

- (AWEJ). Special Issue on the English Language in Ukrainian Context. 2020. P. 234–243. URL: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/elt3.20>
11. European Lifelong Guidance Policy Network. Guidelines for Policies and Systems Development for Lifelong Guidance. A Reference Framework for the EU and for the Commission. Jyväskylä: Finnish Institute for Educational Research, 2015.
 12. European Commission. Council Recommendation on Key Competences for Lifelong Learning. Official Journal of the European Union. 2018. # 61 (189). P. 1–3.
 13. Mind map. From Wikipedia, the free encyclopaedia. URL: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mind_map УДК 373.091.214-053.6:[811.161:808.5]

УДК УДК 37.016:81'243](4)
DOI 10.25128/2415-3605.22.1.20

IRYNA LEVCHYK

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2428-4928>
iralevchyk@tnpu.edu.ua

Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor
Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University
2 Maksym Kryvonis Str., Ternopil

CONTENT-LANGUAGE INTEGRATED LEARNING IN THE CONTEXT OF EUROPEAN INTEGRATION

The conditions of formation of content-language integrated learning (CLIL) have been characterized with a number of theoretical and methodological factors, that have influenced the process of development from different perspectives. The origin of CLIL is connected with the prior methodological approach to second language acquisition – content based language instruction. It has been established with aim to reduce the gap in knowledge of English learners between spoken everyday English and Academic language. The reflection of the psycholinguistic views in CBI led to adoption of concepts of comprehensive output, input hypothesis and proximal zone of development in its subsidiary method (CLIL). Besides this, another methodology affecting formation of content-language integrated learning, known as “English for special purposes”, is also contextualized by specialty content, and they share common goals of learning. However, ESP keeps its focus on language, not content. The comparative analysis of CBI and ESP key features reveals the theoretical and methodological conditions of CLIL formation.

The modified variations of CLIL approach, applied all over Europe like Bilingual Content Teaching, Bilingual Subject Teaching or Content-Based Language Teaching, relied on a common concept of learning a foreign language with a shift of focus from the language itself to the content expressed in this language. The bilingual model of education in European countries adopted the provisions of content-language integrated learning methods at the mainstream level in school education in France, Ireland, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, the Czech Republic, and it has been partially implemented within pilot projects in the UK, Spain, Germany, Italy and Sweden. The method was strongly supported by policy of the European Union and European Commission with an aim of promotion of language learning and linguistic diversity. The support of the European language policy and ideology was reflected in a number of projects launched in order to promote methods based on international cooperation, such as “Content and Language Integrated Learning in Germany” (CLILiG), as well as with the support of the Council of Europe “CLIL Quality Matrix” (2004) and the European Regional Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students (ERASMUS).

Keywords: *content-language integrated learning, content based language instruction, conditions of CLIL formation, European integration, European language policy.*

ПРИНА ЛЕВЧИК

кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент
Тернопільський національний педагогічний університет
імені Володимира Гнатюка
вул. Максима Кривоноса 2, м. Тернопіль

ПРЕДМЕТНО-МОВНЕ ІНТЕГРОВАНЕ НАВЧАННЯ У КОНТЕКСТІ ЄВРОПЕЙСЬКОЇ ІНТЕГРАЦІЇ

При розгляді умов формування предметно-мовного інтегрованого навчання (CLIL) встановлено теоретико-методологічні фактори, засвідчено їх різнобічний вплив на розвиток методики. Виникнення CLIL пов'язане з попереднім методичним підходом до оволодіння другою мовою – навчанням мови на основі змісту. Відображення постулатів з психолінгвістики у СБІ призвело до прийняття концепцій комплексного виходу, гіпотези входу і найближчої зони розвитку у його дочірньому методі (CLIL). Окрім того, інша методика, вплив якої відзначають на формування змістовно-мовного інтегрованого навчання, – це англійська мова для спеціальних цілей, яка також зумовлена контекстом (змістом спеціальності) і поділяє із CLIL спільні цілі навчання. Проте ESP в процесі інтеграції віддає пріоритетне значення мові, а не змістові. Порівняльний аналіз основних характеристик СБІ та ESP розкриває теоретичні та методологічні умови формування CLIL.

Модифіковані варіанти підходу CLIL, що застосовуються в усій Європі, опираються на загальну концепцію вивчення іноземної мови зі зміщенням фокусу з мови на зміст, виражений мовою, яку вивчають. Двомовна модель освіти в європейських країнах прийняла положення предметно-мовного інтегрованого методу навчання як основний напрямок на рівні шкільної освіти у Франції, Ірландії, Фінляндії, Естонії, Латвії, Польщі, Чехії і частково реалізована в рамках пілотних проектів у Великій Британії, Іспанії, Німеччині, Італії, Швеції. Метод підтриманий політикою Європейського Союзу та Європейської Комісії з метою сприяння вивченню мови і поширенню мовного розмаїття. Підтримка європейської мовної політики та ідеології проявилася в різних проектах, започаткованих з метою популяризації методів, заснованих на міжнародному співробітництві: таких, як «Інтегроване навчання з змісту та мови в Німеччині» (CLILiG), а також за підтримки Ради Європи «Матриця якості CLIL» (2004) та «Європейська регіональна схема дій щодо мобільності студентів університетів» (ERASMUS).

Ключові слова: предметно-мовне інтегроване навчання, навчання мови на основі змісту, умови формування CLIL, європейська інтеграція, європейська мовна політика.

Ukrainian methodologists combine the content of foreign language teaching materials and other subjects, either Natural Sciences, Mathematics in primary and secondary education, Humanities – in senior school or they integrate specialty and foreign language teaching on a procedural basis in higher education. Instead, in the traditional Western Methodology integrated language learning (content based language teaching – CBLT, content based language instructions – CBI, sheltered instruction observation protocol – SIOP, English-medium instruction – EMI) is organized according to J. Crandall [4], W. Grabe & F. L. Stoller [17], F. L. Stoller [37], D. J. Short [35], M. A. Snow [36], D. M. Brinton, M. A. Snow, M. Wesche [1] by providing instructions in English at classes of other school subjects, i.e. a foreign language is both a means of learning and an environment for studying content of subjects included in the general education or professional cycle of disciplines. Initially, the approach was designed to overcome the difference in the cost of time and effort of students to study Academic English as a foreign language compared to General language [5; 6; 7].

Separation of CLIL methodology from CBI is associated with the widespread European use of CLIL and, consequently, development of numerous approaches to adapting the methodology to the needs of secondary and higher education institutions in every country, however, a number of researchers [1; 2; 28; 38; 40; 9; 8] still admit common goals of the both approaches of integrated language learning.

The research paper objective is to reveal the theoretical and methodological factors that influenced formation of content-language integrated learning in the context of European integration.

Various aspects of the methodology have been revealed in fundamental studies by D. March & J. Masih [27], D. Harter (2012), D. Wolff [45, 46], K. Papaja [32], P. Calvé, J. Cummins [6], G. Fruhauf., D. Coyle., I. Christ. [16], M. Candelier (2004), P. Mehisto, D. March D., M. J. Fligol [31], D. Coyle [3, 2], M. A. Snow [36], N. Mäscher [30]. Besides, the issues of CLIL organizational models, maintenance the balance between content of subject taught or language learning have been addressed in works by P. Van de Craen, K. Mondt, L. Allain & Y. B. Gao [43], M. Pavesi, D. Bertocchi, M. Hofmannová & M. Kazianka [33], R. Lyster [24, 25], C. Dalton-Puffer [9], D. Marsh, G. Langé [29] and others.

Essential contribution has been made by A. Llinares, T. Morton, R. Whittaker [22], R. Lyster [24, 25], F. Lorenzo [23] in exploration of aspects of counterbalance approach to integrated learning, language and content learning and assessment, the use of language at the lexical-semantic, morpho-

syntactic and genre levels, as well as typical examples of communication patterns of students (interaction patterns) and teacher (scaffolding, corrective feedback: recast, prompt, explicit correction) in the learning process. The potential of socio-cultural strategies in the language integrated learning for the sake of development in students of the tolerance in the intercultural communication has been revealed in works by J. P. Lantolf and G. Sunderman [21].

Psycholinguistic grounds of the methodology are related to the prior language learning integrated approach, which CLIL took its origins from – the CBI method. Content based language instruction was based on the postulates from the theory of Second Language Acquisition revealing effectiveness of learning foreign language through its conscious use and communication in the process of learning; the concept of the zone of proximal development, internal speech and learning tasks, as well as popular hypotheses of the early 80's of the twentieth century: “comprehensible output” (CO) by M. Swain [39] and “input hypothesis” by S. Krashen [20]. The importance of a comprehensible output [35: 4240] is related to “the student’s ability to express their ideas, practice the use of academic language, develop automatisms and get feedback”. Technologies of using language clichés, structured conversation can direct speaking activity of students, in particular, their utterances. Operating academic vocabulary, developing awareness of learning strategies contributes to formation of literacy in a chosen subject by means of English communication in the integrated learning process of language acquisition and processing of the content.

The other factor that influenced the formation of methods of English language integrated teaching from the point of view of Psycholinguistics, is represented by the hypothesis of “input hypothesis” (also “monitor model”) by S. Krashen [20]. Acquiring proficiency in foreign language communication, according to the scientist, is more effective if the student understands the input statement, which is slightly more difficult than his current level of language proficiency, this level is denoted as “ $i + 1$ ”, where “ i ” means input statement, and “ $+1$ ” – the next level of difficulty. In addition to promotion of the ideas of advanced learning, the scientist studied the role of emotional background (affective filter hypothesis), the influence of individual characteristics of the student on the sequence of learning a foreign language (natural order hypothesis), the dependence of spontaneous speech on conscious learning or unconscious language acquisition. S. Krashen’s hypotheses influenced the development of language education, in particular, they encouraged various models of language integrated learning involving subject content. The most widespread ones nowadays are considered to be the methods of immersion, either sheltered or partial, adjunct learning, theme-based learning, content-language integrated learning (CLIL), language across the curriculum (LAC), teaching English for specific purposes (ESP).

The methodology of content-language integrated learning with its double focus on both the language and the content of the chosen discipline was developed approximately about thirty years later after the introduction of traditional English for Special Purposes (ESP) in the 1960's, and despite its affiliation with the CBI, it has many factors in common with ESP that influenced its formation. In particular, according to A. Johns [19], it is a combination of context and practical application requirements for teaching English; while CBI is associated with English as Second Language (ESL), CLIL and ESP are associated with foreign language learning, i.e. English, which is studied for international communication in accordance with globalization trends in economy. However, the ESP methodology focuses on solving language problems, therefore it involves learning English to communicate in specific (professionally oriented) situations, so modern methodologists [34; 41] follow a tendency to place CLIL and ESP in opposite sides of the continuum of integration of specialty content and language learning. To understand the process of formation of subject-language integrated learning, it is necessary to consider the key features of the approach in comparing existing CBI and ESP methods [41: 150], taking into account their impact on the formation of CLIL conceptual frameworks. The comparative analysis has been carried out taking into consideration the main characteristics of the three methods, which are presented in the Table. 1. Key features of CBI, CLIL and ESP.

Key features of CBI, CLIL and ESP (source: M. Tzouanopoulou 2015: 150)

CBI (Grabe & Stoller, 1997)	CLIL (CLIL Compendium, 2001; Coyle, Hood & Marsh 2010)	ESP (Dudley-Evans & St John, 1998)
<p>Exposure to incidental language results in the learning of content.</p> <p>Language is comprehensible, linked to previous learning and relevant to students' needs.</p> <p>Input is contextualized and integrated in relevant discourse contexts.</p> <p>Content instruction integrated with explicit language instruction in a relevant and purposeful context.</p> <p>Learners use prior knowledge and expertise to learn additional language and content material.</p> <p>Generation of increased motivation arising from successful learning.</p> <p>Support from instructional approaches: co-operative learning, apprenticeship learning, experiential learning, project based learning, task-based learning (which facilitates strategy-instruction).</p> <p>Flexibility and adaptability in curriculum design and activity sequences</p> <p>Increase in student-centered classroom activities.</p>	<p>A dual-focused approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language.</p> <p>Successful content learning through another language entails careful reflection on the use of language and on teaching methodologies which should include output and interaction.</p> <p>Using language leads to communication and learning.</p> <p>Language is used in authentic situations; scaffolding occasionally needed.</p> <p>Develops thinking skills; challenges learners cognitively.</p> <p>Fosters international understanding through learning about other cultures in another language.</p> <p>Develops oral communication skills.</p> <p>Methods and forms of classroom practice are diversified.</p>	<p>Designed to meet specific learner needs.</p> <p>Makes use of the underlying methodology and activities of the disciplines and professions it serves.</p> <p>Depends on the language (grammar, lexis, register), skills, discourse and genre relevant to these activities.</p> <p>May be related to or specifically designed for specific scientific fields.</p> <p>May use a different methodology than that of general English.</p> <p>Designed mostly for adult learners either at a higher institution or professional settings.</p> <p>Generally, assumes basic knowledge of the target language system.</p>

In general, the term Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) covers several similar approaches applied in Europe, involving the teaching of the content of non-language subjects in foreign language, such as Bilingual Content Teaching, Bilingual Subject Teaching or Content-Based Language Teaching. They rely on a common concept of learning a foreign language with a shift of focus from the language itself to the content expressed in this language [45: 211; 32: 2–3].

The emergent conceptualisation of Content and Language Integrated Learning as a European construct is in D. Coyle's [3] view deeply significant in terms of the European Commission's Language Objectives with regard to understanding of the diverse nature of the operational demands required to integrate language and subject learning in different European contexts. Diversity in details of learning and teaching objectives and outcomes doesn't contradict the constancy of the aims of CLIL: "that students should be given opportunities to learn subject matter or content effectively through the medium of a European language which would not be considered as the usual language for subject instruction in their regular curriculum; that students should be given opportunities to use language/s in a variety of settings and contexts in order to enable them to operate successfully in a plurilingual and pluricultural Europe; that young people need support in developing specific and appropriate inter-cultural as well as linguistic knowledge skills and strategies, in order to function as autonomous mobile European citizens[3: 27].

The historical circumstances of the emergence of the methodology of content-language integrated learning were regions rich in linguistic diversity due to the presence of minorities, proximity to borders with another country or the functioning of two or more official languages. For example, the French-speaking environment of Quebec in Canada caused English-speaking parents to encourage local authorities to implement language immersion programs to teach their English-speaking children the content of school subjects in French [15; 31; 32]. Efficiency of French-language immersion programs in Canada has contributed to the growth of scientific interest, a number of experimental studies in this field and, consequently, the development of different approaches to teaching that reflect the diversity of linguistic and learning environments and learning targets. According to N. Mäsch [30] and later J. Iluk [18] political changes in Germany and France in the 1960's led to the introduction of a bilingual model of education, which promoted development of linguistic and cultural partnerships between the countries.

At the initiative of the European Union in the 80-90s of the twentieth century in the Netherlands [16] and Finland [27] English-language immersion education programs were introduced as part of government support for bilingual education ("Widening Our Horizons", 1991 [44]). In the UK, on the other hand, scholars [3; 42] expressed a strong concern about the condition of bilingual education in the United Kingdom because minority languages (Welsh Gaelic and Scottish Gaelic) were ignored while the only foreign language officially learnt at schools was French. In general, according to the Eurydice educational network [12; 14: 14), the provisions of content-language integrated learning methods have been adopted at the level of mainstream of school education in France, Ireland, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, the Czech Republic, and it has been partially implemented in frames of pilot projects in the UK, Spain, Germany, Italy and Sweden.

According to C. Dalton-Puffer, A. Llinares, F. Lorenzo, T. Nikula [10: 214], the exclusive affiliation of CLIL to the European space is determined by the support of the European language policy and ideology and, in turn, content-language integrated learning implements this policy at the local and regional levels. For the sake of clarity, the simultaneous spontaneous trend towards CLIL initiatives has been reported at the teacher and parent level in many places across the European continent.

The CLIL methodology was discussed for the first time as a conceptual one at the meeting of EU representatives in 2000 relatively the objectives set by the European Commission in the document "Action Plan 2004–2006 – Promoting Language Learning Linguistic Diversity". The European Commission [13: 23] considered the communicative methodology of integrated language learning as a means to achieve the goal set before every EU country to provide its citizens with the opportunity to learn at least two foreign languages in addition to their native language. This support was later reflected in recommendations in the Progress Report 2004 to summarize the provisions of content-language integrated learning by setting standards for teacher qualifications and the provision of appropriate teaching materials.

In addition, according to K. Papaja [32: 14], in her research of the preconditions for the development of CLIL in the context of European integration, the European Commission has launched a number of projects aimed at supporting methods based on international cooperation, such as CLILiG, as well as with the support of the Council of Europe "CLIL Quality Matrix" [46]. The leading driving force behind the CLIL methodology is linked to the European Regional Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students (ERASMUS) and its successful project in 2014 –

Erasmus Plus [11]. The results of the review of European CLIL practice [26] reported about the widespread application of the program on a monolingual, bilingual and multilingual basis depending on social context factors (language choice, age and level of competence of students).

The potential of CLIL has been reported by D. Coyle [3] to support and develop plurilingual and pluricultural competence in future citizens, with ongoing exploration how it might function better at regional, national and European levels. Overall the researcher believes “that beyond this initial threshold, the next stage is to ‘mainstream’ CLIL so that more learners become participants in effective learning communities and that such experiences will become an entitlement during compulsory education extending to vocational, work and recreational contexts. CLIL will then be cast as a core component of the European Languages Portfolio” [3: 27].

Development of the main provisions of content-language integrated learning was affected by a wide range of factors of theoretical and methodological character. The conceptual framework of CLIL derived from CBL, in particular it is based on the adopted in SLA principles of proximal zone of development, internal speech and learning tasks, as well as, the psycholinguistic postulate of CO (M. Swain) and hypothesis of “input+1” (S. Krashen). The influence of the earlier established integrated language learning methods of CBI and ESP resulted in accumulation of a number of common features alongside with formation of a strong shift toward a focus on the subject content, not the language itself. Besides, consistency and stability of support from the European language policy has been incorporated in multiple European Commission official recommendations [11; 12; 13; 14] relatively bilingual education and a number of successful EU projects, that were launched with aim of international cooperation and linguistic diversity promotion, resulted in widespread European application of CLIL models as mainstream in language education.

The prospects of the further research in the field of integration in language learning are determined by necessity to focus on the issue of adaptation of CLIL to the conditions of study at non-linguistic higher education establishments in Ukraine. It implies analysis of the main research findings in works of the Ukrainian methodologists interested in content-language integrated learning, taking to account the strong and weak points of the existing organizational models alongside with development of the original integral methodological system of integrated learning of professionally oriented English communication for the future specialists, in particular, journalists.

REFERENCES

1. Brinton D. M., Snow M. A., Wesche M. Content-Based Second Language Instruction. Michigan Classics Edition, 2003. 304 p. URL: <https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.8754>
2. Coyle D. Content and language integrated learning: Towards a connected research agenda for CLIL pedagogies. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 2007. Vol. 10 (5), pp. 543-562.
3. Coyle D. Relevance of CLIL to the European Commission Language Learning Objectives. In D. Marsh (Ed.), *CLIL/EMILE European Dimension: Actions, Trends and Foresight Potential European Commission, Public Services Contract DG 3406/001-001*, 2002. 204 p. URL: https://www.ecml.at/Portals/1/resources/Articles%20and%20publications%20on%20the%20ECML/CLIL_EMILE.pdf
4. Crandall J. Content-centered language learning. *ERIC Digest*, 1994. 4 p. URL: <http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/crandal01.html>
5. Cummins J. Immersion education for the millennium: What have we learned from 30 years of research on second language immersion? In M. R. Childs & R. M. Bostwick (Eds.) *Learning through two languages: Research and practice. Second Katoh Gakuen International Symposium on Immersion and Bilingual Education*. (pp. 34–47). Katoh Gakuen, Japan, 1998. URL: <https://carla.umn.edu/cobalt/modules/strategies/immersion2000.pdf>
6. Cummins J. *Language, Power and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire*. Multilingual Matters Ltd Clevedon, Buffalo, Toronto, Sydney: Cambrian Printers Ltd., 2000. 320 p.
7. Cummins J. Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2007. Vol. 10, pp. 221-240.
8. Dalton-Puffer C., Nikula T. Content and language integrated learning. *The Language Learning Journal*, 2014. Vol. 42 (2), pp. 117-122. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2014.891370>
9. 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. Vol. 1 (2), pp. 216–253.

10. Dalton-Puffer C., Llinares A., Lorenzo F., Nikula T. "You Can Stand Under My Umbrella": Immersion, CLIL and Bilingual Education. A Response to Cenoz, Genesee & Gorter (2013). *Applied Linguistics*, 2014. Vol. 35 (2), pp. 213-218. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amu010>
11. European Commission Press Release Database. Green light for Erasmus+: More than 4 million to get EU grants for skills and employability, 2013. URL: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-1110_en.htm
12. European Commission, Directorate-General for Education, Youth, Sport and Culture. Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at school in Europe. Publications Office, 2006. URL: <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/756ebdaa-f694-44e4-8409-21eef02c9b9b>
13. European Commission, Directorate-General for Education, Youth, Sport and Culture. Promoting language learning and linguistic diversity: action plan 2004-06. Publications Office, 2005. URL: <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/b3225824-b016-42fa-83f6-43d9fd2ac96d/language-en/format-PDF/source-search>
14. Eurydice Report. Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at school in Europe. European Commission, 2006. URL: <http://www.eurydice.org/index.shtml>
15. Freed B., Segalowitz N., Dewey D. Context of Learning and Second Language Fluency in French: Comparing Regular Classroom, Study Abroad, and Intensive Domestic Immersion Programs. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 2004. Vol. 26 (2), pp. 275–301. doi:10.1017/S0272263104262064
16. Fruhauf G., Coyle D., Ingeborg Christ I. Teaching Content in a Foreign Language. Practice and Perspective in European Bilingual Education. The European Platform for Dutch Education. The Hague: The Netherlands, 1996. 159 p.
17. Grabe W., Stoller F. Content-Based Instruction: Research Foundations, In M. Snow, D. Brinton (Eds.)/ The Content-Based Classroom. Perspectives on Integrating Language and Content (pp. 5–21). New York: Longman, 1997.
18. Iluk J. Nauczanie bilingwalne: modele, koncepcje, założenia metodyczne [Bilingual learning: model, concept, methodological support]. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 2000. 145 p. [in Polish]. URL: <http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12128/10697>
19. Johns A. Text, Role, and Context: Developing Academic Literacies. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997. 187 p.
20. Krashen S. The input hypothesis: issues and implication. London: Longman, 1985. 120 p.
21. Lantolf J. P., Sunderman G. The struggle for a place in the sun: Rationalizing foreign language study in the twentieth century. *The Modern Language Journal*, 2001. Vol. 85 (1), pp. 5-25.
22. Llinares A., Morton T. and Whittaker R. The Roles of Language in CLIL. Cambridge University Press, 2012. 334 p.
23. Lorenzo F. Genre-based curricula: multilingual academic literacy in content and language integrated learning. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 2013. Vol. 16 (3), pp. 375-388.
24. Lyster R. Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 2004. Vol. 26 (3). pp. 399-432.
25. Lyster R. Learning and Teaching Languages Through Content: A counterbalanced approach. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2007. 172 p.
26. Maljers A., Marsh D., Wolff D. (Eds.). Windows on CLIL. Content and language integrated learning in the European spotlight. Alkmaar: European Platform for Dutch Education, 2007. 178 p.
27. Marsh D., Masih J. Teaching content through a foreign language. In Fruhauf G., Coyle D., Christ I. (Eds.). Teaching content in a foreign language. Practice and perspectives in European bilingual education (pp. 45-66). The European Platform for Dutch Education. The Hague: The Netherlands, 1996. 252 p.
28. Marsh D. Content and Language Integrated Learning: The European Dimension. Actions, Trends and Foresight Potential. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, 2002. 552 p. URL: <http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/languages/index.html>
29. Marsh D., Langé. G. (Eds.). Using languages to learn and learning to use languages. Finland: University of Jyväskylä, 2000. 156 p.
30. Mäsch N. The German Model of Bilingual Education: an Administrator's Perspective. In H. Baetens Beardsmore (Ed.) *European Models of Bilingual Education* (pp. 155–172). Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, 1993. 210 p.
31. Mehisto P., March D., Fligol M. J. Uncovering CLIL. Content and Language integrated learning in bilingual and multilingual education. MacMillans books for teachers, 2008. 238 p.
32. Papaja K. Focus on CLIL: A qualitative evaluation of content and language integrated learning (CLIL) in Polish secondary education. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014. 231 p.
33. Pavesi M., Bertocchi D., Hofmannová M., Kazianka M. CLIL guidelines for teachers. Milan: TIE CLIL, 2001. 32 p.
34. Räsänen A., Greere A.A. Redefining 'CLIL' towards multilingual competence. Lanqua subproject on, 2008. URL: http://www.lanqua.eu/files/Year1Report_CLIL_ForUpload_WithoutAppendices_0.pdf

35. Short D. J. How to Integrate Content and Language Learning Effectively for English Language Learners. Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 2017. Vol. 13 (7b), pp. 4237-4260. doi.org/10.12973/eurasia.2017.00806a
36. Snow M. A. Content-Based Second/Foreign-Language Instruction. The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics, 2012. Vol. 1. pp. 1-7.
37. Stoller F. L. Content-based instruction: A shell for language teaching or a framework for strategic language and content learning? Proc. of the 36th Annual TESOL Convention, Salt Lake City, UT, 2002. URL: <http://www.carla.umn.edu/cobaltt/modules/strategies/Stoller2002/READING1/stoller2002.htm>
38. Stoller F. L., Fitzsimmons-Doolan S. Content-based instruction. Encyclopedia of language and education, 2008. Vol. 4, pp. 59-70.
39. Swain M. Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.) Input in second language acquisition (pp. 235–256). Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1985. 473 p.
40. Tarnopolsky O. Content-Based Instruction, CLIL, and Immersion in Teaching ESP at Tertiary Schools in Non-English-Speaking Countries. Journal of ELT and Applied Linguistics (JELTAL), 2013. Vol. 1 (1), pp. 1–11.
41. Tzoannopoulou M. Rethinking ESP: Integrating Content and Language in the University Classroom. Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2015. Vol. 173, pp. 149-153. doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.02.045
42. Ullman M. History and geography through French: CLIL in a UK secondary school. In J. Masih (Ed.) Learning through a foreign language: models, methods and outcomes. (pp. 96-105) London, CILT, 1999. 158 p.
43. Van de Craen P., Mondt K., Allain L., Gao Y. B. Why and how CLIL works. An outline for a CLIL theory. CLIL Special Issue 2, 2007. Vol. 16 (3), pp. 70-78.
44. Widening Our Horizons: Report of the Review of the Teaching of Modern Languages in Higher Education. Australian Government Publishing Service, 1991. T. 1. 664 p.
45. Wolff D. Integrating language and content in the language classroom: Are transfer of knowledge and of language ensured? Asp, 2003. Vol. 41–42, pp. 35-46.
46. Wolff D. Approaching CLIL. In D. Marsh (Coord.) The CLIL quality matrix. (pp. 10-26) Central workshop report, 2005. 31 p. URL: http://www.ecml.at/mtp2/CLILmatrix/pdf/wsrepD3E2005_6.pdfУДК 378.091.33:811.111'276.5

УДК 378:373.3.091.12.011.3-051:811.161.2'374]:004.032.6
DOI 10.25128/2415-3605.22.1.21

ГАЛИНА ОДИНЦОВА

ORCID ID 0000-0003-0808-1522
odyntsova@ukr.net

кандидат філологічних наук, доцент
Тернопільський національний педагогічний університет
імені Володимира Гнатюка
вул. Максима Кривоноса, 2, м. Тернопіль

ВИКОРИСТАННЯ ВУОД-ТЕХНОЛОГІЇ У ПРОЦЕСІ УДОСКОНАЛЕННЯ ЛЕКСИКОГРАФІЧНОЇ КОМПЕТЕНТНОСТІ МАЙБУТНІХ УЧИТЕЛІВ ПОЧАТКОВОЇ ШКОЛИ

Окреслено важливість упровадження інноваційних освітніх технологій у практику закладів вищої освіти. З'ясовано сутність понять «мобільне навчання», «ВУОД-технологія». Відзначено, що створення мобільного освітнього середовища належить до компетентісно орієнтованих технологій. Охарактеризовано переваги мобільного навчання стосовно інших інноваційних технологій. Проаналізовано зміст і структуру поняття «лексикографічна компетентність» у науково-педагогічній літературі, запропоновано власне тлумачення цього терміна. Виділено компоненти лексикографічної компетентності: лексикографічні знання (знання типів словників і їхнього призначення, принципів побудови словникової статті, основних праць із лексикографії та їхніх авторів тощо); лексикографічні вміння (уміння користуватися словниками різних типів; знаходити і вилучати необхідну інформацію; збагачувати лексикографічний портрет слова граматичною та стилістичною інформацією, яка міститься у примітках, скороченнях й ін.); лексикографічні навички (робота зі збирання