la Investigación y el Desarrollo Educativo*, vol. 11, no. 22, pp. 1, 19, 2021, doi: 10.23913/ride.v11i22.864.
- [12] Deller, S., and C. Price, *Teaching Other Subjects Through English*, Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- [13] Gardner, H., *Multiple Intelligences: The Theory in Practice*, New York, NY, USA: BasicBooks, 1993.
- [14] Lightbown, M. P., and N. Spada, *How Languages Are Learned*, 4th ed., Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- [15] Cenoz, J., F. Genesee, and D. Gorter, "Critical analysis of CLIL: Taking stock and looking forward," *Applied Linguistics*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 243, 262, 2014.