

# INTEGRATION OF CONTENT AND LANGUAGE LEARNING (CLIL) IN AGRICULTURAL TERMINOLOGY INSTRUCTION

**Khasanova Shakhnoza Zokhirovna**  
*Scientific researcher, Samarkand, Uzbekistan*

**Abstract:** *This paper examines theoretical foundations, instructional strategies, and practical applications of CLIL in agro-terminology teaching. Emphasis is placed on task-based activities, project work, and interdisciplinary content integration to foster oral fluency, lexical precision, pragmatic competence, and professional communication skills. The role of cognitive scaffolding, contextualization, and learner-centered methodologies in enhancing both content acquisition and language proficiency is analyzed, demonstrating how CLIL optimizes learning outcomes in agricultural ESP contexts.*

**Key words:** *CLIL; agricultural terminology; ESP; content-language integration; task-based learning; oral competence; lexical development; pragmatic competence; project-based learning; higher education.*

## INTRODUCTION

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) has emerged as a leading methodology for teaching English for Specific Purposes (ESP), particularly in technical and scientific domains such as agriculture. In agricultural higher education, students are required to develop not only language skills but also deep understanding of domain-specific knowledge, including agronomy, soil science, crop management, and agricultural technology. The CLIL approach enables simultaneous acquisition of language and content knowledge, thereby promoting meaningful learning and functional communication. By embedding language instruction within disciplinary content, CLIL fosters contextualized learning where terminology, concepts, and practical skills are learned in authentic contexts.

The theoretical foundation of CLIL is grounded in second language acquisition theory, task-based learning, and constructivist pedagogy. Vygotsky's sociocultural theory emphasizes the role of interaction, scaffolding, and mediated learning in cognitive development, principles that are central to CLIL. In agricultural ESP, learners benefit from guided interaction with peers and instructors, enabling them to negotiate meaning, clarify concepts, and practice specialized terminology in context. This process reinforces both linguistic structures and conceptual understanding, ensuring that technical language is not learned in isolation but integrated within practical knowledge and problem-solving activities.





A primary objective of CLIL in agro-terminology instruction is the development of oral competence. Unlike traditional approaches that focus primarily on reading and writing, CLIL emphasizes active language use in communicative contexts. Students engage in discussions, presentations, debates, and collaborative problem-solving, all of which require precise use of agro-terminology. For instance, a task may involve designing a crop rotation plan, where learners must explain soil management techniques, pest control measures, and crop selection while using appropriate lexical and grammatical structures. This dual focus on content and language promotes lexical retention, syntactic accuracy, and pragmatic appropriateness. Instructional strategies in CLIL for agricultural terminology involve a range of scaffolding techniques to support comprehension and production. Pre-task activities may include vocabulary previews, concept mapping, and multimedia resources that familiarize students with essential terminology and key content. While-task activities often employ problem-solving exercises, case studies, and simulations, allowing learners to apply knowledge in realistic scenarios. Post-task activities focus on reflection, presentation, and assessment, providing opportunities for students to consolidate learning and receive formative feedback. The structured sequencing of activities ensures gradual cognitive load management and promotes the integration of content and language knowledge.

Project-based learning is particularly effective in CLIL settings. Learners may undertake projects such as designing sustainable farm models, analyzing soil fertility data, or developing crop management plans. These projects require collaborative research, synthesis of information, and oral presentation of findings, fostering both content mastery and communicative competence. The use of authentic materials, including agricultural journals, technical manuals, and video documentation, enhances realism and motivates learners by connecting instruction to professional practice. By engaging in projects that mirror real-world tasks, students develop confidence, autonomy, and professional discourse skills.

Assessment in CLIL contexts must align with both content and language objectives. Rubric-based evaluation, performance tasks, and oral presentations provide comprehensive measures of learners' competence. Assessment criteria may include accuracy and appropriateness of terminology, clarity of explanations, discourse coherence, and ability to engage in professional interaction. Peer assessment and self-assessment are valuable tools for fostering reflective learning, allowing students to identify strengths and areas for improvement in both content knowledge and language use. Furthermore, technology-enhanced assessment, such as audio-visual recordings and digital portfolios, enables instructors to monitor progress and provide individualized feedback.





Pragmatic competence is a crucial component of CLIL-based agro-terminology instruction. Students must learn to use terminology not only correctly but also appropriately within professional and cultural contexts. For example, when presenting a soil analysis report, learners must consider the audience, purpose, and social norms, selecting language that conveys authority, clarity, and respect. CLIL activities that involve role-play, simulation, and professional discourse analysis help students develop these skills, bridging the gap between theoretical knowledge and practical communication.

Lexical and cognitive development are intertwined in CLIL instruction. The integration of content provides meaningful contexts that facilitate memory retention and retrieval of technical vocabulary. Cognitive strategies, such as concept mapping, categorization, and problem-solving, enhance learners' ability to organize, link, and apply terminology effectively. This integration ensures that vocabulary knowledge supports cognitive tasks rather than being an isolated linguistic repertoire, thereby enhancing both oral fluency and analytical thinking. The role of collaborative learning in CLIL cannot be overstated. Pair and group work encourage negotiation of meaning, scaffolding, and peer feedback. In agro-terminology instruction, collaborative activities might include joint analysis of crop yield data, planning irrigation systems, or discussing the environmental impact of agricultural practices. Through these interactions, learners refine their oral competence, develop pragmatic sensitivity, and internalize technical terminology. Collaborative work also fosters professional skills such as teamwork, communication, and problem-solving, which are essential in agricultural careers.

Teacher facilitation is another critical element in successful CLIL implementation. Instructors must be adept in both content knowledge and language pedagogy, able to scaffold learning, monitor interactions, and provide timely feedback. Teachers serve as linguistic and cognitive mediators, guiding students in the use of terminology, modeling professional discourse, and supporting comprehension and production. Professional development and training in CLIL methodologies are therefore essential for agricultural educators seeking to integrate content and language learning effectively.

Technology integration further enhances CLIL instruction. Digital tools, such as interactive simulations, multimedia presentations, and virtual laboratories, provide immersive contexts for terminology practice. Online discussion platforms and collaborative software allow students to communicate asynchronously, reflecting on content and language usage. Speech recognition, automated feedback systems, and digital portfolios provide additional opportunities for monitoring oral performance, facilitating self-regulation, and supporting personalized instruction. Technology also enables access to authentic agricultural content, connecting learners to global practices, data, and research findings.





In conclusion, CLIL-based instruction represents a highly effective approach for teaching agricultural terminology in higher education. By combining content mastery with language development, CLIL promotes oral competence, lexical precision, pragmatic appropriateness, and cognitive engagement. Task-based activities, project work, collaborative learning, and technology integration ensure that learners acquire both disciplinary knowledge and communicative skills in meaningful, contextually rich environments.

Assessment strategies aligned with content and language objectives provide diagnostic and summative insights, supporting ongoing development and professional readiness. Through CLIL, agricultural ESP instruction not only enhances academic learning but also equips students with the competencies required for effective participation in professional agricultural discourse.

#### REFERENCES:

Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge University Press.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content-and-language integrated learning: From practice to principles? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 182–204. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190511000092>

Marsh, D. (2002). *CLIL/EMILE – The European dimension: Actions, trends, and foresight potential*. European Commission.

Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2010). Language learning in CLIL classrooms: Student perceptions. *Language Use and Language Learning*, 13(2), 41–66.

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2011). A holistic approach to multilingual education: Introduction. *Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 339–343.

Meyer, O. (2010). Towards quality CLIL: Successful planning and teaching strategies. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 5240–5244.

Nikula, T. (2010). CLIL interaction and classroom discourse. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13(4), 405–421.

Toth, Z. (2012). Assessing oral skills in CLIL classrooms: Practices and challenges. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 9(2), 162–180.

Moate, J., & Riley, P. (2008). Project-based CLIL: Combining content learning and English skills. *ELT Journal*, 62(2), 112–119.

