Alternation between L1 (Italian) and L2 (English) in Three CLIL and EMI Contexts

Alternation between L1 (Italian) and L2 (English) in Three CLIL and EMI Contexts

By

Francesca Costa

Alternation between L1 (Italian) and L2 (English) in Three CLIL
and EMI Contexts

By Francesca Costa

To Marco and Carlo

Nature is a language
The Smiths, 1986

Contents

List of Tables

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

FOREWORD

The utilisation of the L1 in lessons that are being conducted in an L2 has always been a matter of discussion in the world of foreign language teaching and now, with the flourishing of bilingual education programmes, this debate has been extended to these settings. Whether in English-medium instruction (EMI) or in content and language integrated learning (CLIL and also ICLHE if specific for higher education), this controversy is open to debate. The dilemma is clear, using more the L1 facilitates the understanding of content but, on the contrary, it reduces the time of exposure to the L2, it debilitates the attention of students to the L2 and, hence, it may slow down the development of this additional language. Understanding this controversial relationship is a complex endeavour and there are not many studies that have been carried out to investigate the characteristics and results of the combination between the L1 and L2 in CLIL.

As things stand, it is logical that any effort to shed some more light has to be welcomed, especially, as it is the case, when the approach is rigorous and with some degree of innovation. As stated before, there is not much in scientific literature on the use of different languages in the bilingual classroom and, when existing, a lot has been researched about what the practitioners say but much less on what they really do during their lessons. Given this situation, there are several reasons to consider this book a useful contribution. Perhaps the most outstanding aspect in this study is that it combines the insight in the teachers' opinions with the analysis of what they really do during their lessons. Also, it covers three different levels of education (primary, secondary and university) and not only one. In addition, another main asset here is that this book has been written from the passion of an experienced teacher at different levels, a fact that transpires in all the work. I also find a sensible decision the use of *alternation* as an umbrella term due to the difficulty to draw a line between strategies like code-switching, translanguaging, and other practices involving the use of the L1 and L2.

With regards to the contents, the study is divided in five sections: review of existing literature, context of the study, research methodology, data analysis (questionnaire and observation), and transcriptions. To start with, the author offers a detailed exploration of existing literature on the combination of two languages in the classroom, especially interesting is the

review of studies with respect to the difficulty of finding a dividing line between code-switching and translanguaging. This section also offers a profound understanding of initiatives, practices and studies. As a continuation, the author outlines the main differences between CLIL (and ICLHE for the tertiary level of education) and EMI, an excellent idea as probably many of the different outputs in the alternation between L1 and L2 stem from the conceptualisation of these two approaches. As pointed out by the author, CLIL protects the mother tongue of the students, a very important fact for the consideration of the value and usefulness of the L1 as a pedagogical tool for the construction of meaning. In the next section, the book also offers a complete contextualisation of the study, starting with a broad, yet necessary, analysis of the current situation of languages in Italy, the characteristics of the programmes, and the existing regulations at the three different levels of education under scrutiny: primary, secondary (lower and upper) and university. The following section deals with the research methodology, describing the instruments (a questionnaire to gather teachers' opinions and observation of sample lessons), and it provides with the necessary information regarding the context, participants, instruments, data gathering procedure, presentation of results, and ethical issues and limitations. I find really appropriate the combination of a quantitative and qualitative research approach as a way to provide a more complete vision of the area investigated.

With respect to the findings, I think that many interesting aspects have been unveiled. For example, in terms of the opinions of teachers, they show a general acceptance of the use of the L1 in their lessons although they are not very much aware of the different kind of alternations they are bringing in. Obviously, the competence of the students is one of the most significant factors for the utilisation of alternations. With regard to the different types of alternation, results show that, irrespective of the level, teachers do not differ much in the use of this strategy, with the explanation of specific lexis as one of the most frequent type of alternation. The results allow the author to pinpoint several interesting pedagogical implications. The first one is the recognition of the relevance of lexis for the construction of meaning in the bilingual classroom. In fact, in combination with an appropriate use of language functions and communication strategies, subject-specific vocabulary is positioned as one of the cornerstones to build an adequate integration of content and language. Secondly, the clear similarities found in the pedagogical behaviour of teachers at the three different levels, even though they are not normally aware of the characteristics of the alternation. This fact actually constitute a verification of the necessity to gain more knowledge of the L1 strategies and techniques as well of their purpose in

order to delineate a more fruitful and effective use the alternation. In the third place, the opportunity that alternation practices brings in with respect to the preservation of languages also constitutes a relevant pedagogical aspect due to its implications.

This book is far from walking solely on the path of the presentation of scientific data and, accordingly to its nature as an educational text, it also exhibits a necessary applied nature. The author has been able to present a solid account of the opinions of teachers and of the strategies regarding the use of the L1 in three different bilingual education settings, but at the same time she has managed to exemplify the pedagogical precepts behind these practices. It is a work of undoubted value that will put knowledge in the hands of researchers, but also will allow teachers to understand and, presumably, work properly on the complex combination of the L1 and L2 in CLIL.

Víctor Pavón Vázquez
Assistant Professor of Bilingual Education
University of Córdoba (Spain)

Introduction

I started teaching English in 1998, in a primary school in my home country, Italy. Like all new teachers, I did not really know anything about this profession, but I was convinced I wanted to be a teacher. Among the strange things I found myself doing in class was using my L1 a lot while teaching English. This was not because I did not know how to express myself in English or because of the level of the students it was something I did unconsciously for which I felt very ashamed. My shoulder angel started telling me to avoid the use of the L1 (first language) as much as possible, but my shoulder devil kept on questioning why I was doing so. Therefore, when I started my career at university, I began researching the topic, discovering a change in attitudes toward the use of alternation between the L1 and L2 (second language).

When I looked at Medium of Instruction contexts (CLIL Content and Language Integrated Learning and EMI English-medium Instruction, for example),[1] I realised there was not much out there on the alternation between the L1 and the L2, and even less on a comparison of the different educational contexts. I felt that the alternation between the L1 and the L2 in Medium of Instruction contexts was very relevant for making meaning and for understanding the content of the taught disciplines. Not much has been written on the topic apart from one issue of the International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism in 2019[2], which focused on content-based teaching and the use of the L1 in these contexts. In 2021, concomitantly with the current monograph, a volume entitled English-medium Instruction and Translanguaging[3] was issued. The present study will analyse all Medium of Instruction contexts: from CLIL to EMI.

---

[1] Given the scope of this study, no distinction is made between BE (Bilingual education), CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning), ICLHE (Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education) or EMI (English-Medium Instruction) (see Chapter 2). For a thorough analysis of the similarities between these contexts see Costa, F. "What Does Research Tell Us About Experiences and Forms of Bilingual Education?", in Maggioni, M.L. and Murphy, A., forthcoming. Back to the Future. Bern: Peter Lang.

[2] Volume 22, Issue 1.

[3] Paulsrud, B.A., Tian, Z., and Toth, J. (eds.). 2021. *English-Medium Instruction and Translanguaging.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

In this book I have decided to focus on three educational contexts, since this type of study is a completely unexplored area of research. Having been myself a primary, secondary, and tertiary level teacher, I believe there are many meeting points in the three contexts and that these need to be unveiled in further research. Nothing has ever been written on CLIL/EMI and the alternation of the L1 and the L2 in Italy from a vertical perspective.

When designing the methodological part of the study, I kept in mind what Gierlinger said: "the majority of these studies base teachers' beliefs on code switching on qualitative interviews or questionnaires without any reference to classroom data, and therefore may run the risk of presenting a perspective whose results do not adequately portray the complexity of the classroom code-switching context" (2015:351) and decided to investigate alternation between the L1 and the L2 in three medium of instruction (primary, secondary, tertiary) contexts by using two main resources: a teacher questionnaire and discursive and classroom data by means of recordings and related transcriptions.

This book is divided into five main sections. The first presents a concise overview of the literature on the alternation between the L1 and the L2 in educational contexts; the second deals with the context of the study; the third is about the methodology used for the investigation of this study; and the fourth analyses the transcriptions and the questionnaire data. The final two sections present a discussion of the findings and sample transcriptions.

CHAPTER 1

THE ALTERNATION BETWEEN THE L1 AND THE L2

1.1. History and terminology

The alternation between the L1 and the L2 in educational contexts is a very topical issue that has been gaining ground, as Poza (2016, 15) underlines: "the importance of teaching practices that allow for these translanguaging interactions by fomenting spaces of collaboration in which language boundaries are not policed and in which students are encouraged to rely on their full bilingual repertoires". It is also one of the main reasons of attrition between teachers who see themselves as either pro or con on the use of alternation (Cook 2001).

For years, the shift from the L1 to the L2 was banned in language classes, since it was thought that this would impair the learning of the foreign language. In recent years, however, there has been a recognition of the validity of alternation, which has been considered a strategy adopted by all bilingual speakers. In part, the responsibility for this aura of negativity surrounding alternation comes from the early immersion studies (Lin 2015; Chin and Lin 2019) due to the importance they gave to exposure to input in the target language. In 2011, several scholars of the early immersion Canadian programme (Swain, Kirkpatrick and Cummins 2011) titled one of their handbooks: *How to have a guilt-free life using Cantonese in the English class*, thus using a very loaded term (guilt-free) and eventually eliminating any negative connotation associated with the alternation of the L1 and L2.

From a terminological point of view, as often happens in linguistics, many different terms are used to describe the alternation between the L1 and the L2 (Lin 2013): for example, the terms codeswitching and translanguaging (Williams 1994; Baker 2006; García 2009). Bullock and Toribio (2009, 1) describe codeswitching as "the ability on the part of bilinguals to alternate effortlessly between their two languages". Lasagabaster (2013, 2) tries to distinguish between the two terms: "Whereas code-switching assumes that bilinguals use their two languages as two separate

monolingual codes, translanguaging posits that bilinguals have one linguistic repertoire which they select strategically to communicate effectively". Experts usually choose one of the two terms, but rarely do they engage in a comparative analysis. An OUP blog with an article by Li Wei tries to carry out such a comparison: "Code-switching refers to the alternation between languages in a specific communicative episode, like a conversation or an email exchange or indeed signs like the ones above. The alternation usually occurs at specific points of the communicative episode and, as linguistics research demonstrates, is governed by grammatical, as well as interactional (conversational sequencing), rules" (Wei 2018, n.p.). As for translanguaging, Li Wei writes: "The analytical focus is therefore on how the language user draws upon different linguistic, cognitive and semiotic resources to make meaning and make sense. […] Moreover, Translanguaging defines language as a multilingual, multimodal, and multisensory sense- and meaning-making resource. In doing so, it seeks to challenge boundaries: boundaries between named languages, boundaries between the so-called linguistic, paralinguistic and non-linguistic means of communication, and boundaries between language and other human cognitive capacities". In a very comprehensive volume devoted to translanguaging (2018, 3), Prada and Nikula give a trans-gressive connotation to the prefix trans: "To those three levels from which the prefix *trans*- draws its meaning, we add a layer at which translanguaging is a form of *transgression*. The idea of translanguaging as transgression highlights the potential that translanguaging has to remove language-related hierarchies (e.g. García 2009) and for bi-/multilingual individuals to engage in situated practices that challenge traditional normativity of language use". Canagarajah (2011, 403) uses the term codemeshing "for the realization of translanguaging in texts".

In the present work, both terms (codeswitching and translanguaging) have been considered; however, the final choice was to adopt a more neutral term: *alternation*. This position is also shared by Macaro (2019, 272), who thinks the two terms are loaded: "Moreover, the research which shows that use of the L1 (I am deliberately avoiding the more contentious and value laden terms 'translanguaging' and 'codeswitching') is effective in L2 learning is quite thin on the ground".

Another term which could be grouped with the ones just cited is diglossia. In this sense, the alternation is seen from a macro perspective (with an entire linguistic community using alternation), with the two languages seen as separated in their context: one used at an institutional level and the other for ordinary tasks. An example of diglossia is German Swiss and German. The former is used by people in the streets and the latter in institutional contexts.

1.2. Studies in educational contexts

As previously stated, studies on the alternation between the L1 and the L2 are increasing especially in educational contexts. Hereafter, some of the most important studies on the alternation between the L1 and L2 will be presented.

Among the first scholars to research the alternation between the L1 and the L2 were Baker (1996), Antón and DiCamilla (1998), Butzkamm (1998), Cook (2001), Gajo (2001), and Macaro (2001). In different ways, they all pointed to the fact that the alternation between the L1 and the L2 was a natural process.

Baker (1996) distinguished between an alternation that separates and a concomitant alternation. The former divides the language based on various criteria (person, subject, time, place, materials); the latter is a type of code commutation, where the languages alternate within the same educational context. The division occurs based on 1. type of skill (written or oral); 2. the non-didactic function (class management); and 3. the task type (presentation, summary, reinforcement or expansion).

Antón and DiCamilla (1998) saw the L1 as a tool for making meaning in text, retrieving language from memory, and exploring and expanding context, guiding the teacher's actions through the task while maintaining dialogue.

Butzkamm defined alternation in this way (1998, 95) "Used properly and systematically, but on the whole quite sparingly and unobtrusively, it is clearly not a last resort, but a natural short-cut". His studies are in bilingual settings which are very close to CLIL ones, and he thinks that scientific terms should be taught in the L1 as well. He states that codeswitching is an integral part of bilinguals; if used properly and systematically, it represents a natural aid, with and the teacher serving as a bilingual dictionary in interactive classes. However, he also argued that codeswitching can also be effective in teacher-centred presentations.

Cook (2001, 405) used a very emblematic expression to underline how the use of the L1 and L2 is a spontaneous process: "Like nature, the L1 creeps back in, however many times you throw it out with a pitchfork". He declared that codeswitching is by no means incompatible with learning the L2 and highlighted the fact that the L1 has been used in various methods: the New Concurrent Method, Community Language Learning and Dodson's Bilingual Method. In the New Concurrent Method, the teacher switches from one language to another following particular rules (when the concepts are significant or students are not focused), using cognates. The teacher supplies vocabulary in the middle of the sentence. In Community

Language Learning, students speak in the L2 via the mediation of the L1: the L1 is a way of giving L2 meaning in complete sentences. In Dodson's Bilingual Method, the teacher reads an L2 sentence aloud and then does the same in the L1. Cook claims that the L1 is a classroom resource used to convey meaning, explain grammar, and organise the class as a collaborative learning tool as well as an individual strategy for students. For these reasons, it is ridiculous to ban codeswitching from the class, since L2 and L1 meanings do not exist separately from the L2 meanings; the two languages coexist in the same mind. Codeswitching, therefore, is a highly skilled activity.

Gajo (2001) highlighted differences between micro-alternance, meso-alternance, and macro-alternance. Micro-alternance refers to a switch from one language to another within the same verbal interactions. Meso-alternance happens within the same lesson and according to task. Macro-alternance occurs when the decision is made to teach all or part of a discipline in the L1/L2 (see the example of parallel language use in Kuteeva 2014).

Macaro (2001), who is one of the most prominent scholars in the field, carried out a study in secondary schools in the UK. Among the unexpected results is the fact that there is no relation with L1 use by the teacher and that by the learners. Bentley (2008) subsequently carried out a study at Alfrink College, Zoetermeer, with 13-15-year-olds where she tried to analyse codeswitching according to specific categories (see also Costa, 2011). Macaro (2009) and Tian and Macaro (2012) described two experimental studies in secondary Chinese classes in which they tested vocabulary by using codeswitching or by using English and paraphrasing. Macaro concluded that there was no harm in the use of the L1 (Chinese). The study by Tian and Macaro was carried out with university students in China. They tested students on vocabulary acquisition to evaluate listening activities in a focus-on-form context. The results showed better outcomes for the students who had received focus on form and codeswitching.

1.3. Teacher and student alternation in CLIL and EMI contexts

In a comprehensive article on translanguaging, Lewis, Jones and Baker state that: "Firstly, translanguaging may help students to gain a deeper and fuller understanding of the subject matter" (2012, 645). Lin (2019) is of the idea that translanguaging and transemiotising help the construction of knowledge and are crucial for CLIL and EMI contexts. Therefore, the alternation between the L1 and the L2 may be a clear advantage in CLIL-like contexts where both content and language learning are taken into

consideration. To gain a better picture of CLIL and EMI contexts at all educational levels, a chronological overview of studies on the alternation between the L1 and the L2 within them follows.

A CLIL study on L1 and L2 in Canada was carried out by Myers (2006), who analysed the effects of codeswitching on content learning for university students by means of a simulation activity. She studied a classroom situation in which students were given a simulation activity that she was recording. She noted a continuous back and forth between L1 and L2, although students tried to use the L2. The two questions she addressed were: 1. Is content learning more effective or less effective when also using the L1? She found definite evidence of a shift to metacognitive strategies when performing codeswitching; and 2. Is there language learning gain or loss when using languages other than the L2? She found improvement in both L2 reading comprehension and L2 production. She also noted a great improvement in lexis, but less improvement in grammatical competence. The study showed a general positive use of the L1 as a backup and to refine thinking.

Ricci Garotti (2006) in the Italian context points out that if L2 input is reduced in CLIL contexts, some of the content is automatically lost. The fear of traumatizing the students with too much foreign language leads to an impoverishment of the content as well. In her opinion, there should be a shift from primary education, where the teacher should adopt active bilingualism and the students passive bilingualism, to secondary education, where the teacher as well as the students should adopt active bilingualism. The L1 should be functioning as a support to L2.

Méndez García and Pavón Vázquez (2012) worked on codeswitching in Spanish CLIL contexts in primary and secondary schools. They believe that codeswitching is connected to the teachers' roles (content teacher and language teacher) in team teaching: one taking care of BICS and the other of CALP. Teachers seem to appreciate forms of translanguaging even though they feel they are not trained enough to perform it correctly. In 2013, Lasagabaster interviewed 35 Colombian (mostly secondary) teachers on the use of the L1 in CLIL teaching, and they all had a positive impression.

Mazak and Herbas-Donoso (2014) analysed translanguaging in Spanish university science classes (English and Spanish), discovering that it is used mainly for key terminology. Translanguaging in science is a way of "breaking the monopoly of English as the only language of academia in science as a field" (2014, 15). This aspect is particularly interesting because it hints at a multilingual pedagogical function of alternation.

In Hong Kong, Lo (2014) and Wannagat (2007) both noted the use of codeswitching in CLIL, highlighting the fact that it is often used in earlier

stages, though less for older students, which seems to be the case also for Ricci Garotti (2006) in the Italian context.

Gierlinger (2015) studied secondary CLIL classes in Austria in which he categorised the use of alternation by means of classroom research as: 1. Regulative, which comprises classroom and task management codeswitching and behavioural codeswitching, and 2. Instructive, which happens on three levels: content-focused, word-focused, and deficit-focused. Gierlinger concluded that in CLIL classes codeswitching is important not only for language but also for content knowledge.

Gotti (2015) analysed codeswitching discursive data in some international specialised courses at one Italian university. He found out that codeswitching increased cooperation between lecturers and students and contributed to the improvement of specialised communication.

In a comprehensive article on the alternation between the L1 and the L2 in CLIL-like contexts, Lin (2015) stated, among other things, why she thought that the use of the L1 and L2 together was historically seen as negative. As mentioned above, she thinks that the idea of taking the maximum input hypothesis to the limit, and the idea of the alternation between the L1 and L2 as something linked to the grammar-translation method, formed a barrier to the implementation of this type of pedagogy. She summarises the different uses of the L1 in the literature: ideational functions to explain content, textual functions to create boundaries in the lesson, and interpersonal functions. She underlines the connections between the alternation of the L1 and L2 and CLIL, stating that right from the beginning CLIL has always aimed at plurilingualism. She foresees studies on the alternation between the L1 and L2 not only as regards spoken but also written language.

Lin and Wu (2015) described a classroom study carried out in a secondary school as regards science learning in Hong Kong. They came to the conclusion that, since in science teaching and learning it is very important to understand concepts, translanguaging and transemiotising (using multiple semiotic resources such as multimodality) can be a way of doing so. Scientific discourse is therefore crucial for understanding science.

Moore and Nikula (2016, "Introduction") argue that "rather than content and language integration being about L2 monolingualism, first language (L1) is also always in play, as suggested by the very notion of 'bilingual' education associated with CLIL". They acknowledge that the use of the L1 is present in CLIL classrooms and that it has various functions: facilitating content, managing the classroom, creating language awareness, and signalling alignment (see also Bieri 2018; Gallagher and Colohan 2014). They distinguish between "a broad distinction between episodes when

translanguaging can be perceived as salient, as participants orient to language in order to facilitate content learning and, in contrast, to moments when translanguaging is unmarked in the unfolding talk, as participants orient primarily to the flow of interaction" (Moore and Nikula, 2016: "Orienting to language and content"). They note that "saliency in language in content learning revolves principally around lexis/terminology, with language issues being explicitly oriented to in CLIL classrooms, with the emphasis on meaning rather than form" (Moore and Nikula, 2016: "Orienting to flow of interaction").

Poza (2016) investigated codeswitching in the language of science in the U.S., analysing classroom discursive data (Spanish/English) in a primary school. He came to the conclusion that translanguaging practices enhance academic skills and help the learning of content. He is not in favour of translanguaging regulation but in favour of a totally natural use of it.

García Mayo and Hidalgo (2017) compared 32 Spanish primary school students (CLIL and non-CLIL) while performing a communicative task twice in two different school years. They analysed the use of the L1 and found out that it is used mainly for vocabulary and that CLIL learners use it less than non-CLIL leaners.

Bieri (2018) compared the use of translanguaging in CLIL (English) and non-CLIL (German) Biology courses in Switzerland for secondary-school students by means of transcriptions and interviews with teachers. She found a great deal of salient (Nikula and Moore 2016) translanguaging in both cohorts in which Biological concepts (key lexis and scientific concepts) were helped by translanguaging. Unmarked (Nikula and Moore 2016) translanguaging was also used for metacomments. Bieri concluded that: "In fact, these excerpts show that translanguaging with subject-specific terminology, using all linguistic resources available, can be an efficient pedagogy to clarify and negotiate meaning in biology lessons" (2018, 104). One very significant finding was that the teacher who was more adamant in not using translaguaging was the one who used it more, thus showing that discursive data needs to be complemented with interviews in order to show discrepancies between teachers' beliefs and their actual behaviour in class.

Martin-Beltrán, Montoya-Ávila, García, Madigan Peercy and Silverman (2019) examined sessions of peer reading primary school classes (Spanish-English) in the US. Students used alternation for task management, understanding language, negotiating content, and relationships.

Milán-Maillo and Pladevall-Ballester (2019) studied the role of the L1 in CLIL science lessons where Catalan, Spanish and English were used. They recorded and transcribed eight classes and interaction between teachers and students and found out that the L1 serves the role of helping in

the linguistic and cognitive challenges of CLIL.

Pavón Vázquez and Ramos Ordóñez (2019) investigated students' (10-11 year olds) use of the L1 in CLIL in the Spanish context, showing that students frequently but not systematically use the L1, and that such use is not detrimental to content learning.

Pun and Macaro (2019) investigated science classrooms in Hong Kong EMI schools (early EMI and late EMI). In late EMI, when the L1 was used more often, teachers were more interactive and used higher order questions, whereas in early EMI, where the L1 was used less often, teachers were not as interactive and used more lower order questions. Pun (2021) performed a large-scale study on EMI classroom interaction in eight Hong Kong schools with 19 students and 545 students coming to the conclusions that translanguaging provided a favourable environment for the learning of Biology in EMI and the development of higher order thinking skills.

The latest study was conducted by Dalziel and Guarda (2021) in an Italian university. They explored students' translanguaging practices of six EMI lectures. Translanguaging was mostly found during group work and oral presentations.

1.4. Summary of the findings on alternation in CLIL-like contexts

When we put together all the studies (from different parts of the world and from diverse educational levels) on the alternation between the L1 and the L2 in CLIL and EMI contexts, many recurring patterns can be detected.

First of all, it is clear that the alternation between the L1 and the L2 in CLIL and EMI contexts helps in the learning of content and the construction of knowledge because in this way different channels are used to convey meaning (Gierlinger 2015; Poza 2016; Bieri 2018; Lin 2019). Secondly the alternation seems to be relevant not only for facilitating content acquisition but also for negotiating content, for managing the classroom, for metalinguistic awareness, and for the preservation of multilingualism (Moore and Nikula, 2016). Finally, the alternation between the L1 and the L2 happens mainly at the lexical level (Mazak and Herbas-Donoso 2014).

CHAPTER 2

THE CONTEXT OF STUDY

2. 1. CLIL and EMI: a general overview

CLIL-type approaches are spreading more and more throughout Europe, including Italy (with greater or lesser intensity depending on the regions analysed) with the aim of promoting and enhancing the knowledge of European languages among the citizens of the European Union.

As regards education at university level, the phenomenon of globalisation and internationalisation of the knowledge society has contributed to the spread of EMI. There was a turning point starting in 1999, following the Bologna Declaration, which set forth the guidelines for the creation of a homogeneous European university system, by defining characteristics that were common to the different local systems. This harmonisation of the university paths offered by European universities made it possible to increase the mobility of students, researchers and teachers within what is called EHEA (European Higher Education Area) and this progressive process of internationalisation contributed to a greater proliferation of disciplinary courses delivered through English.

This is a definition of CLIL: "the acronym CLIL is used as a generic term to describe all types of provision in which a second language (a foreign, regional or minority language and/or another official state language) is used to teach certain subjects in the curriculum other than languages lessons themselves" (Eurydice 2006, 8). First of all, the CLIL approach has the specific objective of promoting the integrated teaching of a language - not necessarily English - and of contents. Although this is a teaching approach that has its roots around the middle of the last century, the concept of CLIL was defined for the first time from a theoretical point of view around 1995, when it was decided to use the name CLIL as an umbrella term to indicate all those situations in content and language learning and teaching are integrated.

In Dearden's words on the other hand (2014, 2), EMI is based on "The use of the English language to teach academic subjects in countries or jurisdictions where the first language (L1) of the majority of the population

is not English". From a terminological point of view another term often considered synonymous with EMI is ICLHE, an acronym for Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education, which indicates the integrated teaching of language and content at the university level. The term ICHLE was coined in 2003 by Robert Wilkinson during the creation of the first of a series of conferences held in Maastricht and dedicated to ICLHE. These conferences subsequently led to the foundation of the ICLHE association and the creation of a dedicated website. As in CLIL, also in the acronym ICLHE learning is explicitly dual, favoring both language and content learning. In fact, at university level this type of approach is mainly conducted in English. CLIL at the tertiary level is also used for example in the LANQUA project subject group on CLIL in higher education uses the term CLIL to describe their project "despite all variations" that can be used for this L2 medium instruction because it is a "relatively established term in Europe" (Greere and Räsänen 2008, 4).

Mellion (2008) identified three factors that play a fundamental role in determining the success of CLIL programmes especially in the university setting; they are traditionally called the three Cs. Conditions: when deciding to introduce a training course delivered in a foreign language (most of the time in English) it is important to establish which are the most relevant conditions for this course to be effective. In this regard, four dimensions must be identified: the socio-political situation, the economic resources available and the organisational factors involved. With reference to the first dimension, it is necessary to evaluate the attitude of society and local institutions towards the process of internationalisation of education, the recognition of the role of *lingua franca* assumed today by English and the geographical position of the institution. It is also essential that the institutional bodies share the objectives of the program developed and also support it from the financial point of view, allocating the necessary resources to ensure the presence of qualified personnel and the establishment of training courses for teachers already in service. Last but not least, organisational factors must be considered, such as, for example, the preparation of offices for the management of bureaucratic procedures. Commitment: in order for CLIL to bring the desired results, it is essential that all the actors involved are genuinely interested in the project and willing to invest time and energy in its preparation. In order for everyone to feel involved, an environment should be created in which the teachers feel motivated and supported in teaching in another language, so that the transition from one type of teaching to another does not create excessive stress. Competences: the skills required from both teachers and students must be linguistic, didactic and intercultural. From a linguistic point of

view, teachers and learners must have a sufficient language level to be able to tackle the teaching and study of a subject in a foreign language with the necessary degree of in-depth knowledge. They must also develop a positive attitude towards the project and be involved in training courses that allow them to evermore deepen their knowledge of the language and maximise the benefits achieved through participation in these programs.

Finally it is very important to note that as Ricci Garotti (2009) states in her study carried out at the University of Trento, unlike the first and second level schools, which are more willing to experiment with different teaching approaches, universities struggle to take the risk of introducing highly innovative methodologies and to modify the traditional teaching structure of the lessons.

2.2. Summary of terminological issues

As stated in the previous paragraph, it is useful to first briefly discuss the differences among the various approaches mentioned above, even if some feel there are more similarities than differences (Johnstone 2009; Costa and D'Angelo 2011). Above all, CLIL is a form of BE, though it has some unique features: it protects the native language of the students, is not elitist, and does not aim at complete bilingualism (García 2009). Lasagabaster and Sierra (2010) also highlight some other differences, such as the fact that in CLIL contexts teachers are not native speakers and the materials used are usually adapted. The term CLIL can also be used at the tertiary level of instruction (Dafouz, Nuñez and Sancho 2007; Ricci Garotti 2009; Fortanet-Gómez 2010; Aguilar and Rodríguez 2012), even if another term is often used: Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education ICLHE (Wilkinson 2004). The term EMI is also used at the tertiary level, even if it does not specifically refer to the combining of language and content (though in practice there is evidence of such an integration; see Costa 2012a and 2012b), in contrast to the other approaches mentioned above.

2.3. The integration of content and language in Italy in three educational contexts

Italy is a monolingual country with many regional dialects (Balboni 2009) and several minority languages increasingly viewed as protected languages (e.g., Albanese, Catalan, Greek, Slovene, Croat, Friulian, Ladino, Occitan, and Sardinian). Despite this openness toward minority languages, Italy still lags behind other European countries with regard to foreign language learning (Eurobarometer 2005). All this occurs in a context in

which European citizens today must know their mother tongue plus two other languages, one of which English (Argondizzo, De Bartolo and Ting 2007). Moreover, the education system in Italy is generally not regarded as one of Europe's best (OECD 2015, 5), and thus in recent years the attempt has been made to reform the educational system to bring it closer in line with those in the rest of Europe. When analysing the Italian case it is necessary to state that the evolution of the most innovative approaches aimed at promoting knowledge of foreign languages has been profoundly different over the years, depending on whether regions with special status are considered. In fact, in Valle d'Aosta, Friuli Venezia Giulia and Trentino Alto Adige, bilingual education programs have already existed for several years and are mainly aimed at protecting languages. In the Aosta Valley, Italian and French coexist as official languages, but alongside them there are also minor languages such as the Piedmontese dialect, Walser and Franco-Provençal. The multilingualism of this area is protected by the region's school system which provides for bilingual education throughout the students' studies, from kindergarten to secondary school. In Friuli Venezia Giulia there are schools that for several years have offered their users cutting-edge bilingual and trilingual courses, which involve not only the main languages spoken in the region (Italian, Slovenian, Friulian), but also European languages such as English, French, German and Spanish. The path followed by the other Italian regions is different: it took a few years before the CLIL programs were consolidated and were introduced by law in schools by the ministerial authorities themselves. A first step was taken in the 1990s with the establishment of the European high schools, where one or two disciplines have been taught in a foreign language.

In this situation, Content and Language Integrated Learning, Bilingual Education and English-medium Instruction represent an opportunity for Italy and the rest of Europe to improve not only the learning of the subject/matter but also the learning of English. For this, as well as other more utilitarian, reasons (such as employing only one teacher to teach both language and content), these approaches are expanding quickly in Italy.

The next section will provide an overview of the Italian context with reference to the integration of language and content at all educational levels, with examples of English-Medium Instruction presented to describe the higher educational system.

2.4. Historical and legislative overview

There have not been many studies on the CLIL-like approach in Italy, though such studies are certainly on the rise. Some universities have