Agnieszka Borowiak https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6913-2760
Akademia Humanistyczno-Ekonomiczna w Łodzi
e-mail: agnieszka_borowiak@wp.pl

Developing receptive, productive, and academic language skills in CLIL: A comprehensive multi-component perspective on linguistic growth

Abstract

This paper examines linguistic features in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), focusing on the development of reading, listening, speaking, writing, grammar, and lexis. The overview highlights CLIL's potential to enhance receptive and productive skills, foster metalinguistic awareness, and facilitate lexicogrammatical development. Drawing on major theoretical models and empirical research, the discussion also focuses on how CLIL supports the learning of both Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). The paper finishes with implications for pedagogy and future research directions.

Keywords: CLIL, speaking, writing, reading, listening, grammar, vocabulary, CALP, BICS

Linguistic features in a CLIL setting

The notion of language proficiency is often defined in terms of learners abilities, that is, what a learner can and cannot do with a foreign language, regardless of where, when, or how the language has been learned or acquired (ACTFL, 1989). Lee and Schallert (1997: 716) explain that foreign language proficiency is related to "language competence, metalinguistic awareness, and the ability to speak, listen, read, and write the language in contextually appropriate ways". Lin (2016: 11) claims that language proficiency as a concept should be explored in a specific context, that is, "according to its use in different

contexts, then students need to develop language proficiencies appropriate for use in different contexts". This goes in line with the two dimensions of language proficiency proposed by Cummins (1980, 2001): Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). The BICS are used in everyday life, for instance, in conversations with family members and friends or casual chit-chat on Facebook, Twitter or Internet forums (Lin, 2016).

In contrast, the CALP is used to understand and discuss academic topics, for instance, in the classroom and to read and write about these topics in school assignments and examinations (Lin, 2016).

> BICS are said to be used in context-embedded conversations and this means that the conversation is often face-to-face and offers many cues to the listener such as facial expressions, gestures and concrete objects of reference. CALP, on the other hand, is said to be necessary for context-reduced communication, such as those that take place in the classroom where there are supposed to be fewer non-verbal cues and the language is more abstract. However, in recent developments of new media interactions, this face-to-face context can often be a virtual one such as that of a Skype or WhatsApp conversation. It is, therefore, better to conceive of BICS and CALP not as discrete categories but as lying on a continuum (Lin, 2016: 11–12).

A large body of research (e.g. Snow, 1987; Carroll, 1990; Robinson, 2002; Ackerman, 2003; Skehan, 2015; Li, 2016; Saito, 2017) indicates that learners with special language-learning aptitude may reach higher proficiency levels via traditional foreign language classes. In this manner, special language-learning aptitude is the factor which precipitates L2 learning. However, certain researchers (e.g. Mewald, 2007; Dalton-Puffer, 2011) indicate that language proficiency of a broad group of students whose foreign language talents or interests is average may be developed in certain educational contexts. *Content and Language Integrated Learning* (CLIL), which is "a dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language" (Mehisto, Marsh, Frigols 2008: 9) is claimed to support a foreign language learning process, academic competencies and it results in a spectrum of cognitive and motivational benefits (Coyle, Hood, Marsh, 2010). A number of studies indicate that CLIL has a positive influence on foreign language proficiency (e.g. Ball, Kelly, Clegg, 2015; Borowiak, 2021; Bulté, Surmont, Martens, 2022; Vraciu, Marsol, 2023).Thus, the aim of this paper is to analyze linguistic features in CLIL, focusing on the development of reading, listening, speaking, writing, grammar, and lexis.

Reading

Reading facilitates access to both language and contents. Reading texts, if connected with particular branch of knowledge, provides the learner with a lot of information (cf. Hillocks, 1987; Ur, 1999). Reading texts, which are created with the aim other than language teaching, can increase the students' level of reading proficiency in the target language because such texts are more challenging to learners (Brinton et. al, 1989). Wolff (2005) claims that

reading comprehension is essential in the CLIL approach. Coonan (2007) assumes that in a CLIL setting, receptive skills, especially reading, are far more actively worked on than productive skills. This may serve as a predictor of success of reading in a CLIL setting. An overview of research on CLIL indicates that reading skills are positively affected by CLIL teaching (e.g. Dalton-Puffer, 2008). Still, there are also some studies that show no significant differences regarding this competence (e.g. Pladevall-Ballester, Vallbona, 2016).

Some scholars claim that reading strategies in a CLIL setting can decide on the students' success or failure (see Hellekjær, 1996; Garipova, Román, 2016). It concurs with Skogen's observation (2013: 32) that "the students will get stuck when trying to read textbooks in their CLIL subjects if they read them the same way they read their textbook in their English subject". Therefore, a CLIL methodology should promote reading strategies (Wolff, 2005).

Reading strategy is defined "as conscious and systematic reading adjusted to the text and the goal of the reading" (Skogen, 2013: 23). Khaki (2014: 187) notices that "approaches to the teaching of reading have focused on the importance of acquiring those strategies that help students become strategic readers". Garipova and Román (2016) claim that strategic readers, that is, those who make use of reading strategies, are more efficient, creative, and flexible. As a result, they acquire both language and content more easily. From this perspective, CLIL teachers should teach the reading strategies explicitly and subsequently practice and use them in lessons during the course.

Anmarkrud and Refsahl (2010) structure the development of reading strategies at the following four levels:
1) the student observes how reading strategies are used;
2) the student copies reading strategies;
3) the students use strategies together with a teacher or a student;
4) the student uses strategies independently but with some guidance from a teacher before the learner in the end is able to use them independently.

Skogen (2013) argues that teachers should focus explicitly on teaching reading strategies. Otherwise, learners may know that they exist but they will be unlikely to use them in practice.

There are numerous classifications of reading strategies which can be used in a CLIL setting. Anderson and Pearson (1984) and Aebersold and Field (1997) promote bottom-up processing. Goodman (1967) and Smith and Tager-Flusberg (1982), on the other hand, propose top-down processing. This approach emphasizes the prior knowledge of the reader. Grabe and Stoller (2002) and Kintsch (2005) propose the use of interactive approach which can be more effective. This approach involves both the bottom-up and top-down processing. In this case the reader chooses which strategy to use depending on the given situation.

Another categorization which applies to reading includes: (1) basic language skills, (2) academic language skills, and (3) metacognitive skills (Clegg, 2009). To start with basic language skills, reading on a range of topics can help in "making appropriate and accurate use of the language at the level of spelling, grammar, vocabulary, function and discourse" (Barboráková, 2012: 8). Reading, besides listening, speaking, and writing, is taught in their

foreign language lessons and implicitly in content subject lessons. Students learn the L2 also outside school through the media and in communities where this language is used.

Moving to academic language skills, they include Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (Cummins, 1979). In a CLIL setting, reading involves reading "handouts, subject textbooks with the texts full of paragraphing, numbering, and headings, usually supported by clarifying visuals (charts, diagrams, photographs, etc.)" (Barboráková, 2012: 8). Overall, CLIL learners typically use reference books and the Internet to collect necessary information. As a result, they also need the skills of using tables of contents, indexes, key words, skimming and scanning. While CLIL students read, they have to distinguish central information from peripheral information. They are also supposed to take notes.

The third set, metacognitive skills, plays a role of a significant organizer of all of the tasks that are performed by students. They include planning, setting goals, initiating work, sustaining future-oriented problem solving activities, monitoring, and managing progress on tasks to detect and correct errors, and keeping track of the effect of one's behavior on others. Barboráková (2012: 8) claims that these skills are "CLIL-specific, because the students need to ask the teacher to explain and repeat, to be able to look up words, to pre-read texts before a lesson, or to plan, draft and revise writing tasks".

CLIL teachers can use some strategies in order to provide language support for students while reading. Barboráková (2012) argues that CLIL teachers should check if learners understand key vocabulary before they start reading. Teachers may provide students with activities, such as, pre-reading questions, reading support tasks (e.g. filling in a chart, labeling a diagram) or taking notes on specific information (dates, figures) (Barboráková, 2012). Brown and Palincsar (1984) divide reading strategies into four main groups: summarizing, questioning, predicting, and clarifying. Khaki (2014: 188) claims that "two of the most useful strategies are those in which the student summarizes orally what he has read about a passage or answers questions about the passage".

Another set of reading strategies comprises: previewing a text, scanning, skimming, predicting the upcoming information, summarising, guessing the meaning of unknown words, and generating questions about the text (Grabe, Stoller, 2001). Scanning is claimed to be a valuable reading technique since it encourages learners to focus on the information they are looking for, not on the unknown words (Iannou, Pavlou, 2011). Garipova and Román (2016) argue that regardless of the chosen reading activities, teachers should remember that in the CLIL context, the content of the reading tasks is more significant. Thus, two types of reading approach in the CLIL setting are recommended: intensive and extensive reading. The former is related to "a more in-depth study and analysis of a relatively limited amount of text" (Dakowska, 2005: 206). Reading for specific information, reading for general orientations, detailed understanding, reading for pleasure are some of the examples of intensive reading. Extensive reading "serves as communicative experience providing language input in the written form" (Dakowska, 2005: 206). It is usually explained as reading for information and pleasure, as well as for general, overall meaning.

In the context of extensive reading, certain observations regarding L2 ability have been made. They include: reading comprehension and reading speed (Bell, 2001), vocabulary

(Grabe, Stoller, 1997; Horst, 2005; Pigada, Schmitt, 2006), grammar (Yang, 2001), reading and writing (Hafiz, Tudor, 1989).

> Working on the premise that CLIL does provide that "comprehensible input + 1", it seems to make sense to hypothesise that, among those language benefits to be derived from CLIL, a potential boost to the so-called receptive skills (that is listening and reading comprehension) might be found (Prieto-Arranz et al., 2015: 124).

The above discussion suggests that fostering reading skills is essential in the CLIL approach. Reading in a CLIL setting provides learners with various text types which are different from the ones that they are used in regular foreign language classes. In some ways, the way CLIL learners read texts differs from the reading during foreign language classes. CLIL learners should make use of reading strategies in order to deal with challenging texts, which is important to ensure that students are able to deal with the reading material presented in their CLIL subjects. To achieve these goals, an appropriate CLIL methodology with a focus on reading strategies has to be used by CLIL teachers.

Listening

Listening in a CLIL environment is different from listening comprehension tasks in the foreign language class and from listening in a content subject class conducted in the mother-tongue (Liubinienė, 2009). This type of listening involves the content which is derived from content subjects. In this manner, the CLIL language involves BICS and CALP. Liubinienė (2009: 89) points out that in CLIL classes "it is important that students are provided with the suitable materials to listen to. These materials come in a variety of forms, first as a teacher's input, as well as peer input and interaction and as information source". Recorded lectures, films or tutorials can also be used as the materials for listening.

From a cognitive constructivist perspective, CLIL as an educational framework fosters learner autonomy, self-organization, and self-responsibility (Wilhelmer, 2008), which means that CLIL students cognitively process the second language at a deeper and more intense level (Aliaga, 2008). This, in turn, leads to the assumption that CLIL can positively contribute to the development of metalinguistic awareness (Marsh, 2009). All these premises suggest that CLIL can be beneficial in cognitively demanding activities such as listening (Liubin1ené, 2009). Prieto-Arranz et al. (2015: 124) pose a similar hypothesis that language "benefits to be derived from CLIL, a potential boost to the so-called receptive skills (that is listening and reading comprehension) might be found".

However, when it comes to studies investigating the development of listening comprehension skills in the CLIL context, conflicting results have been reported (e.g. Merino, Lasagabaster, 2015; Ruiz de Zarobe, Cenoz, 2015). Certain studies indicate that CLIL does not influence the development of listening comprehension skills among the learners (e.g. Hellekjaer, 2010; Navés, 2011; Roquet, 2011). Others show improved listening skill among CLIL learners (e.g. Serra, 2007; Lasagabaster, 2008, 2011; Lorenzo, Casal, Moore, 2010; San Isidro, 2010; Aguilar, Rodríguez, 2012). Prieto-Arranz et al. (2015) notice that listening comprehension skills in a CLIL setting have received less attention.

> This may be partly due to the fact that, since content and language are equally important in CLIL, research has been conducted enquiring into whether comprehension in the CLIL language was successful without necessarily comparing comprehension skills in CLIL and non-CLIL settings (Prieto-Arranz et al., 2015: 125).

Several factors contribute to the difficulty of the listening tasks in a CLIL setting. They are related to linguistic perspective and the background knowledge of the topic. Factors which can hinder comprehension in the foreign language include the following: "speech rate, complexity of language structures and lexis, phonological features (e.g. dialects or foreign accents, different speakers), lack of visuals, background noise and occasional lapses of concentration or hearing" (Liubinienė, 2009: 91). Certain factors impeding listening comprehension can also be enumerated from a content subject perspective. The background knowledge of the topic is also very important. If the CLIL listener is not familiar with the subject it may result in the impediment of the process of understanding. This is connected to the fact that the listening material may present too high cognitive load. As a result, CLIL learners can face a problem.

Listening materials used in the language lesson can also challenge the learners' language knowledge and skills. During the foreign language lessons students usually listen to mainly recorded staged situations resembling real-life situations, which demonstrate how the L2 is used, for instance, a dialogue or an extract from a film or a radio program. When it comes to the CLIL lessons, the students deal with the foreign language on two levels: Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). The primary source of listening in a CLIL lesson is the teacher. Other sources can also be used, for example, video materials with explanatory text showing aspects of the CLIL subject (Liubinienė, 2009). Generally, when the focus is put on the CLIL language, it is the specialized vocabulary that can be difficult for CLIL learners, but not that much the grammatical structures of this language.

The CLIL methodology may be useful in developing listening comprehension in a CLIL setting (Liubinienė, 2009). CLIL teachers should constantly provide CLIL learners with language scaffolding. For this purpose, teachers can use repetition, rephrasing, synonyms and antonyms, circumlocution, questions, elicitation, and oral feedback among others. Visual scaffolding may be supported with pictures, maps, charts, tables, and other graphic organizers (Liubinienė, 2009). These should help CLIL listeners to structure the information included in the listening and to pay attention to the key content. Liubinienė (2009) furthers the discussion by addressing advanced learners, explaining that the listening material used during lectures can be scaffolded by more complex forms of visuals, for instance, Venn Diagrams. It should also be noted that the use of visuals and their complexity should depend on the age, learners' level of language proficiency, and the complexity of the content under study.

Liubinienė (2009) argues that in a CLIL setting listening skills can be developed by the explicit instruction of general learning strategies. Brown (1994: 104) defines them as "methods of approaching a problem or task, modes of operation for achieving a particular end, planned designs for controlling and manipulating certain information". In this case, listening comprehension strategies should help CLIL learners acquire, store, retrieve, and/or use information (O'Malley, Chamot, Küpper, 1989).

Listeners can use a variety of strategies facilitating comprehension, which include: metacognitive, cognitive, and socio-affective strategies. Liubinienė (2009) defines the listening comprehension strategies with a reference to a CLIL setting. Metacognitive strategies (e.g. planning, note-taking, transfer, resourcing, self-monitoring, evaluation, selective attention, directed attention and parsing) help students to oversee, regulate or direct their language learning process. Cognitive strategies (e.g. elaboration, inferencing, imagery, summarization, contextualization, grouping, repetition, problem identification, hypothesis testing, translation and predicting) manipulate the material which should be learned or apply an appropriate technique to a listening task. Socio-affective strategies (e.g. reprise, feedback, uptaking, clarifying, affective control) include these techniques which listeners use to collaborate with others, to verify understanding or to lower anxiety (Liubinienė, 2009).

CLIL is often described as "a fusion of best practice in language and content subject methodology" (Vázquez, Ellison, 2013: 76). The conclusion to be drawn on the basis of the discussion above is that listening skills can be developed in the CLIL setting successfully (cf. Liubinienė, 2009), particularly when CLIL learners are taught listening strategies. The techniques used in foreign language classes aiming at fostering listening comprehension can also be used in the CLIL setting (cf. Ur, 1991).

Speaking

CLIL courses increase opportunities for authentic communication and interaction while focusing on content subjects. This type of practice can contribute to oral fluency, which is one of the major linguistic benefits of CLIL teaching (see Dalton-Puffer, 2007; Pérez-Vidal, 2009). CLIL learners can improve their speaking skills, hence, oral fluency, because they are foremost the CLIL language users, not learners (Nikula, 2007). Delliou and Zafiri (2016) argue that in a CLIL setting learners have to discuss, justify, debate, and explain certain concepts using more complex language structures. Additionally, CLIL activities promote cooperative learning. In this manner, CLIL learners develop their social skills, which include speaking skills. The integration of topics and subjects is an added value of the educational outcome since the CLIL language is contextualized and becomes purposeful.

CLIL learners can be assumed to develop their speaking skills in a more efficient manner. The explanation can be ascribed to the fact that CLIL courses offer a larger variety of language and a larger amount of information students have to handle. This, in turn, "leads to the promotion of genuine communication and the production of spontaneous speech via collaborative enquiry" (Delliou, Zafiri, 2016: 50). Research outcomes indicate that CLIL has a positive effect on speaking (Hüttner, Rieder-Bünemann, 2007; Lasagabaster, 2008; Ruiz de Zarobe, 2008; Escobar-Urmeneta, Sánchez-Sola 2009; Bret Blasco, 2011; Ruiz de Zarobe, 2011).

To make these assumptions plausible, a brief review of theoretical underpinnings must be provided in the first place. There are two models regarding speaking skills. The first

one, Communicative Competence based on Canale and Swain's model (1980), consists of: (1) linguistic competence, (2) discourse competence, (3) sociolinguistic competence, and (4) strategic competence. Dalton-Puffer (2008) carried out a study focusing on communicative competence. The researcher used Canale and Swain's model (1980). Communicative Competence was analyzed in reference to a study of 40 CLIL lesson transcripts. According to the outcomes of that study, linguistic competence is fostered in the CLIL classrooms. There is a clear distinction in terms of learning possibilities between the lexicon and learning opportunities for grammar due to the CLIL content subjects which definitely stretch students' lexical abilities to an extent where students may both exhibit frequent lexical gaps and make explicit attempts at filling them (see Hüttner, Rieder 2007; Dalton-Puffer, 2008).

Sociolinguistic competence receives less support in a CLIL setting. Dalton-Puffer (2008) assumes that lesson interactions are characterized by a clear role relationship between the teacher and students, which provides students with a greater deal of security. It also means that having to negotiate one's standing during an ongoing interaction is not experienced in this case. The classroom discourse in content lessons is dominated by a small array of speech acts, such as: questions or requirements. All of these imply that other linguistic actions may be extremely rare in CLIL classrooms and can, therefore, not be fully acquired in this environment (cf. Dalton-Puffer, 2008; Schwandegger, 2008). In the case of foreign language classes, they are explicitly taught and learnt.

The description of discourse competence reveals that "the learners possess a great deal of experience handling the speaking requirements of school, they are nothing less than experts in classroom discourse" (Dalton-Puffer, 2008: 18). CLIL learners are typically familiar with the discourse rules. This, in turn, creates a feeling of security and possibly a positive emotional effect, which may influence the perception of the foreign language in a beneficial way. "This may be the reason why CLIL students are frequently observed to be less shy in using the target language" (Dalton-Puffer, 2008: 18). One of the observations refers to the actual discourse rules of the classroom which diverge from informal talk, including natural conversation, in terms of several factors. In this case, the teacher has a prerogative to decide on several facets of communication. Teachers make decisions concerning speaking turns, that is, they are allotted rather than self-selected. The same applies to conversational topics. Teachers "usually behave as hyper-cooperative interlocutors who will attempt to make sense even of the most incomplete contribution made by a student. These are circumstances that students certainly cannot count on outside the classroom" (Dalton-Puffer, 2008: 18).

Finally, strategic competence is related mainly to skills which help "cope with not living in a perfect world of flawless communication" (Dalton-Puffer, 2008: 19). Still, discourse in a classroom and beyond it is different, also in terms of skills used during communication. "In class, it is rather easy for the individual to employ avoidance strategies since the rest of the collective is co-responsible for contributing to the conversation ('somebody will say something')" (Dalton-Puffer, 2008: 19).

The second model regarding speaking was introduced by Moore (2010). It includes a tentative exploration of areas which may guide CLIL teachers in modelling oral proficien-

cy in a CLIL setting, "a model which can be applied to all facets of both the process and the product of CLIL; in other words in teaching, learning, testing and research" (Moore, 2010: 56). This model combines academic content, that is, Cognitive Complexity with Talk. According to Cognitive Complexity, academic content from an oral proficiency perspective, is defined not as "what learners know but how they verbalize this knowledge" (Moore, 2010: 57).

Talk merges three factors: Interaction, Flow, and Repair. It should be noted, however, that the three borders included in the model are fuzzy and overlapping with one another (Moore, 2010: 58). Interaction "reinforces the concept of Talk as communicative exchange – with shared responsibilities" (Moore, 2010: 58). This concept conflates numerous ideas, including Listenership (McCarthy, 2002; Knight Adolphs, 2008), Participatory output (Coyle, 1999), and Reciprocity (Wilkinson, 1970; Westgate, Hughes, 1997).

The area of Interaction includes two other concepts: the physical (turn-taking) and the metaphysical (intersubjectivity). In educational discourse, turn-taking is characterized by highly context specific patterns which differ according to the number of participants. Moore (2010) argues that CLIL classrooms include periods of group and pair work, that is different number of participants. As a result, this educational context provides ample opportunities for students to engage in more conversational-like peer exchanges. From this perspective, CLIL learners are likely to "hone 'real world' turn-taking strategies to deal with features like interruptions, overlapping, abandoned contributions and topic shift" (Moore, 2010: 59). According to CLIL methodology, students may take part in projects or field trips which will allow them to engage in both authentic information gathering and exchange outside the classroom. Such activities will also allow CLIL learners to gain direct experience of extra-mural turn-taking (Moore, 2010).

When it comes to intersubjectivity, it relates to "conflict avoidance" (Goodwin, Heritage, 1990). Matusov (2001: 384) identifies three types of intersubjectivity which may be addressed in a CLIL setting:
1) the recognition of "having something in common", and thus, sharing knowledge;
2) the "co-ordination of participant contributions", which obviously overlaps with turn-taking;
3) the development of "human agency", or making choices and decisions and considering the consequences of one's actions.

The area of Flow is the second factor of Talk. Flow à la Csíkszentmihályi (1991) ties in closely with questions of motivation. From an oral proficiency perspective, it is related to engagement and participation. This concept refers to a CLIL setting because this educational approach focuses on content rather than language. Therefore, anxiety level is reduced and this may result in more L2 talk (Pihko, 2008; Moore, 2010).

The area of Repair is the third factor of Talk. Moore (2010) claims that a generalized model of CLIL repair may involve form-focused repair, with meaning taking precedence over form (see also Dalton-Puffer, 2007; Serra, 2007; Moore, 2010). The framework of oral proficiency in CLIL is multi-faceted. Nevertheless, "if it is to work, we should be able to discuss each of these elements from diverse perspectives including CLIL research, planning, implementation and evaluation" (Moore, 2010: 62).

Certain studies indicate that the development across various areas of proficiency can unevenly spread regarding listening, speaking, reading, and writing. CLIL education supports native-like listening comprehension, however, erratic results as far as speaking are concerned can be noticed (cf. Van de Craen et al., 2007). So far almost all skills, except for listening, have been discussed. The next subsection addresses the issue of writing in a CLIL setting.

Writing

The teaching of writing to speakers of other languages is both a complex and challenging experience (cf. Leńko-Szymańska, 2015) because learners "bring very different backgrounds, knowledge, and learning styles to the classroom. When it comes to writing, students draw on various cross-linguistic and cross-cultural influences at the sentence, paragraph and content levels" (Lehman, 2012: 99). In this manner, all aspects of textual organization, such as: focus and development, coherence and cohesion, sentence structure, and register can be influenced (Lehman, 2012). CLIL education is claimed to develop all CLIL language skills. Whittaker, Llinares, and McCabe (2011) argue that:

> Although the teaching of content through second/foreign languages differs across contexts and countries, one objective that should be shared is that of finding ways of achieving better literacy levels (both in reading and writing), since these are key skills determining academic success in the L2 (Whittaker, Llinares, McCabe, 2011: 344).

In a CLIL setting "writing skills take up a highly significant role" (Wolff, 2009: 557). Heine (2010) notices that the exercise of producing the written genres of school subjects in a CLIL setting can lead to development of writing competence. CLIL learners have to use the foreign language to write down the results of what they have studied. This, in turn, involves, for instance composing reports, definitions or compiling results of observations.

According to Martínez (2007), written competence is a subset of learners' language competence. This competence emphasizes writing-specific abilities such as the production of different genres and rhetorical features, including language-specific abilities, for instance, the use of a range of vocabulary and syntactic structures (Wolfe-Quintero, Inagaki, Kim, 1998). However, when it comes to empirical research into the development of writing competence under CLIL provision, it is still scarce. Dalton-Puffer (2007) explains that extensive classroom observations show little focus on writing in a CLIL setting. Martínez (2007) points out that available studies on the benefits of CLIL education regarding development of written competence are inconclusive. One the one hand, some studies suggest the existence of limited progress regarding writing in a CLIL setting (e.g. Llinares, Whittaker, 2012), on the other hand, other studies report significant improvement in this area (e.g. Lasagabaster, 2008; Navés, Victori, 2010; Roquet, 2011; Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010).

Llinares and Whittaker (2006) on the basis of the study which was conducted among secondary Spanish CLIL participants learning Social Science through English conclude that they hardly ever use resources such as modality or clause expansion through elaboration

in their compositions. However, there are also studies which indicate that the development of CLIL learners' writing skills is not always remarkable from the very beginning of being enrolled in such classes. Nevertheless, positive changes can be observed after a longer period of time of learning in CLIL classes. Merisou-Storm (2014) carried out a study in Finland among CLIL and non-CLIL learners. The researcher found out that the development of writing skills was not remarkable in a group of CLIL learners during their first year at school. After the second year, CLIL learners made significant progress. The writing skill in this case was assessed on the basis of spelling skills. During the fourth grade, participants of the study were asked to write a story about someone's journey to a place that is very different from where they lived. The outcomes of the study indicate that CLIL learners use sophisticated vocabulary more often than non-CLIL learners.

Lasagabaster (2008) examined written competence in a CLIL setting from the holistic perspective. The aim of the study was to measure competence in the CLIL language via four English tests corresponding to grammar, listening, speaking, and writing. This study indicates that the CLIL groups significantly outperform their non-CLIL counterparts in writing and in the overall English competence score. His findings go in line with the research carried out by Navés and Victori (2010). The objective of this study was to examine the general language proficiency as well as writing skills of primary and secondary education among CLIL and non-CLIL students. The writing test consisted of a composition, which was analyzed for accuracy (error-free sentences), fluency (number of words), syntactic complexity (subordinate clauses), and lexical complexity (word variation). The outcomes of the study revealed that CLIL learners' writing at lower grades was at the same level or even higher than that of older non-CLIL learners a few grades ahead.

Wolff (2009: 557) concludes that discourse skills in a CLIL classroom consist of two sets:

1) one more general functional set consisting of speech acts like:
   a) identify – classify/define – describe – explain – conclude/argue – evaluate,
2) one more specific set which differs according to content subjects or groups of subjects, such as:
   a) making inductions/stating laws – describing states and processes – working with graphs, diagrams, tables etc. – interpreting – writing reports.

These pragmatic categories are perceived as the building stones for vocabulary and vocabulary work in the classroom (Wolff, 2009). Among them, writing appears as one of the elements which necessitates special methodological attention from CLIL teachers. Writing in a CLIL setting is a very complex process. It includes not only knowledge concerning content subject knowledge but also advanced skills of a CLIL language concerning grammatical structures of this language, and particularly vocabulary typical for CLIL content subjects.

Dale and Tanner (2012) provide some advice that can be used to deal with challenges related to writing. For instance, CLIL teachers should write short model texts with CLIL learners. These models should be presented on the board. CLIL students should have an opportunity to complete gapped texts. Then, they should be asked to write a similar paragraph, however, on a different topic. Dale and Tanner (2012) explain that tasks should

be short, simple, and realistic. When designing activities, CLIL teachers should include: a purpose, a realistic audience, and a text-type/genre. A purpose refers to the following activities: describing, explaining, instructing. Readers of a website or a magazine cope with a realistic audience. A text type is characterized by different purposes, such as, recounting, reporting, instructing, explaining, persuading or discussing. Thus, CLIL learners should be familiar with different types of genre appropriate to CLIL subjects, for instance, a brochure, a webpage or an email.

Finally, CLIL teachers should help learners develop CALP in writing. To achieve this goal, a fair number of writing tasks which use a benchmark like the CEFR (The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages) should be used during CLIL classes. CLIL teachers should use "production scaffolds or writing frames to help learners prepare for writing" (Dale, Tanner, 2012: 37).

During CLIL lessons learners use writing skills also while listening to a lecture. Longer responses include: answering questions, note-taking, paraphrasing and translating, summarizing, long gap-filling. Answering questions requires learners to answer the questions which are given in advance. In a CLIL setting, the answer often has to be provided in writing, for examples, during a pop quiz. Note-taking describes the situation when learners take brief notes from a short lecture or a talk (Ur, 1991). During CLIL subjects, learners are supposed to prepare their own notes, to use various graphic organizers (Dale, Tanner, 2012). All these activities involve writing skills.

Paraphrasing and translating refer to rewriting the listening text using different words in the same language or a different one. In a CLIL setting, learners are very often expected to write down what they hear, for instance, listening to a lecture. Then, they are supposed to use this knowledge in writing, either in the CLIL language or L1. Summarizing indicates that learners should write a brief summary of the listening passage (Ur, 1991). Again, when preparing notes, CLIL learners very often have to prepare a summary of the lecture. In this manner, learning may be easier for CLIL students. Long-gap filling is the last activity in this category. CLIL learners have to deal with situations when they have to complete (in writing) the missing parts of the text.

The second set, that is, extended responses comprises problem solving and interpretation. Especially the former applies to a CLIL setting. It refers to a situation when "a problem is described orally, learners discuss how to deal with it, and/or write down a suggested a solution" (Ur, 1991: 114). In the case of CLIL subjects, learners are given ample opportunities when they have to solve the puzzle in writing.

The discussion above shows that CLIL can develop writing skills. To achieve it, CLIL teachers should use a wide variety of techniques supporting this skill. The proficiency level in a foreign language focuses on individual skills, including writing. This, in turn, is assessed mainly on the basis of vocabulary and grammatical structures used by a language user.

Grammar

According to Ćirković-Miladinović and Milić (2012: 57), CLIL lessons exhibit the following characteristics:
1) integrate language and skills, both receptive and productive skills;
2) lessons are often based on reading or listening texts/passages;
3) the language focus in a lesson does not consider structural grading;
4) language is functional and dictated by the context of the subject;
5) language is approached lexically rather than grammatically;
6) learner styles should be taken into account in task types.

This suggests that the role of the CLIL language is limited mainly to its functional goals, related to content subjects. It goes in line with Spratt's observation (2012) that the CLIL language is based on the content subject. Spratt (2012: 11–12) characterizes the CLIL language emphasizing a predominance of subject-related vocabulary, language for exploring, discussing and writing about subject matter, language for employing cognitive skills (e.g. defining, giving reasons for opinions, evaluating, hypothesizing, drawing conclusions, exemplifying), and language for carrying out learning skills (e.g. locating information, interpreting information, and classifying).

Three roles of a CLIL language can be enumerated (Coyle, 2006). In terms of grammar, Language of Learning is of paramount importance. This role is linked to an analysis of content, thematic, syllabus demands with an emphasis put on grammar, vocabulary, structures, functions. Both grammatical or structural patterns "occur in the context of achieving particular academic functions" (Spratt, 2012: 11). In this case, grammar is used in context to achieve a learning goal or to finish a task.

However, the role of CLIL teacher is not to focus on the grammatical structures overtly. Spratt (2012) argues that grammatical structures "do not form the building blocks of a syllabus and are not usually subject to 'controlled' or 'free' practice, but their use may be supported by scaffolding devices such as writing or speaking frames" (Spratt, 2012: 11). In a similar vein, Savić (2012: 8) holds the view that "a CLIL lesson focuses on meaning and language use, not on grammar rules and forms, provides language input that is just above the students' level, and gives enough opportunities to use the language in meaningful communication without pressure".

It must be emphasized that the aim of CLIL is not to teach grammatical structures explicitly. However, certain studies show that CLIL can support the development of grammar (e.g. Lasagabaster, 2011; Pérez-Cañado, 2018). This can be explained on the basis of cognitive grammar, construction grammar, and the usage-based approach. Cognitive grammar puts an emphasis "more on semantic structure including tense, aspect, schema among others" (Masuda, Arnett, 2015: 2). It also acknowledges that the grounding of language exists in social interaction, but "even its interactive function is critically dependent on conceptualization." (Langacker, 2008: 8) Constructional grammar focuses on "the interaction between syntactic 'templates' and lexically instantiated verbs so that it can account for syntactic variation" " (Masuda, Arnett, 2015: 2). Finally, according to the usage-based approach, grammar is seen as the product of language use (Bybee,

2006; Langacker, 1987, 2000). In this manner, a language user through exposure to actual expressions extracts patterns (schemas), which then can become entranched (cf. Langacker, 1987; Tomasello, 2003; Masuda, Arnett, 2015).

> In a usage-based model, the primary focus is on the language that is actually used by speakers, whether L1 or L2, rather than language that it might be possible to use. Thus, this model does not privilege the abstract notion of a native speaker (Kramsch 2009) and is uniquely equipped to handle the study of dialects, various genres of writing and speech, differing registers, grammaticalization, and learner language (Masuda, Arnett, 2015: 3).

In CLIL classes, learners are expected to use the foreign language to master the content subjects. One of the premises of CLIL methodology is to encourage learners' active participation. Thus, this type of teaching gives CLIL learners ample opportunities to focus on the language that is used by other students and CLIL teachers. As a result, CLIL learners are likely to extract patterns. This seems to go in line with aforementioned theories.

Mehisto (2012) analyzes the description of an efficient language learner and a CLIL learner pertaining to grammar. Proficient language learners are typically aware of themselves and of how they learn languages. They analyze the target language as a means of communication. Gifted language learners monitor their progress and they also tend to be active learners. Mehisto (2012) concludes that CLIL learners, who are often described as proficient ones, are likely to analyze grammar and look for patterns and regularities. Although, teaching grammar is not the main goal of CLIL lessons, cooperation between language teachers and CLIL teachers can help in supporting their learners in learning grammatical structures.

Lexis

Vocabulary acquisition in any educational setting is crucial to language acquisition (cf. Uberman, 1998 Leńko-Szymańska, 2019). The process of vocabulary learning "is deeper and more complex than just memorising a word's meaning" (Xanthou, 2010: 461). CLIL settings provide learners with numerous situations when they can use vocabulary in contexts for real communication. These contexts are provided by subject matter during CLIL lessons. In this manner, vocabulary learning takes place in a more meaningful way (Heras, Lasagabaster, 2015). Xanthou (2010) argues that Content and Language Integrated Learning seems to be an approach satisfying all the necessary learning conditions, especially, in terms of learning vocabulary.

Schmitt and Schmitt (1995) explain that teachers designing vocabulary programs should incorporate L2 words into language that is already known. In this manner, lexical items are integrated into the old network and these associations enable their recall (Xanthou, 2010). In practical terms, "the primary goal of vocabulary instruction should be to present new concepts that can be applied to the student's already existing knowledge" (Xanthou, 2010: 462). On the basis of CLIL methodology, it may be assumed that CLIL education satisfies this condition.

Exposure to new words is expected to aid vocabulary learning (Xanthou, 2010). Foreign language learners can use a new word when they acquire the word's pronunciation, morphology, syntactic functions, meanings, collocations or association with specific words, and the context in which this word may be used (see Nation, 2001). Also in this case, a CLIL setting "allows dealing with a particular topic for a sustained period of time providing recurring exposure to new vocabulary through clarifications, justifications etc., with possible positive outcomes" (Xanthou, 2010: 464). As a result, CLIL students are able to understand, learn, and use the new word.

Certain studies corroborate the hypothesis that CLIL supports vocabulary learning (e.g. Catalán, Ruiz de Zarobe, 2009; Xanthou, 2010). Catalán and De Zarobe (2009) report significant differences in receptive vocabulary size in a CLIL group. Xanthou (2010) carried out a study in public primary schools in Cyprus. The results show that CLIL may provide more opportunities to activate the learner's previous knowledge to learn vocabulary in context and to actively process new vocabulary. Jiménez and Ojeda (2009) also measured lexical availability, that is, how easily a word can be generated in a given category. In this case, the results indicate that the non-CLIL students produced a significantly higher number of words in each category. These findings show that CLIL can have a positive effect on "the acquisition of general vocabulary of the target language but receptive vocabulary is affected more than productive. CLIL's influence on receptive vocabulary may be clearer than in the case of productive vocabulary" (Heras, Lasagabaster, 2015: 75). Heras and Lasagabaster (2015) emphasize the need for more evidence on the influence of the CLIL approach regarding technical content-related vocabulary both in production and reception.

Since the issue of vocabulary in a CLIL setting refers to BICS and CALP, a question arises how it should be taught. According to Wolff (2005), one of the most important principles regarding teaching vocabulary in a CLIL setting is the introduction of general vocabulary of a particular field of study before more specialized vocabulary comes to the fore. Eldridge, Neufeld, and Hancioğlu (2010: 97) provide detailed 'LexiCLIL' principles. According to them, key to success in a CLIL environment is the acquisition of a productive vocabulary that includes knowledge of the most frequent vocabulary items in the target language, key vocabulary in individual subject areas, and key vocabulary needed to function in the educational environment.

Eldridge et al. (2010) explain that the next principle refers to a coherent and economic approach to vocabulary acquisition which requires a coordinated and systematic approach that functions across the curriculum. It should be noted that the bands of the Common European Framework for languages and word frequency lists such as the BNL (Billuroğlu, Neufeld, 2007) and CELF [the Common English Lexical Framework] provide a firm basis for the staged acquisition of vocabulary to be built into the curriculum. Furthermore, all lessons should present opportunities for vocabulary learning, recycling and production opportunities. Vocabulary cannot just be 'picked up'. It requires repeated exposure and practice of key words. When it comes to assessment, it should focus on vocabulary in all subjects. Finally, the Internet and Web 2.0 tools offer unparalleled opportunities to enrich vocabulary teaching and learning and they should be embedded in a LexiCLIL approach (Eldridge et al., 2010: 97).

According to the traditional model discussed by Radford, Atkinson, Britain, Clahsen, and Spencer (1999), lexical entries should consist of its lemma and its form information. The former refers to meaning and syntax. The latter involves morphological information and phonological forms this lemma can take in speech. Xanthou (2010) claims that CLIL practice exposes the students to the semantic form of the target word and its morphophonological form.

According to most recent approaches, the knowledge of lexis is much more complex and intricate because it involves the aspect of entrenchment (Langacker, 2008):

> Meanings (like other linguistic structures) are recognized as part of a language only to the extent that they are (i) entrenched in the minds of individual speakers and (ii) conventional for members of a speech community. Only a limited array of senses satisfy these criteria and qualify as established linguistic units. But since entrenchment and conventionalization are inherently matters of degree, there is no discrete boundary between senses which have and which lack the status of established units. We find instead a gradation leading from novel interpretations, through incipient senses, to established linguistic meanings (Langacker, 2008: 38).

For example, Apple, Inc. is famous for notoriously using marketing slogans that break conventions of grammaticality. In 1997 the company introduced the attention-grabbing slogan "Think different", which was received as grammatically unconventional. Despite initial criticisms, the slogan has been widely accepted, (or entrenched in the minds of speakers), which makes it grammatical (Trenga, 2010, see Waliński, 2015: 56 for a discussion). In this case grammaticality is replaced with the idea of entrenchment.

The present discussion is finished focusing on lexico-grammatical competence which indicates that "lexis and syntax cannot be but artificially separated from other language-related knowledge at supra-sentential or discourse level" (Juan-Garau, Salazer-Nuguera, Prieto-Arranz, 2014: 236). CLIL education is beneficial with respect to lexico-grammatical competence in the target language (cf. Juan-Garau et al., 2015). One of aims of CLIL approach is to foster the learner's overall CLIL language competence (cf. Dalton-Puffer, 2008). It can be attributed to the fact that CLIL learners are exposed to vocabulary and grammar in authentic, specific contexts through "social activities in which students interactively construct their knowledge of language use and practices" (Wilhelmer, 2008: 20–21).

Conclusion

One conclusion that emerges from the literature overview presented in the present paper is that CLIL methodology puts an emphasis on providing CLIL learners with ample opportunities to be active participants in their learning process. The overview of linguistic features in CLIL settings demonstrates that CLIL may provide a supportive environment for developing multiple dimensions of language proficiency. While empirical results remain varied across skills, there is substantial evidence that CLIL promotes receptive skills, fosters authentic communication, and enhances lexical and grammatical development. The integration of content and language may lead to meaningful language exposure and

increases learner motivation. Future research should further explore longterm development across skills, the role of individual learner variables, and effective methodological strategies for maximizing linguistic gains in CLIL contexts.

References

Ackerman P.L. (2003), *A theory of adult intellectual development: Process, personality, interests, and knowledge*, "Psychological Bulletin", vol. 129(1), pp. 3–29.

Aebersold J.A., Field M.L. (1997), *From reader to reading teacher: Issues and strategies for second language classrooms*, Cambridge.

Aguilar M., Rodríguez R. (2012), *Lecturer and student perceptions on CLIL at a Spanish university*, "International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism", vol. 15(2), pp. 183–197.

Aliaga R. (2008), *CLIL and cognitive constructivism*, [in:] D. Marsh, P. Mehisto (eds.), *CLIL practice: Perspectives from the field*, Jyväskylä, pp. 54–60.

Anmarkrud Ø., Refsahl V. (2010), *Leseforståelse – Teori og undervisning*, Oslo.

Anderson R.C., Pearson P. D. (1984), A schema-theoretic view of basic processes in reading comprehension, [in:] P.D. Pearson (ed.), *Handbook of reading research*, London, pp. 255–291.

Ball P., Kelly K., Clegg J. (2015), *Putting CLIL into Practice*, "Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education", vol. 5(1), pp. 140–143, https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.5.1.07gie

Barboráková Z. (2012), *CLIL and reading strategies*, Brno.

Ball P., Kelly K., Clegg J. (2015), *Putting CLIL into Practice*, "Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education", vol. 5(1), pp. 140–143, https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.5.1.07gie

Borowiak A. (2021), *Exploring the role of individual variables in the success of CLIL as an approach to EFL learning*, PhD dissertation, Łódź.

Brinton D.M., Snow M.A., Wesche M. (1989), *Content-based second language instruction*, Newbury.

Brown H.D. (1994), *Principles of language learning and teaching* (3rd ed.), Hoboken.

Brown A.L., Palincsar A.S. (1984), *Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring activities*, "Cognition and Instruction", vol. 1(2), pp. 117–175.

Bybee J. (2006), *From usage to grammar: The mind's response to repetition*, "Language", vol. 82(4), pp. 711–733.

Bulté B., Surmont J., Martens L. (2022), *The Impact of CLIL on the L2 French and L1 Dutch Proficiency of Flemish Secondary School Pupils*, "International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism", vol. 25(9), pp. 3151–3170.

Canale M., Swain M. (1980), *Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing*, "Applied Linguistics", vol. 1(1), pp. 1–47.

Carroll J.B. (1990), *Cognitive abilities in foreign language aptitude: Then and now*, [in:] T. Parry, C. Stansfield (eds.), *Language aptitude reconsidered*, Hoboken, pp. 11–29.

Catalán R.M. J., Ruiz de Zarobe Y. (2009), *The receptive vocabulary of CLIL and non-CLIL students*, "VIAL", vol. 6, pp. 85–98.

Clegg J. (2009), *Developing language through reading*, [in:] D. Marsh (ed.), *CLIL practice: Perspectives from the field*, Jyväskylä, pp. 6–12.

Coonan C.M. (2007), *Insider views of the CLIL class through teacher self-observation–introspection*, "International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism", vol. 10(5), pp. 625–646.

Coyle D. (2006), *Content and language integrated learning: Motivating learners and teachers*, "Scottish Languages Review", vol. 13, pp. 1–18.

Cummins J. (1979), *Cognitive/academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimum age question and some other matters*, "Working Papers on Bilingualism", vol. 19, pp. 121–129.

Cummins J. (1980), *The cross-linguistic dimensions of language proficiency: Implications for bilingual education and the optimal age issue*, Toronto.

Cummins J. (2001), *Bilingual children's mother tongue: Why is it important for education?*, "Sprogforum", vol. 7(19), pp. 15–20.

Dakowska M. (2005), *Teaching English as a foreign language: A guide for professionals*, Warszawa.

Dalton-Puffer C. (2007), *Discourse in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) classrooms*, Amsterdam.

Dalton-Puffer C. (2008), *Outcomes and processes in CLIL: Current research from Europe*, [in:] D. Marsh, P. Mehisto (eds.), *CLIL practice: Perspectives from the field*, Jyväskylä, pp. 41–48.

Dalton-Puffer C. (2011), *Content and language integrated learning: From practice to principles?*, "Annual Review of Applied Linguistics", vol. 31, pp. 182–204.

Dale L., Tanner R. (2012), *CLIL activities: A resource for subject and language teachers*, Cambridge.

Delliou A., Zafiri M. (2016), *CLIL and speaking skills*, "Journal of Applied Linguistics", vol. 32(2), pp. 45–58.

Eldridge J., Neufeld S., Hancıoğlu N. (2010), *Towards a LexiCLIL agenda*, "Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching", vol. 4(1), pp. 95–108.

Escobar-Urmeneta C., Sánchez-Sola A. (2009), *Learning through interaction in CLIL*, "The CLIL Research Journal", vol. 2(1), pp. 30–46.

Garipova L., Román E. (2016), *Reading strategies in CLIL*, "Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences", vol. 232, pp. 186–192.

Goh C.C.M. (2000), *A cognitive perspective on language learners' listening comprehension problems*, "System", vol. 28(1), pp. 55–75.

Goodman K.S. (1967), *Reading: A psycholinguistic guessing game*, "Journal of the Reading Specialist", vol. 6(4), pp. 126–135.

Grabe W., Stoller F.L. (2002), *Teaching and researching reading*, London.

Hellekjaer G.O. (2010), *Lecture comprehension in English-medium higher education*, "Hermes – Journal of Language and Communication Studies", vol. 45, pp. 11–34.

Heras A., Lasagabaster D. (2015), *The impact of CLIL on affective factors and vocabulary learning*, "Language Teaching Research", vol. 19(1), pp. 70–88.

Hillocks G. (1987), *Research on written composition: New directions for teaching*, New Delhi.

Iannou A., Pavlou P. (2011), *The role of scanning in reading comprehension*, "Reading in a Foreign Language", vol. 23(1), pp. 1–16.

Jiménez A., Ojeda M. (2009), *Lexical availability of CLIL students*, "Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada", vol. 22, pp. 83–98.

Khaki N. (2014), *Teaching reading strategies: The role of CLIL*, "International Journal of English and Education", vol. 3(4), pp. 183–190.

Langacker R.W. (1987), *Foundations of cognitive grammar (Vol. 1)*, Stanford.

Langacker R.W. (2008), *Cognitive grammar: A basic introduction*, Oxford.

Lasagabaster D. (2008), *Foreign language competence in content and language integrated courses*, "The Open Applied Linguistics Journal", vol. 1, pp. 30–41.

Lasagabaster D. (2011), *English achievement and student motivation in CLIL and EFL settings*, "Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching", vol. 5(1), pp. 3–18.

Lee J.F., Schallert D.L. (1997), *The relative contribution of L2 language proficiency and L1 reading ability to L2 reading performance*, "Language Learning", vol. 47(4), pp. 713–744.

Lehman C. (2012), *Writing across languages and cultures*, [in:] M. Byram, A. Hu (eds.), *Routledge encyclopedia of language teaching and learning*, Abingdon, pp. 99–104.

Leńko-Szymańska A. (2015), Complexity, accuracy and fluency in EFL writing, "System", vol. 47, pp. 1–17.

Li C. (2016), *Language aptitude and second language acquisition*, New York.

Liubinienė V. (2009), *Developing listening comprehension in CLIL*, "Studies about Languages", vol. 14, pp. 88–94.

Lin A.M.Y. (2016), *Language across the curriculum & CLIL in English-as-an-additional-language (EAL) contexts: Theory and practice*, New York.

Lorenzo F., Casal S., Moore P. (2010), *The effects of content and language integrated learning in European education*, "Applied Linguistics", vol. 31(3), pp. 418–442.

Martínez A. (2007), *Developing writing skills in CLIL*, "The Journal of Language Teaching and Research", vol. 8(2), pp. 25–36.

Masuda K., Arnett C. (2015), *Usage-based approaches to language learning and teaching*, "Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching", vol. 5(1), pp. 1–10.

Mehisto P. (2012), *Criteria for producing CLIL learning material*, "Encuentro", vol. 21, pp. 15–33.

Mewald C. (2007), *A comparison of CLIL and non-CLIL students in Austrian secondary schools*, "Vienna English Working Papers", vol. 16(3), pp. 5–12.

Moore P. (2010), *The development of speaking proficiency in CLIL*, "The CLIL Research Journal", vol. 3(1), pp. 56–63.

Navés T., Victori M. (2010), *CLIL in Catalonia: An overview*, [in:] D. Lasagabaster, Y. Ruiz de Zarobe (eds.), *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, results and teacher training*, Cambridge, pp. 30–54.

O'Malley J.M., Chamot A.U., Küpper L. (1989), *Listening comprehension strategies in second language acquisition*, "Applied Linguistics", vol. 10(4), pp. 418–437.

Pérez-Cañado M.L. (2018), *CLIL and grammar learning*, "International Journal of Applied Linguistics", vol. 28(4), pp. 456–473.

Pigada M., Schmitt N. (2006), *Vocabulary acquisition from extensive reading*, "Reading in a Foreign Language", vol. 18(1), pp. 1–28.

Prieto-Arranz J., Fabra M., Calafat-Ripoll M., Catrain-González A. (2015), *Receptive skills in CLIL*, "Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences", vol. 178, pp. 123–129.

Roquet H. (2011), *The impact of CLIL on written competence*, "Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada", vol. 24, pp. 45–64.

Ruiz de Zarobe Y. (2008), *CLIL and foreign language learning: A longitudinal study*, "International CLIL Research Journal", vol. 1(1), pp. 60–73.

Saito K. (2017), *Effects of language aptitude on pronunciation development in classroom settings*, "Applied Psycholinguistics", vol. 38(5), pp. 1023–1047.

Savić V. (2012), *Grammar in CLIL*, „Belgrade English Language Forum", vol. 10(2), pp. 35–40.

Schmitt N., Schmitt D. (1995), *Vocabulary notebooks: Theoretical underpinnings and practical suggestions*, "ELT Journal", vol. 49(2), pp. 133–143.

Serra C. (2007), *Assessing CLIL at primary school: A longitudinal study*, "International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism", vol. 10(5), pp. 582–602.

Skehan P. (2015), *Individual differences in second language learning*, Abingdon.

Skogen T. (2013), *Reading strategies in CLIL classrooms*, Bergen.

Snow M.A. (1987), *Content-based language instruction: Approaches and procedures*, "TESOL Quarterly", vol. 21(3), pp. 475–498.

Spratt M. (2012), *Language in CLIL contexts*, [in:] D. Coyle, P. Hood, D. Marsh (eds.), *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning*, Cambridge, pp. . 9–20.

Ur P. (1991), *A course in language teaching: Practice and theory*, Cambridge.

Ur P. (1999), *A course in language teaching: Practice and theory* (2nd ed.), Cambridge.

Vázquez G., Ellison M. (2013), *CLIL and the development of oral skills*, "Language Learning Journal", vol. 41(1), pp. 75–88.

Vraciu A., Marsol A. (2023), *Content-Specific Vocabulary in CLIL: Exploring L2 Learning Outcomes in a Primary Education Programme in Catalonia*, "Language Teaching Research", vol. 0(0), https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688231170073

Wolff D. (2005), *Developing CLIL: The European dimension*, "Bulletin CILA", vol. 82, pp. 1–17.

Wolff D. (2009), *The role of language in CLIL*, "International CLIL Research Journal", vol. 1(3), pp. 557–564.

Xanthou M. (2010), *The impact of CLIL on L2 vocabulary development*, "Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences", vol. 3, pp. 460–465.

Streszczenie
Rozwijanie receptywnych, produktywnych i akademickich umiejętności językowych w CLIL – kompleksowa, wieloskładnikowa perspektywa rozwoju językowego

Artykuł przedstawia analizę cech językowych w klasie dwujęzycznej (ang. CLIL). Omówiono rozwój umiejętności receptywnych i produktywnych, w tym czytania, słuchania, mówienia i pisania, a także zagadnienia gramatyczne i leksykalne. Na podstawie przeglądu literatury można stwierdzić, że CLIL wspiera rozwój zarówno podstawowych umiejętności komunikacyjnych (BICS), jak i akademickich umiejętności językowych (CALP). Artykuł kończy dyskusja dotycząca zastosowania CLIL w praktyce edukacyjnej oraz kierunki dalszych badań.

Słowa kluczowe: CLIL, mówienie, pisanie, czytanie, słuchanie, gramatyka, słownictwo, CALP, BICPS