

Agnieszka Borowiak  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6913-2760>  
University of Humanistic and Economics in Lodz  
e-mail: [agnieszka\\_borowiak@wp.pl](mailto:agnieszka_borowiak@wp.pl)

## Assessment issues in CLIL and the Polish perspective

### Ocenianie w klasie dwujęzycznej a polska perspektywa

#### Abstract

The aim of this paper is to discuss selected CLIL assessment issues, which are juxtaposed with the Polish perspective. To achieve the aforementioned aim, first brief characteristic of CLIL is provided, including the role of non-linguistic content, the use of L1 and L2. Then, the shift is made to assessment in a CLIL setting. The final part of the paper is finished with a discussion concerning the Polish perspective on CLIL assessment. The reference is made to selected legal documents describing the way CLIL courses are organized. The author of this paper hopes that this paper will stimulate further discussion and empirical research in the field.

**Keywords:** CLIL, Content and Language Integrated Learning, assessment, core curriculum

#### Streszczenie

Celem tego artykułu jest omówienie wybranych zagadnień dotyczących oceniania w klasach dwujęzycznych/zintegrowanym kształceniu przedmiotowo-językowym (ang. *Content and Language Integrated Learning*), które zostaną zestawione z polską perspektywą. By osiągnąć zamierzony cel, na samym początku krótko zostanie omówione zintegrowane kształcenie przedmiotowo-językowe, uwzględniając rolę treści pozajęzykowej, użycie języka ojczystego, jak również i języka obcego. Następnie zostaną omówione najważniejsze kwestie dotyczące oceniania w klasie dwujęzycznej. Ostatnia część artykułu poświęcona jest ocenianiu w polskich szkołach/klasach dwujęzycznych. Odnosi się ona do wybranych dokumentów regulujących funkcjonowanie klas/szkoł dwujęzycznych. Autorka ma nadzieję, że ten teoretyczny wywód wzbudzi dalsze dyskusje oraz badania skupiające się na zintegrowanym kształceniu przedmiotowo-językowym.

**Słowa kluczowe:** CLIL, Content and Language Integrated Learning, nauczanie dwujęzyczne, ocenianie, podstawa programowa

## Introduction

Assessment can be seen as a part of evaluation which is not only focused on the final level of a learner's knowledge but also on the process of learners' development which is equally, or even more important. Assessment should be oriented towards the learner (e.g., his or her knowledge, progress or achievement) (Babocká, 2015) and should play the role of a "tool for learning rather than the end of the learning process" (Williams, 2003: 37). Nevertheless, to make assessment an effective pedagogical tool, two conditions have to be met, that is, a thorough understanding of what is going to be assessed and the teaching process designed in such a way that learners may achieve the learning objectives (Del Pozo Manzano, 2024: 231). Assessment has always been a demanding task for teachers. Thus, focusing on *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)*, which in an educational approach in which "a foreign language is used as the medium of instruction to create an authentic language learning environment" (Reierstam, 2024: 197), can be a difficult venture. During CLIL lessons non-linguistic content is usually the focus, whereas a foreign language is not consciously taught. Thus, numerous questions may appear, such as: what should be corrected – non-linguistic or linguistic content, which language should be used when testing – L1 or L2 or who should correct – a teacher (which teacher, a language teacher or a non-linguistic teacher) or a peer. To answer these questions, there is a need to analyze the basic issues concerning CLIL, such as the role of content and a foreign language in CLIL, and assessment concerning the aforementioned areas (Borowiak, 2021).

## Content in a CLIL setting

Content in CLIL, according to the 4Cs Framework, "is the subjects or the CLIL theme" (Coyle, Hood, Marsh, 2010: 53). Across Europe, various subjects are offered in CLIL programs. Generally, the choice is related to the availability of particular teachers who are willing to teach in a CLIL setting and who have the qualifications to teach a subject through the target language. According to Eurydice (2006), in majority of the schools of the European countries, it is possible to select from across the entire curriculum one or more subjects that can be included in CLIL courses. Marsh and Marsland (1999) argue that the following subjects are frequently chosen for CLIL courses: Environmental Studies, Mathematics, Art, Biology, Geography, History, Chemistry, Psychology, and Religious Studies. However, some differences, regarding CLIL subjects, between primary and secondary education can be enumerated.

Nevertheless, content "does not have to be part of a discrete curriculum discipline such as Maths or History, it can be drawn from alternative approaches to a curriculum involving cross-curricular and integrated studies" (Coyle, Hood, Marsh, 2010: 53). Coyle et al. (2010) imply that the overall planning of CLIL lessons should rely on content. In this manner, content will not be limited or reduced to match the linguistic level of the students. Nevertheless, analysis of various CLIL programs in Europe shows that the way

CLIL classes are organized may vary due to certain factors. One difference can be noticed in the way CLIL is understood in particular countries.

The aim of CLIL is to integrate language learning and content learning at two levels, that is, cognitive and cultural levels. Dupuy emphasizes the role of culture indicating that CLIL as “a dual-focused educational approach wherein an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language, has emerged to cater to the linguistic and cultural demands created by this global age” (2011: 22). Skopinskaja (2003) claims that CLIL learners, apart from being aware of similarities and differences between the target culture and their own cultural background, should also establish a sphere of interculturality. It can be achieved by learning to observe the world from the perspective of others, thus, decentering their own perspective. It means that in CLIL education “culture can include extending the content” (Coyle et al., 2010: 53).

The integration of content and language can pose a formidable challenge for CLIL teachers. Thus, as emphasized by Pawlak (2013: 212), “teachers must be reflective practitioners who are capable of selecting instructional options that are best suited to the attainment of specific pedagogic goals.” Apart from using methodology appropriate for a CLIL course, CLIL teachers can also use other strategies aiming at supporting content in CLIL programs. Numrich (1989) provides five strategies which can be used to improve the comprehension of content in CLIL education. They include (1) predicting on the basis of prior knowledge, (2) anticipating what will be read next, (3) using statements to check comprehension of a text during reading, (4) analyzing text organization by looking for specific patterns, and (5) classifying to facilitate comprehension of similarities and differences (Numrich, 1999).

Content in Content and Language Integrated Learning may be defined in several ways. Combining two areas, that is, a non-linguistic subject and a foreign language may influence not only the way CLIL lessons are organized but also the final shape of assessment. In the case of CLIL, teachers not only take into account the two areas but also the role of L1. This is another factor which should be analyzed when discussing assessment in CLIL settings.

## The role of a mother tongue in a CLIL setting

The amount of a foreign language which is used during CLIL lessons (the CLIL language) and mother tongue can be different depending on the type of CLIL program.

Second-language acquisition research has shown that the level of proficiency in the first language has a direct influence on the development of proficiency in the second language. The lack of continuing first-language development has been found, in some cases, to inhibit the levels of second-language proficiency and cognitive academic growth (Navés, 2009: 27–28).

Learners who are expected to use the L2 only, especially when they need to use their mother tongue, can face problems (Marsh, Marsland, 1999). CLIL programs enable the use of two languages, namely, L1 and L2. L1 helps to learn CLIL content subjects (Wolff, 2005). This knowledge, in turn, helps CLIL learners make the CLIL language they hear

and read more comprehensible. Literacy, which is developed in L1, transfers to the second language (Navés, 2009). This may be explained by the concept of linguistic interdependence, which implies that knowledge of one language bolsters knowledge of the second language (García, 2008). The development of L1 skills typically leads to academic success in and through English as a second language (Crawford, Krashen, 2007).

Navés argues that “effective CLIL programmes acknowledge and support learners’ home language and culture by allowing learners to use their L1 at early stages and also providing some academic instruction in learners’ L1” (2009: 28). The extent to which the CLIL language and L1 are used depends on the aims of the lesson and a type of a CLIL model which is implemented (Marsh, Marsland, 1999). The use of the L1/L2 ratio of 75/25% is recommended “as a minimum starting point for CLIL. This is very low in terms of L2 usage, but it allows for teachers to see CLIL as means of enriching rather than constraining the learning context” (Marsh, Marsland, 1999: 51).

During CLIL lessons students may use L1 and L2 for different purposes. As a result, switching and mixing between the languages occur (Arthur, Martin, 2006). *Code-switching* can be defined as “the alternative used by bilinguals of two or more languages in the same conversation” (Milroy, Musyken, 1995: 7). The switching of languages can occur either at intersentential level (code-switching, CS) or intrasentential level (code-mixing, CM). García (2007) and Coyle et al. (2010) prefer the term *translanguaging* to show that languages are not hermetically sealed units. Coyle et al. (2010: 16) explain that translanguaging “refers to a systematic shift from one language to another for specific purposes.” An instance is a teacher who speaks in one language and a pupil replies in another. Alternatively, CLIL learners can work as a pair speaking through one language, whilst analyzing materials produced in another one (Marsh, 2002). Marsh explains that “translanguaging is allowed when it can help avoid a break-down in communication, but does not normally need to be used more often because of the additional language training provided in the language classes, and the support provided by language teachers” (2002: 98). Ariffin and Misyana Husin (2011: 224) argue that “translanguaging goes beyond CS/CM as bilinguals use languages based on prestige, appropriateness, preference, ability and other factors.”

Lewis, Jones and Baker (2012) propose a distinction between *classroom* and *universal* modes of translanguaging. The former refers to classroom practice, which involves “planned” or “serendipitous” translanguaging, but always “with a pedagogic emphasis” (Lewis et al., 2012: 650). The latter pertains to typical bilingual behavior: “irrespective of context and particularly for gaining understandings, everyday communication, and achievement in interactions irrespective of site” (Lewis et al., 2012: 650).

Translanguaging is in a way, a re-branding of code-switching (Schwartz, Asli, 2014). Merritt et al. (1992: 112–113) identify arguments explaining why code switching may be used in the CLIL classroom:

- 1) linguistic insecurity, e.g. the difficulty teachers/learners experience in relating new concepts (Merritt et al., 1992: 112–113);
- 2) topic switch, that is when the teacher/learner switches code according to the topic;
- 3) affective functions, e.g. spontaneous expression of emotions and emotional understanding in discourse with students;

- 4) socializing functions, that is when teachers turn to the students' first language to signal friendship and solidarity (Merritt et al., 1992: 112–113);
- 5) repetitive functions, that is when teachers convey the same message in both languages for clarity.

CLIL classes may differ in the way they are organized in various educational settings. The differences can be seen in terms of the time spent on using L1 and L2. The aims of the lessons or the proficiency level and age of CLIL students may play a pivotal role. The discussion presented in this section shows that the use of a mother tongue can be indispensable.

## Assessment in a CLIL setting

Numerous definitions of assessment can be provided. Hönic (2009) distinguishes the following types of assessment:

- 1) *formal vs. informal assessment*;
- 2) *formative vs. summative assessment*;
- 3) *holistic vs. analytic assessment*.

*The formal assessment* includes formal techniques, such as tests, written exams or quizzes (Babocká, 2015). On the other hand, *the informal assessment techniques* “can be used at any time without interfering with instructional time” (Navarette et al., 1990: 2). They occur in a casual manner, during or after the lesson. In this case, verbal praise, facial expressions or gestures to assess a student's work and learning progress can be used.

When it comes to *the formative assessment*, it is process-oriented and diagnostic. Its key role is to help a learner to form their own learning process by the systematic collection of data, which provides information about their current level of learning (Trumbull, Lash, 2013). In contrast, *the summative assessment* has a much more “limited perspective with a focus on the ‘ends’ of learning in terms of what the learner has achieved at particular points” (Rea-Dickens, Germaine, 2003: 5). Marks are used for assessment of students' learning outcomes, e.g., written/oral tests, projects or essays written during the semester or at the end of the school year. Marks usually correspond to specific classification scales.

Whereas *the holistic assessment* looks at the whole learner's product and assesses it as a whole, *the analytic assessment* marks prescribed components of a final student's product (e.g. an essay, test, or invention). This type of assessment is believed to be more objective since it provides a more complex diagnosis of a student's work (see: Rea-Dickens, Germaine, 2003 for a broader discussion).

CLIL covers several issues related to teaching two areas, non-linguistic content and L2. Thus, the assessment in a CLIL setting seems to be even more complex. Llinares, Morton, and Whittaker (2012: 280) argue that assessment “is an indispensable part of instruction. It is by thinking about assessment that we really start to sharpen up our idea of what CLIL is about and the role of language within it.” Barbero (2012) claims that assessment is a foundation stone to the success of CLIL. It is connected to the fact that assessment, which guides learning and students, ends up focusing on what they are

assessed. Nevertheless, as indicated earlier, assessment in CLIL is a complex process, which raises concerns over some basic questions, such as “What” (should be assessed), “How” and “Why” (it should be assessed) (Barbero, 2012), as well as “Who” should conduct the assessment (Coyle et al., 2010).

Briggs, Woodfield, Martin, and Swatton (2008) enumerate three main concepts associated with assessment, which may be a foil for further discussion regarding the assessment in a CLIL setting: (1) assessment *OF* learning, (2) assessment *FOR* learning, and (3) assessment *AS* learning. The assessment *OF* learning is a summative assessment. The assessment *FOR* learning is a formative assessment. Its main aim is to inform the planning of future learning and teaching.

This involves the teacher and the learner in a continual review of the progress achieved. Formative assessment has three important characteristics: it is planned, since teachers collect evidence about the state of learners’ knowledge; it is reactive, since teachers adjust their teaching activities in the light of the information they gain; it is reciprocal, since both teachers and learners may improve the quality of the studies according to the information they get from formative assessment (Barbero, 2012: 39).

These features seem to have particular implications in CLIL courses. Formative assessment provides feedback to learners and teachers through specific assessment tools. According to Massler (2011: 118), formative assessment in CLIL classes should embrace:

- 1) development in foreign language competence;
- 2) development in the content area;
- 3) development of positive attitudes towards both the foreign language and content area;
- 4) development of strategic competence in both the language and content;
- 5) development of intercultural awareness and promotion of intercultural education.

The third concept is related to the assessment *AS* learning. The aim is to increase the awareness about the learning processes. Learners and teachers are expected to share learning intentions and success criteria. They also evaluate learning through “alternative forms of assessment, such as self- and peer assessment, and through tools such as portfolios, observation grids and other instruments” (Barbero, 2012: 39).

The assessment in CLIL should also fulfil two essential quality criteria: *validity* and *reliability* (Barbero, 2012). Formative assessment should be supported by *valid* assessment tools, which measure exactly what these tools intend to assess, and are consistent with the teaching objectives. The assessment should also provide *reliable* feedback for the learner. It should consist of criteria, scores, and descriptors, which quantify, evaluate, and interpret the outcomes. Reliable assessment should be accurate, precise, and consistent, that is, the same or similar outcome should rate the same. As pointed out by Babocká (2015: 180):

In terms of CLIL’s uniqueness, it is very important to identify whether the “gap” is caused by the lack of subject knowledge and understanding or by the failure of communication caused by insufficient foreign language acquisition. This requires offering some alternative ways of expressing understanding.

In this context, Massler, Ioannou-Georgiou and Steiert (2011) recommend integrating hands-on activities and symbolic representations, e.g. pictures, pictographs, maps, diagrams, pantomimes, drama techniques or even using one’s mother tongue.

The discussion of theoretical underpinnings of the assessment in a CLIL setting, aimed at addressing the problems of *how* and *why*, leads to more practical facets. One aspect of the assessment in CLIL subjects addresses the question of what should be assessed, that is, content knowledge or the CLIL language. Barbero (2012), with reference to Coyle et al. definitions of CLIL, argues that “so-called “European” CLIL states clearly that the focus should be on content, and the language is intended as instrumental to the latter’s development” (Coyle et al., 2010: 41).

Another issue concerning assessment is related to the question of how it should be done, that is, the content and the language should be assessed separately or together. Barbero (2012) argues that the CLIL teacher should consider both the criteria for the content-subject assessment and the criteria for the CLIL language assessment (Babocká, 2015). Massler (2011) also claims that even when content and language are assessed in one task, having separate and clear criteria for each area, that is, language ability and content knowledge, is highly recommended.

It should also be noted that CLIL language is the academic language (CALP) used for teaching the CLIL subjects. Thus, CLIL teachers have to resolve the problem of the formal correctness of language, which includes two basic principles. The first one addresses comprehensible input, that is, specific strategies of scaffolding must ensure understanding of the message or text. The second one applies to linguistic correctness, which must be ensured in different ways than those traditionally followed in language courses. A language clinic (Coyle et al., 2010) can be one of the examples of such a solution. In this case, “from time to time, the teacher gathers language errors, which need to be addressed as a class and holds a “language clinic” in a lesson, explaining to learners that this is a necessary step to support better communication of content” (Coyle et al., 2010: 120).

Massler (2011: 121) claims that “the content that was taught in the L2 needs to be assessed in the L2 as well.” A consensus emerges in the following observation made by Coyle et al. (2010: 115):

The teacher designing the unit will know what she or he wishes to teach and what the overall purpose of the CLIL module is. Therefore, the answer to the ‘language or content’ question is determined by the relative priority within those objectives; [...] the content should always be the dominant element in terms of objectives, even though we intend that language will be learned securely alongside the content’s concepts and skills.

It means that “teachers should know why they are assessing language as opposed to content and how they wish to do this” (Coyle et al., 2010: 119).

Barbero (2012) proposes a framework for the assessment, which integrates content, at different complexity levels, CALP functions, and cognitive skills. This framework shows how the ways in which content knowledge at different levels of cognitive difficulty integrate and express each other through the CLIL language. Barbero (2012) explains this framework on the basis of the *knowledge framework*, which as postulated by Mohan (1986), involves a taxonomy where knowledge is considered in its relationships with language at three different levels, including: classification/concepts, principles/processes, and evaluation/creation. Their language manifestations are also taken into account including: description, sequences, their choices. This framework also involves the

cognitive dimension pertaining to lower-order processing (e.g. recognizing, identifying, classifying) and higher-order processing (e.g. explaining, applying, or putting together pieces to construct something new and making critical judgments) (see: Barbero, 2012 for broader discussions).

Another issue in the area of assessment in a CLIL setting refers to a person who should be responsible for the assessment. Coyle et al. (2010) insist that it has to be carried out by CLIL teachers. However, relying on teacher assessment alone can have the negative potential of impoverishment in a CLIL program. Thus, the use of self- and peer-assessment methods can be crucial in a CLIL setting.

When learners are involved in assessment in a CLIL classroom, they are involved in decisions about how to learn and what to learn and why they are learning, and they are also actively involved in decisions about the criteria for assessment and their studies will probably be qualitatively different from that of students who are treated as recipients of teaching and who are the object of other's unilateral assessment (McConnell, 2006: 92).

This indicates that implementing various assessment types and involving different parties in the assessment process may bring an added value. Additionally, Barbero (2012: 58–59) refers to a set of suggestions which can be used by CLIL teachers with respect to assessment and evaluation. They include:

- 1) engaging students in an assessment-for-learning culture including:
  - a) making connections between planned outcomes, learning skills and processes, actual outcomes, and planning for future learning,
  - b) using self and peer-assessment tools,
  - c) maintaining a triple focus on language, content and learning skills;
- 2) distinguishing and navigating CLIL-specific characteristics of assessment and evaluation, which include:
  - a) language for various purposes,
  - b) work with authentic materials,
  - c) communication with speakers of the CLIL language,
  - d) ongoing language growth,
  - e) level of comfort in experimenting with language and content,
  - f) progress in achieving planned content, language and learning skills goals,
  - g) developing all language skills,
  - h) distinguishing content and language errors,
  - i) carrying out assessment in the target language;
- 3) preparing students for formal examinations including high-stakes examinations.

To recap, assessment in CLIL settings should develop critical assessment skills at a deeper cognitive level. The main purpose of learner assessment tasks should be encouraging reflective gap-closing and informative feedback (O'Dwyer, de Boer, 2015). Moreover, CLIL teachers should use a mixture of formal and informal assessment and content knowledge should be assessed using the simplest form of a CLIL language (Cole et al., 2010). The CLIL language, in turn, should be assessed for a real purpose in a real context (Borowiak, 2021).



## CLIL assessment and the Polish perspective

This section provides state of the art of CLIL education in Poland, including CLIL teachers' qualifications, types of schools in Poland where CLIL classes may be introduced, and the analysis of the Polish Core Curriculum with reference to assessment. When it comes to job requirements, teachers who want to teach CLIL subjects in Polish schools must have qualifications to teach content subjects and the CLIL language proficiency reaching at least B2 level (confirmed by a certificate). A teacher who has earned an MA degree in language studies or applied linguistics, or has completed a BA course in the field of language studies, or in the field of the foreign language or applied linguistics may start teaching a CLIL course. Teachers who have earned higher education in a country where the official language is the foreign language, or have graduated from a teacher training college of foreign languages in the field corresponding to a given foreign language are also allowed to teach CLIL subjects (Borowiak, 2021).

In the Polish educational setting, content subject teachers usually obtain a language certificate. However, it is also possible for language teachers to finish studies allowing them to teach a content subject (Borowiak, 2019). As can be seen, there are several ways of obtaining qualifications to teach in CLIL classes. Nevertheless, there is no reference to the need to obtain knowledge concerning methodology used while teaching a CLIL subject. This indicates that for teachers who are experienced in teaching non-linguistic subjects, using a foreign language as a means of instruction may be a challenging task. Similar difficulty may find those teachers who are experienced mainly in teaching a foreign language. Both situations may influence the way CLIL teachers assess.

In Poland, two types/levels of schools can be identified, that is, (1) primary school [PL *szkoła podstawowa*] (learners aged between 6 and 15 years), and (2) high school/vocational school [*liceum/technikum*] (learners aged between 15 and 19 years).<sup>1</sup> Foreign language education starts in the first grade of primary school. The second foreign language is introduced in the seventh grade of primary school. CLIL courses can be implemented in the seventh grade of primary school.<sup>2</sup> A second foreign language can also be used as the medium of instruction in CLIL programs. When it comes to the first foreign language, usually English, according to the Polish Core Curriculum, CLIL learners should master the CLIL language in respect of the vocabulary and grammar necessary for the CLIL content subjects. The objective of CLIL programs using the second foreign language is to teach new vocabulary and grammatical structures via CLIL subjects, hinging mainly on understanding. Before entering such programs, students are supposed to take an aptitude test. In both cases, two extra hours for teaching languages are available for CLIL classes. There is no CLIL exam at the end of primary school (Borowiak, 2024). If there are no external exams at the end of primary school for CLIL learners, there are no external exam

<sup>1</sup> The changes in the types of schools and CLIL classes were introduced in 2017 as a result of the second *Educational Reform* relevant to CLIL (Ustawa z dnia 7 września 1991 r. o systemie oświaty).

<sup>2</sup> Rozporządzenie Ministra Edukacji Narodowej z dnia 28 marca 2017 r. w sprawie ramowych planów nauczania dla publicznych szkół.

requirements of the Ministry of Education. As a result, it may happen that assessment in such classes may vary when schools are compared.

In high schools [PL *liceum*] CLIL programs can be introduced in the first grade. There are six hours of CLIL language learning per week, except for the fourth year, when there are only five hours available. In vocational schools [PL *technikum*], which lasts five years, during each year, CLIL learners are provided two additional lessons of the CLIL language, that is, four hours during the first, second and third grades, and five hours of the CLIL language during the fourth and fifth grades. Similarly to primary schools, second foreign language can also be used during CLIL classes. It is possible to organize an additional year, that is, the *zero class* [PL *klasa zerowa*] for CLIL students aimed at developing their CLIL language skills. Moreover, all learners, who wish to attend CLIL courses, have to pass a diagnostic test. The Polish Core Curriculum indicates that CLIL students should reach the C1/C2 level of proficiency. The emphasis is also placed on CLIL language skills and CLIL subjects. At the end of their education, CLIL students may take a final exam [PL *egzamin maturalny z języka obcego nowożytnego*] in the content subjects in the CLIL language. From 2023, students enrolled on the CLIL classes in high schools have had to take the CLIL exam in the CLIL language with the CEFRL level: C1/C2. Both in primary school and high school, two subjects have to be taught in the CLIL language. One subject must be chosen from the following list: *Biology, Chemistry, Physics, Geography, or History* (Borowiak, 2024). Even though there are the external exams for CLIL learners, the external exam requirements of the Ministry of Education focus mainly on language requirements relevant for L2, not for a CLIL content subject. Similarly to primary schools, when it comes to CLIL content subjects e.g. *Biology*, assessment may vary from school to school. This may be visible in the way non-linguistic content is taught and assessed. The amount of time devoted to using a CLIL language and at the same time how or if the language is included in the assessment.

The final issue to be discussed is the Polish Core Curriculum. When it comes to CLIL content subjects, such as *Biology* or *Math*, there is no separate Core Curriculum. There are no legal documents indicating which content should be taught using a CLIL language. Since CLIL learners do not have to pass content subjects in a CLIL language, it may be assumed that not only the way do teachers teach, but also assess may differ when comparing various schools. Thus, there is a need to create a Core Curriculum devoted to CLIL content subjects, indicating obligatory areas/topics taught using L2. This may help teachers in making decisions concerning issues discussed in the above sections, such as what and how should be assessed, and finally who should assess. CLIL is offered in schools in different countries in Europe. Thus, there is a need to create general regulations which can be used in all educational settings. This may help to maintain high standards of such education (cf. Muszyńska, Borowiak, Leek, 2024).

## References

- Ariffin K., Susanti Husin M. (2011), *Code-switching and Code-mixing of English and Bahasa Malaysia in Content-Based Classrooms: Frequency and Attitudes*, "Linguistics Journal", vol. 5(1), pp. 220–247.
- Arthur J., Martin P. (2006), *Accomplishing lessons in postcolonial classrooms: Comparative perspectives from Botswana and Brunei Darussalam*, "Comparative education", vol. 42(02), pp. 177–202.
- Babocká M. (2015), *Assessment in CLIL classes*, [in:] S. Pokrivčáková (ed.), *CLIL in Foreign Language Education: E-textbook for Foreign Language Teachers*, Nitra: Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra, pp. 176–188,
- Barbero, T. (2012), *Assessment tools and practices in CLIL*, [in:] F. Quatarpelle (ed.), *Assessment and Evaluation in CLIL*, European Commission: AECLIL-EACEA, pp. 38–56, <http://www.alsdgc.ro/userfiles/2827-10627-1-PB.pdf> [accessed: 20.12.2024].
- Briggs M., Woodfield A., Swatton P., Martin C. (2008), *Assessment for learning and teaching in primary schools*, Exeter: Learning Matters.
- Borowiak A. (2019), *Nauczanie dwujęzyczne w Polsce*, [in:] M. Woźnicka, A. Stolarczyk-Gembiak, M. Trojszczak (eds.), *Zbliżenia 5. Językoznawstwo – Literaturoznawstwo – Translatologia*, Konin: Państwowa Wyższa Szkoła Zawodowa w Koninie, pp. 157–170.
- Borowiak A. (2021), *Exploring the role of individual variables in the success of CLIL as an approach to EFL learning*, rozprawa doktorska, Łódź: Repozytorium Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Borowiak A. (2024), *The role of individual differences in Content and Language Integrated Learning success*, Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Crawford J., Krashen S.D. (2007), *English learners in American classrooms: 101 questions, 101 answers*, New York: Scholastic.
- Del Pozo Manzano E. (2024), *Assessment in CLIL: the pending subject in bilingual education? A case study*, "Revista de Educación", vol. 403, pp. 231–257, <https://doi.org/10.4438/1988-592X-RE-2024-403-605>
- Coyle D., Hood P., Marsh D. (2010), *Content and language integrated learning*, Stuttgart: Ernst Klett Sprachen.
- Dupuy B. (2011), *CLIL: Achieving its goals through a multiliteracies framework*, "Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning", vol. 4(2), pp. 21–32.
- Eurydice (2006), *Content and language integrated learning at school in Europe*, Brussels: Eurydice European Unit.
- Garcia O. (2008), *Multilingual language awareness and teacher education. Encyclopedia of language and education*, [in:] J. Cenoz, N.H. Hornberger (eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education*, vol. 6, New York: Springer, pp. 2130–2145.
- Hönig I. (2009), *Assessment in CLIL. A Case Study*, Vienna: University of Vienna, [http://othes.univie.ac.at/7976/1/2009-11-21\\_0107764.pdf](http://othes.univie.ac.at/7976/1/2009-11-21_0107764.pdf) [accessed: 12.08.2018].
- Lewis G., Jones B., Baker C. (2012), *Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond*, "Educational Research and Evaluation", vol. 18(7), pp. 641–654.
- Llinares A., Morton T., Whittaker R. (2012), *The roles of language in CLIL*, Stuttgart: Ernst Klett Sprachen.

- Massler U. (2011), *Assessment in CLIL learning*, [in:] S. Ioannou-Georgiou, P. Pavlou (eds.), *Guidelines for CLIL implementation in primary and pre-primary education*, Nicosia: PRO-CLIL, pp. 114–136.
- Massler U., Ioannou-Georgiou S., Steiert C. (2011), *Effective CLIL teaching techniques*, [in:] S. Ioannou-Georgiou, P. Pavlou (eds.), *Guidelines for CLIL Implementation in Primary and Pre-primary Education*, Nicosia: PROCLIL, pp. 66–97.
- Marsh D. (2002), *CLIL/EMILE-The European dimension: Actions, trends and foresight potential*, Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Marsh D., Marsland B. (eds.), (1999), *Learning with Languages: A Professional Development Programme for Introducing Content and Language Integrated Learning: English Upper Secondary Education*, Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- McConnell D. (2006), *E-learning groups and communities*, New York: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Merritt M., Cleghorn A., Abagi J.O., Bunyi G. (1992), *Socialising multilingualism: Determinants of codeswitching in Kenyan primary classrooms*, “Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development”, vol. 13(1–2), pp. 103–121.
- Milroy L., Muysken P. (1995), *Introduction: Code-switching and bilingualism research*, [in:] L. Milroy, P. Muysken (eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1–14.
- Mohan B.A. (1986), *Language and content (Vol. 5288)*, Reading: Addison Wesley Publishing Company.
- Muszyńska B., Borowiak A., Leek J. (2024), *Overview of curricular demands of disciplinary literacies. An Exploratory Survey: A Report by CLILNetLE Working Group 3 Deliverable 7*, doi: [10.25365/phaidra.532\\_20](https://doi.org/10.25365/phaidra.532_20)
- Navarette C., Wilde J., Nelson C., Martinez R., Hargett G. (1990), *Informal assessment in evaluation of educational programs: Implications for bilingual education programs*, Arlington: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Navés T. (2009), *Effective content and language integrated learning (CLIL) programmes*, [in:] Y. Ruiz de Zarobe, R.M. Jimenez (eds.), *Content and language integrated learning: Evidence from research in Europe*, Bristol: Multilingual Matters, pp. 22–40.
- Numrich C. (1989), *Cognitive strategies for integrating ESL and content area instruction*, ERIC Document Reproduction Service (No. ED314959).
- O’Dwyer F., De Boer M. (2015), *Approaches to assessment in CLIL classrooms: Two case studies*, “Language Learning in Higher Education”, vol. 5(2), pp. 397–421.
- Pawlak M. (2013), *Principles of instructed language learning revisited: Guidelines for effective grammar teaching in the foreign language classroom*, [in:] K. Drożdżał-Szelest., M. Pawlak (eds.), *Psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives on second language learning and teaching. Studies in honor of Waldemar Marton*, Heidelberg: Springer, pp. 199–220.
- Rea-Dickens P., Germaine K. (2003), *Evaluation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reierstam H. (2024), *Assessment of content and language: The case of CLIL, EMI, and multilingual contexts*, “Transnational Approaches to Bilingual and Second Language Teacher Education. Routledge”, pp. 197–218, doi: [10.4324/9781003348580-14](https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003348580-14)
- Schwartz M., Asli A. (2014), *Bilingual teachers’ language strategies: The case of an Arabic-Hebrew kindergarten in Israel*, “Teaching and Teacher Education”, vol. 38, pp. 22–32.

Skopinskaja L. (2003), *The role of culture in foreign language teaching materials: An evaluation from an intercultural perspective*, [in:] I. Lázár (ed.), *Incorporating intercultural communicative competence in language teacher education*, Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, pp. 39–68.

Thomas W.P., Collier V. (1997), *School effectiveness for language minority students*, Washington: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Trumbull E., Lash A. (2013), *Understanding formative assessment. Insights from learning theory and measurement theory*, San Francisco: WestEd.

Williams M. (2003), *Assessment of portfolios in professional education*, “Nursing Standard”, 18 (8)/2003, pp. 33–37, doi: [10.7748/ns2003.11.18.8.33.c3485](https://doi.org/10.7748/ns2003.11.18.8.33.c3485)

Wolff D. (2005), *Approaching CLIL*, [in:] D. Marsh (ed.), *Project D3 – CLIL Matrix. The CLIL quality matrix*, Graz: Central Workshop Report, pp. 10–25. [d.blagoeva@ibl.bas.bga](mailto:d.blagoeva@ibl.bas.bga)

