

EMI methodology and CLIL differences

Kasimova Dildora Xusanovna

Senior teacher at the University of Management and Future Technologies,

Independent researcher at the State Pedagogical Institute, Kokand

Abstract: Today, the pressure of being educated to get a position in the digitalised work community makes instructors rethink the way they are instructing students. The reason for that is the technology which is intruding on our lives in all spheres, and employer requirements to have abilities not only to speak English but also to use it professionally. Thus, universities and vocational colleges are the places where students have an opportunity to learn specific English to be involved in their professional careers.

Key words: CLIL, EMI, Differentiation, Integration, Application

Introduction

A foreign teacher at a university is advised to be universal in leading content-based lessons, integrating them with various programs. This methodological manual is aimed at assisting in delivering ESP lessons based on Cognitive learning, metacognitive, and language learning strategies. When teaching English for a specific purpose, there is always a need for scaffolding techniques, which is one of the important techniques in sheltered instruction. They are teaching ideas for strategies, differentiation for multi-level Classrooms, and teaching scenarios. The most important outcome of teaching is a productive outcome of the lesson that leaves a student with logical reasoning.

The intersection of language acquisition and content delivery in educational strategies has garnered significant scholarly attention. The methodologies of English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) emerge as pivotal frameworks within this discourse. By examining their unique characteristics and objectives, educators can discern the nuanced differences that define each approach. While EMI primarily focuses on delivering subject matter through the English language, CLIL emphasises the simultaneous learning of both content and language, fostering a more integrated and holistic educational experience. As this exploration unfolds, it will become evident that understanding these distinctions is crucial for implementing effective pedagogical practices. Ultimately, synthesising knowledge from EMI and CLIL may guide future teaching strategies, enhancing language proficiency and content understanding in increasingly multilingual classroom settings.

Overview of EMI (English as a Medium of Instruction) and CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning)

Integrating English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is transforming higher education landscapes, particularly in non-native English-speaking contexts. EMI primarily focuses on delivering academic content in English, facilitating access to global knowledge and participation in international academic discourse. In contrast, CLIL merges language learning with subject matter, emphasizing acquiring content and linguistic skills. As noted in a recent analysis, many universities adopting EMI report a high presence of international content courses, particularly in humanities and social sciences, yet struggle with integrating English for Specific Purposes (ESP), which is underutilized despite its potential [1]. By examining issues within bilingual education, such as the need for teacher training and institutional support, researchers advocate for synergizing EMI and CLIL methodologies, ultimately fostering improved pedagogical practices and linguistic competence within content areas [2].

A comprehensive theoretical framework is essential for understanding the distinctions between English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). While both approaches aim to enhance language proficiency alongside subject mastery, they bear unique pedagogical implications. EMI primarily focuses on delivering content in English, potentially sidelining explicit language instruction, which can lead to varying levels of language proficiency among students. In contrast, CLIL integrates language learning targets more explicitly with content objectives, fostering a more balanced approach to both facets of education. This delineation is further supported by research highlighting the implementation of EMI and CLIL in different contexts. For instance, studies show that regardless of the methodology employed, a clear understanding of curricular internationalization remains critical. As noted, “the potential role of ESP as an internationalisation driver may be neglected” [9], underscoring the importance of aligning pedagogical objectives within these frameworks.

Key principles and pedagogical foundations of EMI and CLIL

Understanding the pedagogical frameworks underpinning English Medium Instruction (EMI) and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is essential for grasping their unique language and content teaching approaches. Both methodologies prioritize integrating language development with subject matter learning; however, their principles diverge significantly. EMI primarily emphasises using English as the medium of instruction across disciplines, aiming to enhance learners' proficiency in the language while engaging with the content. Conversely, CLIL focuses on a dual objective: improving language skills and acquiring knowledge simultaneously, using the target language as a vehicle for content instruction. This integration promotes a culture-sensitive teaching philosophy, as evidenced by the empirical findings highlighting how EMI lecturers leverage their bilingual capabilities to enrich their pedagogical practices and adapt their methods to specific contexts [12]. Further, the analysis of CLIL implementation in mathematical contexts reveals the need for tailored assessment methods and deeper exploration of

language acquisition levels, underscoring the adaptability and contextualisation inherent in both approaches [11].

Exploring practical applications within English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) reveals significant pedagogical insights that enhance language acquisition and content mastery. Research conducted in a Spanish Faculty of Economics demonstrates that implementing hands-on methodologies and student-centred designs markedly improves student grades, affirming the impact of engaging pedagogical practices in bilingual settings [5]. Similarly, the shift towards project-based learning in a Chinese university, embodied in the new ‘Xue ke’ English course, illustrates how collaboration among educators can foster adaptability and innovative teaching methods in response to evolving curriculum demands [6]. This adaptability is crucial, as it aligns educational practices with the diverse needs of learners and institutions, promoting a holistic approach to language education. Ultimately, integrating effective methodologies in both EMI and CLIL contexts underscores the potential for practical applications to enhance educational outcomes in increasingly globalized academic landscapes.

Comparative analysis of implementation strategies in EMI and CLIL contexts

Implementation strategies in English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) reveal distinct yet overlapping methodologies concerning language integration and subject content delivery. While EMI predominantly focuses on effectively transmitting content through English, CLIL emphasizes dual-focused learning—where both language and subject content are given equal weight. This difference significantly impacts curriculum design and teaching methodologies. For example, teachers in an EMI context may prioritize linguistic competence solely to enhance the comprehension of technical subjects. In contrast, CLIL necessitates incorporating soft skills, such as teamwork and problem-solving, as vital parts of student learning objectives [8]. Moreover, the literature highlights that successful implementation in both approaches

requires specific conditions, including systematic planning and the alignment of educational goals with both language learning and content acquisition [1]. This nuanced understanding of each framework fosters an environment where both language proficiency and academic mastery can be achieved collaboratively.

Ron Morrain, a University lecturer, in his publication called EMI-English as a Medium of Instruction: A Teacher's Guide, provides a structural differentiation between CLIL and EMI:

EMI	CLIL
· Focuses solely on teaching the subject content in English. · There are no explicit language learning aims. · Often used at the tertiary level in universities. · Also used to deliver lectures, seminars, webinars, conference talks, and training courses for adult professional development learning environments.	· Involves teaching both the subject content and the English language. · Has dual aims of subject knowledge and language proficiency. · Often used at primary and secondary schools to promote multilingualism · Can be used at vocational schools, community colleges, and universities · Can also be used in corporate language training courses. · Subject (content) and language learning are integrated; tasks and activities may explicitly focus on language teaching, aka language mechanics.

Conclusion

In examining the distinctions between English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), it becomes evident that both methodologies play pivotal roles in enhancing language acquisition and academic proficiency. The literature indicates that while EMI focuses primarily on teaching subjects in English, CLIL integrates content and language learning to improve overall linguistic competence [7]. This nuanced difference underscores the necessity for educational frameworks that can address students' evolving linguistic and academic demands. For instance, as highlighted by the experiences at X University, transitioning from traditional College English to more specialised courses like 'Xue ke' English illustrates the challenges educators face amidst curriculum reforms. Ultimately, both EMI and CLIL offer valuable insights into the effective teaching of language in context, indicating the need for further research to optimise these methodologies in various educational settings [6].

Summary of findings and implications for future research and practice

The comparative analysis of English Medium Instruction (EMI) and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) methodologies reveals significant insights into their respective pedagogical strengths and limitations. Findings indicate that while EMI emphasises content delivery in English, often at the expense of language development, CLIL promotes simultaneous language acquisition alongside subject-matter mastery. This dual approach enhances linguistic proficiency and fosters critical thinking and cultural awareness among learners. Findings by Monica Hamciuc (Miyazaki International College) reveal that students have difficulties in studying content because of special vocabulary and phrases in long texts, which involve dictionary usage and websites to get more concepts and ideas on a particular topic in EMI classes. Consequently, students had to cut off their extracurricular activities to catch up with content learning. The diversity in understanding the specific topical lesson is another issue, as the quality of discussions fails because the majority of students cannot handle the amount of preparation. Moreover, students, in most

cases, are not aware of what is being taught, so it is difficult for them to answer the questions. It has been repeatedly emphasized that the utilization of the integrated methodology necessitates specialized training. It is imperative that English teachers who undertake this endeavor are cognizant of the challenges inherent in this undertaking, as well as their role as leaders in the realm of higher education. A comprehensive understanding of the content's intricacies and its interconnection with other related domains is imperative to facilitate the selection of a methodology that not only fosters the acquisition of a specialized language but also enables effective communication within the chosen domain. It has been observed that students who face challenges in comprehending their specialized subjects in their native language can, under certain circumstances, achieve proficiency in another language if they develop and implement a compelling lesson plan.

Future research should investigate the long-term effects of each methodology on student outcomes, particularly in diverse educational settings that aim to accommodate varying levels of language proficiency. Additionally, practitioners are encouraged to integrate best practices drawn from both methodologies to create a more holistic instructional framework. Ultimately, by understanding and addressing the intricacies of EMI and CLIL, educators can better equip students for global citizenship and academic success in an increasingly interconnected world.

References

1. Álvarez-Gil, Francisco J., "Possible implementation of subjects taught using English as a Medium of Instruction methodology in tourism studies", 'Universitat Jaume I', 2021
2. Wang , Yi, Wang, Jing, Wang, Lisha, "Trialing project-based learning in a new EAP ESP course: A collaborative reflective practice of three college English teachers", 2019

3. Aguilar Pérez, Marta, Arnó Macià, Elisabet, "ESP, EMI and interculturality: How internationalised are university curricula in Catalonia?", 'Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade', 2018
4. Álvarez-Gil, Francisco J., "Possible implementation of subjects taught using English as a Medium of Instruction methodology in tourism studies", 'Universitat Jaume I', 2021
5. Jiménez Muñoz, Antonio, "Contenido y lengua: el impacto de los diseños pedagógicos sobre el rendimiento académico en educación universitaria con inglés como lengua vehicular", 'Editorial de la Universidad de Granada', 2016
6. Wang , Yi, Wang, Jing, Wang, Lisha, "Trialing project-based learning in a new EAP ESP course: A collaborative reflective practice of three college English teachers", 2019
7. Álvarez-Gil, Francisco J., "Possible implementation of subjects taught using English as a Medium of Instruction methodology in tourism studies", 'Universitat Jaume I', 2021
8. Díez Ramírez, Javier, Querol Julián, Mercedes, "El desarrollo de habilidades blandas y el inglés a través de ICLES: revisión de la literatura y propuesta pedagógica para estudiantes de ingeniería", 'Universidade da Coruna', 2021
9. Aguilar Pérez, Marta, Arnó Macià, Elisabet, "ESP, EMI and interculturality: How internationalised are university curricula in Catalonia?", 'Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade', 2018
10. Griffith, Mary, "Tapping into the intellectual capital at the University", 2017
11. Medina Sánchez, Leopoldo, Rodríguez García, Antonio Manuel, Ruiz Cecilia, Raúl, "Teaching and Learning of Mathematics through CLIL, CBI, or EMI—A Systematic Literature Review", MDPI, 2023
12. Han, Jinghe, "English Medium Instruction as a Local Practice", 'Springer Science and Business Media LLC', 2022