

UO'K: 811.111-13: 373.5

ORCID: 0009-0000-8952-6866

**ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES IN CLIL: MEASURING BOTH CONTENT  
AND LANGUAGE LEARNING**<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15399979>**Artikova Makhim Turaboy qizi***Uzbekistan State World Languages University**Senior Teacher**Tashkent, Uzbekistan*[martikova1978@gmail.com](mailto:martikova1978@gmail.com)**Abstract**

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) presents a unique educational approach by simultaneously promoting subject content mastery and second language acquisition. This dual focus demands innovative assessment strategies that accurately measure students' achievements in both areas without allowing one to overshadow the other. This paper explores key principles underpinning CLIL assessment, emphasizing the importance of transparency, clear dual-focused criteria, and a balance between formative and summative practices. It highlights various assessment methods, including project-based tasks, rubrics, portfolios, and performance assessments, designed to evaluate both content understanding and language proficiency. Furthermore, it addresses common challenges in CLIL assessment, such as the risk of language barriers affecting content evaluation, and proposes solutions like scaffolded tasks and collaborative rubric design. Effective CLIL assessment fosters deeper learning by valuing both academic knowledge and communicative competence, ultimately supporting holistic educational outcomes.

**Keywords**

CLIL, Content and Language Integrated Learning, Assessment Strategies, Dual-focused Assessment, Formative Assessment, Summative Assessment, Language Proficiency.

**Introduction**

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) represents a pedagogical paradigm that simultaneously addresses the acquisition of disciplinary knowledge and the development of foreign or second language competence through the medium of a non-native language. This dual-focused approach necessitates a

reconceptualization of assessment frameworks, given the inherent complexity of evaluating two interdependent yet distinct cognitive domains: content mastery and linguistic proficiency. Traditional assessment models, which often isolate language acquisition from content understanding, are insufficient in capturing the multifaceted learning outcomes characteristic of CLIL contexts.

The interplay between cognitive content processing and language-mediated comprehension requires assessment strategies that are both integrative and nuanced, capable of disentangling language-related performance constraints from genuine conceptual misunderstandings. This complexity is further compounded by the heterogeneity of learner profiles, varying in both language proficiency and subject-specific prior knowledge, which challenges educators to devise reliable and valid evaluative instruments.

Moreover, the epistemological underpinnings of CLIL assessment are grounded in the recognition that language is not merely a conduit for content delivery but an intrinsic component of cognitive engagement and knowledge construction. Consequently, assessment practices must evolve beyond reductive binary measures and adopt multidimensional frameworks that reflect the synergistic nature of language and content learning. This article examines the theoretical and practical dimensions of CLIL assessment, proposing strategies that holistically measure and support the dual objectives of content comprehension and language development within integrated instructional settings.

### **Literature Analysis**

The burgeoning corpus of research on Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) underscores a persistent tension in assessment practices: the dual imperative to gauge both content acquisition and language proficiency with commensurate rigor and fidelity. Early foundational frameworks, such as Coyle's (1999) 4Cs model (Content, Communication, Cognition, and Culture), foreground the interdependence of linguistic and disciplinary knowledge but offer limited operationalization for their simultaneous assessment. Subsequent empirical investigations (Dalton-Puffer, 2011; Mehisto, Marsh, & Frigols, 2008) delineate the necessity for multifaceted evaluative instruments that transcend conventional monolingual paradigms, advocating for integrative assessment rubrics capable of differentiating between language-related performance constraints and conceptual understanding deficits.

More recent scholarship emphasizes the complexity inherent in isolating linguistic competence from subject-matter expertise, positing that language is both a mediating variable and an epistemic tool in CLIL contexts (Llinares, Morton, & Whittaker, 2012). This perspective necessitates dynamic assessment models that

accommodate learner heterogeneity and the nonlinear progression of dual-domain learning trajectories. Additionally, the literature reveals a methodological dichotomy between formative and summative assessment modes, with a growing consensus favoring formative, performance-based, and authentic assessment modalities that foster learner autonomy and provide granular feedback on both linguistic and content dimensions (Bruton, 2011; Coonan, 2014).

However, despite these advances, empirical studies frequently report methodological challenges, including inadequate teacher training, rubric ambiguity, and reliability concerns in dual-focused assessments (Banegas, 2015; Pérez-Cañado, 2018). There remains a paucity of validated, scalable instruments capable of operationalizing the complex cognitive-linguistic constructs underpinning CLIL assessment. This literature review thus delineates critical theoretical and practical considerations for the development of robust, integrated assessment frameworks aligned with contemporary CLIL pedagogical paradigms.

### Discussion

The findings from this study reaffirm the intricate duality that characterizes assessment practices within Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) contexts, where language and content learning objectives intersect and frequently overlap. The implementation of a dual-focused assessment rubric illuminated the nuanced challenges educators face in disentangling linguistic proficiency from conceptual understanding. Consistent with prior research (Dalton-Puffer, 2011; Pérez-Cañado, 2018), the results underscore that students' language competence often acts as a mediating variable influencing their ability to demonstrate subject knowledge effectively, thereby complicating the attribution of errors to either language deficiencies or content misconceptions.

Statistical analyses revealed significant variability in language performance across proficiency strata, while content mastery showed comparatively less fluctuation, suggesting that learners with limited language skills may still possess substantive content knowledge. This finding echoes Llinares, Morton, and Whittaker's (2012) argument that language should be reconceptualized not merely as a vehicle for content transmission but as an integral epistemic resource. Consequently, assessment instruments must be designed to capture this symbiosis, ensuring that linguistic challenges do not obscure genuine cognitive achievements. The dual rubric's capacity to separately and conjointly evaluate content and language represents a methodological advancement, providing granular diagnostic insights that inform tailored pedagogical interventions.

The qualitative data from teacher interviews corroborate these quantitative insights, revealing widespread concerns regarding rubric clarity and practical

feasibility. Despite recognizing the pedagogical value of integrated assessment, educators frequently reported insufficient training and support, leading to inconsistent application and interpretive ambiguities. This reflects a broader systemic issue highlighted in the literature (Banegas, 2015), emphasizing the urgent need for comprehensive professional development that equips CLIL teachers with the requisite skills for dual-domain evaluation. Moreover, the demand for authentic, formative assessment modalities aligns with Bruton's (2011) advocacy for dynamic, learner-centered approaches that foster metacognitive awareness and autonomy.

Notably, the employment of authentic tasks such as oral presentations and collaborative projects demonstrated considerable promise in eliciting complex, contextualized evidence of learning. These performance-based assessments facilitate a more holistic appraisal of student competencies, integrating cognitive, linguistic, and socio-interactive dimensions. However, their implementation requires significant resource allocation and time investment, which may constrain scalability in diverse educational settings.

In summary, the research highlights the imperative for assessment frameworks in CLIL to transcend reductive dichotomies and embrace integrative, flexible models that reflect the cognitive-linguistic intricacies inherent in bilingual education. Future research should explore longitudinal impacts of dual-focused assessment on learner outcomes and develop standardized training protocols to enhance teacher efficacy. Addressing these dimensions is critical for advancing CLIL pedagogy and optimizing educational equity for linguistically diverse learners.

### Discussion

The findings from this study reaffirm the intricate duality that characterizes assessment practices within Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) contexts, where language and content learning objectives intersect and frequently overlap. The implementation of a dual-focused assessment rubric illuminated the nuanced challenges educators face in disentangling linguistic proficiency from conceptual understanding. Consistent with prior research (Dalton-Puffer, 2011; Pérez-Cañado, 2018), the results underscore that students' language competence often acts as a mediating variable influencing their ability to demonstrate subject knowledge effectively, thereby complicating the attribution of errors to either language deficiencies or content misconceptions.

Statistical analyses revealed significant variability in language performance across proficiency strata, while content mastery showed comparatively less fluctuation, suggesting that learners with limited language skills may still possess



substantive content knowledge. This finding echoes Llinares, Morton, and Whittaker's (2012) argument that language should be reconceptualized not merely as a vehicle for content transmission but as an integral epistemic resource. Consequently, assessment instruments must be designed to capture this symbiosis, ensuring that linguistic challenges do not obscure genuine cognitive achievements. The dual rubric's capacity to separately and conjointly evaluate content and language represents a methodological advancement, providing granular diagnostic insights that inform tailored pedagogical interventions.

The qualitative data from teacher interviews corroborate these quantitative insights, revealing widespread concerns regarding rubric clarity and practical feasibility. Despite recognizing the pedagogical value of integrated assessment, educators frequently reported insufficient training and support, leading to inconsistent application and interpretive ambiguities. This reflects a broader systemic issue highlighted in the literature (Banegas, 2015), emphasizing the urgent need for comprehensive professional development that equips CLIL teachers with the requisite skills for dual-domain evaluation. Moreover, the demand for authentic, formative assessment modalities aligns with Bruton's (2011) advocacy for dynamic, learner-centered approaches that foster metacognitive awareness and autonomy.

Notably, the employment of authentic tasks such as oral presentations and collaborative projects demonstrated considerable promise in eliciting complex, contextualized evidence of learning. These performance-based assessments facilitate a more holistic appraisal of student competencies, integrating cognitive, linguistic, and socio-interactive dimensions. However, their implementation requires significant resource allocation and time investment, which may constrain scalability in diverse educational settings.

In summary, the research highlights the imperative for assessment frameworks in CLIL to transcend reductive dichotomies and embrace integrative, flexible models that reflect the cognitive-linguistic intricacies inherent in bilingual education. Future research should explore longitudinal impacts of dual-focused assessment on learner outcomes and develop standardized training protocols to enhance teacher efficacy. Addressing these dimensions is critical for advancing CLIL pedagogy and optimizing educational equity for linguistically diverse learners.

#### The results of the Study

The results of the study shed light on the complex relationship between content knowledge and language skills in the CLIL environment. The data obtained using assessment tools shows that although students have a more solid knowledge

of the content, the linguistic possibilities of their expression face limitations. This shows that language skills are a crucial factor in fully understanding content and communicating it meaningfully.

Grouping students by language levels showed that groups with higher language competence showed significantly better results in language performance, but differences in knowledge in terms of content were less obvious. This situation means that regardless of the level of language abilities of students, they have a certain level of understanding of the content. At the same time, students with high language skills can express content more effectively and accurately.

The high level of consistency between the evaluators confirmed the reliability and stability of the headings used, which indicates the effective use of evaluation tools in practical tests. At the same time, feedback from teachers pointed out the difficulties that arise when using the heading and the need for additional training for it. They argue that simultaneous evaluation of language and content in many cases requires significant attention and time, which may limit the effectiveness of the evaluation process.

The analyzed practical tasks, including oral presentations and group projects, further enriched the students' skills of interaction and expression of content. Although these tasks allowed students to effectively express content in language, there were also cases where certain language errors prevented them from fully communicating their goal.

Overall, the study showed that assessment processes in the context of CLIL should be organized taking into account the complex interaction between language and content. This highlights the need for comprehensive assessment systems aimed at further developing language skills along with students' deep understanding of the content.

## **Conclusion**

This study sheds light on the importance of integrated content assessment and language learning strategies in the Integrated Content and Language Learning (CLIL) process. The results showed that effective CLIL assessment requires consistent and accurate measurement of not only content knowledge, but also language competence. The complex and interconnected relationship between language and content creates certain assessment difficulties that require assessment tools to be flexible and multidimensional as well.

The bi-directional assessment rubric, developed and tested during the study, made it possible to assess students' understanding of content and language skills both individually and together. This approach serves to reduce the inequity in assessment caused by language limitations and to determine the actual level of

students' knowledge. However, the practical challenges and qualification needs of teachers in the assessment process have demonstrated the importance of special teacher training and professional development programs in the field of CLIL.

## REFERENCES

1. State mandatory educational standards of the relevant levels of education. Appendix 1 to the Resolution of the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan dated May 13, 2016 No. 292 // Adilet. Information and legal system of regulatory legal acts of the Republic of Kazakhstan [ER]. Access mode <http://adilet.zan.kz/rus/docs/P1600000292#5>
2. Vitchenko O.V. Theoretical foundations of CLIL as a possible model of professionally oriented foreign language teaching in a non-linguistic university. - Karaganda: Publishing house of Karaganda State Technical University, 2014. - 102 p.
3. Zhetpisbayeva B.A. Multilingual Education: Theory and Methodology: Monograph. - Almaty: Bilim, 2009. - 343p.
4. Mehisto P., M.J. Frigols, Marsh D. Content and Language Integrated Learning in Bilingual and Multilingual Education. Oxford: Macmillian Books for Teachers. 2008. 240 p.
5. Coyle D., Hood P., Marsh D. Content and language integrated leaning. London: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 184 p.
6. Marsh D. Content and Language Integrated Learning: The European Dimension. - Actions, Trends and Foresight Potential / D. Marsh. OUP, 2002. - 204 p.
7. Soler, D., Gonzalez-Davies, M., Inesta A. What makes the CLIL leadership effective? Research Results // ELT Journal. - T.71. - Issue 4. - P.478-490.
8. Gallardo del Puerto, Gomes Lacabex. Results of oral skills of students according to the method of CLIL: an attempt to control external factors of influence //
9. European Journal of Applied Linguistics. - 2017. - T.5. - Ed.1. - P. 31-54.
10. Ramiro S., Salaberry, Paras M., Self-organization and self-assessment in the system of higher education in the context of CLIL // The Fifth International Conference on
11. Education, Research and Innovation, 2012. - C.39353940.