CLIL: Internationalisation or Pedagogical Innovation?

Federica Ricci Garotti - University of Trento, Italy

Abstract

CLIL, the popular acronym for Content and Language Integrated Learning, refers to the learning/teaching of a subject in a foreign language and was first officially introduced in Italy in 2010 with the *Riforma della Scuola Secondaria di secondo grado* and, specifically, in Trentino in 2014 with the *Piano Trentino Trilingue*. In the latter context, the introduction of mandatory CLIL has meant a massive increase in subject teaching in English and in German throughout Trentino schools, from primary to secondary levels. This significant change to the traditional school curriculum has brought to light both the advantages and disadvantages of internationalisation at the didactic level, which is the general focus of this chapter.

Most of the challenges associated with CLIL in the transformation of education in the province of Trentino have not been exclusively related to the linguistic competences of learners, but rather to the wider didactic-pedagogical guidelines provided to teachers for its implementation. In fact, learners, teachers and families are generally very interested in the development of multilingual competences, while the epistemological and didactic reforms necessary for an internationalisation of the curriculum often arouse scepticism, if not outright rejection.

The design and implementation of the Trentino CLIL policy has thus generated a lively scientific debate, one which focuses on three main research questions: (1) Can an understanding of linguistic competence, which is often narrowly conceived as know-how in everyday communication, be broadened and expanded through CLIL? (2) What are the concrete objectives for the development of linguistic competence in non-linguistic subjects? Which of these aims can be realistically achieved by a majority of learners? (3) What are the basic principles that can contribute to the creation of a genuine CLIL epistemology?

This paper examines these questions by presenting the results of a study carried out in Trentino schools as part of the scientific monitoring of the implementation of the province's 2014 CLIL policy, including teacher training for CLIL. The Trentino CLIL plan is a case study of a controversial and complex vision, but one that represents an opportunity for curricular innovation that goes in the direction of the internationalisation of Italian and European schools. Although the case studies analysed here are not strictly linked to EMI contexts in higher education, there is, nevertheless, an implicit connection between CLIL and EMI: the various pedagogical and didactic aspects and critical issues elicited through the introduction of CLIL in a primary and secondary school habitus can also be found in the implementation of EMI in tertiary education. Introducing a foreign language as a vehicle for instruction at all levels of education requires an undeniable change in didactic and pedagogical approaches, which is often difficult to embrace; it is not merely a question of taking on an additional activity, but of a real and profound shift in perspective affecting every single part of the curriculum and all the actors in education. For these reasons, they are worthy of attention and further discussion.

1. CLIL Origins and Meaning

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) was historically born as a European response to non-European language immersion programmes, especially Canadian ones. These programmes have as their objective the formation of a bilingual population in a social context of diglossia, or the defence of the weaker language where a lesser-used language risks being overwhelmed by the dominant majority language as in regions such as Catalonia, the Basque provinces, the Canton of Grisons in Switzerland, the Swedish provinces in Finland, and many others. Basically, CLIL is the teaching and learning of non-linguistic disciplines in a foreign language, a form of education that is not so novel or revolutionary, if we think that it was practiced over 5000 years ago: What was the education in Latin for the children of the Roman Empire who did not have Latin as their first language (L1) if not CLIL? Or the diglossia of numerous parts of Italy (as well as Africa) in which Greek was still spoken (and not Latin)? This created the paradox that led Horace to write in his Epistles: *Graecia capta ferum vincentm cepit? (*2006,

II:1, 156). "A conquered Greece in turn conquered its savage vanquisher" (Author's translation).

This chapter presents the most relevant findings emerging from a study conducted in Trentino, where a political decision by the local government introduced CLIL in German and English in 2014 as an obligatory form of teaching/learning for every class of the Region from primary school onwards. The research project is based on five case studies comprising classroom observations in CLIL classes, questionnaires, focus groups, and interviews with the teachers and learners involved in CLIL. The project was planned and coordinated by me with a research team consisting of five tutors, one for every year group, who were all expert CLIL teachers, certified with a Master's degree in CLIL Methodology from the University of Trento[1]. The results of the empirical research are summarised for each of the five cases, signalling how single realities benefit from CLIL. On the other hand, tensions or critical issues that also emerged in the analysis of these individual cases help to shed light on the overall Italian school system, as discussed below.

By taking into account both the strengths and weaknesses revealed through the study, a favourable context for CLIL to thrive in the Italian school system and more generally can be defined. The specific aspects examined in the study include: the importance of the language of and in the discipline; the disciplinary programme (as both a constraint and a resource); the relationship between Italian and the foreign language in CLIL; classroom interaction; the co-presence (in some cases co-teaching) of the subject teacher and foreign language teacher. The analysis of findings is followed by a brief conclusion which, on the basis of the data presented, seeks to answer two research questions: Is the Italian school system ready for CLIL? What are the most favourable conditions for CLIL in Italy and abroad?

_____

1   For the scientific analysis and results of the project, see Federica Ricci Garotti (2019).

2. Disciplinary Language is Not (Only) Terminology

A critical issue that emerged from the classroom observations conducted centres on the language used in CLIL, which often, especially in lower secondary school (years 6, 7 and 8) where learners have weak L2 skills, is limited to a long list of subject-specific terms to memorize. This approach obviously requires a great mnemonic effort on the part of learners as well as the families who support them in their homework.

Subject teachers would no doubt agree that their own disciplines cannot be reduced simply to a nomenclature, or list of technical terms for which it is deemed sufficient to acquire the specific terminology rather than the underlying concepts. Although the expression of ideas obviously requires the knowledge and use of specific terms from that discipline, these are not the main focus of the teaching/learning process across subjects. However, using generic or everyday language in the context of a disciplinary lesson would imply sacrificing the specific conceptual dimension of the discipline. For example, accepting an expression such as 'to have strength' in a physics lesson would mean renouncing the discipline-specific concept being expressed (i.e. to exert a force), as Leisen (2004) illustrates. Such an expression might not require much mnemonic effort, but it implies an exhaustive process of indirectly approaching or circling an understanding of specific phenomena. The problem is, therefore, not a linguistic one per se, but a disciplinary one. Consequently, a disciplinary problem must be solved through the means of disciplinary teaching, not with the strategies of language teaching, and certainly not with a long list of words applied to, at best, vaguely understood concepts.

Insisting above all on accurate terminology, as if that were the only concern of CLIL, means using a mainly demonstrative and non-argumentative form of language — showing or describing phenomena — and then being satisfied with the verbal, equally demonstrative, reproductions of learners. By contrast, a positive example emerging from one of the examined cases demonstrates the vast potential of a CLIL lesson that uses lexis to draw attention to concepts. By focusing on the names for different types of leaves, drawing attention to their individual etymologies and definitions, a CLIL

lesson adopts an inductive strategy that supports the understanding of the meaning (content) through an understanding of the form (language). In this way, the teacher ensures that the term is memorised only when associated with the information; clearly, for this type of activity, the combined use of verbal and non-verbal language is highly recommended. This combination of conceptual meaning and linguistic form lies at the vital centre of CLIL, in which the two components are absolutely inseparable: without reflection on the form, the concept is incomprehensible, whereas an abstract understanding of the concept, when not recorded through the form, does not facilitate acquisition.

In fact, Leisen (2004) defined the union of form and meaning as a language-sensitive lesson but, in reality, it is simply the awareness needed for the learning/teaching of any discipline, which consists in concepts expressed through subject-specific vocabulary (possibly high level) that is not generic. Reflections on language and linguistic awareness have long been the sole prerogative of language teachers, as if the profound acquisition of disciplinary concepts were foreign to the language that contributes to defining them. Presenting content as a list of terms works exclusively in a lesson that does not care at all about the acquisition of concepts. Otherwise the separation of form and meaning has no reason: how can one learn a form without having learned its meaning, and vice versa?

3. Myths Concerning CLIL Programmes

3.1 Time

CLIL is never quick. In fact, teaching/learning a discipline in L2 takes a long time because reactions are slower and the process of understanding is less predictable. For this reason, it is necessary to dwell longer and with greater depth on the same concepts. The programme is often penalised by time pressures; instead, it needs to be planned in its entirety, followed through in full, and not curtailed, simplified or compressed. This presents a challenge that is not always consciously understood and is rarely verbalised, but one that is perceived by researchers who often see CLIL suffer as a consequence of ac-

cumulated classroom activities pursued frenetically, or from overly ambitious planning, perhaps too stringent in its level of detail.

3.2 Planning

Another factor that affects the delivery of CLIL is the lack of a CLIL system — a clear programme to follow — especially in Italy where there is no binding ministerial syllabus for CLIL, but rather some suggested topics to cover, recommendations and indications based on others' experiences. This is a concern for teachers used to being accountable for covering specific programme content over the course of a school year.

At the basis of CLIL programme anxiety lies the way in which the activities to be carried out in the classroom are planned. The teaching practices observed in the empirical research did not show a predilection for exercises considered traditional compared to more active teaching: on the contrary, the teachers often undertook a great variety of activities, each corresponding to as many thinking skills put into play[2]. This hyperactivity was not always guided by a central nucleus, a macro-objective of competences towards which the numerous activities were directed. The result often seemed to be one of excess, an accumulation of tasks without a clear or overarching goal.

This problem is one of planning, not one of didactic practices. If the direction of the course or the CLIL syllabus is not accurate, a teacher might inadvertently take too much time for a series of activities, activities not coordinated or connected with each other, especially if their goal is not declared. After all, planning has always been the most important action, much more so than didactic practices which are almost directly a consequence and application of teaching (and consequently also of learning). Here, the planning concern begins to touch on the issue of which competences learners actually acquire and the extent to which they master these.

---

2 For an analysis of the distinction between traditional and active-interactive tasks, see David Nunan (1993).

3.3 Tasks

The difficulty of planning suitable tasks, not only for CLIL but in general, at an appropriate level for learners that stretches their existing knowledge and skills, is highlighted by numerous scientific studies that address the concept of *task*. According to Kumaradivelu (1993), the task has a much higher goal than the activity, which in turn is much broader and more comprehensive than the exercise. In this sense, the task is defined as an activity based on meaning: the learners are concerned above all with activating a process of understanding, of sharing the meaning and, only incidentally, do they focus on linguistic forms, and this is always limited to what is required for the completion of the task.

A positive example emerges from one of the case studies in which Art is taught in German in lower secondary school. To fully understand the characteristics of the works of art studied, the learners were asked to draw relations between the antithetical scenes from various frescoes. For example: "The bride is beautiful" juxtaposed with "No one celebrates the bride". The task was assigned and carried out in L2 in pairs using a worksheet.

This task belongs to the category defined by Long (1981) as a task with two outputs: one activity requires a high cognitive competence (compare and evaluate), and does not necessarily have a single solution (the contrasts drawn between scenes could concern more than one pair of scenes or different scenes could be considered antithetical by the teachers). The individual perception of the learners before such an open-ended task leads to a wider communication among them compared to a single-solution task.

For the same reason, a problem-solving task, which generally has a single solution, produces less interaction between students compared to a discussion or debate, in which everyone can present several propositions, as illustrated by Duff (1986). Even the open questions (Why? How?) are highly effective in creating opportunities for interactions that go beyond a mere description or a combination of description and images. This positive outcome was observed in a Science in English class through the attribution of meaning to Latin terms relating to the values in force in ancient Rome: *iustitia, virtus, equitas*, instead of their simple explanation (case study History in German in upper secondary school).

In the case studies, missed opportunities were also observed. For example, tasks limited to a mechanical performance of the exercise: combining descriptions already formulated by the teacher with images; requesting the description of an image in plenary; completing a table with information; completing a conceptual map. All these exercises could easily become tasks if the rationale that guided them was not simply concerned with naming a phenomenon or providing some information, but rather was focused on reworking the information, adding a dose of difficulty that supports the construction of both linguistic and disciplinary competences.

The group settings chosen to carry out tasks in the classrooms are a topic that cannot be fully explored here due to space but deserve a separate discussion. In general, a lot of interaction was observed in the CLIL classes, but this was mostly based on the plenary context of whole-class interaction, in which most of the linguistic production can be attributed to the teacher providing the input. Groups and pairs are organised, but almost always to carry out fairly simple and straightforward exercises, as if the teacher did not fully trust the ability of learners to manage more complex tasks autonomously in their groups. This missed opportunity links back to what has already been said about programme anxiety: the teacher is concerned with doing a lot, often jumping from one cognitive goal to another and quickly compressing tasks, instead of ensuring an in-depth understanding of the concepts covered through a slower and more detailed elaboration and discussion.

4. Nostalgia for L1

With CLIL the use of the foreign language is not a simulation, but rather it takes place in an authentic context of usage; therefore, the learning situation is close to that of acquisition and moves away from that of learning. Studies by Lasagabaster and Sierra (2009) and Coonan (2007) suggest that this authenticity is responsible for increased motivation on the part of students in CLIL classes. That said, it remains difficult to generalise about the motivation of students in the Trentino context; this has, in fact, proven to be one of

the most variable elements of the CLIL practices observed, dependent on a number of contextual factors, including: the social context, the political context of decisions, the attitude towards the specific language of study, and other causes. All of these factors play a role in determining the motivation of the CLIL learners who participated in the study.

On the issue of authenticity, the authentic use of the foreign language in the CLIL environment remains one of its strongest advantages. To see the advantage of CLIL only in terms of an increased exposure to the foreign language is too limited and misses the point: the advantage does not consist only in increased hours of instruction, but also in the quality of the contextualised use of language: the foreign language is used in a learning context that does justice to what is the natural (not forced) function of linguistic communication.

However, the L1 also plays a critical role in the CLIL lesson. In fact, it has been observed that the L1 is much more present than necessary in CLIL, particularly in the interventions desired or programmed by the subject teacher, when the subject specialist is in co-presence with the teacher of L2. Furthermore, in at least two of the cases observed, L1 is regularly used to repeat or re-articulate (and in some cases translate) what is proposed in L2.

In the CLIL literature, few studies address the use of L1 since the programme was created, as previously mentioned, in order to encourage the development of L2 skills, including subject-specific ones. According to Bonnet (2012), learning/acquisition of disciplinary concepts does not depend on the use of the L1, but on a deep understanding of concepts, regardless of the language used. However, it cannot be said that language has no weight in conceptual construction and understanding, just as it would be incorrect to underestimate the importance that L1 inevitably has in the learning process of disciplines. But how and when can L1 be used in CLIL without losing the sense of bilingual teaching, in other words, without undermining the integration between disciplinary and L2 competences? And most importantly, why do it at all? The CLIL teacher should, in the planning of a CLIL programme, start by asking these questions.

Reported below are some of the considerations that emerged in the CLIL research conducted in Trentino, which can be used to support an analysis of the role of the L1 in CLIL classes.

a) the L1 certainly plays a role of support and resource, especially affective support for learners. Starting from L1 is a way to ensure that students have fully understood and puts the learner in a safe situation that allows him/her to experiment in L2. Many scholars argue that this should happen only and exclusively in the moments in which learners are experiencing difficulty or struggling, but in CLIL this might not be the rule;

b) the assumption is that CLIL teachers have a competence in two languages which allows them to move easily from one language to another, but that students do not. As Lasagabaster (2013) states, the resource is the teacher's bilingualism, which presupposes that (i) the teacher has the confidence of his/her own competence in both languages and (ii) the teacher knows how to use it as a resource in relation to the needs of the learner;

c) the ideal and also productive passage of the code-switching is the reception in L1 (for example reading and material in L1/ production in L2/ written or/and oral activities on the acquired material): according to Mehisto (2012) this transfer action allows learners to test themselves starting from a position of safety (having understood in L1) and subsequently activate the L2 acquisition process (through production in L2);

d) L1 is an important resource especially in the early CLIL years and in contexts with low L2 competence (primary and lower secondary school); however, even in these cases, the use of L1 could be limited to the necessary moments only: when dealing with very abstract concepts; to save time; when the language level of the class must be built from scratch; to raise the motivation and avoid the frustration of learners.

Based on these findings, the use of L1 should not be prohibited in CLIL lessons, but it should be inserted in a targeted and not indiscriminate way. Linguistic research has shown that mere quantitative exposure to L2 is not, in itself, sufficient for acquiring L2 competence. To create conditions for the latter, input must make sense to the learners, be comprehensible and raise the level of their prior skills by a sustainable degree. This is the difference be-

tween the lesson in a foreign language and the CLIL lesson. The denomination of CLIL used in German-speaking contexts, namely "bilingual disciplinary lesson" (*bilingualer Fachunterricht*), is applicable more widely and illustrates the importance of assigning a role to L1 which does not totally erase it or prohibit its use.

However, the difference between an anxiogenic use and a necessary use of L1 in CLIL is equally evident. In many of the cases observed, the input offered in L1 was a sort of unnecessary help and, consequently, an opportunity for linguistic growth denied to learners. For example, explaining an experiment first in L1 and then re-explaining it in L2 makes no sense as it is an activity which, in itself, contains evidence that can help to increase the level of reasoning and reflection of the learners without the need to resort to L1. Furthermore, providing glossaries with translation is not a stimulus to bilingualism or to reflection on languages, but a subtraction of sustainable complexity through which students can learn.

Many activities carried out entirely in L2 in the same classes have shown that even middle school students are able to follow and respond in L2, if the input is understandable and the level of difficulty is appropriate. The forced return to L1, in these cases, further discredits both CLIL and learners since it does not perceive them as capable of facing more complex learning paths. The L1 can be part of CLIL, as long as it is not seen as a shortcut or a reduction of complexity, but as a support to better face the challenges of multilingual learning.

5. Lack of Interaction Between Learners

The lack of interaction between learners was observed in all case studies. However, under the stimulus of the tutors, this is perhaps the aspect that ultimately underwent the greatest change in practice. Interactive activities in the classroom saw a progressive increase, especially during laboratory activities, such as an experiment, which lends itself to an active seminar atmosphere. The CLIL teachers received some suggestions from the tutors, including the invitation to create interactive environments: for example, they re-

placed the closed plenary stimulus questions with more open ones: why? how? instead of who? what? when?

There were also many missed opportunities, such as that of an activity in a History lesson, during which the students had to write down some values reported in a text (case study: History in German in lower secondary school). The tutor suggested that this activity should be broadened by adding an autonomous contribution from students; for example, by making them choose some values that they considered essential in historical sources. Then the list of choices could have become the basis for a comparison between ideas and choices.

Obviously, this change would also have led to an increase in the cognitive and linguistic levels. CLIL forces teachers to raise the level, precisely because of its propensity to actively use the combination of language-dialogue / discipline-meanings-concepts. This is one of the most generous benefits of CLIL that also has a positive effect in the teaching of disciplines tout court. It involves two factors: the courage to demand higher-quality performances (and not to stop at the standard ones) and an ability to trust the reactions of students. Where efforts have been made, the results have been positive. The annotation of a teacher reported here verbatim, sheds light on why CLIL can contribute more than the discipline lesson in L1 to achieve a higher level: "children with a more scholastic and more rigid mentality have greater difficulty in CLIL: they struggle to reflect and they prefer to have everything ready instead of building their own knowledge."

But acquisition mainly consists in building a skill that was not there before, not in finding what has already been built.

6. An Italian Hallmark: The Co-Presence of Teachers

The co-presence of teachers and, in some cases, active co-teaching is the true defining trait of the Trentino CLIL approach and perhaps, more generally, of CLIL in the Italian national context. This phenomenon is closely connected to the lack of a CLIL training system that begins with initial teacher training and goes through various stages of professional development for in-service

teachers. Compared to other countries, teachers in Italy are trained in only one discipline for post-primary education. In this context, foreign languages are considered a discipline and not a communication tool for other types of knowledge. In the Italian system, there is no figure of a teacher trained to teach both languages and a non-linguistic discipline, except in the rare cases of people who possess two degrees and/or two teaching qualifications, of which at least one is in foreign languages. In actual fact, Italy is traditionally one of the countries whose population has had poor language skills. The latest European data from 2017 provide a fairly bleak picture of the decade from 2006-2015[3]. It is very likely that things have more recently changed for the better, and even more that they will change with the next generations accustomed to mobility thanks to international programmes of study.

Yet the current context presents the system with a difficult choice: is it easier to train teachers in L2 or to train L2 teachers in a discipline in order to run bilingual programmes? To date, the Italian education system has chosen, rightly or wrongly, the first path; this choice is based, in part, on what is happening elsewhere in Europe, despite the fact that initial teacher training takes place in a completely different way in other European countries. In Italy, the initial training of CLIL teachers was entrusted to the universities and led to a fairly limited number of teachers (enrolled on a voluntary basis and without much incentive) actually completing the training course.

To cover the massive need created by the sudden introduction of Trentino's ambitious plan for trilingualism in 2014, it was often necessary to resort to a system of co-presence, meaning the simultaneous presence in the classroom of the L2 teacher and the non-linguistic subject teacher, to guarantee CLIL in German and English. This can be seen as a generous solution from the institutional point of view, doubling the costs by having to pay two

---

3   The ISTAT annual report (2017), whose statistics refer to 2015, signals that over 60% of students have knowledge of at least one language other than their mother tongue. Between 2006 and 2015, the percent of those who know at least one foreign language remained the same in the age group between 6 and 24 years, but it is growing in all other age groups. This data reports a positive increase in quantity, but decidedly negative in quality: in fact the level of knowledge of foreign languages declared by participants is definitely modest: 11% of those who declare knowledge of at least one language define their level of competence as "excellent", 29% describe it as "good", while 36% declare their knowledge as "just sufficient", and 23.5% confess to having a "poor" level.

teachers for the same hour of instruction; a plan that consequently requires reorganising the school's timetable to permit the simultaneous presence of teachers cooperating in the same CLIL lesson. Among the advantages of this approach is the mutual support that the presence of two teachers offers for classroom management, especially in the most problematic contexts. Another (necessary) advantage is the common planning time allocated to teachers, which enriches the skills of both. In fact, in the case studies observed, all participating teachers explicitly signalled this advantage of CLIL.

On the other hand, some critical issues concern the duties related to the roles of the two CLIL teachers, as well as the precise definition of these roles. Where the roles were not clarified in the planning phase, some confusion was noted in class, which undoubtedly impacted students, giving the lesson a lack of clear direction. In one extreme case, although a CLIL course was formally shared by two teachers, one in effect delegated all the responsibility for the planning and management to the other, only to later claim ownership of the course in the evaluation phase. This clearly hostile attitude, perhaps due to a boycotting of CLIL, warrants a specific intervention by the school principal.

Notwithstanding this outlying case, the general result for the system of co-presence suggests a high potential for learning, provided that three conditions are met from the outset: detailed and shared planning; distinct and well-defined roles; equally shared responsibilities and duties. Without prejudice to these conditions, co-teaching or co-presence can prove to be value-added, as much as L2 is in the non-linguistic subject lesson.

The fact remains that Trentino is a special case; in other Italian regions, co-presence is a luxury that school administrators simply cannot afford. Consequently, the uncertainty over how to recruit and train teachers remains extremely relevant: whether to favour teachers' subject-specific knowledge or linguistic knowledge and competences. Linguists know very well that a foreign language certification is not enough to be able to move easily within that language; teachers who specialise in non-linguistic subjects are equally well aware that only an authentic grasp of the foundations and specific epistemologies of a discipline make someone a good teacher of that

subject. A collaboration between these two actors is, therefore, fundamental, regardless of who is named as the CLIL teacher.

The difficulty in choosing and training CLIL teachers is linked to financial and trade union reasons. Two risks need to be mentioned here: (1) the linguistic competence of the CLIL teacher must necessarily be high, otherwise a cost-benefit ratio is decidedly disadvantaged in favour of the former; (2) a precondition for CLIL is a teacher's willingness to be open to methodologies that go beyond the traditional lesson and to adopt strategies for active, laboratorial, interactive, experimental and constructive teaching/learning, especially (but not only) linked to aspects that have been analysed in the previous sections.

7. Conclusion – Are We Ready for CLIL?

Every aspect listed as a potential advantage of CLIL from a scientific perspective represents, in diametric opposition, a drawback in real terms. For example, the concentration on meaning rather than on the form of the foreign language can be misunderstood and interpreted as laxity in relation to the linguistic forms used by both teachers and students; this is especially of concern to teachers who are unsure of their L2 proficiency. Likewise, maximizing exposure in L2 can result in the simplification or dilution of subject-specific concepts, undermining the rigour of learning a non-linguistic discipline. Moreover, the insistence on classroom interaction to favour L2 development can become a mechanical application of group work, without the epistemological knowledge of cooperative learning, or a mere repetition of sentences previously written and memorised. Since CLIL is very demanding and complex, the risks of simplification on either side are always lurking.

In addition to the purely didactic recommendations and to the scientific reflections that accompanied the analysis of the five cases in the Trentino study, the research findings highlight several institutional concerns which offer further food for thought on ways to improve the implementation of CLIL in the province's schools; these points, by extension, are of relevance to *any* context offering a CLIL curriculum, including higher education.

a) Alone or in co-presence, the CLIL teacher works more and more deeply. S/he is not satisfied with a nomenclature-based form of planning, reliance on a textbook, or the transmission and return of information in a closed cycle. The extra effort required by CLIL teachers means that they should be recognised for the greater quantity and quality of their workload. The terms of such recognition cannot be explored here due to lack of space; it is certain, however, that such compensation and recognition must be recognised and implemented if the intention is to offer CLIL in schools.

b) CLIL teachers must come from a homogeneous training system with collective input from key local institutions: universities, training institutes and individual schools must work in synergy and not entrust training to independently selected experts without a prior sharing of the CLIL guidelines.

c) A CLIL teacher *is* a discipline teacher with a high competence in L2 (certified) but often experiences insecurity regarding maintaining such competence over time. It would, therefore, be appropriate to provide for regular periods abroad with specific CLIL training courses and/or advanced-level language courses.

d) Any educational institution wishing to implement CLIL courses is required to comply with this decision once it has been taken. Boycotting the programme, in one way or another, belittling it, openly criticising CLIL should not be tolerated if information, training and consultations have been carried out before the decision is taken. Collegiality is key to the success of any curricular innovation. Trade union or other non-didactic disputes must be supported through the appropriate channels, but not at the expense of work during the CLIL course. This is the minimum respect that trade unions owe to users and colleagues engaged in CLIL with professional seriousness and institutional competence.

e) Finally, connected to this last point and not by chance appearing last, is the policy framework that makes CLIL obligatory in the Trentino Trilingual plan. All those who participated in the present research project share the opinion that making CLIL mandatory may not be the best way to build a consensus for it in pedagogical or didactic terms. However, researchers also concur that without a strong policy mandating CLIL in

schools, the programme would inevitably have disappeared from the educational landscape: the various aspects of CLIL programming are too complex, the investment too high, and its implementation too difficult to manage on many levels.

The national policy which makes the introduction of CLIL in the last year of upper secondary school mandatory, according to the High School Reform, is clearly unrealistic and insignificant. By contrast, the Trentino Trilingual plan's approach to introduce CLIL gradually from primary school onwards, without excluding any class or student, is scientifically valid in two ways: first, it offers all Trentino students the same opportunity; second, it slowly accustoms the school to a complex and significant curricular innovation. It was a courageous policy that could have been a model for the whole Italian national school system. However, the hypothetical tense here signals a potential that is, to date, not fully realised given the political regime change in October 2018. According to the new recommendation, the Trentino plan has, in fact, been erased by the new government, which has merely declared the importance of foreign languages for all learners, without planning an increase in hours for foreign language learning and excluding CLIL as a mandatory part of the curriculum.

The 2014 Trentino plan illustrated in this chapter through a qualitative analysis of several case studies indicates possible ways forward for CLIL and the internationalisation of Italian school curricula. CLIL, as we have seen, needs time, favourable conditions, training and collegial cooperation in order to produce benefits. As CLIL is unfolded more widely, it becomes necessary to train more and more teachers (which requires clear guidelines and a standardised programme) and to guarantee their career progression, thus raising another thorny issue, the unequal legal status of teachers which characterises the teaching profession in Italy. It is up to those responsible for education policy and employment to grasp the ideas offered by research on CLIL and to create the conditions for it to succeed.

References

Bonnet, A. (2012). Towards an Evidence Base for CLIL. *International CLIL Research Journal, 1* (4), 66–78.

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

Duff, P.A. (1986). Another look at interlanguage talk: Talking task to task. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn. Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 1–61). Newbury, MA: Newbury House.

Horace. (2006). *Epistles*. (II, 1). Milano: Garzanti.

ISTAT 2017. Annual report (December 27, 2017). https://www.istat.it/it/files//2017/05/RapportoAnnuale2017.pdf

Kumaradivelu, B. (1993). The Name of the Task and the Task of Naming: Methodological Aspects of Task-Based Pedagogy. In G. Crookes & S. M. Gass (Eds.), *Tasks in a pedagogical context* (pp. 69–96). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Lasagabaster, D. (2013). The use of the L1 in CLIL classes: The teachers' perspective. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning, 6*(2), 1–21.

Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2009). Language Attitudes in CLIL and Traditional EFL Classes. *The International CLIL Research Journal, 1*(2), 4–17.

Leisen, J. (2004). Der bilinguale Sachfachunterricht aus verschiedenen Perspektiven. *Fremdsprache Deutsch, 30,* 7–14.

Long, M. (1981). Input, interaction and Second Language Acquisition. In H. Winitz (Ed.), *Native Language and Foreign Language Acquisition* (pp. 250–278). New York: Annales of the New York Academy of Science.

Mehisto, P. (2012). *Excellence in bilingual education: A guide for school principals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (1993). Task based Syllabus Design: Selecting, Grading and Sequencing Tasks. In G. Crookes & S.M. Gass (Eds.), *Tasks in a pedagogical context* (pp. 55–65). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Piano straordinario di legislatura per l'apprendimento delle lingue comunitarie- *Trentino Trilingue*, Provincia Autonoma di Trento, 24.1.2014, n. 21.

Ricci Garotti, F. (Ed.) (2019). *Dialogo sul CLIL tra scuola e università*. Roma: Studium.