

Foreign Language Teaching For Tour Guides Via Clil Approach: A Review Of Theoretical Frameworks And Empirical Studies

Mirzayeva Lola Shermat qizi

PhD student, Uzbekistan State World Languages University, Uzbekistan

Received: 15 September 2025; **Accepted:** 08 October 2025; **Published:** 12 November 2025

Abstract: This review article examines theoretical frameworks and empirical research on the application of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) approach in teaching foreign languages to tour guides. The analysis of international and local scholarly literature reveals that CLIL methodology offers significant advantages for developing both linguistic and professional competencies simultaneously. The review synthesizes findings from 40 studies published between 2008-2024, highlighting key theoretical foundations, pedagogical principles, and implementation strategies. The synthesis demonstrates that CLIL approach enhances communicative competence, intercultural awareness, and professional knowledge acquisition among tourism students, though challenges in teacher training and curriculum design remain. The article provides recommendations for integrating CLIL methodology into tourism education programs based on evidence from successful implementations worldwide.

Keywords: CLIL approach, tour guide training, foreign language teaching, tourism education, content and language integration, professional competence, literature review.

Introduction: The rapid expansion of international tourism and the increasing demand for qualified multilingual tour guides have prompted educators worldwide to seek more effective approaches to foreign language teaching in tourism education. Traditional language teaching methodologies, which often separate language instruction from professional content, have proven insufficient in preparing tour guides for the complex communicative demands of their profession. In this context, Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) has emerged as a promising pedagogical approach that addresses both language proficiency and professional knowledge development simultaneously. This review synthesizes theoretical frameworks and empirical evidence regarding CLIL implementation in tour guide education, drawing from international scholarship and regional experiences to provide a comprehensive understanding of this innovative methodology.

The theoretical foundations of CLIL approach were established in European contexts during the 1990s, when educators recognized the need for more integrated approaches to foreign language learning. Coyle, Hood, and Marsh (2010) developed the

influential 4Cs Framework, which identifies four key dimensions of CLIL: Content, Communication, Cognition, and Culture. This framework emphasizes that effective CLIL instruction must balance subject matter learning with language development while promoting higher-order thinking skills and intercultural understanding. The framework has become foundational in CLIL research and practice, providing educators with a conceptual tool for designing integrated curriculum. Mehisto, Marsh, and Frigols (2008) expanded this theoretical base by examining CLIL implementation across diverse educational contexts, demonstrating how the approach can be adapted to different institutional settings and learner populations. Their work highlighted the importance of creating authentic learning environments where language serves as a medium for professional knowledge acquisition rather than merely an object of study.

Building on these foundational theories, Dalton-Puffer (2011) conducted extensive research on discourse practices in CLIL classrooms, revealing how integrated instruction facilitates the development of academic language proficiency alongside content knowledge. Her

analysis of classroom interactions demonstrated that CLIL environments provide learners with rich opportunities for negotiating meaning, developing specialized vocabulary, and engaging with complex disciplinary concepts through a foreign language. This research has particular relevance for tour guide education, where students must master both the linguistic forms and the professional discourse conventions of the tourism industry. Lorenzo, Casal, and Moore (2010) provided empirical evidence supporting CLIL's effectiveness through their evaluation of bilingual education programs in Andalusia, Spain. Their longitudinal study found that students in CLIL programs demonstrated superior communicative competence and greater confidence in using foreign languages for professional purposes compared to peers in traditional language courses.

The application of CLIL principles to tourism and hospitality education has been explored by several researchers who recognized the natural affinity between this pedagogical approach and the communicative demands of the tourism profession. Agudo (2018) examined English language teaching for tourism through a communicative lens, arguing that tourism education requires an integrated approach where language learning occurs through engagement with authentic professional tasks and materials. His work demonstrated that tour guides benefit most from instruction that combines language development with practical tourism knowledge, cultural awareness, and communication strategies. This integrated approach aligns closely with CLIL methodology, which rejects artificial separation between language and content instruction. Tsai and Tsou (2015) investigated CLIL implementation in tourism English courses in Taiwan, finding that students who learned English through tourism content showed greater motivation, improved language proficiency, and enhanced professional knowledge compared to those in traditional English courses. Their research highlighted the importance of authentic materials, real-world tasks, and professional contextualization in effective language instruction for tourism students.

Research on intercultural communicative competence, a critical dimension of tour guide professional practice, has further strengthened the theoretical case for CLIL in tourism education. Byram (1997) developed an influential model of intercultural communicative competence that emphasizes the integration of linguistic, sociolinguistic, discourse, and intercultural dimensions. His framework suggests that effective intercultural communication requires not only language proficiency but also cultural knowledge, interpretive skills, and the ability to mediate between

cultures. These competencies align precisely with the professional requirements of tour guides, who serve as cultural mediators between visitors and host communities. Sercu (2005) examined intercultural competence development in foreign language education, demonstrating that integrated approaches like CLIL are particularly effective in developing learners' cultural awareness and sensitivity. For tour guides, who must navigate complex cultural dynamics and facilitate meaningful cross-cultural encounters, this intercultural dimension of CLIL is especially valuable.

The cognitive benefits of CLIL have been documented through research in educational psychology and second language acquisition. Bialystok (2017) reviewed extensive evidence demonstrating that bilingual and multilingual learning enhances cognitive flexibility, problem-solving abilities, and metalinguistic awareness. These cognitive advantages are particularly relevant for tour guides, who must process information rapidly, adapt to diverse audiences, and communicate complex ideas across linguistic and cultural boundaries. Coyle (2007) argued that CLIL promotes higher-order thinking skills by requiring learners to engage with challenging content through a foreign language, thereby developing both linguistic and cognitive capacities simultaneously. This dual development is essential for tour guides, who must demonstrate sophisticated analytical and communicative abilities in their professional practice.

Research on CLIL implementation has identified several pedagogical principles and strategies that enhance effectiveness in tourism education contexts. Pérez-Cañado (2012) examined teacher training needs for CLIL instruction, revealing that successful implementation requires educators who possess both content expertise and language teaching competence. Her research emphasized the importance of professional development programs that help teachers develop integrated pedagogical approaches, design appropriate materials, and assess student learning effectively. This finding has significant implications for tourism education programs seeking to adopt CLIL methodology, suggesting the need for substantial investment in faculty development. Morton (2016) investigated teachers' knowledge for integrating content and language, proposing a conceptual framework that identifies key knowledge domains including content knowledge, language awareness, pedagogical content knowledge, and knowledge of learners. This framework provides guidance for preparing educators to implement CLIL effectively in specialized fields like tourism.

The design of curriculum and materials for CLIL-based

tour guide education has been addressed by several researchers who recognized the challenges of creating appropriate integrated learning resources. Ball, Kelly, and Clegg (2015) provided practical guidance for putting CLIL into practice, emphasizing the importance of scaffolding, multimodal resources, and task-based activities that promote both language development and content learning. Their work highlighted strategies such as using visuals to support comprehension, incorporating authentic materials from the tourism industry, designing communicative tasks that mirror professional situations, and providing language support through glossaries and models. Bentley (2010) developed training materials specifically for CLIL teachers, offering practical techniques for integrating language and content instruction effectively. These resources have proven valuable for educators developing CLIL-based tourism programs.

Empirical studies examining CLIL implementation in tourism education have provided evidence of the approach's effectiveness while also identifying challenges and areas requiring attention. Ruiz de Zarobe and Jiménez Catalán (2009) synthesized research evidence from multiple European contexts, demonstrating that CLIL students consistently outperform peers in traditional programs across various language proficiency measures. Their review found particular advantages in receptive skills, vocabulary acquisition, and willingness to communicate. Lasagabaster and Sierra (2010) compared CLIL and English as a Foreign Language approaches, finding important differences in how students develop language proficiency and attitudes toward learning. CLIL students demonstrated greater confidence in using English for professional purposes and more positive attitudes toward multilingualism, both crucial attributes for tour guides working in international contexts.

Research addressing specific aspects of language development in CLIL contexts has revealed nuanced patterns of growth across different linguistic domains. Cenoz, Genesee, and Gorter (2014) conducted a critical analysis of CLIL research, noting that while receptive skills and vocabulary tend to develop strongly in CLIL programs, productive skills and grammatical accuracy may require additional focused attention. This finding suggests that CLIL-based tour guide programs should complement integrated instruction with targeted language practice in areas like pronunciation, grammar, and speaking fluency. Pérez-Vidal (2015) examined language ability profiles of CLIL learners, finding that sustained participation in CLIL programs leads to well-rounded language development when instruction includes explicit attention to linguistic

forms alongside content learning. For tourism education, this research implies that effective CLIL implementation requires careful balance between meaning-focused and form-focused instruction.

The role of assessment in CLIL programs has received increasing attention from researchers concerned with evaluating both language and content learning outcomes. Ioannou-Georgiou and Pavlou (2011) examined assessment practices in CLIL contexts, arguing that evaluation must address both content understanding and language proficiency without disadvantaging students whose language skills are still developing. They recommended assessment approaches that use multiple formats, provide language support, focus on meaning rather than form errors in content tasks, and include separate evaluation of language development. These recommendations are particularly relevant for tourism programs where students must demonstrate both professional knowledge and communicative ability.

Research on student experiences and perspectives in CLIL programs has provided insights into motivational and affective factors influencing learning outcomes. Hüttner, Dalton-Puffer, and Smit (2013) investigated beliefs and attitudes toward CLIL among students and teachers, finding that positive perceptions and understanding of CLIL principles contribute significantly to successful implementation. Students who understood the rationale for integrated instruction and recognized its professional relevance demonstrated greater engagement and achievement. For tour guide education, this research suggests the importance of helping students understand how CLIL methodology prepares them for professional communication demands they will face in their careers.

The development of discipline-specific discourse competence through CLIL has been examined by researchers interested in how learners acquire the specialized language patterns and rhetorical conventions of professional fields. Nikula, Dalton-Puffer, and Llinares (2013) analyzed classroom discourse in CLIL settings, revealing how students gradually develop ability to use language appropriately for specific professional purposes. Their research demonstrated that CLIL environments provide rich opportunities for apprenticeship into professional discourse communities. For aspiring tour guides, this means developing facility with tourism industry terminology, narrative structures for presenting information, persuasive language for marketing, and interaction patterns for managing tourist groups. These specialized discourse competencies develop most effectively through sustained engagement with authentic professional content and tasks.

Teacher roles and competencies required for effective CLIL instruction have been explored by researchers seeking to understand the professional demands of integrated teaching. Pavón Vázquez and Ellison (2013) examined teacher roles in CLIL contexts, identifying multiple competencies including content expertise, language awareness, intercultural competence, and pedagogical flexibility. Their research revealed that effective CLIL teachers must navigate between traditional content teaching and language teaching roles, adapting instruction to address both content understanding and language development. For tourism education programs, this finding emphasizes the need for collaborative teaching models where content specialists and language teachers work together, or for professional development that helps individual teachers develop integrated competencies.

Challenges in CLIL implementation have been documented by researchers who recognize that adopting this approach requires significant institutional changes and resource commitments. Alcaraz-Mármol (2018) examined teacher training curricula for CLIL instruction, identifying gaps in preparation programs and recommending comprehensive training that addresses both theoretical foundations and practical implementation strategies. His research highlighted challenges including limited availability of appropriate materials, insufficient teacher training, difficulty balancing content and language objectives, and assessment complexities. These challenges are particularly acute in tourism education contexts where specialized content knowledge and industry connections are essential. Pérez-Cañado (2012) investigated teacher perceptions of training needs, finding that educators implementing CLIL desire ongoing professional development, collaborative planning opportunities, and access to quality resources specifically designed for integrated instruction.

The integration of technology and digital resources in CLIL-based tourism education represents an emerging area of research and practice. Digital tools offer particular advantages for CLIL implementation by providing access to authentic materials, facilitating multimodal learning, enabling virtual experiences of tourism destinations, and supporting differentiated instruction. Research has shown that technology-enhanced CLIL can increase student engagement, provide access to diverse linguistic and cultural resources, and create opportunities for authentic communication with international audiences. For tour guide education, digital technologies enable students to explore destinations virtually, access multilingual tourism materials, create multimedia presentations, and practice communication skills through video

conferencing and social media platforms. The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated adoption of digital approaches in tourism education, revealing both possibilities and challenges of technology-mediated CLIL instruction.

Regional research from Central Asian contexts has begun examining CLIL implementation in local educational settings, though this body of literature remains relatively limited compared to European and Asian scholarship. Studies have explored challenges specific to post-Soviet educational systems including limited foreign language proficiency among content teachers, traditional teacher-centered pedagogical approaches, and insufficient resources for integrated instruction. However, research has also identified opportunities including strong content knowledge among faculty, growing recognition of English language importance for international tourism, and increasing institutional support for innovative pedagogical approaches. These regional studies suggest that successful CLIL implementation in Central Asian tourism programs requires contextualized approaches that address local challenges while building on existing strengths.

Research examining long-term outcomes of CLIL instruction has provided evidence that benefits extend beyond immediate language and content learning to influence career trajectories and professional practice. Follow-up studies of CLIL program graduates working in tourism and hospitality industries have found that professionals prepared through integrated approaches demonstrate greater confidence in using foreign languages at work, stronger intercultural communication skills, and better integration of language and professional knowledge in practice. These findings validate CLIL methodology as preparation for the complex linguistic and cultural demands of professional tourism work. Graduates report that CLIL instruction better prepared them for workplace communication than traditional language courses because they developed language skills in authentic professional contexts rather than through decontextualized exercises.

The review of theoretical frameworks and empirical research reveals several key conclusions regarding CLIL implementation in tour guide education. First, substantial evidence supports the effectiveness of CLIL approach for developing both linguistic competence and professional knowledge among tourism students. The integrated nature of CLIL instruction aligns well with the authentic communicative demands of tour guide work, where language serves as a medium for sharing professional knowledge and facilitating intercultural encounters. Second, successful CLIL

implementation requires careful attention to pedagogical principles including balanced attention to content and language, scaffolded instruction that supports developing proficiency, authentic tasks and materials from tourism contexts, and explicit development of intercultural communicative competence. Third, teacher competence and preparation emerge as critical factors determining CLIL effectiveness, suggesting that programs must invest substantially in faculty development or adopt collaborative teaching models. Fourth, assessment practices must address both content understanding and language development appropriately, avoiding practices that disadvantage students whose language proficiency is still developing. Finally, while CLIL offers significant advantages, implementation challenges including resource requirements, teacher preparation needs, and curriculum design complexities must be addressed thoughtfully.

Based on this review, several recommendations emerge for tourism education programs considering CLIL adoption. Programs should develop comprehensive implementation plans that address curriculum design, faculty preparation, materials development, and assessment practices. Faculty development initiatives should help teachers understand CLIL principles, develop integrated instructional strategies, and create appropriate learning materials. Curriculum should integrate language and tourism content progressively, beginning with supported introduction to professional topics in foreign language and advancing toward independent engagement with complex professional tasks. Assessment should evaluate both content learning and language development using varied formats that provide fair evaluation of both domains. Programs should foster collaboration between language teachers and tourism content specialists to leverage complementary expertise. Finally, continuous evaluation and refinement of CLIL implementation should use evidence from student learning outcomes, faculty experiences, and graduate feedback to improve practice over time.

Future research should address several gaps in current understanding of CLIL in tourism education. Longitudinal studies tracking student development throughout CLIL programs and into professional practice would provide valuable evidence of long-term outcomes. Comparative research examining different CLIL implementation models could identify optimal approaches for tourism contexts. Investigation of technology integration in CLIL-based tourism education would address increasingly important questions about digital learning environments. Research examining CLIL

implementation in diverse geographical and institutional contexts would enhance understanding of how local factors influence effectiveness. Studies addressing specific aspects of tour guide professional competence such as intercultural mediation, crisis management communication, and marketing discourse would deepen understanding of specialized language development. Finally, research examining collaborative teaching models and faculty development approaches would provide practical guidance for programs seeking to build capacity for CLIL instruction.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the review of theoretical frameworks and empirical studies demonstrates that CLIL approach offers significant potential for enhancing foreign language teaching in tour guide education. The integrated methodology addresses the complex communicative and professional demands of tourism work more effectively than traditional approaches that separate language instruction from content learning. While implementation challenges exist, substantial evidence supports CLIL effectiveness in developing linguistic competence, professional knowledge, and intercultural awareness simultaneously. As international tourism continues expanding and demand for skilled multilingual tour guides grows, CLIL methodology provides a theoretically grounded and empirically supported approach for preparing professionals who can communicate effectively across languages and cultures while demonstrating sophisticated tourism expertise.

REFERENCES

1. Agudo J.A. Teaching English for Tourism: A Communicative Approach. – Madrid: Editorial Sintesis, 2018. – 224 p.
2. Alcaraz-Mármol G. The Secondary School Teacher-training Curriculum in CLIL // Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning. – 2018. – Vol. 11(1). – P. 89-113.
3. Ball P., Kelly K., Clegg J. Putting CLIL into Practice. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015. – 192 p.
4. Bentley K. The TKT Course: CLIL Module. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. – 108 p.
5. Bialystok E. The Bilingual Adaptation: How Minds Accommodate Experience // Psychological Bulletin. – 2017. – Vol. 143(3). – P. 233-262.
6. Byram M. Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence. – Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1997. – 124 p.
7. Cenoz J., Genesee F., Gorter D. Critical Analysis of CLIL: Taking Stock and Looking Forward // Applied

- Linguistics. – 2014. – Vol. 35(3). – P. 243-262.
8. 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). – P. 543-562.
 9. Coyle D., Hood P., Marsh D. *CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. – 173 p.
 10. Dalton-Puffer C. Content and Language Integrated Learning: From Practice to Principles // *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*. – 2011. – Vol. 31. – P. 182-204.
 11. Hüttner J., Dalton-Puffer C., Smit U. The Power of Beliefs: Lay Theories and Their Influence on the Implementation of CLIL Programmes // *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. – 2013. – Vol. 16(3). – P. 267-284.
 12. Ioannou-Georgiou S., Pavlou P. Assessing Young Learners in CLIL Context // *Research Papers in Language Teaching and Learning*. – 2011. – Vol. 2(1). – P. 98-114.
 13. Lasagabaster D., Sierra J.M. Immersion and CLIL in English: More Differences than Similarities // *ELT Journal*. – 2010. – Vol. 64(4). – P. 367-375.
 14. Lorenzo F., Casal S., Moore P. The Effects of Content and Language Integrated Learning in European Education: Key Findings from the Andalusian Bilingual Sections Evaluation Project // *Applied Linguistics*. – 2010. – Vol. 31(3). – P. 418-442.
 15. Mehisto P., Marsh D., Frigols M.J. *Uncovering CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning in Bilingual and Multilingual Education*. – Oxford: Macmillan Education, 2008. – 238 p.
 16. Morton T. Conceptualizing and Investigating Teachers' Knowledge for Integrating Content and Language in Content-based Instruction // *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*. – 2016. – Vol. 4(2). – P. 144-167.
 17. Nikula T., Dalton-Puffer C., Llinares A. *CLIL Classroom Discourse: Research from Europe* // *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*. – 2013. – Vol. 1(1). – P. 70-100.
 18. Pavón Vázquez V., Ellison M. Examining Teacher Roles and Competences in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) // *Linguarum Arena*. – 2013. – Vol. 4. – P. 65-78.
 19. Pérez-Cañado M.L. Teacher Training Needs for Bilingual Education: In-service Teacher Perceptions // *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. – 2012. – Vol. 15(4). – P. 359-377.
 20. Perez-Vidal C. CLIL in Context: Profiling Language Abilities // *The Language Learning Journal*. – 2015. – Vol. 43(3). – P. 284-299.
 21. Ruiz de Zarobe Y., Jiménez Catalán R.M. *Content and Language Integrated Learning: Evidence from Research in Europe*. – Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2009. – 285 p.
 22. Sercu L. Teaching Foreign Languages in an Intercultural World // *Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Context, New Objectives*. – 2005. – P. 1-18.
 23. Tsai Y., Tsou W. Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) in Taiwan: An Analysis of the Implementation of Tourism English // *Asian EFL Journal*. – 2015. – Vol. 17(4). – P. 87-114.
 24. Coyle D., Marsh D. *Planning Tools for Teachers*. – University of Nottingham: School of Education, 2013. – 45 p.
 25. Eurydice Report. *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at School in Europe*. – Brussels: European Commission, 2006. – 68 p.
 26. Marsh D., Langé G. *Using Languages to Learn and Learning to Use Languages*. – Jyväskylä: UniCOM, University of Jyväskylä, 2000. – 341 p.
 27. Wolff D. *CLIL: Bridging the Gap Between School and Working Life* // *Insights from the European Year of Languages*. – 2003. – P. 15-25.
 28. Navés T., Victori M. *CLIL in Catalonia: An Overview of Research Studies* // *Insights from the European Year of Languages*. – 2010. – P. 30-54.
 29. Lyster R. *Learning and Teaching Languages Through Content: A Counterbalanced Approach*. – Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2007. – 173 p.
 30. Genesee F., Lindholm-Leary K. The Education of English Language Learners // *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education*. – 2013. – P. 499-518.
 31. Tedick D.J., Wesley P.M. *Content-based Instruction for Multilingual Learners* // *International Encyclopedia of Education*. – 2015. – Vol. 6. – P. 434-441.
 32. Llinares A., Morton T., Whittaker R. *The Roles of Language in CLIL*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. – 301 p.
 33. Nikula T. Hands-on Tasks in CLIL Science Classrooms as Sites for Subject-specific Language Use and Learning // *System*. – 2015. – Vol. 54. – P. 14-27.
 34. Evnitskaya N., Morton T. *Knowledge Construction*,

- Meaning-making and Interaction in CLIL Science Classroom Communities of Practice // Language and Education. – 2011. – Vol. 25(2). – P. 109-127.
- 35.** Smit U., Dafouz E. Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education: An Introduction // AILA Review. – 2012. – Vol. 25. – P. 1-12.
- 36.** Dafouz E., Smit U. Towards a Dynamic Conceptual Framework for English-medium Education in Multilingual University Settings // Applied Linguistics. – 2016. – Vol. 37(3). – P. 397-415.
- 37.** Fortanet-Gómez I. CLIL in Higher Education: Towards a Multilingual Language Policy. – Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2013. – 267 p.
- 38.** Doiz A., Lasagabaster D., Sierra J.M. English-Medium Instruction at Universities: Global Challenges. – Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2013. – 256 p.
- 39.** Airey J. The Content Teacher's Dilemma: Evidence from Sweden and Implications for CLIL // The European Conference on Educational Research. – 2011. – P. 1-12.
- 40.** Yang W. Content and Language Integrated Learning Next in Asia: Evidence of Learners' Achievement in CLIL Education from a Taiwan Tertiary Degree Programme // International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism. – 2015. – Vol. 18(4). – P. 361-382.