

Understanding the perspective of plurilingual assessment in teaching English at tertiary level in Ukraine

Viktoriia Osidak, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine

Karin Vogt, Heidelberg University of Education, Germany

Maryana Natsiuk, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine

<https://doi.org/10.37546/JALTSIG.CEFR7-2>

This article is open access and licensed under an Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) licence.

Considering the need for improving assessment instruments that measure language proficiency of plurilingual learners in the foreign language classroom, this article investigates the potential of plurilingual assessment in language education in the Ukrainian context. For this purpose, a developmental project has been carried out engaging several universities. The CEFR and its Companion Volume (CEFR/CV) were used as foundational documents to understand goals of language education and approaches to teaching, learning and assessment. The project was implemented in three phases. During phase 1, a focus was put on the analysis of contributed samples of tests (14 tests comprising 70 assessment tasks) to identify prevailing approaches to language assessment at tertiary level in the Ukrainian context. Most of the contributed assessment tasks (87%) were in English, with a smaller portion (12.8%) both in Ukrainian and English, with 11% out of 12.8% being translation tasks. No assessment tasks were in or more (2+) languages. Phase 2 aimed at empowering the teachers (n=16) with the procedures and assessment instruments to facilitate the implementation of plurilingual assessment in teaching English. Phase 3 collected teacher feedback on proposed changes to language assessment in teaching English using a questionnaire and reflection logs. The outcome of the workshops suggested that plurilingual assessment reflects real-life and professional situations that students can find themselves in but does not seem to represent common practice in the teaching context. In addition, participating teachers indicated that plurilingual assessment is of great relevance to the learning goals of their courses.

Keywords: assessment practices, linguistic repertoire, plurilingualism, plurilingual language assessment, CEFR/CV

1 Introduction

English is increasingly used worldwide as a language of communication and education. In educational contexts, English is often taught as a subject in schools and frequently serves as a medium of instruction in universities. Learners of English are typically emergent multilinguals, for whom English becomes their third language (L3) after their home language(s) (L1) and a second language (L2), which may be acquired through schooling (Sridhar and Sridhar 2018). In the Ukrainian educational context, learners of English are often bilingual in Ukrainian and Russian or another regional minority language. Consequently, English becomes their L3 when their home language and the school language differ.

Thus, recent developments in language teaching and learning when English is their L3 for most learners, make it necessary “to recognise the language ability that language learners already have when learning English” (Seed 2020: 5) and use the knowledge of other languages as a tool in learning English (Seed 2020: 6).

New developments in teaching and learning English in the last few decades have responded to a more diversified linguistic reality in societies (Cummins 2008; Duarte and Gogolin 2013; Tsagari et al. 2023). For teaching English as a foreign language (EFL), the development of multilingualism/plurilingualism and plurilingual assessment is essential, given its importance as an international language. Yet, little research has been done in order to help teachers to implement this multilingual turn in EFL or English as an additional language (EAL) classrooms in Ukraine. Duarte and Günther-van der Meij (2020) mainly attribute this to the fact that a monolingual norm is commonly applied to the understanding of language, learners and the learning process. In addition, the European policy agenda (L1+2 (European) languages) is targeted at promoting additive multilingualism at school level, treating languages as separate entities. As a result, many teachers base their classroom activities on language separation practices. Contrary to classroom practices, learners mobilise their entire linguistic resources in real-life contexts in order to accomplish tasks for personal and communicative purposes (COE 2020).

The current practice of keeping languages apart rather than embracing the full linguistic repertoire of students, presents a dilemma for teachers. Studies e.g., by Duarte and Günther-van der Meij (2020) evidence that language teachers often express positive attitudes towards plurilingualism. Yet, some studies carried out in European and Asian educational contexts indicate that language teachers struggle to implement these attitudes in their instructional practice (e.g., Bisai and Singh 2018; Duarte and Günther-van der Meij 2020). While teachers recognise the value of multilingualism, they may lack clear guidance on how to integrate it effectively into their instructional strategies. This ambivalence highlights the need for greater support without which teachers may feel uncertain about how to assess students' language skills in a way that acknowledges and values their diverse linguistic backgrounds. As a result, students may not have the opportunity to fully demonstrate their entire linguistic repertoire, and the potential benefits of plurilingualism in the classroom may remain untapped. For foreign language teaching and assessment, this means considering multilingual resources already present in diverse learning groups.

2 Literature review

2.1 Terminology

The Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) (COE 2001) and its updated policy document, the CEFR/CV (COE 2020), make a distinction between *multilingualism* and *plurilingualism*. Multilingualism is defined as the coexistence of different languages at the social or individual levels while plurilingualism as the dynamic and developing linguistic repertoire of an individual user/learner (COE 2020: 28). A person is seen as a social agent, using their language repertoire in order to accomplish a task or an action (Piccardo and North 2019). In educational settings, plurilingualism takes an individual perspective that aims to capture the holistic and dynamic nature of the individual learner's linguistic repertoire as it develops through life (COE 2001: 168). A plurilingual learner has a "single, interrelated, repertoire that they combine with their general competences and various strategies in order to accomplish tasks" (COE 2020: 30). In this context, following the CEFR descriptive framework and the action-oriented approach, the focal point of the learning and teaching process is the collaborative creation of meaning through interaction (COE 2020). From this standpoint, plurilingual language assessment takes a perspective that recognises the interconnectedness of languages in an individual's repertoire and considers the holistic and dynamic nature of language use across multiple languages. In essence, it aims to assess overall communicative competence, considering how languages are integrated and used together.

2.2 A multilingual turn in assessment?

Although assessment is an inherent part of the education process and multilingual education has been discussed for several decades, little attention has been paid to multilingualism or plurilingualism in assessment and the much-cited multilingual turn (Conteh and Meier 2014) has not become a reality in

language assessment yet. As a result, plurilingual learners are still being predominantly assessed in each language separately (Chalhoub-Deville 2019; De Backer et al. 2020; Tsagari et al. 2023). According to Choi et al. (2022), the current prevailing monolingual approach to language assessment that conceptualises languages as separate entities fails to acknowledge complex communicative practices of plurilinguals and their ability to draw on their diverse linguistic repertoire and are invalid in terms of assessing what plurilingual learners know or can do (Choi et al. 2022: 333). Furthermore, in Bisai and Singh's view (2018: 309), assessment from a monolingual standpoint fails to capture the reality of the EFL classroom. There is a shared understanding that language assessment tasks should provide learners with opportunities to demonstrate their relevant language skills by observing performance on relevant and authentic tasks. Gorter and Cenoz (2017) advocate that if teaching is to consider plurilingual concerns, assessment practices should follow suit.

The integration of plurilingual assessment has always been a challenge in many respects: operationalising a construct for authentic assessment tasks, and providing reliable scoring are among plurilingual assessment concerns. One of the reasons for such a challenge is that plurilingual assessment tasks should be personalised as they "would depend on the contexts that each plurilingual, pluricontextual language learner finds themselves in" (Seed 2020: 9). The same idea is reiterated by Bisai and Singh (2018) who argue that the language resources mobilised by plurilinguals are individualised, dynamic, and contextualised. To meet the requirements of plurilingual assessment, assessment should be multimodal, integrated, fluid, and ongoing, and these qualities are largely compatible with alternative and formative assessment (Gorter and Cenoz 2017; Poehner and Inbar-Lourie 2020; Seed 2020).

2.3 Plurilingual assessment of English as a Foreign Language

In recent years, the question of how plurilingual assessment can be organised has received increasing attention. Seed (2020) specifies the framework of assessment in plurilingual situations into four broad constructs that can capture individuals' plurilingual abilities in four different ways. In essence, the framework distinguishes between assessment of language proficiency in one or several named language(s), assessment of content knowledge and the assessment of plurilingual competence that includes learners' competence of both languages known and only partially known.

The focus of this paper is on plurilingual assessment in foreign language education, which relates to assessment in one named language such as English with both input and output in that language. Seed (2020) argues that language tests, even if they are monolingual, should be considered as integral components of a broader multilingual language profile that a person can demonstrate in multilingual situations (Seed 2020: 10; Seed and Holland 2020). Schissel et al. (2018) found that tasks that integrate multilingual reading materials result in better performance by plurilingual participants compared to English-only tasks. Therefore, instances of other languages during assessment should be taken as evidence of assistance in accomplishing a task (communication) successfully. The findings, suggesting that incorporating multilingual resources in language assessment design can enable language learners to exhibit more advanced writing skills and higher-order thinking abilities, may become a valuable pedagogical implication for plurilingual assessment in the EFL classroom.

Flexible plurilingual assessment methods that recognise learners' (partial) proficiency in multiple languages have recently received much attention. Such assessment is based on the idea that learners are disadvantaged if they are not allowed to build on their whole linguistic repertoire (De Backer et al. 2020). In fact, plurilingual assessment acknowledges the different skills that plurilinguals require, such as the use of other languages and the role of their cross-linguistic and metalinguistic skills to complete a test task (Lopez et al. 2017).

According to North and Piccardo (2016, 2017) and Stathopoulou (2020), people communicate using a combination of different languages, making it important for language users to develop the ability to mediate cross-linguistically. Mediation as a common cross-linguistic activity involves moving between

different languages with the purpose to explain, clarify, interpret, summarise, or convey the main points of a text to someone else (North and Piccardo 2016, 2017). Mediation always occurs in a social context (public, academic, and professional) and is a purposeful activity that language users engage in when there is a communication gap (COE 2020). Therefore, a test that combines two or more languages can be a solution for assessing English in a multilingual context. In this regard, the CEFR/CV provides scales for different aspects of mediating a text (including literature), mediating concepts, and mediating communication (COE 2020: 91-122). In addition, the CEFR/CV provides scales for signposting different aspect of a plurilingual repertoire in a task: Scales for *Building on plurilingual repertoire* and *Building on pluricultural competence; Plurilingual comprehension* (COE 2020: 124-128). North and Piccardo (2023) highlight that descriptors are important tools that can support teachers and learners in several respects. The descriptors can empower teachers in their desire to promote a plurilingual approach to teaching and assessment; suggest real world-oriented classroom tasks and become an indicator of students' performance etc. Likewise, descriptors can also help learners become aware of their plurilingual repertoire, and demonstrate the purpose of the activity.

Despite the availability of CEFR/CV scales for mediating texts and concepts and building on plurilingual competence, there remains a gap in the practical implementation of plurilingual assessment. Specifically, current assessments of English often do not create opportunities for learners of English to engage with their whole linguistic repertoire in plurilingual contexts effectively. Thus, our research aims to address this gap by developing a test that incorporates multiple languages, and leveraging CEFR/CV descriptors to support a plurilingual approach to language assessment. To effectively address this goal, the paper will investigate Ukrainian Higher Education Institution (HEI) language teachers' assessment practices and strategies regarding plurilingual assessment. As the project involved a follow-up workshop, its further objective was to empower university teachers with knowledge about plurilingualism in language education and assessment strategies designed to facilitate the implementation of plurilingual assessment in teaching English to pre-service teachers and students majoring in Linguistics. Therefore, the following research questions have been formulated:

1. To what extent are the samples of assessments from Ukrainian universities plurilingual?
2. What strategies were employed to develop plurilingual tasks to assess students' proficiency in English?
3. What strategies were employed to tailor descriptors selected from the CEFR/CV relevant to the local context?
4. How do HEI language teachers based in Ukraine evaluate the proposed changes to existing language assessment?

3 Research Methodology

3.1 Participants

The data was obtained from two sets of participants. Convenience sampling was used for the purpose of this developmental project (Dörnyei 2007). Although we were aware of the disadvantages of convenience sampling such as a possibly imbalanced sample, convenience sampling was used due to ease and the participants' voluntary agreement to commit their time and effort to the research goals, which was especially crucial due to the war-related circumstances in Ukraine. The first group, 16 University English teachers from National University *Yuri Kondratyuk Poltava Polytechnic*, volunteered to participate in the workshop training and complete the online questionnaire. In addition, five of these 16 teachers volunteered to fill in the reflection logs. All participants gave written informed consent to their participation in the study, and all data collected were anonymised.

3.2 Method

A mixed-methods approach was used to collect data to answer the research questions of the study. Using a mixed-method study design has a number of advantages over a single method in educational research, especially when exploring a new phenomenon (Cohen et al. 2007; Dörnyei 2007). By applying different methods of collecting data, including analysis of the assessment tasks, a small-scale questionnaire survey and reflection logs, we were able to achieve a more comprehensive understanding of the matter from multiple perspectives. The chosen approach aimed at triangulating data from these different sources, enabling us to answer our research questions while also supporting evidence for drawing conclusions. (Cohen et al. 2007). In this light, quantitative methods (a small-scale questionnaire survey and descriptive statistics of the data) were used to collect explicit numerical evidence (Creswell 2009) about existing assessment practices and strategies employed in developing plurilingual assessment tasks. Descriptive statistics (the mean) was used to establish types of assessment tasks by calculating the percentage and to identify a set of strategies related to developing plurilingual assessment tasks and customising the descriptors to the local context. In addition, descriptive statistics (percentage) was calculated to interpret the data collected by the questionnaire. Among the strategies of inquiry of a qualitative method, a reflection log was employed to arrive at a ‘thick description’ (Younas et al. 2023) of the participants’ experience and the development in their assessment practice.

3.3 Project design

The project framework includes three subsequent phases: Understanding of the local context, awareness and engagement, and evaluation (see Table 1).

Table 1. *Phases of the project design*

Project design		
Phase #	Description of the phase	Activities
Phase 1: Understanding of the local context RQ 1: To what extent are the samples of assessments from Ukrainian universities plurilingual?"	Collecting and analysing assessments from Ukrainian universities: 14 sample tests consisting of 70 tasks.	Collaborating with colleagues from different HEI; Reflective practice
Phase 2: Awareness and engagement RQ 2: What strategies were employed to develop plurilingual tasks to assess students’ proficiency in English? RQ 3: What strategies were used to customise the descriptors to the local context?	Workshop 1 (90 min): (16 participants) Input relating to the basic CEFR/CV related concepts: multilingualism vs plurilingualism, language competence, partial competence, native-speaker standard, language portraits and individual language profiles, linguistic repertoires, monolingual/ multilingual approaches to language teaching and assessment, cross-linguistic mediation etc. Workshop 2 (90 min): (16 participants) Input relating to plurilingual assessment strategies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussing plurilingual assessment strategies • Adapting assessment tasks to plurilingual contexts • Presentation of adapted assessment tasks • Discussing descriptors • Selecting and customising descriptors • Presentation of adapted descriptors 	Participating in training Brainstorming; Group discussion; Collaborating in breakout rooms

Project design		
Phase #	Description of the phase	Activities
Phase 3: Evaluation RQ 4: How do HEI language teachers based in Ukraine evaluate the proposed changes to existing language assessment?	Mixed methods Collecting teacher feedback: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflection logs (5 participants) • Online survey (16 participants) 	Reflective practices

In Phase 1, colleagues from three universities contributed tests used at their departments to assess students' proficiency in English. The analysis of the assessment tasks was carried out with the purpose to understand to what extent the samples of assessments were plurilingual. To this end, the collected assessment tasks were scrutinised against the following aspects 1) the targeted competences, 2) whether a test enables students to demonstrate their plurilingual comprehension and/ or build on their plurilingual repertoire; 2) target language(s) of input and output; 3) assessment types.

The awareness and engagement phases included two online workshops using Zoom. The workshops lasted 90 minutes each and were held within one week. The purpose of workshop 1 (Awareness) was to familiarise the participants with the key concepts related to the field of multilingualism/ plurilingualism (see Table 1) in order to establish a common knowledge base. It also helped to understand fundamental concerns in multilingual/plurilingual language education to eliminate possible misinterpretations. In addition, workshop 1 was designed to give all the participants the possibility to analyse their local contexts and consider whether plurilingual assessment tasks are compatible with their existing assessment framework.

Workshop 2 (Engagement) was aimed at engaging the teacher participants to demonstrate their competency in modifying assessment tasks to the plurilingual context, selecting the descriptors from the CEFR/CV and customising them to the modified tasks. For this purpose, the workshop included several steps.

First, the teachers were invited to analyse the original assessment tasks. They collectively offered suggestions as to how a monolingual task can be adapted to a plurilingual context (see Table 2).

Table 2. An example of a task modification during the workshop (modifications added in blue).

Original task: Plan a group vacation	Modified task: Plan a group vacation
The sources are given in English.	The sources are given in English and Ukrainian
As a group, decide on a budget for your vacation and select a destination that everyone is interested in. Analyse travel brochures, online websites, and other sources of information to find the best options for your group vacation. Look for destinations that offer activities and attractions that match the interests and preferences of everyone in the group. Choose two or three destinations that you think would be the most suitable for your group vacation, and present your analysis to the class or in a video.	As a group, decide on a budget for your vacation and select destinations that everyone is interested in. Analyse travel brochures, online websites, and other sources of information in two languages that popularise different destinations in Britain and in Ukraine to find the best options for your group vacation. Look for destinations that offer activities and attractions that match the interests and preferences of everyone in the group. Choose two destinations (one in Britain and one in Ukraine) that you think would be the most suitable for your group vacation, and present your analysis to the class or in a video in English .

Next, teachers were invited to collaborate in breakout rooms, forming groups of four. Their collective objective was to propose plurilingual strategies aimed at adapting assessment tasks collected during

Phase 1. The teachers engaged in collaborative discussions that contributed to co-constructing knowledge on designing plurilingual assessment tasks. Subsequently, each group in turn showcased the outcomes by presenting the modified task. Finally, the teachers submitted the modified assessment tasks to the authors for further analysis.

The next step of workshop 2 included discussing and localising the descriptors relevant to the task using the CEFR/CV as a benchmark. The teachers worked following the same pattern: discussing descriptors – collaboration in breakout rooms – presenting descriptors – submitting the outcome of collaborative product to the authors for further analysis. The added descriptors to the tasks drew on the following scales: Building on plurilingual comprehension, pluricultural competence and mediation (see Table 3). After compiling a list of descriptors from the CEFR/CV, the possibilities of adjusting those descriptors were discussed.

Table 3. Relevant descriptors from the CEFR/CV, descriptors for the original task are in black; strategies are in blue; added descriptors to a modified task are in green.

Reading for orientation	B1+	Can scan through straightforward, factual texts in magazines, brochures or on the web, identify what they are about and decide whether they contain information that might be of practical use (COE 2020: 56).
Sustained monologue: Putting a case	B1	Can briefly give reasons and explanations for opinions, plans and actions (COE 2020: 64)
Oral production: Addressing audience	B1	Can give a prepared straightforward presentation on a familiar topic within their field which is clear enough to be followed without difficulty most of the time, and in which the main points are explained with reasonable precision (COE 2020: 66).
Overall mediation	B1	Can convey information given in clear, well-structured informational texts on subjects that are familiar or of personal or current interest, although lexical limitations cause difficulty with formulation at times (COE 2020: 92).
Planning	B1	Can work out how to communicate the main point(s) they want to get across, exploiting any resources available and limiting the message to what they can recall or find the means to express (COE 2020: 69)
Collaborating in a group	B1+	Can collaborate on a shared task, e.g., formulating and responding to suggestions, asking whether people agree, and proposing alternative approaches (COE 2020: 111)
Processing texts in speech	B1	Can summarise simply (in Language B, namely English- our addition) the main information content of straightforward texts (in Language A, namely Ukrainian – our addition) on familiar subjects (e.g., a short record of an interview, magazine article, travel brochure) (COE 2020: 101).
Building on pluricultural repertoire	B1	Can explain features of their own culture to members of another culture or explain features of the other culture to members of their own culture (COE 2020: 125)
Plurilingual comprehension	B1	Can deduce the message of a text by exploiting what they have understood from texts on the same theme in different languages (e.g., news in brief, museum brochures, online reviews) (COE 2020: 126).

After discussing the suggested descriptors, the participants were given the task to locate the descriptors for the plurilingual tasks modified in Phase 1 and then to customise the selected descriptors. To complete this task, the participants worked in groups of four in breakout rooms. The CEFR/CV (COE 2020) served as reference. The presented results of a collaboration demonstrate that allotted time in breakout rooms was not enough to locate the descriptors and to offer modifications to them. Therefore, it was decided that the groups required more time to finalise the descriptors. Thus, the groups were offered to submit their final descriptors to the authors within 5 days.

Phase 3 collected teachers' views on proposed changes to language assessment in teaching English. For this, a structured online questionnaire was administered to the participants, and the focus group was asked to fill in the reflection log. The questionnaire was open for three weeks during which the 16 participants of the workshop could submit their responses. The focus groups were asked to submit their answers in a weeks' time.

3.4 Data collection and data analysis

To identify to what extent language assessments in teaching English are plurilingual, we approached universities specialised in preparing pre-service EFL teachers and students majoring in Linguistics. Three universities located in different regions in Ukraine volunteered to contribute tests that are developed by their English teachers and are used by the universities to assess their students' proficiency in English. Altogether, the universities contributed 14 sample tests: 8 tests from University 1; 5 tests from University 2 and 1 test from University 3. This imbalance could lead to overrepresentation or underrepresentation of certain variables across universities by thus potentially distorting findings and limiting the generalisability of the conclusions. Consequently, the skewed sample necessitates caution in interpreting the results. Despite this limitation, it was expected that the collected assessment tasks could provide us with insights into the most typical assessment activities used for evaluating the language proficiency of pre-service EFL teachers' and students majoring in Linguistics.

Then, the collected tests were analysed using descriptive statistics (establishing frequencies) in order to define 1) the targeted skills, 2) whether a test enables the students to demonstrate their plurilingual comprehension and/ or build on their plurilingual repertoire; 3) language(s) of input and output; 4) assessment types. The summary of the analysis is presented in Appendices A and B.

A structured questionnaire and a reflection log (see Appendix D) were used to collect teachers' views on proposed changes to the existing language assessments. The questionnaire and the reflection logs consisted of questions aligned with the objectives of the workshops (see Table 1) and targeted three main areas 1) the teachers' understanding of the key concepts of plurilingualism in language education; 2) pedagogical practices used in the language classroom and 3) approaches to language assessment. Altogether, the questionnaire comprised 18 items. A five-step Likert scale, ranging from '1-totally disagree', '2-disagree', '3-undecided' '4-agree', to '5-totally agree', was employed. The questionnaire was administered online, using Google Forms among 16 participants immediately after the two workshops. To encourage participants to express their genuine perceptions of the workshop content, all answers were kept anonymous. Then, the frequency for each response was recorded and data were presented in percentages.

The reflection log (11 items) was used to arrive at an in-depth picture of the participants' perceptions of the workshops. Reflective practices in educational context promote teacher critical thinking, and raise awareness about their surrounding and context (Hashim and Yusoff 2021) The data analysis was guided by the exploratory nature of the study and content analysis to ensure valid inferences from the content of textual data (De Wever et al. 2006). Pre-ordinate categorisation was used (Cohen et al. 2007), which means that the authors identified three main categories devised from the areas of their interest in advance. Consequently, the teachers' reflections were analysed according to these categories of keywords: (1) the participants' understanding of plurilingualism in language education, (2) language classroom practices, and (3) the approaches to language assessment. In this light, the codes in this

part of the study were deductive. From the start, coding involved meticulous reading and annotating each teacher reflection material. Then, significant responses were tied to the relatable categories and analysed using an interpretive perspective (Cohen et al. 2007). Finally, the integration and merging of the statistical analysis of the quantitative data and interpretation of qualitative data took place.

4 Results

Research question 1 explored to what extent the samples of assessments from Ukrainian universities were plurilingual. The collected tests measure English proficiency of pre-service teachers and students majoring in Linguistics, targeting English for communication and professional purposes (communication and grammar, 1st to 4th years of study, Bachelor programme) at CEFR levels B1+ to C1 and tasks that target academic English/ English for professional purposes (Master programme) at CEFR levels C1-C1+. The test analysis demonstrates that all 14 tests are characterised by a summative test design. The test from University 3 has a built-in progression through the course. The tests are mainly monolingual, in English. All 14 tests target at an ideal native-speaker language use. In addition, 13 tests include two assessment parts – written and oral and consist of four to six assessment tasks. Altogether, 14 tests include 70 assessment tasks. Language competence is assessed by measuring proficiency in several skills: reading, writing, mediation, speaking, interaction and language functions: grammar and vocabulary. These mostly discrete-point tests do not include tasks which assess listening skills.

Most of the assessment tasks (87%) are in one named language – English. Nine assessment tasks (12.8%) are in two languages, namely Ukrainian and English. Eight (11%) of these tasks are translation tasks: three tasks (University 1) focus on translating isolated sentences comprising target vocabulary from Ukrainian into English and 5 tasks (University 2) focus on translating a written text from English into Ukrainian. In addition, University 2 includes one task that assesses cross-linguistic mediation by relaying specific information in writing, namely summarising and explaining in English the purpose of a dissertation conducted in Ukrainian. No assessment tasks are in 2+ languages. Table 4 illustrates languages involved in tests to assess language proficiency in English.

Table 4. Languages in tests to assess language proficiency in English

Languages involved in 70 tasks	n	%
Tasks in one language	61	87%
Tasks in two languages	9	12.8%
Tasks in 2+ languages	0	0%
Tasks in mediation	24	34%
Tasks in mediation in one language, English	15	21%
Tasks in mediation in two languages, English and Ukrainian	9	1.5%
Tasks in translation	8	11%

Research question 2 looked into the strategies that the teachers used to develop plurilingual tasks to assess students' proficiency in English. The participants worked in groups of three or four. Each group modified one or two of the assessment tasks collected in Phase 1. The analysis of the modified tasks demonstrated that the teachers successfully employed several strategies to design assessment tasks that engage students' plurilingual competence (see Tables 5-9). Among such strategies were:

- Communicating written or oral information from Ukrainian to English in writing or speaking.
- Summarising information read or heard in Ukrainian (and English) and its further presentation in speaking or writing in English where changes of discourses or genre of the original text(s) are possible.

- Collating information from different sources in Ukrainian and English in order to produce a written text in English.
- Comparing grammar in students' L1 and English.
- Reflecting on an issue raised in Ukrainian and English cultures.

The overarching objective of these language assessment activities is to foster language contact and raise awareness of linguistic and cultural diversity, particularly for languages like English and Ukrainian. By incorporating elements of different languages, students are encouraged to employ their linguistic repertoire in their L1 and English but also demonstrate a deeper understanding of language dynamics and intercultural communication.

Table 5. Modifications of the tasks assessing mediation of a text (modifications added in blue) as proposed by group 1.

Original task A	Modification 1	Modification 2
Read the text <i>Bilinguals</i> and write a summary paragraph (10-12 sentences) commenting on the issue raised in the text. To what extent do you share the author's opinion?	Read the two texts <i>Bilinguals</i> and <i>Двомовні з дитинства</i> ¹ and write a summary paragraph in English (20-25 sentences) commenting on the issue raised in the texts. Compare and contrast the ideas discussed in the two texts.	Read the text <i>Двомовні з дитинства</i> and write a summary paragraph in English (10-12 sentences) commenting on the issue raised in the texts. To what extent do you share the author's opinion?
Original task B	Modification	
Read a short text and analyse its communicative message. Identify the main problem that the text introduces and provide a detailed explanation, supported by relevant arguments and examples. Additionally, provide recommendations or potential solutions to the problem discussed in the text.	Read a short text in Ukrainian and analyse its communicative message in English . Identify the main problem that the text introduces and provide a detailed explanation, supported by relevant arguments and examples. Additionally, provide recommendations or potential solutions to the problem discussed in the text.	

As can be seen from the examples in Table 5, modifications of the tasks often involved cross-linguistic mediation that included introducing an additional text in Ukrainian, or substituting the text in English with a text in Ukrainian (task b).

1. Bilingual from Childhood (our translation)

Table 6. Modifications of the tasks assessing grammar (modifications added in blue) as proposed by group 2.

Original task A	Modification
Rewrite the sentences by using the compound adjectives. Example: A train which moves fast. – A <u>fast-moving train</u> .	Rewrite the sentences using compound adjectives. Example: A train which moves fast. – A <u>fast-moving train</u> . Then, provide the equivalent sentence in Ukrainian and comment in English on the differences in parts of speech used in the two languages. Consider the different structures and word order in Ukrainian and English.
Original task B	Modification
Provide a complete syntactic analysis of the sentence 'People who speak more than one language are fascinating.'	Provide a complete syntactic analysis of the sentence 'People who speak more than one language are fascinating' and compare it with the syntactic structure in Ukrainian. Identify and explain any differences between the syntactic structures of the two languages, taking into consideration the word order and sentence structure.

Table 6 demonstrates that the changes to grammar tasks (paraphrase, syntactic analysis of the sentence) included raising language awareness about the differences in syntactic structures used and included analysis and comparison of linguistic structures in English and Ukrainian. Similar modifications to grammar tasks were offered to task b.

According to the CEFR and the CEFR/CV (COE 2001, 2020), plurilingualism entails communication not only across languages, but also across cultures and contexts. Therefore, the teachers of group 3 modified a speaking on the topic monolingual task by including reflection on and the analysis of problems raised in the task from a cultural perspective (see Table 7).

Table 7. Modifications of the tasks assessing speaking (modifications added in blue) as proposed by group 3.

Original task	Modification
Look at the pictures and explain the problems they illustrate.	Look at the pictures and explain the problems they illustrate. Are these problems common for Ukraine too? Compare and contrast the issue and its solutions in the two contexts.

Group 3 deployed the same pluricultural strategy with regard to the task for assessing translation and the analysis of a creative text. First, the teachers omitted the translation task overall. Instead, modification was offered to the analysis of a creative task, which included analysis of a literary text from a cultural perspective (see Table 8).

Table 8. Modifications of the tasks assessing translating a written text and relaying information (modifications added in blue) as proposed by group 3.

Original task	Modification
<p>1. Read and translate the extract from ‘Philomel Cottage’ by Agatha Christie (1, 501 words) (Christie, n. d.).</p> <p>2. Explain the message presented in the extract from ‘Philomel Cottage’ (67-68) by Agatha Christie.</p>	<p>Read an extract from ‘Philomel Cottage’ by A. Christie (1, 501 words) (Christie, n.d.) and present a summarised version of the information contained in the text. Pay close attention to any cultural phenomena or references in the text that may not be properly understood by Ukrainian readers. Additionally, provide explanations or context for any cultural references or vocabulary (comment on at least 3 instances) that may be unfamiliar to Ukrainian readers, and use your knowledge of both cultures to bridge any potential gaps in understanding.</p>

Group 4 proposed adaptation of the monolingual collaborative task by introducing a requirement to work with diverse linguistic contexts (see Table 9). Thus, the modified task engages students with the broader scope of the project. This allows students to get a richer and more comprehensive understanding of the topic by exploring authentic, multilingual resources beyond topic-related materials, enhancing their exposure to real-world language use. It also allows them to draw connections between their L1 and the language they are learning, promoting deeper linguistic and cultural understanding.

Table 9. Modification of a task assessing a collaborative group project (modifications added in blue) as proposed by group 4.

Original task A	Modification
<p>Prepare a collaborative group project that incorporates the topics, vocabulary, and grammar structures learned throughout the course. The project can take the form of a video, performance, or presentation.</p>	<p>Prepare a collaborative group project that incorporates the topics, vocabulary, and grammar structures learned throughout the course. In addition to the course material, utilise podcasts, interviews, videos, and blogs in other languages that you know (including L1) related to the course topics. The project should be presented in English and can take the form of a video, performance, or presentation. Present a reference list of the sources used.</p>

Research question 3 analysed the strategies used by the teachers to customise selected descriptors. After the analysis of the submitted descriptors, the participants drew on the descriptors for cross-linguistic mediation, descriptors on plurilingual comprehension and building on plurilingual repertoire. In order to adjust these descriptors to their contexts, the teachers used three main strategies, namely removing irrelevant information, adding specific details related to the language of input and output or combining several descriptors. Further, we will exemplify teachers’ decisions regarding the choice of the descriptors from the CEFR/CV and comment on strategies employed to customise the descriptors.

Table 10 illustrates selecting and adapting relevant descriptors from the CEFR/CV to the assessment task in mediation.

Table 10 Selecting and adapting relevant descriptors: Read the two texts *Bilinguals* and *Двомовні з дитинства* and write a summary paragraph (20-25 sentences) commenting on the issue raised in the texts. Compare and contrast the ideas discussed in the two texts.

Table 10. *Selecting and adapting relevant descriptors*

Criteria	Level	Descriptors from the CEFR/CV	Adaptation of the descriptors
Relaying specific information in writing	B2+	Can relay in writing (in Language B) the relevant point(s) contained in propositionally complex but well-structured texts (in Language A) within their fields of professional, academic and personal interest (COE 2020: 94).	Can relay in writing (in English) the relevant point(s) contained in both of the propositionally complex but well-structured texts presented in Ukrainian and English.
Processing text in writing	B2+	Can compare, contrast and synthesise in writing (in Language B) the information and viewpoints contained in academic and professional publications (in Language A) in their fields of special interest (COE 2020: 99).	Can compare, contrast and synthesise in writing (in English) the information and viewpoints contained in both of the professional publications (in Ukrainian and English).
Plurilingual comprehension	B2	Can use their knowledge of contrasting genre conventions and textual patterns in languages in their plurilingual repertoire in order to support comprehension (COE 2020: 126).	Can use knowledge of contrasting genre conventions and textual patterns in Ukrainian and English in order to support comprehension
Building on plurilingual repertoire	B2	Can alternate between languages in their plurilingual repertoire in order to communicate specialised information and issues on a subject in their field of interest to different interlocutors (COE 2020: 128).	Can alternate between Ukrainian and English in order to communicate specialised information and issues on a subject

Table 11 illustrates selecting and adapting relevant descriptors from the CEFR/CV to the assessment task in grammar. For assessing students' ability to explain the difference between the syntactic structures in the two languages, the teachers located relevant descriptors in plurilingual comprehension and the explaining data scales. As this scale "refers to the transformation into a verbal text of information found in figures" (COE 2020: 96), the syntactic composition of the sentence may be regarded as graphic data, the choice of the descriptor is seen as justifiable.

Table 11 Selecting and adapting relevant descriptors to the assessment task: Provide a complete syntactic analysis of the sentence 'People who speak more than one language are fascinating' and compare it with the syntactic structure in your L1. Identify and explain any differences between the syntactic structures of the two languages, taking into consideration the word order and sentence structure.

Table 11. Selecting and adapting relevant descriptors to the assessment task

Criteria	Level	Descriptors from the CEFR/CV	Adaptation of the descriptors
Plurilingual comprehension	B2	Can use their knowledge of contrasting genre conventions and textual patterns in languages in their plurilingual repertoire in order to support comprehension (COE 2020: 126).	Can use their knowledge of contrasting syntactic structures in languages (English and students' L1) in their plurilingual repertoire in order to support comprehension.
Explaining data	B2	Can interpret and describe reliably (in Language B) detailed information contained in complex diagrams, charts and other visually organised information (with text in Language A) on topics in their fields of interest (COE 2020: 97).	Can interpret and describe reliably in English detailed information contained in syntactic sentence analysis diagram on syntactic differences in English and a student's L1.

As Table 12 shows, the assessment task with the focus on reflection upon and analysis of problems from a cultural perspective was evaluated using descriptors from mediation scales and building on pluricultural repertoire. To adjust the descriptors from the CEFR/CV to the assessment task, information that specified languages involved in assessment was added, irrelevant information was removed. Considerable adjustments underwent the descriptor in the explaining data in speech or sign scales by removing the information about the type of data and the topic.

Table 12 Selecting and adapting relevant descriptors to the assessment task: Look at the pictures and explain the problems they illustrate. Are these problems common for Ukraine, too? Compare and contrast the issue and its solutions in two countries.

Table 12. Selecting and adapting relevant descriptors to the assessment task

Criteria	Level	Descriptors from the CEFR/CV	Adaptation of the descriptors
Overall mediation	B2+	Can establish a supportive environment for sharing ideas and facilitate discussion of delicate issues, showing appreciation of different perspectives, encouraging people to explore issues and adjusting sensitively the way they express things (COE 2020: 92).	Can share ideas of delicate issues, showing appreciation of different perspectives, adjusting sensitively the way they express things.
Explaining data in speech or sign	B2	Can interpret and describe reliably (in Language B) detailed information contained in complex diagrams, charts and other visually organised information (with text in Language A) on topics in their fields of interest (COE 2020: 97)	Can interpret and describe reliably in English detailed information contained in images.

Criteria	Level	Descriptors from the CEFR/CV	Adaptation of the descriptors
Building on pluricultural repertoire	B2	Can explain their interpretation of the cultural assumptions, preconceptions, stereotypes and prejudices of their own community and of other communities that they are familiar with (COE 2020: 125).	No adjustments
Building on pluricultural repertoire	B2	Can generally interpret cultural cues appropriately in the culture concerned (COE 2020: 125)	No adjustments

Similar strategies were applied to the task assessing relaying information (see Table 13). Two descriptors were left without changes. In addition, two descriptors related to building on pluricultural repertoire scales were combined into one.

Table 13 Selecting and adapting relevant descriptors to the assessment task: Read an extract from ‘Philomel Cottage’ by Agatha Christie (n.d.) and present a summarised version of the information contained in the text. Pay close attention to any cultural phenomena or references in the text that may not be properly understood by Ukrainian readers. Additionally, provide explanations or context for any cultural references or vocabulary (comment on at least 3 instances) that may be unfamiliar to Ukrainian readers, and use your knowledge of both cultures to bridge any potential gaps in understanding.

Table 13. *Selecting and adapting relevant descriptors to the assessment task*

Criteria	Level	Descriptors from the CEFR/CV	Adaptation of the descriptors
Overall mediation	B2+	Can convey the main content of well-structured but long and propositionally complex texts on subjects within their fields of professional, academic and personal interest, clarifying the opinions and purposes of speakers/signers (COE 2020: 92).	No adjustments
Expressing a personal response to creative texts (including literature)	B2	Can give a personal interpretation of the development of a plot, the characters and themes in a story, novel, film or play (COE 2020: 106).	Can give a personal interpretation of the development of a plot, the characters and themes in a story.
Facilitating pluricultural space	B2+	Can exploit knowledge of sociocultural conventions in order to establish a consensus on how to proceed in a particular situation that is unfamiliar to everyone involved (COE 2020: 115).	No adjustments

Criteria	Level	Descriptors from the CEFR/CV	Adaptation of the descriptors
Strategies to explain a new concept: Adapting language	B2	Can make accessible for others the main contents of a text on a subject of interest (e.g., an essay, a forum discussion, a presentation) by paraphrasing in simpler language (COE 2020: 119).	Can make accessible for others the main contents of a story by paraphrasing in simpler language and breaking into a series of smaller steps.
Strategies to explain a new concept: Breaking down complicated information		Can make a complicated process easier to understand by breaking it down into a series of smaller steps (COE 2020: 119).	
Building on pluricultural repertoire	B2	Can generally interpret cultural cues appropriately in the culture concerned (COE 2020: 125).	Can interpret cultural cues appropriately in the culture concerned by explaining particular ways of communicating in their own and other cultures
Building on pluricultural repertoire	B2	Can reflect on and explain particular ways of communicating in their own and other cultures, and the risks of misunderstanding they generate (COE 2020: 125).	

Similar to other adapted descriptors, the descriptors to a collaborative group project specify the languages used, provide additional clarifications on cultural aspects and strategies used to complete a project (see Appendix C).

To answer Research question 4, a questionnaire survey and a reflection log were used to investigate the teachers' views on the changes to language assessment in teaching English. The collected data will be presented along the three focal pre-ordinate categories: Understanding plurilingual/multilingual goals in language education, plurilingual pedagogical practices in teaching English, approaches to teaching English. Table 14 presents the results of the survey, gauging teacher understanding of plurilingual/multilingual goals in language education.

Table 14. The results of teacher understanding of plurilingual/ multilingual goals in language education

Understanding key concepts	n=16
In the English classroom, students should NOT learn about the language as a subject.	Disagree - 25% (4) Undecided - 25% (4) Agree - 43.8 (7) Strongly agree - 6.7% (1)
In the English classroom, students should use the language to co-construct meaning and create a product.	Agree - 75% (12) Strongly agree - 25% (4)
I understand the difference between plurilingualism and multilingualism.	Undecided - 6.7% (1) Agree - 43.8% (7) Strongly agree - 50% (8)

Understanding key concepts	n=16
It is important to promote the development of plurilingualism in the language classroom.	Undecided - 6.7 % (1) Agree – 62.5% (10) Strongly agree - 31.3% (5)
Language teaching should NOT aim to achieve native speaker proficiency	Disagree - 12.5% (2) Undecided - 18.8% (3) Agree – 62.5% (10) Strongly agree – 6.7% (1)
A learner’s competence in a language is always “partial” and evolving.	Undecided - 6.7% (1) Agree - 68.8 % (11) Strongly agree – 25% (4)

N.B.: Due to the sample size (n=16), it was only possible to use descriptive statistics.

As can be seen from Table 14, the majority of the teachers understand and share goals of the language education with a multilingual focus. All the respondents agree that students should use the language for communicative purposes, for 73% of the teachers ‘a native-speaker proficiency’ is not a benchmark against which learners’ language proficiency should be measured. This understanding is in line with the teacher agreement (93.8%) that a learner’s competence in a language is always ‘partial’. In addition, the majority of the respondents (93.8%) claims that they understand the difference between plurilingualism and multilingualism and they also acknowledge the importance of developing plurilingualism in the language classroom. At the same time, only slightly over 50% of the teachers agree that students should not learn about the language as a subject, suggesting an action-oriented approach to language teaching.

The reflection group data help us interpret the findings of the survey. In general, teachers’ reflections demonstrate that they understand basic concepts that define a multilingual, plurilingual turn in education. Thus, all five teachers viewed plurilingualism as an asset with students. However, teacher 1 remarks that students’ linguistic repertoire might be a hurdle in learning an additional language. She did not specify the reasons but mentioned some research report about the cases of interference in learning an additional language, which might really be the point she was making. In addition, all teachers highlight that it is crucial to develop students’ repertoire in two or more languages” as student plurilingualism “provides more opportunities for students to grow and develop” (Teacher 3). Therefore, the teachers underscore that “language education should equip a learner with sufficient skills and knowledge to ensure his/her efficient communication in diverse contexts” (Teacher 2). They also explained their understanding of learners’ linguistic repertoire as “the knowledge of languages students use or learnt, including students’ L1”. In addition, the teachers recognise that “every learner possesses an individualised and unique repertoire” (Teacher 2).

A finding of the reflection group regarding a ‘native speaker standard’ as a criterion against which learners’ language proficiency is measured is contradictory to the finding regarding the goal of language education as presented by the respondents of the questionnaire. Four teachers of the focus group acknowledge that a ‘native speaker standard’ is used as a criterion in language learning when it comes to measuring grammatical and lexical accuracy, and language proficiency of pre-service teachers. At the same time, 74% of the respondents of the questionnaire report that they agree or strongly agree that the goal of language education should not be the development of native-like proficiency. In this example, there is an inconsistency between recognising the use of a native speaker standard to assess language proficiency and the belief that language education should not aim for native-like proficiency. This indicates a transitional process where teachers might be theoretically embracing plurilingualism and plurilingual assessment but are unsure about how to implement it effectively in practice (Vogt 2024).

Table 15 presents the data of the section of the questionnaire that looked into the multilingual/plurilingual practices in teaching English.

Table 15. The results of reported multilingual/plurilingual practices in teaching English

Multilingual/plurilingual practices	n=16
In the language classroom, I ensure that my students act as social agents.	Agree - 68.8 %(11) Strongly agree - 31.3% (5)
In Ukraine, language teaching develops language students' plurilingualism (establishing the relationship between all the languages taught).	Disagree - 12.5 % (2) Undecided - 25% (4) Agree - 56.3 (9) Strongly agree - 6.3% (1)
In Ukraine, language teaching develops language students' multilingualism (teaching each language separately).	Disagree - 18.8% (3) Undecided - 31.3% (5) Agree - 50% (8)
In teaching English, I encourage my students to use other languages.	Disagree - 31.3% (5) Agree - 62.5% (10) Strongly agree - 6.3% (1)
In teaching English, I build on my students' linguistic repertoire.	Disagree - 6.3 % (1) Undecided - 6.3% (1) Agree - 68.8% (11) Strongly agree -18.8% (3)

According to the data of Table 15, promoting student plurilingualism is an important aim of language education in teaching English in Ukraine. In this regard, 62.6 % of the respondents (10 teachers) report that they develop students' plurilingualism. To support this claim, 70% (11) of the teachers allow other languages in teaching English and 87.6 % (14) of the teachers build on their student linguistic repertoire.

According to the findings of the reflection logs, all respondents admit that students' linguistic repertoire is a valuable resource that can be used to assist their students' progress in learning an additional language. However, in the opinion of the focus group, teaching practices in Ukraine foster additive multilingualism. This finding contradicts the collected data of the questionnaire where the majority of the respondents (60%) agree that in the English classroom teaching practices promote learner plurilingualism rather than multilingualism. The contradiction between the opinion expressed in the reflection log and the questionnaire responses regarding teaching practices in Ukraine can be explained by the conflicting perceptions and transitory nature of language teachers in this educational context. On the one hand, teachers may not necessarily expect to contribute to fostering students' repertoire while teaching English. On the other hand, the questionnaire responses might reflect the practical experiences of teachers who see language learning as a process where students engage with multiple languages to varying degrees rather than solely focusing on one language. When asked how teachers build on their students' repertoire, two respondents (teachers 1, 4) mentioned that they allow translanguaging and extralinguistic means of communication for the sake of meaning when it comes to teaching English to students of non-language specialisations; and teacher 2 allows L1 to translate vocabulary and explain difficult concepts.

Table 16. The results presenting plurilingual assessments in language education

Plurilingual assessment	n=16
Monolingual assessment fails to acknowledge complex communicative practices of plurilinguals.	Undecided - 25 % (4) Agree – 68.8% (11) Strongly agree – 6.3% (1)
In Ukraine, monolingual language assessment is a prevailing approach.	Disagree - 6.3% (1) Undecided - 31.3% (5) Agree – 50% (8) Strongly agree – 12.5% (2)
In Ukraine, plurilingual assessment is coherent with teaching English.	Strongly disagree – 6.3% (1) Disagree – 18.8% (3) Undecided – 18.8% (3) Agree – 56.3 % (9)
In Ukraine, approaches to language assessment should be reconceptualised from the standpoint of plurilingualism.	Undecided – 37.5% (6) Agree – 50% (8) Strongly agree – 12.5% (2)
Plurilingual assessment tasks should be used to assess my students' proficiency in English.	Undecided - 12.5% (2) Agree - 87.5% (13)
I understand what language assessment tasks should be used to engage all linguistic resources of my students.	Agree – 75% (12) Strongly agree - 25% (4)
I understand how to select and adapt the descriptors from the CEFR/ CV relevant to a language task.	Agree – 81.3 % (13) Strongly agree – 18/8% (3)

Table 16 shows that 60% of the teachers agree that monolingual language assessment is prevailing in Ukraine; and 31.3% have not decided whether assessment in Ukraine targets at one language only. The most significant finding of the questionnaire is that above 56.3% (9) of the respondents find that plurilingual assessment actually reflects teaching practices in the English classroom. This might be the reason for 62.5% of the teachers in the study to agree that language assessment should be reconceptualised from the standpoint of plurilingualism. In this respect, the study reveals a significant change in the teachers' perspective, suggesting a departure from approaches that may have centred on monolingual standards or assessments. This shift reflects a growing recognition among the respondents of the need to adapt assessment practices to better reflect the multilingual realities of contemporary language learning contexts.

Another finding of the survey indicates that the workshop equipped the teachers with strategies for creating an assessment task which can engage students' plurilingual resources, and empowered them with an understanding of how to select and adapt the CEFR/CV descriptors relevant for a plurilingual language task. In a transitory situation like the one the teachers seem to find themselves in, it is vital to provide language teachers with relevant strategies and practices to bring the change they seem to embrace theoretically. The data of the reflection log demonstrate that the teachers unanimously believe that plurilingual assessment is a requirement of the foreign language classroom today. However, there is a danger that these responses may be influenced by social desirability bias, where teachers might provide answers they believe are expected or valued by the researchers or their peers (Lavidas et al. 2022). This bias can distort the results, potentially misrepresenting the true opinions and attitudes of the teachers involved. Despite this concern, the arguments that the teachers offer to advocate for the reconsideration of the approaches to language assessment are compelling. Teacher 1 highlights that

otherwise assessment does not reflect how communication really happens. Teachers 2 and 5 underscore that language assessment should reflect the modern requirements of an authentic communicative task. Teacher 3 highlights that assessment tasks should be developed to measure learners' ability to use their other languages in diverse multilingual situations. According to Teacher 4, "monolingual language assessment fails to acknowledge complex communicative practices of plurilinguals and their ability to draw on their diverse linguistic repertoire". Therefore, the respondents clearly see affordances of plurilingual assessment and seem to embrace it despite the fact that assessment practices in Ukraine have not followed suit.

5 Discussion

Ukraine is a multilingual country, with the majority of the population speaking several languages to different levels of proficiency (Myhre et al. 2021; Osidak and Natsiuk 2024). In this context, "tests should match actual language practices and multilinguals use resources from their whole linguistic repertoire" (Gorter and Cenoz 2017: 243). The teachers in the study report that other languages including Ukrainian have often been present in a variety of teaching activities (explaining difficult concepts, defining vocabulary, translation tasks, translanguaging). However, the analysis of the samples of assessment tasks demonstrates that the prevailing approach to test construction is monolingual. Given that the data involves only Ukrainian and English, it might be more accurately described as a bilingual rather than truly plurilingual approach. This limited inclusion of languages may not fully capture the diverse linguistic repertoires of plurilingual learners, thus restricting the potential to assess and support their plurilingual competencies comprehensively.

Another finding of the sample test analysis regards the validity of using written translation of creative texts tasks to assess the language proficiency of pre-service teachers. As it is noted in the CEFR/CV (COE 2020: 44), "translating a written text in writing is a formal process related to the activities of professional translators". The analysis of teacher assessment practices has revealed that translation as a common assessment task in the Ukrainian context and translation from Ukrainian into English is often used to assess knowledge of vocabulary use. In this respect, Flognfeldt et al. (2020) underscore that the foregrounding of translation as a plurilingual assessment task is indicative (again) of the transitory, ambivalent phase of plurilingual assessment in which teachers have a positive attitude towards plurilingual assessment but lack the means to implement it in their classrooms. This finding is also in line with the conclusions made in other studies (e.g., Simensen 2007; Studer and Kelly 2023). The analysis of the submitted plurilingual assessment tasks demonstrates that to promote plurilingualism in language education and create assessment tasks that will provide conditions for learners to engage with their other languages, several strategies were successfully employed: using crosslinguistic mediation of a text in writing or speech; engaging multilingual resources; applying language awareness and pluricultural awareness. Most of the participants of the project included only the state language in order to modify monolingual tasks to the plurilingual context, indicating a monolingual paradigm for assessment (Dendrinios 2019). In this respect, Flognfeldt et al. (2020) report that allowing students to build on their linguistic resources in a language classroom may be a challenge for educators and managing more than one language can be seen as a problem for teachers. As a result, the inclusion of only the state language by most participants overlooks the possible linguistic diversity and the presence of other languages that participants might speak and understand. In addition, other studies report that teachers do not always consider their students' previous language knowledge to be a resource in the classroom (De Angelis 2011). Our findings reflect Flognfeldt et al.'s (2020) and Simensen's (2007) conclusion that teacher persistent adherence to one language-only (English) teaching and assessment practices may be the reflection of recently prevailing language-didactic orthodoxy.

In order to encourage teachers to bring a shift towards a plurilingual perspective in language teaching and assessment, it is important to equip them with practical tools (North and Piccardo 2023). The use of

CEFR/CV descriptors are a significant prerequisite for fostering change in assessment approaches and can be really helpful to language teachers who wish to promote a plurilingual approach by suggesting real-world oriented activities (North and Piccardo 2023). Additionally, descriptors can empower teachers to create assessments that not only measure language proficiency but also promote and recognise the diverse linguistic repertoires of their students. Based on the data of this study, the selected and adapted descriptors indicated that the teachers in this project found the CEFR/CV to be a useful instrument for designing tests and developing assessment task descriptors. The teachers also effectively customised and adapted the descriptors to suit their local context. This finding reiterates a conclusion of the study by Vogt et al. (2022) carried out among Ukrainian university teachers to investigate their familiarity and expertise with the CEFR/CV, stating an understanding of an important message of the framework that it should be tailored to and customised in local contexts. The respondents in other studies (cf. Alas and Liiv 2014) similarly valued the CEFR because it is adaptable to many language situations and local contexts. Furthermore, all 16 teachers stated that the selection of relevant descriptors for the plurilingual task helped them familiarise with the CEFR/CV (see Table 16), which might contribute to the teachers' overall improved assessment literacy (Inbar-Lourie 2017). These adapted descriptors can serve as a common reference point, facilitating consistency and coherence in plurilingual assessment practices across different educational institutions.

Both the teacher reflection responses and the findings of the questionnaire analysis evidence that the workshops urged the teachers to think about their existing assessment practices as well as teaching and learning strategies in the English classroom. According to the findings of the reflection logs, students' plurilingualism is perceived as an asset in language education and calls for teaching and assessment practices that involve all learner linguistic repertoire. This implies that students' linguistic diversity is no longer viewed as a hindrance in EFL assessment in the Ukrainian context. On the contrary, the respondents were ready to embrace it as a valuable resource. The participants in the study incorporated assessments that encourage cross-linguistic mediation, language and cultural awareness between Ukrainian and English, allowing students to draw upon their diverse linguistic resources.

Moreover, the teachers in the study realise that this necessity arises from the practical language usage requirements that are linked to the present-day linguistic diversity of society (Cutrim Schmid 2021; Stathopoulou 2020; Tai and Wong 2022). The data of the reflection log demonstrate that plurilingual activities reflect real-life and professional situations that students can find themselves in and these activities are of a great relevance to the learning goals of their courses. Consequently, data collected from both cohorts of teachers indicated the necessity to reconceptualise assessment practices so that students can draw on their plurilingual competence while completing a task. Yet, the teachers do not quite know how to implement plurilingual assessment practices. For example, in modifying assessment tasks to a plurilingual context and adapting descriptors for the language assessment, the teachers chose to centre their focus on Ukrainian and English as part of a plurilingual repertoire rather than strictly viewing it as a bilingual context. Such an approach suggests that the teachers in the study observe a bilingual rather than multilingual approach to multilingualism.

On the other hand, focusing on Ukrainian and English as a plurilingual repertoire, broadens students' understanding of language competence and enables teachers to develop descriptors that are more inclusive and reflective of the diverse linguistic realities of their students. Yet, the focus on Ukrainian and English makes the authors think that the participants may feel vulnerable if an assessment task includes languages that the test-taker does not know. By limiting assessments to English and Ukrainian, there is a risk of not fully engaging with the plurilingual reality of many learners. Consequently, such an approach may ultimately hamper the development of a truly inclusive and representative plurilingual assessment framework. Moreover, this approach fails to leverage the whole linguistic repertoire that learners bring to the classroom (COE 2020). Therefore, addressing this issue requires careful consideration of how to support and empower learners in multilingual contexts, ensuring assessments are both fair and reflective of learners' diverse linguistic capabilities.

According to Harsch and Seyfer (2020), revising existing assessment practices implies bringing changes to educational systems. Such a change cannot be managed by few teachers alone as the development and validation of the instruments is time- and resource-demanding. To effectively handle such alterations, collaborative methods that include relevant stakeholders are preferable (Harsch and Seyfer 2020). Regarding this study, developing and validating sets of criteria and test specifications that take into account the implications of a new plurilingual paradigm in an assessment task is the next step to be taken. For example, an increase in reading time is necessary in modified tasks that include an additional reading text in students' L1.

The reconceptualisation of existing assessment practices cannot be simply inserted into an existing context (Poehner and Inbar-Lourie 2020). Obviously, the change will necessitate retraining teachers and assisting them in developing their professional expertise in conducting plurilingual teaching practices in general and assessment in particular. However, this project demonstrates that the teachers' awareness and positive attitude to multilingual assessment practices has been raised and they have shown their ability to design plurilingual assessment tasks on the basis of the CEFR descriptors, which is a major prerequisite of change, providing a structured framework for teachers to implement plurilingual assessment practices effectively (North and Piccardo 2023). This experience is one of the first steps in the Ukrainian context in creating more valid tests through collaborative professional initiative with other universities.

A limitation of the study was that it analysed assessment practices contributed to the study by only three universities with different number of tests provided for analysis. Therefore, it is a small-scale study. In this light, we cannot present generalised conclusions about the assessment instruments used in Ukraine to assess students' proficiency in English. Another limitation is the sample of the participants of the questionnaire (n=16) and the reflection log (n=5). Thus, we cannot argue that findings are representative for drawing consistent conclusions, but they will still provide valuable insights.

6 Conclusion

This paper presents the outcomes of a project aimed at enhancing teachers' awareness and strategies for implementing plurilingual assessment in English language teaching. The study involved analysing assessment tests from three universities in Ukraine to evaluate the extent to which plurilingual assessment practices are implemented. This study reveals that in the realm of educational assessment, there is a notable incongruity between teachers' positive attitudes towards plurilingual assessment and the predominant adherence to monolingual assessment practices. Despite recognising the value of plurilingual assessment in providing a more authentic reflection of learners' linguistic diversity, the teachers in this study reported a lack of concrete repertoire of plurilingual assessment strategies. This disjunction underscores the tension between willingness and implementation, which means that while the teachers express readiness to embrace plurilingual assessment, they struggle with putting this intention into practice. This might explain a predominance of partly monolingual assessments in English that limits students' opportunities to showcase their plurilingual competence.

In this light, this collaborative professional development project was carried out to assist teachers' growing awareness and capacity for plurilingual assessment practices. As a part of the project, two workshops were conducted to train the teachers on plurilingual assessment aligned with the CEFR/CV framework. Results indicate teachers' readiness to adopt plurilingual assessment methods, prompting a need to reconceptualise existing monolingual approaches. The participants demonstrated proficiency in developing plurilingual assessment tasks and adapting CEFR/CV descriptors to their teaching contexts when receiving appropriate guidance. Through the adaptation of CEFR/CV descriptors to their instructional contexts, the teachers demonstrated an evolving ability to integrate plurilingual assessment strategies into their pedagogical frameworks. This collaborative approach to knowledge construction not only empowered the teachers but also positioned them as catalysts for educational

change, particularly in this transitional period. Moreover, the project underscores the instrumental role of the CEFR/CV descriptors in facilitating this shift towards plurilingual assessment. By aligning these descriptors with evolving plurilingual assessment paradigms and contextualising them within specific educational settings, the participants succeeded in effectively designing assessment tasks to employ their students' linguistic repertoire. Thus, the presented project is an evidence of the transformative impact of collaborative knowledge construction and strategic utilisation of established frameworks in navigating the transition towards plurilingual assessment practices.

7 References

- Alas, Ene & Suliko Liiv. 2014. Assessment literacy of national examination interviewers and raters – Experience with the CEFR. *Eesti Rakenduslingvistika Ühingu Aastaraamat* 10. 7-22. <https://doi.org/10.5128/ERYa10.01>
- Bisai, Samrat & Smriti Singh. 2018. Rethinking assessment – A multilingual perspective. *Language in India* 18(4). 308-319. www.languageinindia.com (accessed 9 September 2024).
- Chalhoub-Deville, Micheline B. 2019. Multilingual testing constructs: theoretical foundations. *Language Assessment Quarterly* 16(4/5). 472-480. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2019.1671391>
- Choi, Julie, Russell Cross, Larissa McLean Davies, Sue Ollerhead & Melissa Barnes. 2022. Looking towards plurilingual futures for literacy assessment. *The Australian Journal of Language and Literacy* 45. 325-340 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44020-022-00021-3>
- Cohen, Louis, Lawrence Manion & Keith Morrison. 2007. *Research methods in education*, 6th ed. London & New York: Routledge.
- Conteh, Jean & Gabriela Meier. 2014. Introduction. In Jean Conteh & Gabriela Meier (eds.), *The multilingual turn in languages education. Opportunities and challenges*, 1-14. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Council of Europe (COE). 2001. *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment (CEFR)*. COE.
- Council of Europe (COE). 2020. *Common European framework of reference for languages (CEFR): Learning, teaching, assessment – Companion volume*. COE. www.coe.int/lang-cefr (accessed 9 September 2024).
- Creswell, John W. 2009. *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*, 3rd edn. Los Angeles, London, New Delhi & Singapore: Sage.
- Christie, Agatha. n.d. *Philomel cottage*. <http://celine.klinghammer.free.fr/documents%20pdf/nouvelles/Philomel%20cottage.pdf> (accessed 13 January 2025).
- Cummins, Jim. 2008. Teaching for transfer: Challenging the two solitudes assumptions in bilingual education. In Nancy Hornberger (ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and education*, 1528-1538. New York: Springer.
- Cutrim Schmid, Euline. 2021. 'I think it's boring if you now only speak English': Enhancing learner investment in EFL learning through the use of plurilingual tasks. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*. 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2020.1868476>
- De Angelis, Gessica. 2011. Teachers' beliefs about the role of prior language knowledge in learning and how these influence teaching practices. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 8(3). 216-234. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2011.560669>
- De Backer, Fauve, Stef Slembrouck & Piet Van Avermaet. 2020. Functional use of multilingualism in assessment: Opportunities and challenges. *Research Notes* 78. 35-43.
- De Wever, Bram, Tammy Schellens, Martin Valcke & HildeVan Keer. 2006. Content analysis schemes to analyze transcripts of online asynchronous discussion groups: A review. *Computers and Education* 46. 6-28. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2005.04.005>

- Dendrinios, Bessie. 2019. Multilingual testing and assessment for plurilingual education. 'MultiTest' ECSPM position paper. 1-12 <http://ecspm.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/MultiTest.pdf> (accessed 9 September 2024).
- Dörnyei, Zoltan. 2007. *Research methods in Applied Linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Duarte, Joana & Ingrid Gogolin. 2013. Linguistic superdiversity in educational institutions. In Joana Duarte & Ingrid Gogolin (eds.), *Linguistic superdiversity in urban areas. Research approaches*, 1-24. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/hslid.2.02dua>
- Duarte, Joana & Mirjam Günther-van der Meij. 2020. Multilingual interaction in secondary education in the Netherlands: A translanguaging approach. In Christiane Kirsch & Joana Duarte (eds.), *Multilingual approaches for teaching and learning: From acknowledging to capitalising on multilingualism in European mainstream education*, 75-93. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429059674-7>
- Flognfeldt, Mona E., Dina Tsagari, Dragana Šurkalović & Therese Tishakov. 2020. The practice of assessing Norwegian and English language proficiency in multilingual elementary school classrooms in Norway. *Language Assessment Quarterly* 17(4). 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2020.1827409>
- Gorter, Durk & Jasone Cenoz. 2017. Language education policy and multilingual assessment. *Language and Education* 31(3). 231-248. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2016.1261892>
- Inbar-Lourie, Ofra. 2017. Language assessment literacy. In Elana Shohamy, Ilana G. Or & Stephen May (eds.), *Language testing and assessment. Encyclopedia of language and education*, 257-271. Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02261-1_19
- Hashim, Noor Aneis & Nurahimah Mohd Yusoff. 2021. The use of reflective practice towards achieving effective English language teaching at primary schools. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education* 10(1). 364-373. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i1.20956>
- Harsch, Claudia & Sibylle Seyfer. 2020. Marrying achievement with proficiency – Developing and validating a local CEFR-based writing checklist. *Assessing Writing* 43. 1-15. ELSEVIER. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2019.100433>
- Lavidas, Konstantinos, Stamatios Papadakis, Dionysios Manesis, Anastasia Sofia Grigoriadou & Vasilis Gialamas. 2022. The effects of social desirability on students' self-reports in two social contexts: Lectures vs. lectures and lab classes. *Information* 13(10). 491. <https://doi.org/10.3390/info13100491>
- Lopez, Alexis A., Turkan Sultan & Danielle Guzman-Orth. 2017. Assessing multilingual competence. In Elana Shohamy, Ilana Or & Stephen May (eds.), *Language testing and assessment. Encyclopedia of language and education*, 1-12. Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02261-1_6
- Myhre, Marthe Handå, Olena Muradyan & Oksana Nekhaienko. 2021. Educational reform and language policy in Ukraine: Implementation in the border regions. In Aadne Aasland & Sabine Kropp, (eds.), *The accommodation of regional and ethno-cultural diversity in Ukraine. Federalism and internal conflicts*, 171-209. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-80971-3_7
- North, Brian & Enrica Piccardo. 2016. *Developing illustrative descriptors of aspects of mediation for the common European framework of reference (CEFR)*. Strasbourg: COE.
- North, Brian & Enrica Piccardo. 2017. Mediation and the social and linguistic integration of migrants: Updating the CEFR descriptors. In Jean-Claude Beacco, Hans-Jürgen Krumm, David Little & Philia Thalgott (eds.), *The Linguistic integration of adult migrants / L'intégration linguistique des migrants adultes: Some lessons from research / Les enseignements de la recherche*, 83-90. Berlin & Boston: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110477498-011>
- North, Brian & Enrica Piccardo. 2023. Plurilingualism and assessment. In Silvia Melo-Pfeifer & Christian Ollivier (eds.), *Assessment of plurilingual competence and plurilingual learners in educational settings. Educative issues and empirical approaches*, 178-194. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003177197-14>

- Osidak, Viktoriia & Maryana Natsiuk. 2024. Towards 21st century multilingualism in Ukraine: The present landscape. In Karin Vogt & Bassey Edem Antia (eds.), *Multilingual assessment - finding the nexus?*, 259-284. Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Piccardo, Enrica & Brian North. 2019. Developing new CEFR descriptor scales and expanding the existing ones: Constructs, approaches and methodologies. *Zeitschrift für Fremdsprachenforschung* 30(2). 143-161.
- Poehner, Matthew E. & Ofra Inbar-Lourie (eds.). 2020. *Toward a reconceptualization of second language classroom assessment: Praxis and researcher-teacher partnership*. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland AG. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-35081-9>
- Schissel, Jamie L., Constant Leung, Mario Lopez-Gopar & James R. Davis. 2018. Multilingual learners in language assessment: Assessment design for linguistically diverse communities. *Language and Education* 32(2). 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2018.1429463>
- Seed, Graham. 2020. What is plurilingualism and what does it mean for language assessment? *Research Notes* 78. 5-15.
- Seed, Graham & Martine Holland. 2020. Taking account of plurilingualism in Cambridge Assessment English products and services. *Research Notes* 78. 16-25.
- Simensen, Aud Marit. 2007 [1998]. *Teaching a foreign language: Principles and procedures*, 2nd edn. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Sridhar, Sankaran Narayanan & Kamal Krishna Sridhar. 2018. Mixing, multilingualism, and intelligibility. *World Englishes* 37. 511-522. WILEY. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12340>
- Stathopoulou, Maria. 2020. The new CEFR descriptors for the assessment of written mediation: Exploring their applicability in a local context in an effort towards multilingual testing. *CEFR Journal - Research and Practice* 2. 40-78. <https://doi.org/10.37546/JALTSIG.CEFR2-3>
- Studer, Patrick & Paul Kelly. 2023. From monologue to dialogue: Opening Teachers' minds to authentic interaction with students. *Journal of Multilingual Theory and Practice* 4(1). 117-138
- Tai, Kevin W. H. & Chiu-Yin (Cathy) Wong. 2022. Empowering students through the construction of translanguaging space in an English as a first language classroom. *Applied Linguistics* 20. 1-53. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amac069>
- Tsagari, Dina, Kirstin Reed & Lucilla Lopriore. 2023. Teacher beliefs and practices of language assessment in the context of English as a lingua franca (ELF): Insights from a CPD course. *Languages* 8(58). 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages8010058>
- Vogt, Karin. 2024. Teaching (foreign) languages in multilingual contexts – a European contextualization. In Karin Vogt, & Bassey Edem Antia (eds.), *Multilingual assessment - finding the nexus*, 63-94. Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Vogt, Karin, Viktoriia Osidak & Olga Kvasova. 2022. Understanding Ukrainian university teacher's familiarity with the CEFR/CV: Establishing university teacher's profile in a local context. *Ars Linguodidacticae* 9. 4-22. <https://doi.org/10.17721/2663-0303.2022.1.01>
- Younas, Ahtisham, Sergi Fabregues, Angela Durante, Elsa Lucia Escalante, Shahzad Inayat & Parveen Ali. 2023. Proposing the "MIRACLE" narrative framework for providing thick description in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 22. 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069221147162>

8 Biographies

Viktoriia Osidak, a PhD holder in Education, is an Associate Professor at Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine. She has authored numerous publications, with an emphasis on alternative assessment strategies to enhance L2 learning and teaching. Her research interests lie within Teaching English as a Foreign Language, multilingualism and Language Testing and Assessment.

Karin Vogt is a professor at Heidelberg University of Education. Among her research interests are the CEFR/CV, language testing and assessment, Vocationally-Oriented Language Learning and inclusive foreign language teaching. She is the author of numerous publications on different aspects related to Teaching English as a Foreign Language. Currently she is involved in research projects on multilingual and multimodal language assessment and inclusive foreign language teaching.

Maryana Natsiuk, a PhD holder in Education, Associate Professor at the Department of Methodology of Teaching Ukrainian and Foreign Languages and Literature, Educational and Scientific Institute of Philology, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine. The scientific interests include teaching EFL, innovative methods of teaching foreign languages, teaching culture, multilingualism. She is the author of numerous publications on different aspects related to Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

Appendix A

Analysis of the test against such criteria as targeted skills, task characteristics, the language of input, the language of student performance, and the type of assessment.

University 1: Test #1: General English for communication	
Year/ programme	1 st to 3 rd year of Bachelor, B1+ - B2+ at CEFR Level
Skills	Speaking, writing (opinion essay), grammar (state the difference in meaning, paraphrase/ find and correct the mistake), vocabulary (translation)
Task characteristics	Monolingual, bilingual, communicative, generic, aims at an ideal native-speaker language use
Input	English, Ukrainian
Output	English
Mode of assessment	Summative
University 1: Test #2: General English for communication	
Year/ programme	1 st to 4 th year of Bachelor, B1+ - B2+ at CEFR Level
Skills	Interaction; mediation (Explaining data/ image); speaking; writing (an opinion essay), grammar (language focus tasks; syntactic analysis of a sentence)
Task characteristics	Monolingual, isolated, communicative, generic, aimed at an ideal native speaker language use
Input	English
Output	English
Mode of assessment	Summative
University 1: Test #3: English for Business Communication	
Year/ programme	4 th year of Bachelor, B2+ - C1 at CEFR Level
Skills	Reading into speaking, reading into writing, grammar test (language focus tasks, syntactical analysis of the sentence)
Task characteristics	Monolingual, integrated, communicative, generic, aims at an ideal native speaker language use
Input	English
Output	English
Mode of assessment	Standardised testing system

University 2: Test 1: English for professional purposes - consists of two parts, includes exams of winter and spring terms	
Year/ programme	1 st year, Bachelor programme, B1+ - B2+ at CEFR Level
Skills	Reading into writing, speaking, interaction, translation from English into Ukrainian, grammar.
Task characteristics	Monolingual, bilingual, targets isolated skills, integrated communicative, generic, aims at ideal native speaker language use
Input	English
Output	English, Ukrainian
Mode of assessment	Summative
University 2: Test 2: English for professional purposes - consists of two parts, includes exams of winter and spring terms	
Year/ programme	4 th year of Bachelor, B2+ - C1 at CEFR Level
Skills	Mediation, writing, translation from English into Ukrainian, grammar.
Task characteristics	Monolingual/ bilingual, targets isolated/ integrated skills, communicative/ discrete, generic, aims at ideal native speaker language use
Input	English
Output	English, Ukrainian
Mode of assessment	Summative
University 2: Test 3: English Communication Course	
Year/ programme	1 st year Master, C1 at CEFR Level
Skills	Mediation, speaking, translation from English into Ukrainian, grammar.
Task characteristics	Monolingual/ bilingual, targets isolated/ integrated skills, communicative/ discrete, generic, aims at ideal native speaker language use
Input	English
Output	English, Ukrainian
Mode of assessment	Summative
University 2, test 4: Speak English Professionally Course	
Year/ programme	1 st year, Master, C1 at CEFR Level
Skills	Mediation (relaying specific information), speaking, writing, translation from English into Ukrainian, vocabulary.
Task characteristics	Monolingual/ bilingual, targets isolated/ integrated skills, communicative/ discrete, generic, aims at ideal native speaker language use
Input	English
Output	English, Ukrainian
Mode of assessment	Summative
University 3, Test 1: A practical English Course	
Year/ programme	1 st year, Bachelor, B1+-B2 at CEFR Level
Skills	Speaking/ Interaction, a language focus test (vocabulary and grammar)
Task characteristics	Monolingual targets isolated skills, communicative/discrete, generic, aims at an ideal native speaker language use
Input	English
Output	English
Mode of assessment	Ongoing, formative (a project)/ summative

Appendix B

The analysis of languages in tests to assess language proficiency of pre-service teachers

Years 1-3, Bachelor	3 tests	5 tasks	Languages involved
University 1: Test #1: General English for communication	Speaking	1	in one language (English)
	Writing an essay	1	in one language (English)
	Grammar	2	in one language (English)
	Vocabulary (translation)	1	in two languages (Ukrainian, English)
Years 1-4, Bachelor	4 tests	6 tasks	Languages involved
University 1: Test #2: General English for communication	Interaction	1	in one language (English)
	Mediation: Explaining data/ image	1	in one language (English)
	Speaking	1	in one language (English)
	Writing an essay	1	in one language (English)
	Grammar	2	in one language (English)
Year 4, Bachelor	1 test	4 tasks	Languages involved
University 1: Test #3: English for Business Communication	Mediation: Relaying specific information in speaking	1	in one language (English)
	Mediation: Relaying specific information in writing	1	in one language (English)
	Grammar- language focus tasks, syntactic analysis of the sentence	2	in one language (English)
Year 1, Bachelor	2 tests	5 tasks	Languages involved
University 2: Test 1: English for professional purposes	Translating a written text	1	In two languages (Ukrainian, English)
	Mediation: Relaying information	1	in one language (English)
	Mediating: Expressing a personal response	1	in one language (English)
	Interaction	1	in one language (English)
	Grammar	1	in one language (English)
Year 4, Bachelor	1 test	5 tasks	Languages involved
University 2: Test : English for professional purposes	Translating a written text	1	In two languages (Ukrainian, English)
	Mediation: Relaying specific information	1	in one language (English)
	Mediation: Expressing a personal response	1	in one language (English)
	Interaction	1	in one language (English)
	Grammar	1	in one language (English)

Year 1, Master	1 test	5 tasks	Languages involved
University 2: Test 3: English Communication Course	Translating a written text	1	In two languages (Ukrainian, English)
	Mediation: Relaying specific information	1	in one language (English)
	Mediation: Expressing a personal response	1	in one language (English)
	Grammar	2	in one language (English)
Year 1, Master	1 test	6 tasks	involved Languages
University 2, test 4: Speak English Professionally Course	Translating a written text	1	In two languages (Ukrainian into English)
	Mediation: Relaying specific information	1	in one language (English)
	Speaking	1	in one language (English)
	Mediation: Relaying specific information in writing	1	In two languages (Ukrainian into English)
	Grammar	1	in one language (English)
	Vocabulary	1	in one language (English)
Year 1, Master	1 test	1 tasks	Languages involved
University 3, Test 1: A practical English Course	Speaking: A project with a built-in progression	1	in one language (English)

Appendix C

Selecting and adapting relevant descriptors from the CEFR/CV to the assessment task: Prepare a collaborative group project that incorporates the topics, vocabulary, and grammar structures learned throughout the course. In addition to the course material, utilise podcasts, interviews, videos, and blogs in other languages that you know (including L1) related to the course topics. The project should be presented in English and can take the form of a video, performance, or presentation. Present a reference list of the sources used.

Criteria	Level	Descriptors from the CEFR/CV	Adaptation of the descriptors
Overall mediation	B2+	Can establish a supportive environment for sharing ideas and facilitate discussion of delicate issues, showing appreciation of different perspectives, encouraging people to explore issues and adjusting sensitively the way they express things. Can build on others' ideas, making suggestions for ways forward. Can convey the main content of well-structured but long and propositionally complex texts on subjects within their fields of professional, academic and personal interest, clarifying the opinions and purposes of speakers/signers (COE 2020: 92).	Can establish a supportive environment for sharing ideas and facilitate discussion of delicate issues, which can arise in the process of collating multilingual sources, showing appreciation of different perspectives, encouraging people to explore issues and adjusting sensitively the way they express things. Can build on others' ideas, making suggestions for ways forward. Can convey the main content of well-structured but long and propositionally complex texts on subjects within the given task.
Relaying specific information in speech or sign	B2+	Can relay (in Language B) which presentations given (in Language A) at a conference, or which articles in a book (in Language A) are particularly relevant for a specific purpose (COE 2020: 94).	Can relay (in English) which presentations, video, articles given (in English, Ukrainian and other languages) are particularly relevant for a specific purpose
Processing text	B2+	Can summarise clearly in well-structured language (in Language B) the information and arguments contained in complex texts (in Language A) on a wide range of subjects related to their fields of interest and specialisation (COE 2020: 99).	Can summarise clearly in well-structured language (in English) the information and arguments contained in complex texts (in English, Ukrainian and other languages) on a wide range of subjects related to their task.
Processing text	B2	Can synthesise and report (in Language B) information and arguments from a number of sources (in Language A) (COE 2020: 100).	Can synthesise and report (in English) information and arguments from a number of sources (in English, Ukrainian and other languages).

Criteria	Level	Descriptors from the CEFR/CV	Adaptation of the descriptors
Facilitating collaborative interaction with peers	B2+	Can act as rapporteur in a group discussion, noting ideas and decisions, discussing these with the group and later giving a summary of the group's view(s) in a plenary (COE 2020: 110).	No adjustment
Collaborating to construct meaning	B2+	Can contribute to collaborative decision making and problem solving, expressing and co-developing ideas, explaining details and making suggestions for future action (COE 2020: 110).	No adjustment
Strategies to simplify a text: Amplifying a dense text	B2+	Can make concepts on subjects in their fields of interest more accessible by giving concrete examples, recapitulating step by step and repeating the main points (COE 2020: 122).	Can make concepts on subjects in their fields of interest more accessible by giving concrete examples, recapitulating step by step in order to perform the task
Building on pluricultural repertoire	B2	Can, in an intercultural encounter, recognise that what one normally takes for granted in a particular situation is not necessarily shared by others, and can react and express themselves appropriately (COE 2020: 125).	Can, as an intercultural encounter, recognise that what one normally takes for granted in Ukrainian culture is not necessarily shared by others.
Plurilingual comprehension	B2	Can use their knowledge of contrasting genre conventions and textual patterns in languages in their plurilingual repertoire in order to support comprehension (COE 2020: 126).	No adjustment
Building on plurilingual repertoire	B2	Can alternate between languages in their plurilingual repertoire in order to communicate specialised information and issues on a subject in their field of interest to different interlocutors (COE 2020: 128).	Can alternate between Ukrainian and English in their plurilingual repertoire in order to communicate specialised information and issues of their task

Appendix D

Teacher reflection log

Understanding the basic CEFR/CV related concepts

1. What is the difference between multilingualism and plurilingualism?
2. What is your learners' language repertoire?
3. What is the difference between plurilingual and multilingual students?
4. Why is it important to promote the development of plurilingualism in the language classroom and assessment?
5. What is a 'partial' language competence?

Plurilingual practices in the English classroom

6. Do you consider your learners' repertoire?
7. Do you use "a native speaker's standard" as a criterion in language learning?
8. What are the objectives of language education in Ukraine?
9. Does language teaching in Ukraine include developing language students' plurilingualism?

Plurilingual assessment practices in the language classroom

10. Why should approaches to language assessment be reconsidered?
11. Would plurilingual assessment tasks be compatible with your existing assessment framework?