CONTEXTUAL CLIL INTEGRATION TO ENHANCE ACADEMIC SPEAKING SKILLS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Kakhkhorova Nigina Abdivakhidovna
English Teacher of Karshi State Technical University

ABSTRACT	KEYWORDS
This article investigates into the way non-linguistic university students might enhance their speaking skills by combining contextual instruction with Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). The paper focuses on activation tactics, guided understanding, concentrated speaking activities, and mixed-level group interactions, drawing on previous classroom experiences such as environmental English courses and contextual practice. It offers a framework for improving speaking fluency, confidence, and material understanding through contextualized exercises such as pair presentations, reverse outlining, and problem-solving talks. There are methodological implications and practical recommendations for teaching foreign languages in non-linguistic fields.	Speaking skills development, communicative competence, content-based instruction, task-based speaking activities, integrated skills approach, essential pedagogical components

Introduction

Communicating effectively are becoming increasingly important in today's higher education, particularly in non-linguistic fields. Traditional teaching approaches are frequently ineffective for inspiring students or supporting them in utilizing English to communicate concepts pertaining to their topic of study. As a result, contextual approaches and CLIL techniques have increased in popularity as effective methods of integrating language instruction with actual, meaningful content. Instead than sticking to a single fixed paradigm, Coyle, Hood, and Marsh (2010) define CLIL as incorporating essential pedagogical components such as previous knowledge activation, understanding guidance, language, speaking, writing, and assessment. These concepts are consistent with contextual teaching, which promotes problem-solving abilities, connects learning to real-world circumstances, and encourages knowledge creation through meaningful assignments. This article synthesizes methodological insights from previous CLIL-based teaching experiences and applies them to a contextual framework for improving speaking skills among non-linguistic university students, particularly those studying environmental disciplines.

Effective CLIL instruction is assumed to begin with activation (Dale et al., 2011). Students are encouraged to go over what they already know about the subject before learning new material. For example, during the extended producer responsibility class, students brainstormed ideas for reducing technological waste in groups. Their ideas, which largely revolved around "reduce, reuse, recycle,"

helped dispel misunderstandings and highlight areas that needed to be reconsidered in light of new scientific findings. This technique is also aligned with contextual learning, which seeks to link new information to students' past knowledge and life experiences.

Guided understanding is essential for students as they go from ordinary knowledge to academic topics. The teacher in one CLIL class used the quote "Waste isn't the fault of consumers; it's a design flaw" to challenge the students' assumptions. By examining and evaluating new knowledge using guided questioning, students improved their content comprehension and higher-order thinking skills. Contextual teaching contributes to scaffolding by helping students to gradually develop meaning through discussion, inquiry, and analysis.

Language education is delivered "in service of the content" in CLIL classes. In academic literature, students identify idioms or difficult terminology, deduce their meaning from context, rephrase them, and discuss their application. This strategy increases involvement while reducing vocabulary-related anxiety. The contextual speaking methodology emphasizes paraphrasing, term definition, and meaning negotiation. They assist students become better communicators and speak convincingly about work-related topics.

Both systems center on speaking activities. Examples include:
• Talking about environmental issues in small groups
• Reverse outlining, in which students underline significant aspects and summarize parts of a text
• Pair presentations, which reduce anxiety by allowing several repeats.
• Task-oriented talks, such as resolving drought difficulties or evaluating ecologically friendly goods. Presenting in small groups or couples improves confidence, fluency, and performance pressure, all of which promote engagement. Furthermore, students learn how to explain content to someone who is unfamiliar with it, which is an important indicator of speaking ability.

Both techniques rely heavily on speaking-based activities.

A small-group discussion about environmental issues is one example. • Reverse outlining: students summarize textual portions and emphasize essential topics.
• Presentations in pairs, which allow numerous repeats and reduce nervousness.
• Task-based talks, such as evaluating eco-friendly items or addressing drought challenges. Presentations in pairs or small groups result in more engagement because they promote confidence, fluency, and reduce performance pressure. Furthermore, as a key indicator of speaking proficiency, pupils learn how to communicate content to someone who is unfamiliar with it.

Conclusion

Integrating contextual and CLIL-based approaches provides an effective method for developing speaking abilities in non-linguistic university students. Learners develop communicative competence and topic mastery by activating prior knowledge, facilitating comprehension, emphasizing meaningful language use, and fostering structured interaction via activities and presentations. This dual-focus strategy not only boosts student enthusiasm but also equips students to speak English successfully in academic and professional settings. Future research can look into the long-term effects of contextual-CLIL integration and the function of digital tools in improving speaking skills.

References

1. Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

2. Dale, L., van der Es, W., & Tanner, R. (2011). CLIL Skills. Leiden: European Platform.

3. Dale, L., & Tanner, R. (2012). CLIL Activities: A Resource for Subject and Language Teachers. Cambridge University Press.

4. Marsh, D. (2002). CLIL/EMILE – The European Dimension: Actions, Trends and Foresight Potential. European Commission.

5. Mehisto, P., Marsh, D., & Frigols, M. J. (2008). Uncovering CLIL. Macmillan.

6. Richards, J. C. (2008). Teaching Listening and Speaking: From Theory to Practice. Cambridge University Press.

7. Nation, I. S. P., & Newton, J. (2009). Teaching ESL/EFL Listening and Speaking. Routledge.

8. Johnson, E. B. (2002). Contextual Teaching and Learning: What It Is and Why It's Here to Stay. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

9. Berns, R., & Erickson, P. (2001). Contextual Teaching and Learning: Preparing Students for the New Economy. The Highlight Zone: Research @ Work.

10. Shrum, J., & Glisan, E. (2016). Teacher's Handbook: Contextualized Language Instruction. Cengage.

11. Anderson, L. & Krathwohl, D. (2001). A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing. New York: Longman.

12. Swain, M. (2005). The Output Hypothesis: Theory and Research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning.

13. Vygotsky, L. (1978). Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes. Harvard University Press.