
БІЛІМ БЕРУДЕ ИННОВАЦИЯЛАР МЕН ДӘСТҮРЛЕР ТРАДИЦИИ И ИННОВАЦИИ В ОБРАЗОВАНИИ TRADITIONS AND INNOVATIONS IN EDUCATION

UDC 373.2

B.A. Zhetpisbayeva

*Ye.A. Buketov Karaganda State University, Kazakhstan
(E-mail: zhetpisbayeva@mail.ru)*

The notion of «CLIL-teacher» concept

This article attempts to reveal the essence of the «CLIL-teacher». This notion is quite new for pedagogical science. The validity of this definition has been provided by addressing the terminology theory in pedagogy, when we had chosen an algorithm of four analytical procedures as a starting point: targeted study of terms, etymological analysis, contextual analysis and normalization of the author's term system. The conclusion of terms targeted learning allowed discovering that despite many interpretations, the unifying core of the concept of CLIL is a dual goal - learning a non-language subject and target languages. As a result of etymological analysis, it has been determined that CLIL has an English origin. The contextual analysis has revealed that as CLIL spreads, it acquires a broader meaning: from methodology to self-direction in the sphere of multilingual education. In the end we have provided our own interpretation of the «CLIL-teacher» notion.

Keywords: CLIL, CLIL-teacher, integrated learning, terminology, term formation, multilingual education, target languages.

As is known, any scientific research is always conducted on the basis of a specific conceptual apparatus. This is the primary condition for conducting scientific research. According to I.M. Cantor, «terminology is the basis of the language of science. It denotes the essential features and signs of pedagogical processes and phenomena. Just as scientific generalizations are impossible outside a certain linguistic terminological form, scientific terminology is impossible outside the prevailing system of concepts, judgments and conclusions. The set of concepts and terms corresponding to them creates the thinking and language apparatus of science, determines its boundaries and topical issues» [1].

At the same time modern pedagogical science still has some obvious problems in the sphere of different interpretations of its concepts and terms. This is due not only subjective, but also a number of significant objective factors. According to G.N. Shtinova, there are the following factors among them:

1) transparency of the pedagogical boundaries, the emergence of a significant part of narrowly specialized terms into the category of general language vocabulary, which makes most pedagogical terms commonly used, therefore, not always correctly used;

2) close connection with other sciences (philosophy, psychology, law, physiology, etc.), systematic consideration of knowledge of other disciplines and constant term exchange, which also often leads to meaningful and semantic distortion;

3) terminological polysemy, which is expressed in the multidimensional nature of pedagogical concepts and the impossibility to reflect all their aspects in one definition;

4) terminological variation - the use of its synonyms or other lexical units along with the main term, which leads to the parallel existence of terms with the same content, but different designations;

5) unpredictability of the term fixation in the scientific circulation (as opposed to natural or technical sciences, where the term is fixed by copyright and must be accepted by the scientific community) [2].

That is why for the most correct definition of a concept it is very important to strictly observe the principles of constructing the conceptual apparatus of pedagogical science. They include:

1) monosemy (the content should be strictly fixed). This is especially important, since according to the results of the analysis conducted by I.Kicheva [3], about 28 % of the total number of identified new terms in pedagogical terminology are related by synonymous relations. These relations are absolute synonymy (doublet reflection) — more than 71 %. It is hard not to agree with the scientist that the use of doublet terms in pedagogy indicates the search for the most successful form for expressing a new concept, but at the same time an increase in the number of doublet terms clutters up the conceptual and terminological apparatus of pedagogy and creates the illusion of the formation of new concepts;

2) systematicity (compliance with both conceptual and lexical systems of modern pedagogy). This principle for our study is updated in connection with the intensive borrowing of terms, including foreign ones, indicating the development of interdisciplinary pedagogical research. It is clear that this process introduces new knowledge into the conceptual and terminological apparatus of pedagogy, at the same time it leads to its overloading. Therefore, the borrowing of terms should meet the pedagogical goals and objectives, should be justified by the need to introduce it;

3) the adequacy of lexical, morphological means and syntactic constructions to the content of the term, in other words, one of the requirements for the pedagogical term should be compliance with the motivation of its linguistic expression, since the «motivated term» is easier to perceive, ensures its adequate perception [3]. What has been said here is directly related to the previous principle. In general, motivation shows why a given object or phenomenon received this name;

4) ability to word formation;

5) brevity (the minimum of possible phrase combinations).

In addition to the above-mentioned principles of term formation, for introducing new concepts into scientific use, it is necessary to observe a number of conditions, namely:

– abstraction and generalization of the essential features;

– the content of the concept must have a certain form, or verbal design [4]. It should also be remembered that in the course of cognition, a constant adjustment of the content of the concept is carried out [5].

In addition, for disclosing the content of the concept, scientists strongly recommend:

a) to identify key features (using abstraction, comparison);

b) to specify the specifics, thereby ensuring its independent status;

c) to take into account the data obtained and in accordance with the laws of the language and the requirements of logic to create the author's wording of the definition [6].

These recommendations of N.O. Yakovleva we use along with the four main analytical procedures proposed by I.N. Kuznetsov, namely:

1) *targeted study of terms*: the identification of terms and their corresponding concepts, the selection of basic terms, the identification of the established practice of their use, the fixation of all inaccuracies and illogic of terms and their definitions;

2) *etymological analysis*: finding out the original meaning of the word, learning the language environment that served as its primary source;

3) *contextual analysis*: study of the process of formation and development of the concept inside science, the study of terms and the concepts reflected by them from the moment they enter into the term system of science, characterization of the use of the term in texts written at different times;

4) *normalization of an author's term system*: return to the author's term system, clarifying its composition taking into account new materials, building clear concepts for each term, establishing unambiguous, logically based links between concepts [7].

We intend to perform the above two algorithms of actions in relation to the new concept of «CLIL-teacher». In general, when introducing a new concept («CLIL-teacher»), as well as clarifying and expanding the concepts used in science («competence of CLIL-teacher» and «training CLIL-teacher»), we relied on the works of such scholars in the field of terminology, as I.M. Cantor, D.P. Gorskii, V.P. Danilenko, S.G. Barkhudarov, N.L. Korshunova, and B.T. Likhachev [8-13].

To study the three key concepts of our study, a circle of related terms was defined: CLIL (term-abbreviation), competence, teacher competence, teacher readiness, teacher training, and others.

Central to all three key concepts is the foreign language abbreviation term «CLIL», borrowed from English. In decoding, it means - Content and Language Integrated Learning. The term was put into scientific use in 1994 by David Marsh (University of Jyväskylä, Finland), who in his article «The relevance of learning and language refers to any two-field-focused educational context in which an additional language, ..., is used as a means for teaching a non-language subject» [14]. According to the scientist, CLIL is related to situations

in which school subjects or part of school subjects are studied in a foreign language and have a dual purpose to study a subject while learning a foreign language, although the focus may be on either language or non-language subject.

The idea of using the principle of integrated teaching in the subject and language arose as a result of increased requirements for the level of proficiency in a foreign language with a limited time. In the 1990s, the Council of Europe and the European Commission initiated the use of CLIL as a European approach to bilingual education [15]. According to representatives of the public organization Eurydice, the use of CLIL implies that a non-language subject is taught not only in a foreign language, but with the help or through a foreign language.

For several years at the end of the last century, a number of scientists (Coyle Do, Hood Philip, Marsh David, Dalton Puffer, Fernandez Fontecha, A.Gierlinger, Koopman G., Anikina Y., Westhoff G. David Lasagabaster, Yolanda Ruizde Zarobe, Dieter Wolff, Stephan Breidbachand, Britta Viebrock, Movchan Larysa, Kari Nieminen) are purposefully engaged in the study of this technology, the development and improvement of its methods and forms [16]. It should be noted that researchers of those years associated this technology with the teaching of a foreign language, mainly English. CLIL is studied and tested in universities of several European countries (Spain, Italy, Czech Republic, Lithuania, etc.), it is actively used in public schools in Finland, Sweden, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Spain and a number of other countries.

Practically in all sources it is noted that the main provisions of CLIL are built on four «с»:

- «Content» — mastering new knowledge and skills in a non-language subject;
- «Communication» — usage of a foreign language for communication;
- «Cognition» — development of students' mental abilities for a better understanding of the language and subject;
- «Culture» — mastering the culture of the countries of the studied languages through an understanding of their characteristics, similarities and differences with their native culture and on this basis the development of students' abilities to adapt in the multicultural space.

Already at the first approximation to the essence of CLIL, it can be argued that, being introduced as a teaching method, this phenomenon, attracting the attention of a wide range of researchers, experts, attracts into its orbit a number of concepts and terms, such as: CLIL-technology, CLIL education, CLIL competencies, CLIL approach, CLIL program, first and second languages, target languages, etc. Indeed, in their totality, the above four components of CLIL directly correlate with the principles of modern foreign language and multilingual education, namely, the principle of learning the language and culture, the principle of learning the language. In other words, when learning languages, culture should be subject to co-study. This is one line. The second line is determined by the fact that when learning a native language and culture, a foreign language and a foreign culture become the subject of study. That is why it is necessary to combine the study of the second (third, etc.) language and culture of the country of the target language with the study of the native language and the native (national) culture.

Regarding this aspect B.A. Zhetpisbayeva emphasizes that with this approach it is impossible to assume or set the goal of learning full acculturation. In this regard, it would be more correct to speak about the formation by means of the native and studied languages of a single multicultural personality, the distinguishing feature of which is conscious self-determination in the spectrum of cultures of modern multicultural societies. That is why it is proposed to consider the cultural self-determination of individuals studying with the means of their native and studied language as one of the final target levels of bilingual or multilingual socio-cultural competence [17].

We believe that this example is enough to declare the relevance of such a thing as «CLIL-education». The exception does not constitute other terms that we have cited above, for example, the CLIL-approach. So, Do Coyle, Philip Hood, David Marsh define CLIL as a pedagogical approach that focuses on achieving two goals - teaching a non-language subject and a foreign language, and the focus, depending on the task, may shift from the subject content to the language and vice versa [16]. At the same time, which is especially important, the priority task of CLIL is not so much the teaching of foreign languages, as the formation of students' subject and language competences. In other words, as goals CLIL considers not only the mastery of knowledge on a non-language subject and the formation of foreign language competence in a given subject area, but also the development of students' cognitive abilities. They are divided into low-order thinking skills (LOTs) - fairly simple skills (memorization, classification, definition of an object, etc.) and high order thinking skills (HOTs) - high-order thinking operations (forecasting, reasoning, creative thinking, synthesis, evaluation) [18].

To better understand existing CLIL models, it is important to know and understand another term «target languages». To reveal its essence, we will highlight a specific context, and consider it in the context of Kazakhstan's trilingual education, which has identified three target languages: Kazakh and Russian as second languages, English as the third language. We would like to clarify the terminology:

- the first language (L1) is the language of instruction at school. There are five of them in Kazakhstan: Kazakh (L1), Russian (L1), Tajik (L1), Uzbek (L1), and Uigur (L1);
- the second language (L2) is: the Kazakh language (L2) in schools with non-Kazakh language of instruction and Russian (L2) in schools with non-Russian language of instruction;
- the third language (L3) is a foreign language. In the schools of Kazakhstan, these include English (L3), German (L3) and French (L3);
- the target language is: Kazakh (L2), Russian (L2), English (L3), i.e. second and third languages.

The choice of target languages in Kazakhstan is based on the idea of a trinity, expressed by the following formula: we develop the state language, we support Russian, and we learn English [19].

Then the following CLIL models become clear, which are based on two basic concepts — «language» and «integration»:

- soft CLIL - language-led, using the target language in a particular lesson (lesson) in a non-language subject, and in the target language lessons using themes and materials from non-language subjects, while there are no clear standards for the percentage of study time for using it (this is a partial immersion mode in language);
- hard CLIL - subject-led, curriculum development, in which at least 40 % of non-language subjects are taught in target languages (this is a mode of complete immersion in the language).
- CLIL as a technique requires adherence to a number of principles:
 - authenticity, active learning, safe learning environment, gradual learning (scaffolding learning), interdisciplinary communication, cultural awareness, internationalization (harmonization);
 - the formation of students' linguistic and communicative competences in a non-native language in the same educational context in which they develop and develop general educational knowledge and skills;
 - focus on pupils' age;
 - the use exclusively of one (foreign) language, the same teacher and audience;
 - the teacher of a non-language subject to a certain extent becomes the teacher of the target language.

Other benefits of CLIL are:

- 1) increasing the motivation of students to learn a foreign language to solve specific communication problems;
- 2) better understanding of the culture of the country of the target language, which contributes to the formation of socio-cultural competence among students;
- 3) a large amount of language material (especially due to the development of the terminology of non-linguistic subjects), which certainly develops the vocabulary of students.

All of the above suggests that the CLIL-method is one of the directions in the communicative methodology of foreign languages and shares all the principles of communicative learning.

CLIL as a technology involves the integration of a non-language subject and language, which can be implemented in different ways:

- the study of the target language may be included in the program of teaching a non-language subject (history, geography, chemistry, biology, and etc.);
- subject content can be used in the target language classes.

CLIL as a program can have three options:

- 1) C1: Plurilingual education.
- 2) C2: Supplementary / additional integrated teaching of the subject and language (Adjunct CLIL).
- 3) C3: Language-embedded content courses.

Depending on the option chosen, the language can act either as a *language of learning*, or as a *language for learning*, or as a *language through learning* [20].

As a rule, CLIL is understood as an innovative technology of teaching non-language subjects in a foreign language. In addition, it should be stipulated that the methodology with respect to technology is part of the total. In this sense, we adhere to the understanding of learning technology as a set of methods and means of presenting educational material.

So, for the definition of the new concept «CLIL-teacher» we applied, as we mentioned earlier, an algorithm of four analytical procedures proposed by I.N. Kuznetsov. On this basis, we have come to the following conclusions:

1) as a result of the first analytical procedure — *targeted study of terms* — we found that the basic term is the concept CLIL, which is widely used in scientific and professional environments, which is interpreted both as education, as a pedagogical approach, and as a program, as a technique, and as a technology in because it has its own methodological principles, different models, different applications, but the unifying core is a dual goal - learning a non-language subject and target languages with the priority of the first. Consequently, is directly related to the teacher non-language subjects. This is the first. Secondly, we understand CLIL as a technology, and further in our dissertation we will adhere to this position;

2) as a result of the second analytical procedure — *the etymological analysis* — we found out that in its original meaning the concept of CLIL was used as a method of integrated learning for a non-language subject and a foreign (mostly English) language, has English-language;

3) as a result of the third analytical procedure — *contextual analysis* — we found out that as the functional scope of the application spreads and expands, this term acquires a broader meaning: from methodology to self-direction in multilingual education;

4) as a result of the fourth analytical procedure — *the normalization of the author's term system* — we gave our interpretation of the notion «CLIL-teacher»: this is a teacher (teacher / teacher) of a non-language subject / discipline with knowledge of the target language, carrying out his professional activities based on the application of CLIL-technology.

Let us clarify the clarifications: teacher / lecturer and subject / discipline. This means that our definition of the term «CLIL-teacher» applies to all levels of education, starting with school education and ending with postgraduate education.

We especially stress the need to use this concept in the context of a multilingual education, when it should not be allowed to be arbitrarily extracted from the specified contextual field, which can lead to a complete distortion of its essence.

References

- 1 Кантор И.М. Понятийно-терминологическая система педагогики: Логико-методологические проблемы / И.М. Кантор. — М.: Педагогика, 1980. — 133 с.
- 2 Штинова Г.Н. Предмет и проблематика педагогической лексикографии как прикладного раздела педагогической теории / Г.Н. Штинова // Понятийный аппарат педагогики и образования: сб. науч. тр. — Екатеринбург: УрГПУ; УГППУ, 1995. — Вып. 1. — С. 178–189.
- 3 Кичева И.В. Формирование понятийно-терминологической системы педагогики в 90-е годы XX века: дис. ... д-ра пед. наук: 13.00.01 – «Общая педагогика, история педагогики и образования» / И.В. Кичева. — Пятигорск, 2004. — 507 с.
- 4 Резников Л.О. Понятие и слово / Л.О. Резников. — Л.: Изд-во ЛГУ, 1958. — 124 с.
- 5 Кошкина Е.А. Педагогическая терминология как объект междисциплинарного исследования [Электронный ресурс] / Е.А. Кошкина. — Режим доступа: [http:// sun.tsu.ru](http://sun.tsu.ru).
- 6 Яковлева Н.О. Понятийный аппарат современного педагогического исследования / Н.О. Яковлева // Педагогическое образование и наука. — 2012. — № 12. — С. 94–99.
- 7 Кузнецов И.Н. Научное исследование: Методика проведения и оформление / И.Н. Кузнецов. — 2-е изд., перераб. и доп. — М.: Издат.-торговая корпорация «Дашков и Ко», 2006. — 460 с.
- 8 Кантор И.М. Педагогическая лексикография и лексикология / И.М. Кантор. — М.: Просвещение, 1968. — 200 с.
- 9 Горский Д.П. Вопросы абстракции и образования понятий / Д.П. Горский. — М.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1961. — 351 с.
- 10 Даниленко В.П. Лексика языка науки. Терминология: автореф. дис. ... д-ра филол. наук: 10.02.01 – «Русский язык» / В.П. Даниленко. — М., 1977. — 41 с.
- 11 Бархударов С.Г. О значении и задачах научных исследований в области терминологии // Лингвистические проблемы научно-технической терминологии / С.Г. Бархударов; под ред. С.Г. Бархударова. — М.: Наука, 1970. — С. 157–162.
- 12 Коршунова Н.Л. Методологические условия однозначности терминов в педагогическом исследовании: автореф. дис. ... канд. пед. наук: 13.00.01 – «Общая педагогика, история педагогики и образования» / Н.Л. Коршунова. — М., 1990. — 20 с.
- 13 Лихачев Б.Т. Педагогика: Курс лекций / Б.Т. Лихачев. — М.: Прометей, 1993. — 520 с.
- 14 CLIL: An interview with Professor David Marsh // International House Journal of Higher Education, Issue 26: Spring 2009 (22). [Electronic resource]. — Access mode: // ihjournal.com.
- 15 Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at School in Europe. Eurydice. The Information Network on Education in Europe. — Brussels: Eurydice, 2005. — 80 p.
- 16 Coyle D., Hood P., Marsh D. CLIL content and language integrated learning / D. Coyle, P. Hood, D. Marsh. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. — 184 с.

17 Жетписбаева Б.А. Теоретико-методологические основы полиязычного образования: автореф. дис. ... д-ра пед. наук: 13.00.01 – «Общая педагогика, история педагогики и образования»/ Б.А. Жетписбаева. — Караганда: Изд-во КарГУ, 2010. — 44 с.

18 Tikhonova E. Sophisticated thinking: lower order thinking skills / E.Tikhonova, N.Kudinova // Education and Educational Research SGEM // 2015 International Multidisciplinary Scientific Conferences on Social Sciences and Arts [Electronic resource]. — Access mode: <http://imfl.sci.pfu.edu.ru/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/7.pdf>.

19 Жетписбаева Б.А. К вопросу о методическом обеспечении трехязычного образования / Б.А. Жетписбаева, А.Е. Кубеева // Вестн. Караганд. ун-та. Сер. Педагогика. — 2017. — № 2(86). — С. 138–145.

20 Анисимова А.Т. Приоритетность смыслопорождающей деятельности в овладении иностранным языком / А.Т. Анисимова // Вопросы теории и практики. — 2015. — № 3(45). — С. 15–17.

Б.А. Жетписбаева

«CLIL-педагог» ұғымының мәні туралы

Мақалада педагогикалық ғылым үшін жаңа «CLIL-педагог» ұғымының мәні ашылып, қарастырылған. Аталмыш анықтаманың негізділігі педагогикадағы терминдердің пайда болу теориясына жүгіну есебінен қамтамасыз етілген, бастапқы ұстаным ретінде біз төрт талдамалы рәсімдердің алгоритмін таңдадық: терминдерді мақсатты түрде зерттеу, этимологиялық талдау, контекстуалды талдау және авторлық терминдік жүйені қалыпқа келтіру. Терминдердің мақсатты түрде зерттеу көптеген түсініктерге қарамастан, «CLIL» ұғымын біріктіруші ядро ретінде екі мақсат – тілдік емес пәндер мен мақсатты тілдерді оқыту деген қорытынды жасадық. Этимологиялық талдау нәтижесінде CLIL ағылшын тілінен шыққан екендігін анықтадық. Контекстуалды талдау CLIL таралуына қарай кең мағынаға: әдістемеден бастап көптілді білім беруде дербес бағытқа ие болатынын анықтауға мүмкіндік берді. Қорыта келе, авторлық терминдік жүйені қалыпқа келтіру «CLIL-педагог» ұғымы жайлы түсініктеме беруге мүмкіндік берді.

Кілт сөздер: CLIL, CLIL-педагог, кіріктірілген оқыту, терминжасам, көптілді білім беру, мақсатты тілдер.

Б.А. Жетписбаева

О сущности понятия «CLIL-педагог»

В статье раскрыта сущность нового для педагогической науки понятия «CLIL-педагог». Обоснованность данной дефиниции обеспечена за счет обращения к теории терминообразования в педагогике, когда в качестве исходной позиции нами был выбран алгоритм четырех аналитических процедур: целевое изучение терминов, этимологический анализ, контекстуальный анализ и нормализация авторской терминосистемы. Целевое изучение терминов позволило сделать вывод о том, что, несмотря на множество трактовок, объединяющим ядром понятия CLIL выступает двойная цель — обучение неязыковому предмету и целевым языкам. В результате этимологического анализа было установлено, что CLIL имеет англоязычное происхождение. Контекстуальный анализ позволил выяснить, что по мере распространения CLIL приобретает более широкое значение: от методики до самостоятельного направления в полиязычном образовании. И наконец, нормализация авторской терминосистемы позволила дать свою трактовку понятию «CLIL-педагог».

Ключевые слова: CLIL, CLIL-педагог, интегрированное обучение, терминология, терминообразование, полиязычное образование, целевые языки.

References

- 1 Kantor, I.M. (1980). *Poniatiiino-terminolohicheskaia sistema pedahohiki: Lohiko-metodolohicheskie problemy [Conceptual and terminological system of pedagogy: Logical and methodological problems]*. Moscow: Pedahohika [in Russian].
- 2 Shtinova, G.N. (1995). *Predmet i problematika pedahohicheskoi leksikohrafiu kak prikladnoho razdela pedahohicheskoi teorii [The subject and problems of pedagogical lexicography as an applied section of pedagogical theory]*. *Poniatiiinyi apparat pedahohiki i obrazovaniia – Conceptual apparatus of pedagogy and education, Vol. 1*, 178–189. Ekaterinburg [in Russian].
- 3 Kicheva, I.V. (2004). *Formirovanie poniatiiino-terminolohicheskoi sistemy pedahohiki v 90-e hody XX veka [Formation of the conceptual-terminological system of pedagogy in the 90s of the XX century]*. *Doctor's thesis*. Piatiorsk [in Russian].
- 4 Reznikov, L.O. (1958). *Poniatie i slovo [Concept and word]*. Leningrad: Izdatelstvo LHU [in Russian].
- 5 Koshkina, E.A. *Pedahohicheskaia terminolohiia kak obekt mezhdistsiplinarnoho issledovaniia [Pedagogical terminology as an object of interdisciplinary research]*. *sun.tsu.ru*. Retrieved from <http://sun.tsu.ru> [in Russian].

- 6 Yakovleva, N.O. (2012). Poniatiinyi apparat sovremennoho pedahohicheskoho issledovaniia [Conceptual apparatus of modern pedagogical research]. *Pedahohicheskoe obrazovanie i nauka – Pedagogical education and science*, 12, 94–99 [in Russian].
- 7 Kuznetsov, I.N. (2006). Nauchnoe issledovanie: Metodika provedeniia i oformlenie [Scientific research: Methodology and design]. (2d ed.). Moscow: Izdatel'sko-torhovaia korporatsiia «Dashkov i Ko» [in Russian].
- 8 Kantor, I.M. (1961). *Pedahohicheskaia leksikografiia i leksikolohiia [Pedagogical lexicography and lexicology]*. Moscow: Prosveshchenie [in Russian].
- 9 Gorskii, D.P. (1961). *Voprosy abstraktii i obrazovaniia poniatii [Questions of abstraction and education concepts]*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR [in Russian].
- 10 Danilenko, V.P. (1977). Leksika yazyka nauki. Terminolohiia [The vocabulary of the language of science. Terminology]. *Extended abstract of Doctor's thesis*. Moscow [in Russian].
- 11 Barkhudarov, S.G. (1970). O znachenii i zadachakh nauchnykh issledovaniy v oblasti terminolohii [On the meaning and objectives of scientific research in the field of terminology]. *Linhvistiicheskie problemy nauchno-tekhnicheskoi terminolohii – Linguistic problems of scientific and technical terminology*, 157–162. Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].
- 12 Korshunova, N.L. (1990). Metodolohicheskie usloviia odnoznachnosti terminov v pedahohicheskom issledovanii [Methodological conditions for the uniqueness of terms in pedagogical research]. *Extended abstract of Candidate's thesis*. Moscow [in Russian].
- 13 Likhachev B.T. (1993). *Pedahohika: Kurs leksii [Pedagogy: Course of lectures]*. Moscow: Prometei [in Russian].
- 14 CLIL: An interview with Professor David Marsh // *International House Journal of Higher Education*, Issue 26: Spring 2009 (22). *ihjournal.com*. Retrieved from //ihjournal.com.
- 15 Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at School in Europe. Eurydice. The Information Network on Education in Europe. (2005). Brussels: Eurydice.
- 16 Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 17 Zhetpisbayeva, B.A. (2010). Teoretiko-metodolohicheskie osnovy poliiazychnogo obrazovaniia [Theoretical and methodological foundations of multilingual education]. *Extended abstract of Doctor's thesis*. Moscow [in Russian].
- 18 Tikhonova, E., & Kudinova, N. (2015). Sophisticated thinking: lower order thinking thinking // SGM // *International Multidisciplinary Scientific Conferences on Social Sciences and Arts*. Retrieved from <http://imfl.sci.pfu.edu.ru/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/7.pdf>.
- 19 Zhetpisbayeva, B.A., & Kubeeva, A.E. (2017). K voprosu o metodicheskom obespechenii trekhazychnogo obrazovaniia [On the issue of methodological support of trilingual education]. *Vestnik Karahandinskogo universiteta. Seriya Pedahohika – Bulletin of Karaganda University. Pedagogy Series*, 2 (86), 138–145 [in Russian].
- 20 Anisimova, A.T. (2015). Prioritetnost smysloporozhdaiushchei deiatelnosti v ovladenii inostrannym yazykom [Priority meaning-generating activities in mastering a foreign language]. *Voprosy teorii i praktiki – Questions of theory and practice*, 3 (45), 15–17 [in Russian].