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ABSTRACT

The aim of this dissertation is to discuss the difficulties encountered in the planning and implementation of a museum study programme in a non native tongue, focussing on the Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) Museum Programme currently running at a contemporary art museum in Italy.

The research was conducted over a period of six months, and data were collected through the observation of 2 CLIL museum tours for students and the administration of 7 interviews to the museum staff and museum foreign language educators. Two different questionnaires were prepared to understand both teachers’ and students’ perspectives on the project.

Despite the potential of the CLIL museum programme aimed at promoting the learning of both the foreign language (Spanish, French or English) and the museum contents (contemporary art), issues emerged with regard to the marketing of the project, which resulted in a low rate of school groups attending the programme, and with regard to the planning and implementation of the CLIL museum curriculum.

In consideration of these results, a model has been developed, offering valid suggestions in relation to the Museum-School Collaboration, answering the question: How can museum and schools efficiently collaborate in relation to the CLIL Museum Programme?
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1. Introduction

1.1. Museum and Foreign Language Education

In the last two decades, people working in and around museums have all at some point asked themselves the same question: what role should museums play in today society?


A museum is a non-profit, permanent institution in the service of society and its development, open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits the tangible and intangible heritage of humanity and its environment for the purposes of education, study and enjoyment.

Even though museums have often redefined their missions and goals through the centuries, their uniqueness as “social institutions” has never been denied. As Arinze (1999: 1) claims in addressing the need of museums “to reflect the expectations of a changing world”, museums must be “agents of change and development” (idem: 2). That is, they need to respond to the dynamics of modern society, by planning and promoting actions that will encourage its citizens’ development (idem) and lifelong learning (Demel, 2005: 14). The conclusion that can be drawn here is that not only “education” is one of the pivotal functions of museums, but also, as Hooper-Greenhill (1995: 229) claims, the reason for their existence.

In the last two decades, museums have expanded and improved their educational programmes through the exploration of different strategies, contents and services. Recently, and especially in the European context, they have tried to plan programmes for the promotion of multiculturalism and active citizenship. Taking into consideration that in order to be a European citizen one has “to be able to acquire and keep up one’s ability to communicate in at least two Community languages in addition to their mother tongue” (European Commission, 1995: 47), it seems more than desirable for European museums to offer foreign language students the opportunity to take part in educational programmes in a foreign language (henceforth...
Indeed, in discussing the points of intersection between museum education and FL education, Wilson (2012) claims that both expand people’s cultural horizon and have an important role in their life. However, while the majority of museums offer resources in a FL\(^1\) (ex. guided tours and audio guides), very few provide educational programmes in a FL, which are tailored to the linguistic needs of FL learners.

The reason for the lack of these types of museum programmes in a non native language is related to factors regarding both the planning and the implementation of such programmes. Questions like “what aims and objectives should the activity in a non native language have?”, “what methodology and what contents should be chosen?”, “which institutions should the museum partner with to offer a programme in a non native language?” are just a few.

In order to contribute to this debate, the current study focuses on the CLIL museum programme running at one of the contemporary art museums in Italy, with the aim of answering the following research question:

1- What are the difficulties encountered in planning and implementing a museum study programme in a non-native tongue?

In order to answer this question, the CLIL Museum Programme was investigated taking into consideration the issues encountered in relation to Coonan (2012)’s CLIL curriculum categories:

a. Context
b. Learning Situation
c. Aims
d. Objectives
e. Language Needs
f. Contents
g. Methodology
h. Evaluation

\(^1\) The reference is to those museum resources and programmes that are in a language other than the one spoken in the country where the museum is located.
As the hypothesis was that the major issue would be identified in the Museum-School Collaboration (Context), a second research question was formulated:

2- How can museum and schools efficiently collaborate in relation to the CLIL Museum Programme?

Thus, in chapter 2, the literature on the issues of planning and implementing museum study programmes and of planning and implementing quality CLIL will be reviewed. In particular, the main theories related to learning in museums will be described, through outlining Eshach (2007)’s model of museum learning (paragraph 2.1.). Thus, the issues in engaging young people through contemporary art will be taken into consideration (paragraph 2.2), and in paragraph 2.3. studies which have researched the issues and dynamics of the collaboration between museums and schools will be looked at in detail. Paragraph 3 will be dedicated to CLIL, with the description of the problems and implications related to the use of the FL in CLIL contexts (paragraph 3.1.), the factors involved in and issues related to the oral comprehension (paragraph 3.2.) and oral production in CLIL contexts (paragraph 3.3.), and to the planning and implementation of CLIL programmes (paragraph 3.4.).

In chapter 3, the methodology employed in the current research will be outlined. Thus, the context of the study will be looked at (paragraph 3.2.) and the research questions will be briefly described (paragraph 3.3.). In paragraph 3.4., it will be said that the current research belongs to the constructive paradigm and that the research employs a mixed methodology, based on the collection of both quantitative and qualitative data, through a Triangulation Design. Then, the categories of participants taking part in the research project will be described (paragraph 3.5.) and the design and procedure of the observation, interviews and questionnaires used to collect the data (paragraph 3.6.) and the methodology of data analysis will be outlined (paragraph 3.7.). Finally, the ethical philosophy at the base of the current research will be briefly presented (paragraph 3.8.).

In chapter 4, the data collected through observation, interviews and questionnaires will be analysed through the adoption of Coonan (2012)’s CLIL categories as themes to organise the data.

In chapter 5, the findings of the current research will be discussed. Thus, the issues encountered in the collection of the data through the teachers’ and students’
questionnaires will be explained (paragraph 5.2.). In paragraph 5.3., the data will be discussed to answer the first research question, while in paragraph 5.4., a Model to respond the second research question will be discussed giving some practical examples of how the Museum and schools could efficiently collaborate in relation to the CLIL Museum Programme. In paragraph 5.5., the limitations of the study will be taken into consideration and interesting topics that could be researched further will be briefly looked at.

In chapter 6, some conclusive remarks will be outlined.

It is believed that to plan and implement museum study programmes in a non native language is challenging and that only through discussing the issues that the actors involved in these programmes face, can best practice strategies be developed. Indeed, as Dwight D. Eisenhower said, “in preparing for battle I have always found that plans are useless, but planning is indispensable” (Eisenhower).
2. Literature review

2.1. Introduction

In the current chapter, an overview of the factors and dynamics involved in learning in the museum and CLIL contexts will be provided. The aim is that of constructing a strong theoretical framework, which will account for both the designing of the instruments of data collection (see chapter 4) and the discussion of the data (see chapter 6).

In paragraph 2.2.1., learning in museums will be explored and special attention will be dedicated to the learning dynamics of school groups. Given its holistic nature, Eshach (2007)’s model of museum learning, which combines Falk and Dierking (1992 and 2000)’s Contextual Model of Learning and Orion and Hofstein (quoted in Eshach, 2007)’s Three Factors Model, will be used as framework to describe the complexity and dynamism of the museum learning experience. As Eshach’s model places great importance on the teaching context before, during and after the visit, it will offer an invaluable tool for organising the information about school field trips to museums. Within this model, other theories of learning will be explored. In particular, Gardner (1983, 1990 quoted in Hooper-Greenhill, 1994)’s Theory of Multiple Intelligences and Csikszentmihalyi (1990 quoted in Falk and Dierking, 2000)’s Theories of Flow and Motivation will prove to be very useful in understanding the personal context of learning. In exploring the socio-cultural context, particular attention will be given to the sociocultural mediation within school groups. Finally, the physical context will be investigated, highlighting the importance of Eshach (2007)’s Novelty Phenomenon Theory and the role of subsequent experiences on visitors’ learning. In paragraph 2.2.2, the nature of museum objects will be further discussed, especially in relation to the issues related to how young people approach and feel about Contemporary Art. In paragraph 2.2.3., a varied body of research on school-museum partnerships will be used to outline the main issues related to teachers’ perceptions of museum field trips and training, teachers’ planning and implementation of school trips to museums and the communication and collaboration between museums and schools.
In paragraph 2.3, a definition of CLIL will be given, highlighting the benefits of adopting such a methodology, and attention will be focussed on its state of the art in the Italian school system. Thus, in paragraph 2.3.1., the characteristics of the FL used as a medium of instruction will be looked at in detail and the issues related to the language competence necessary to access non-linguistic contents will be outlined, through discussing the difference between BICS and CALP competence. In paragraph 2.3.2., the factors involved in planning a CLIL curriculum will be explored through Coyle (2006)’s 4Cs Framework and Coonan (2012)’s CLIL curriculum. In paragraph 2.3.3., attention will be given to listening comprehension in the CLIL context. In particular, the difficulties related to listening comprehension will be outlined, thus leading to the discussion of the importance of making the input comprehensible and to the description of the strategies and activities that teachers can use to support and scaffold students’ listening comprehension. Finally, in paragraph 2.3.4, speaking in the CLIL context will be investigated. First, the importance of producing output for students’ development of FL competence will be outlined, through the discussion of Swain (1988 quoted in Lyster, 2007)’s Output Hypothesis. Then, the problems related to students’ oral production in the FL will be described. Thus, the types of questions, the factors involved in students’ interaction and the learning activities to use to promote students’ speaking in the FL will be looked at in more details. In particular, in the last session, attention will be given to the benefits, components, structures and graduation of difficulty of tasks.

2.2. Learning in the museum setting

2.2.1. Theories of learning in the museum setting

In the last thirty years, the role of museums as learning institutions has grown tremendously. As a result, more and more attention has been given to dynamics involved in learning in museums and researchers have debated three important

---

2 It is important to highlight that much of the research on CLIL focuses on formal learning context, while this study focuses on the museum learning context. However, it is felt that this paragraph gives a detailed overview of the factors that affect learning in the CLIL environment and thus will be very useful when analysing and discussing the data.
questions: Do people learn as a result of museum experiences? What are they learning? How are they learning? While the answer to the first question is today widely accepted as being positive, much more difficulty has been encountered in trying to answer to the last two.

As Kelly claims in her paper “What is learning… and why do museums need to do something about it?”, “museum learning is ‘messy’ and complex and studying it is challenging and requires a range of responses” (Kelly, 2002: 13). The “range of responses” Kelly refers to are the theories of learning that have been used to study learning in museums. For example, Hooper-Greenhill, one of the main experts on museum education, has focussed on the skills and strategies involved in learning through objects in museums, using Gardner’s Theory of Multiple Intelligences and Csikszentmihalyi’s Theory of Flow and Motivation, among other theories (Hooper-Greenhill, 1994). Hein, on the other hand, is responsible for having framed the Theory of Constructivism within a museum context (see Hein, 1991). The Developmental Theory, which combines Piaget and Vygotsky’s theories of children cognitive development, has been used by Housen to build a model to describe people’s aesthetic development (Housen, 1983 quoted in De Santis and Housen, 1996: ). However, none of these theories and models has had the ability to place the individual within a holistic and infrastructural learning context as has done Falk and Dierking’s (1992 and 2000) Contextual Model of Learning.

In order to describe the several factors involved in the museum learning experience, Falk and Dierking (1992 and 2000) have created a model, in which the visitor’s learning is the result of the “never-ending interaction” of three contexts - personal, socio-cultural and physical – “over time in order to make meaning” (Falk and Dierking, 2000: 11). These three contexts are neither separate nor stable, but change through time. As Falk and Dierking (2000: 11) claim:

> Perhaps the best way to think of it is to view the personal context as moving through time; as it travels, it is constantly shaped and reshaped as it experiences events within the physical context, all of which are mediated by and through the sociocultural context.

Each of these contexts contains a myriad of details, which are responsible for the factors that influence learning. Falk and Dierking (2000: 137) argue that, among all of
these factors, eight are specifically pivotal to museum learning experiences and can be divided as follow:

*Personal Context*

1. Motivation and expectations
2. Prior knowledge, interests and beliefs
3. Choice and control

*Sociocultural Context*

4. Within-group sociocultural mediation
5. Facilitated mediation by others

*Physical Context*

6. Advance organizers and orientation
7. Design
8. Reinforcing events and experiences outside the museum

With regard to the Personal Context - which is “the sum of personal and genetic history that a visitor carries with him/her into a learning situation” (Eshach, 2007: 180) – motivation is the factor that has been probably studied the most. According to Falk and Dierking (2000: 18), there are two kinds of motivation: intrinsic and extrinsic. Whereas intrinsic motivation refers to the situation in which “the action is done for its own sake”, extrinsic motivation means that the action is done for an external reward (idem: 19). While both types of motivation are neither good nor bad in and of themselves nor mutually exclusive, intrinsic motivation is connected with what Csikszentmihalyi calls the “Flow” experience. As Hooper-Greenhill (1994: 153) claims, Flow “refers to a feeling of deep involvement and effortless progression” and depends upon the satisfaction of the following conditions (idem and Falk and Dierking, 2000: 24):
• the task must match or be attainable by the present ability of an individual to perform
• the focus of attention must be limited to a small number of stimuli
• all the senses must be involved
• the experience must contain coherent and clear goals for action
• the experience must provide clear and unambiguous feedback

The interesting idea that Hooper-Greenhill (2000) carries on is that all individuals, even those at a low level of aesthetic skills, can have a flow experience in a museum if the conditions outlined above are met. The researcher discusses Flow in relation to individual visitors, but it can be argued that even those who visit the museum as part of a school trip have expectations as regards the opportunity of experiencing Flow during their time in a museum. From this perspective, expectations play a vital role in the outcomes of the museum experience: when goals and feedbacks are not clear, learning suffers. Equally important are also the role of choice and control over learning. People are particularly motivated to learn when they feel they have control over what they are learning. For many years, learners were seen as empty vessels ready to be filled with knowledge by this or that teacher. The belief was that learning occurred through accumulation and absorbing of knowledge. However, it is now widely accepted that learning occurs through the individual’s personal and social meaning-making of sensory data. Indeed, according to Hein (1991)’s Constructivist Learning Theory:

Learning is not understanding the ‘true’ nature of things, nor is it (as Plato suggested) remembering dimly perceived perfect ideas, but rather a personal and social construction of meaning out of bewildering array of sensations which have no order or structure besides the explanations (…) which we fabricate for them.

From this point of view, learning is a continuous process of construction of new meanings on the base of prior knowledge and understanding (Falk and Dierking, 2000: 27) and is subjected to the individual’s choice and control.

In regard to the Sociocultural Context – which relates to the social nature of humans – it is important that all forms of informal learning are socio-culturally situated (Eshach, 2007: 180). As Falk and Dierking (2000) well highlight, because humans are
primarily social animals who share knowledge and experience within delimited communities, “learning is both an individual and a group experience” (idem: 50). For this reason, the sociocultural dimension of any learning situation is pivotal as regards “people’s ability to remember the experience” and shape “subsequent experiences with the same objects, ideas or events” (idem: 92). Among the communities of learners cited by Falk and Dierking in relation to “within-group socio-cultural mediation”, attention will now be focussed on the school groups “community”. According to the two authors, the social aspect of school trips is very important for students and, if taken into consideration and capitalised upon, can lead to an increase in learning (idem: 102). The research conducted on school groups suggest that students prefer to share what they are learning, during their visit, with their peers, instead of listening to adult educators. They also seem able to define in which way they could best share and learn museum contents and discuss the conditions under which they visit a museum (idem: 103). Finally, they perceive museums as places to learn about new things (idem). In outlining a longitudinal study at Bank Street College in New York City, Falk and Dierking (idem) highlight how children seem to recall better when:

- the museum visit is linked to the school curriculum
- they have choice and control over the museum experience
- there are multiple visits

As regards the “socio-cultural mediation by others”, museum staff, educators included, play an important role in positively influencing the visitor experience, especially when they are well trained and have a good understanding of museum visits dynamics (ibid.). These results will prove very useful when outlining the issues in school-museum collaboration (see paragraph 2.2.3.).

In regard to the Physical Context – which is the physical environment in which the learning takes place - three factors seem to affect museum learning. The first one refers to novelty and to the difference between how frequent and new visitors behave in the museum context. While frequent visitors pay more attention to the exhibition, new visitors focus their attention on orientation, way-finding, behaviour modelling and general efforts to cope with novelty (Falk and Dierking, 2000: 55). In order to
reduce the novelty effect, advance organisers, such as orientation, need to be taken into consideration when dealing with new visitors. Indeed, orientation is also a tool required to fulfil visitors’ expectations, which, if are not met, can negatively affect the enjoyment of their experience (idem: 117). According to Orion (1992 quoted in Eshach, 2007: 182), the success of a field trip in terms of students’ productivity, depends upon the fulfilment of three conditions: the familiarity with their assignments and field trip and the kind of events in which they will participate. The research has indeed revealed that the Novelty Phenomenon influences the students’ both emotional and cognitive learning outcomes and suggests the reduction of its effects by identifying three novelty-reduction approaches (Burnett et al, 1996 quoted in idem):

1. Increasing students’ familiarity with the physical location
2. Insuring that students have the appropriate level of knowledge of the topics or focus of the exhibits/activities
3. Providing preceding opportunities for students to practice relevant skills

The second major factor is the design of the museum/exhibition. Because learning is highly situated, people are affected by how a space is physically organised, both as regards what they observe and what they remember. According to Falk and Dierking (idem: 57), even the absence or presence of adequate seating can have an impact on visitors’ learning as much as light and noise. However, it is important to highlight that when dealing with groups, the most central of all the physical features is the size of the rooms. Indeed, this last aspect is of major concern for museum educators, especially during guided tours, and usually affects both the choice of the museum contents and the order in which they are presented. Finally, the last factor relates to the impact that events outside the museum have on the reinforcement of the museum experience. Given that “people learn by accumulating understanding over time, from many sources in many different ways” (idem: 139), it is no surprise that the experiences inside the museum become relevant and useful when enabled by events outside the museum. This is the reason why it is very difficult to track what people actually learn from a museum visit: it can even take years before a visitor is able to make meaning out of what he/she has experienced in the museum. According to Falk and Dierking (idem: 140), “the knowledge and experience gained from a museum is incomplete; it requires enabling contexts to become whole”. Associated with this
concept is the definition of learning as highly “situated”, which refers to the difficulty that people have in transferring knowledge acquired in a certain context to another. According to the available research, because learning “appears to be inextricably bound to the environment in which it occurs” (idem: 59), people of all kinds seem unable to apply the principles learned in a context to novel contexts. As Falk and Dierking suggest, the transfer of knowledge needs to be facilitated, for example through interdisciplinary projects and school activities that connect the museum trip to the school curriculum. These actions are thought to create relevant physical contexts for the students’ learning, “resulting in greater transfer and subsequent learning” (idem: 60).

Even though Falk and Dierking’s Contextual Model of Learning describes the museum visit from a holistic perspective, Eshach (2007) criticises the fact that the model does not place the teaching context where it is supposed to be. In discussing school trips to science museums, Eshach argues that Falk and Dierking’s Contextual Model of Learning and Orion and Hofstein’s Three Factors Model should be combined and adds to the three contexts originally presented by Falk and Dierking a fourth one, the Instructional Context, to account for the teaching context. This fourth context sums up the three factors that, in Orion and Hofstein (1994, quoted in Eshach, 2007)’s model, affect learning during scientific fieldtrips in natural environment:

1. Teaching factors (e.g. teaching methods and aids, quality of teachers, location of the field trip in the curriculum structure)
2. Field trips factors (e.g. duration and attractiveness of the trail, weather conditions)
3. Student factors (e.g. previous knowledge of associated topics, previous attitudes to subject matter, previous acquaintance with area in question)

Through incorporating these factors into the Instructional Context, Eshach (2007) highlights the importance that the beforehand trip preparation has on the students’ both cognitive understanding of and emotional preparation for the field trip.
2.2.2. What objects? Young people and contemporary art

“The eye is part of the mind, and looking and seeing are not the end of what happens to a visitor in a museum but only the starting points of an ultimately holistic experience” (Weil, 2002: 72)

When asked to discuss their museum experiences, most people, even those with a background in museum studies and art, do not quite know how to explain the reason why they love going to museums. Following in what Weil (ibid.) says in the quote above, there are indeed a varied number of factors that make a visit to a museum different from any other kind of experience. In particular, museums can be distinguished from other social institutions for the presence of objects or realia. These objects seem to have a great power in triggering “an almost infinite diversity of profound experiences among” museum visitors (idem: 71). According to Weil (idem: 72), there is a huge difference between the feeling of empowerment that one feels by standing right before the Mona Lisa and the feeling of looking at one of its replicas on a catalogue or t-shirt. Weil defines this experience of standing in front of an original art work as unique, almost as the visitor could feel the connection with the artist at the very moment of the art creation (idem: 72). Thus, it is what Walter Benjamin (quoted in ibid.) calls the “aura” of the authentic original that probably represents the greatest strength of museums as places of learning and distinguishes learning in a museum context from learning in school.

Through exploring the model and the strategies involved in teaching with objects, Hooper-Greenhill (1994: 232) claims that the first stage is about using all the senses (sense-perception) to collect “as much data as possible about the object(s) under analysis”. Thus, the second stage is about discussing the data, in relation to previous knowledge and experience, and sharing these perceptions with others (ibid.). Because of the different ways in which objects are approached, “hypotheses and deductions as to use and meaning over time and through space may be constructed and tested” (ibid.). Moreover, perceptions related to the objects encountered in museums always trigger interest, being either attractive or odd, and “lead learning into curious unpredictable paths” (ibid.), promoting learning beyond the museum experience. Indeed, according to Hooper-Greenhill (ibid.), objects release their full potential only when the initial perceptions related to them are changed or extended through further
research, which lead to different interpretations. In describing the methodological process of teaching with objects (see Figures 33.1 to 33.5 in idem: 234-238), Hooper-Greenhill clearly states that one of the benefits of using objects is that they “cross-relate to many areas of the curriculum” (ibid.). Indeed, it is this richness of input and stimuli offered by objects, which appeal to teachers, always in search of possible ways to create cross-curricular experiences that could enhance and enable students’ transversal and language skills.

Hooper-Greenhill (1994) does not specify what kind of objects she refers to when talking about the “learning power” of objects in museums, almost assuming that this is an intrinsic characteristic of all objects in museums. However, contemporary art “objects” seriously challenge both Benjamin’s idea of “aura” (see above) and Weil’s concept of empowerment (see above).

In discussing the particular way in which teenagers engage with contemporary art, Illeris (2005: 3) uses the following observations, collected from one of the teenage participants in her study, as a starting point:

1. the encounter with contemporary works of art becomes interesting when you forget to make sense out of it
2. contemporary art is different from the art we are used to. The artwork gives you no information about how to approach it
3. your sense of personal attitudes and morals determines what you can or will get out of interactions with such artworks

In relation to the first point, it is important to highlight that teenagers’ learning is determined by the fulfilment of pre-conditions, which are defined by Illeris (idem: 6) as “the hook”, “the experience of otherness”, “social interaction” and “metareflection”. With regard to “the hook” pre-condition, Illeris (idem: 9) claims that, in line with Csikszentmihalyi’s description of flow experience and intrinsic motivation (see paragraph 2.2.1.), teenagers look for artworks they immediately feel an emotional connection with and only engage in the process of learning when they are intrinsically motivated. With regard to “the experience of otherness”, it is interesting to point out that contemporary art can represent “an alternative to young people’s self-centred attitudes in a positive way (…) they can accept by challenging their intuitive conceptions of normality” (Ziehe, 1989 quoted in ibid.). The encounter with contemporary art encourages young people to forget what they know and what is
normal and “adopt a curious and sensitive attitude” (ibid.) towards what is unusual.
With regard to social interaction, what seems very important about the way teenagers
learn and develop further meaning is the opportunity of sharing and reflecting on their
first individual impressions with their peers. Indeed, the role played by the
sociocultural context during a museum visit (see Falk and Dierking’s Contextual
Model in paragraph 2.2.3.) is evident in the way teenage groups approach museums.
Furthermore, as Illeris (2005: 5) claims, students often prefer “to hear about each
other’s experiences than what the educator has to say”. Finally, with regard to
“metareflection”, Illeris’ opinion is that by using different methodologies of audience
engagement, such as “appropriation of artistic strategies” and “ performative staging
of relationships in front of the camera” (Illeris, 2003 and 2004 quoted in Illeris, 2005:
10), one can help teenagers reflect on their own social position as learners.
In relation to the second point, Illeris (idem: 6) claims that contemporary artworks are
different from the modernist artworks teenagers are used to. While the latter are “self-
enclosed objects imbued with a very special aura or charisma which the viewer is
expected to absorb through a receptive and contemplative attitude” (ibid.), the former
refer to “art made and produced by artists living today” (About Contemporary Art),
representing something to engage with and to experience. According to Bonnard
(quoted in ibid.), the contemporary artwork ceases to be a “monument” and becomes
“an invitation to take a break from normal instrumentalised experiences (...)”. Indeed,
as stated by the Getty educational staff (ibid.), when “experiencing” contemporary
artworks, questions about the quality or aesthetical pleasantness of the artwork need
to be set aside and replaced by questions on the interest and challenge that it spurs. It
is important to highlight that contemporary art creates a dialogue with the viewer by
discussing traditional ideas of “how art is defined, what constitutes art, and how art is
made” (ibid.). Through the use of a wide range of mediums, contemporary art reflects
and comments on modern-day society (ibid.). Despite these characteristics of
contemporary art, which makes it “unusual” and difficult to approach, Illeris (2005: 6)
is of the opinion that contemporary art mediums, such as performances, installation
art, video and computer art “are preferred to traditional art forms” by teenagers,
describing contemporary art as “ the students’ natural element” (Hjort and Larsen,
2003 quoted in ibid.).
In relation to the third and last point, it seems possible to say that contemporary art
responds to the “new forms of consciousness” (Simonsen and Ziehe quoted in idem:}
3), which characterise teenagers. Whereas adults, museum staff included, usually position youngsters in a “negative and childish role as being irresponsible, irresolute, unfocused (…) and not yet capable of handling their own lives” (idem: 4), teenagers see themselves in a “transitional phase”, in which they can choose among different lifestyles, tastes, jobs and sexuality. Thus, they live in a persistent state of liberation, which is expressed by their will to protect their individuality and need to stay true to themselves (Simonsen, 2000 quoted in ibid.). Given these psychological features, the aesthetical experience teenagers have is mainly a personal one and is highly influenced by issues of personal choice and rightness: “will I and can I engage in this experience?”.

2.2.3. School-Museum collaboration

In the western world, school trips to museums are common and well established and are widely recognised as valuable learning experiences, in varied domains, such as “cognitive, affective, social, motivational, aesthetic, and so on” (Anderson, Kisiel & Storksdieck, 2006: 366). Indeed, studies that have investigated the intrinsic significance of school trips have indicated that student groups that visit a museum often show cognitive gain (Stronck, 1983 quoted in Griffin, 2004: 59) and a more positive attitude towards learning (Orion and Ofstein, 1991 quoted in ibid.) than those who do not. According to Schauble et al. (1996 quoted in idem: 60), “learning in a museum context includes outcomes like an expanded sense of aesthetic appreciation, the development of motivation and interest, the formation and refinement of critical standards, and the growth of personal identity”. Moreover, museums are said to “provide important learning opportunities that potentially bridge the gap between the classroom and the world beyond, enabling education to fulfill its aim of preparing students for the opportunities, responsibilities and experiences of adult life” (Mathewson, 2006: 5).

Despite the potential and important value of field trips to museums, researchers have pointed out that school-museum collaboration is still very problematic, especially in regard to teachers’ perceptions and training, museum field trips planning and implementation and the communication and collaboration between museums and schools.
In describing the outcomes of three studies on teacher’s perspectives on museum field trips in three countries, Anderson, Kisiel & Storksdieck (2006: 367) come to the conclusion that the decision to do a museum field trip is influenced by a wide range of factors:

- the venue location
- the safety and security of the students
- the relevance of the field trip experience to the school curriculum
- the communication between the field trip venue and schools
- time
- the lack of support from the school administration

Another factor is certainly the Cost of the excursion (Hooper-Greenhill, 1994: 159), which can be off-putting.

In relation to teachers’ perceptions, researches have found that teachers often assume they have a marginal role on the realisation or value of museum experiences (Mathewson, 2006: 7). Indeed, many of them wrongly believe that, once in the museum, “meanings will be transmitted in a naturalistic manner” (ibid.). According to Griffin (1994 quoted in Anderson, Kisiel & Storksdieck, 2006: 367), the role the teachers play on student learning in a museum varies between being totally passive, “following the museum guide, helping with keeping the order, and watching their students” (Falk and Dierking, 2005: 932), to being active and working with students in small groups. As Falk and Dierking (ibid.) claim, teachers’ ill perception of field trips as fun events instead of well-planned educational experiences is clear in the lack of clear goals for their excursion and of students’ preparation through pre- and post-visit activities. Indeed, according to Griffin (quoted in Bailey, 1999), it seems clear that teachers have a difficult time understanding “the premises of learning in informal environments, such as learning through play and direct involvement with phenomena” and the way they can link the museum visit to the school curriculum. In this regard, the definition of “curriculum fit”, which is usually ranked by teachers as the most important factor in choosing a museum programme over another, seems to be widely underestimated (Anderson, Kisiel & Storksdieck, 2006: 379). In studying the Israeli museum context, Falk and Dierking (2005) found that of the thirty teachers taking
part in their study, only eight connected the topic of the museum trip to what was being learned in school and only three said that they would talk about the visit, while others stated that they would not do anything beyond the visit itself (idem: 928). It is important to highlight that, even though Falk and Dierking’s study is only related to the situation of Israeli museums, researches in other countries have showed similar results.

In regard to the situation just outlined, Mathewson (2006: 9) stresses the importance of training teachers so as to enable them to best use museums and take full advantage of their learning potential. In particular Hooper-Greenhill (1994: 244) highlights that teachers are not always clear about what is possible to do in a museum and this usually leads to their objectives not being completely formed. Thus, she suggests a pre-planning moment in which the museum staff explains the potential of the museum and discuss the specific visit with teachers (ibid.). Moreover, she also claims that, if possible, teachers should visit the museum and get acquainted with the environment before taking the students. She further suggests that, in order to support teachers in planning their field trip to a museum, the museum staff should visit the schools, offer teachers’ workshops and/or provide notes and other written materials (ibid.). In terms of school-museum collaboration, the distinction put forward by Xanthoudaki (1998 quoted in Griffin, 2004: 65) between art museum programs which are aimed at supporting the teacher by “helping teachers help themselves” through discussing and planning programs with and for teachers” and “ready-prepared programs which may or may not match the teachers’ or students’ requirements” is pivotal. According to her, while visits following the first model are more likely to promote integration of the field trip into the classroom, because of curriculum fit, the latter shows the opposite (ibid.).

In terms of actual planning, Xanthoudaki (1998 quoted in Mathewson, 2006: 85) claims that the best way to plan a museum experience is to think of it as a “three part unit”, “consisting of preliminary preparation, visit and follow up work”. Indeed, according to Hooper-Greenhill (ibid.), after defining the objectives, teachers should place the museum visit into their course of study, by designing both pre- and post-visit activities. In regard to the preparatory phase, it is important that teachers explain the objectives of the visit to their students and discuss the knowledge they will need to best experience the museum contents, though without explaining the specific objects.
According to Bailey (1999), an important factor that appears significant in this phase is the knowledge of the environment, so as to reduce the Novelty Phenomenon (see paragraph 2.2.1.). Furthermore, Bailey (ibid.) advises towards focussing the pre-visit orientation on students’ personal agenda, in order to promote their freedom and control over learning in the museum setting. In regard to the follow-up phase, its importance is undeniable, given that one of the intrinsic characteristics of learning in a museum setting is that museum experiences become actual knowledge only when they are reinforced by subsequent experiences. Thus, if teachers want the museum visit to be of any value they need to think about ways to follow-up the field trip with classroom activities.

In exploring ways to make school-museum collaborations more efficient, Stone (1986 quoted in Mathewson, 2006: 85) lists the following components to establish and maintain cooperative relations between museums and schools:

1. Prelude of cooperative relationships – involves a familiarity with the priorities and operations of each prospective institution involved
2. Building cooperative relationships – requires building strong communication between teachers and museum staff
3. Preplanning art museum/school programs – establishes programs and services for teachers to receive in-service training
4. Planning art museum/school programs – requires the involvement of both museum staff and teachers to establish logistics, mutual goals and objectives appropriate for the museum visit. Curricula are determined in conjunction with learning goals and objectives
5. Implementing art museum/school programs – involves the implementation and evaluation of programs and operations and any necessary modifications.
6. Teacher support – includes resources, activities and intervention extended by the museum for teachers to employ in the classroom in conjunction with museum visits
7. Evaluating art museum/school programs – teacher feedback and evaluations are initiated to establish appropriateness and effectiveness of programs
8. Maintaining cooperative relationships – the model concludes with an emphasis on maintaining partnerships once they have been established to further benefits gained from museum-school collaborations
It is important to point out that, in order to provide the best educational services, museums need to establish fruitful relations with other external bodies or/and museums. Moreover, even within the museum, communication needs to be clear as regards the delineation of responsibilities and tasks (Hooper-Greenhill, 1994: 241), so as to avoid gaps that can diminish visitors’ learning outcomes.

2.3. CLIL

According to Coyle, Holmes and King (2009: 4), there is nothing revolutionary about linking language to meaning, especially because language is considered to be a necessary tool “to interpret the world (…) to access new meanings” and to shape “our understanding of that world”. The same could be said about learning a FL and, indeed, all models of FL learning admit that a FL is a means to access a new culture. None of these models, though, seems to have addressed this link between meaning and FL as successfully as CLIL. This is the reason why this methodology is today widespread and is on the national educational agendas of many countries that are part of the European Union.

CLIL (Content Language and Integrated Learning) is a term, which was first developed by the European Network of Administrators, Researchers and Practitioners (EUROCLIC) in the mid 1990s and can be defined as (Marsh and Langé, 2000 quoted in Wolff, 2007: 16):

\[
\text{(…) any educational situation in which an additional language and therefore not the most widely used language of the environment is used for the teaching and learning of the subjects other than the language itself.}
\]

Marsh and Langé (quoted in ibid.) assert that there are three necessary points to make as regards this definition. Firstly, the CLIL approach is concerned and aims to improve both students’ FL and content competence. Secondly, in the CLIL context, FL and content are viewed as a whole and learnt in integration. Finally, even though the FL is used as medium of instruction, there needs to be time for focussing upon it when necessary and in order to support and facilitate the learning of the content. It is indeed this “integrating” nature of CLIL that differentiates it from similar
developments (Coyle, 2012: 3), such as immersion and content-based instruction in a FL, and makes it:

(…) a powerful pedagogic tool which aims to safeguard the subject being taught whilst promoting language as a medium for learning as well as an objective of the learning process itself (Coyle in Marsh 2002: 37 quoted in ibid.).

Among the promises of CLIL is certainly that of promoting multilingualism and it is in this perspective that, in the last twenty years, the Italian Ministry of Education has explored ways to encourage programmes in which the foreign language is used as medium of instruction (henceforth FLM). In particular, with the law on school autonomy (1999), schools and teachers gain a new flexibility in addressing the specific needs and interests of the students and communities they serve, setting programmes that involve different subjects, in the form of curricular and extracurricular FL modules (Coonan, 2012: 11-13). However, it is with the so-called Riforma Moratti (DL. 17 October 2005 and law 28 March 2003, n. 53)” (Coonan, 2008: 13), that CLIL is formally introduced in the school curriculum both in the scuola dell’infanzia and the ciclo primario di istruzione (scuola primaria and scuola secondaria di I grado) (2005) and the scuola secondaria di II grado (2009). It is important to highlight though that whereas the legislator only advises towards the provision of CLIL programmes in the scuola dell’infanzia and the ciclo primario di istruzione, he/she clearly states the compulsivity of the CLIL provision in the scuola secondaria di II grado. In particular, in the scuola secondaria di II grado “l’obbligatorietà si limita all’ultimo anno di tutti i tipi di Liceo (articolo 6 e 10) ad eccezione dei Licei Linguistici dove è previsto l’insegnamento di una disciplina non-linguistica in una prima LS (a scelta) nel primo anno del secondo biennio e di un’altra disciplina non-linguistica in lingua inglese, scelta questa operata per legge” (idem: 15). It is very important to consider that the current academic year 2013/2014 has seen the implementation of the above prescription for the Licei Linguistici, while the other secondary schools will implement it only in the next academic year 2014/2015. The so-called “Riforma Moratti” has produced great preoccupation as regards the training of subject teachers in the CLIL methodology and their competence in the FL (idem: 17). Even though in Italy, Universities are directly responsible for the training
of the CLIL teacher (1500 hours), there is still a lot of work to do in relation to both educational policy and school context collaboration and team teaching.

2.3.1. The foreign language in the CLIL context

It is today common opinion that the learning of the FL in a CLIL context is more authentic than that in a traditional FL learning context (Wolff, 1997 quoted in Coonan, 2012: 97). Even if, in the Communicative Approach, the activities, materials and purposes for the use of the FL are authentic, they are nonetheless only a test in preparation for using the FL in the real world (Coonan, 2012: 98). On the contrary, in a CLIL context, the learning of a FL is characterised by increased authenticity, both with regard to materials and contents and interaction and context. In particular, Wolff (1997 quoted in ibid.) claims that the materials and contents in the CLIL classroom are more authentic than are those in the traditional FL teaching classroom because:

- contents are strictly related to real life
- the FL used as a medium of instruction is less ambiguous
- contents are more complex and rich

As regards interaction, Wolff (1997 quoted in idem: 100) asserts that, in a CLIL setting, the increase of authenticity in students’ interaction is due to the fact that they: explore real contents through interactive activities, write and read texts in a FL to learn the contents and work on the FL with the purpose of problem solving, in relation to the learning of the non-linguistic contents. As regards the context, the CLIL environment offers a far richer context than does the traditional FL teaching one. Firstly, the linguistic and cognitive complexity and the range of texts and of the linguistic functions make the CLIL context qualitatively better in relation to the input. Secondly, both input and output are motivated, because the CLIL student uses the language “per comprendere concetti, per appropriarsi dei contenuti, per riflettere su di essi e per manifestare la sua comprensione, conoscenza e perplessità al riguardo” (idem: 101). Indeed, the CLIL teacher does not teach the FL but promotes its competence through its use as a vehicular language of instruction. Therefore, in the
CLIL environment students use the language to learn and not the other way round (ibid.).

The CLIL approach has also proven ideal in responding to the general dissatisfaction towards the FL teaching methodologies, developed since the eighties, as to promoting FL learning motivation (Coyle, Holmes and King, 2009: 4; Lasagabaster, 2010; Coyle, 2012). Indeed, according to Lasagabaster (2010: 15):

(…) different types of tasks completed in a CLIL context tend to generate more positive motivational responses than those carried out in traditional EFL contexts and, therefore, they raise the students’ language-learning interest through a more appropriate approach. The use of the foreign language to teach content thus seems to create a learning environment, which is more alluring to students.

Of the same opinion is Coyle (2012), who, in her study of the CLIP report (Wiesemes, 2005 quoted in Coyle, 2012), claims that CLIL methodology benefits both teachers motivation towards their teaching practice and students’ motivation in learning the FL.

CLIL is also believed to help students develop their general cognitive skills, giving them the possibility to access and acquire new knowledge across the curriculum. From this perspective, a varied amount of studies has demonstrated that not only CLIL students are better language learners, because they learn it more proficiently and deeply, but are also better content learners, because they process knowledge more deeply and “construct more complex concepts and schemata” (Wolff, 2007: 21-22). However, among the benefits of CLIL, researchers also highlight that of fostering multicultural understanding among pupils, both contributing to their personal development and preparing them to become global citizens of the Knowledge Society (Coyle, Holmes and King, 2009: 4). This is the reason why the CLIL approach can be adopted with all language learners, even in the early stages, and is open to several different possibilities in and outside of school.

In researching the type of language competence that students need to have in order to be able to study a non-linguistic subject through a FL, Cummins (1994 quoted in Coonan, 2012) distinguishes between two different types of communication, BICS and CALP. According to Coonan (2008a: 25), BICS (Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills) refers to “un tipo di competenza legato alla comunicazione di tipo socializzante”, that is, the abilities that the students need to have in order to
communicate with friends about daily aspects of their life (i.e. very basic personal and family information, shopping, local geography, employment) or to ask for information and services in contexts, such as at the restaurant, in a shop etc.. On the other hand, CALP (Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency) is defined as a more complex and cognitively demanding competence, which is developed through using the FL in activities that “implicano l’uso di processi cognitivi di ordine superiore” (Coonan, 2012: 90), such as analysis, synthesis, evaluation, generalisation, hypothesis and so on. Indeed, this is the type of FL competence that students need to have to approach and learn contents related to non-linguistic subjects (idem).

As studies on bilingual formal settings, especially in Canada and in the US, have revealed, the failure experienced by students in studying non-linguistic subjects in the L2 is often closely related to their preparation for a BICS competence in place of a CALP competence. According to Coonan (idem), BICS is usually the competence developed in traditional FL classrooms and is connected to a basic general knowledge, which corresponds to that of the Basic User (A1 and A2 levels) and the Independent User (B1 level), for some activities, of the Common European Framework of Reference (henceforth CEFR). For clarity, the definitions of A1, A2 and B1 levels of the CEFR are reported below:

A1.
Can understand and use familiar everyday expressions and very basic phrases aimed at the satisfaction of needs of a concrete type. Can introduce him/herself and others and can ask and answer questions about personal details such as where he/she lives, people he/she knows and things he/she has. Can interact in a simple way provided the other person talks slowly and clearly and is prepared to help.

A2.
Can understand sentences and frequently used expressions related to areas of most immediate relevance (e.g. very basic personal and family information, shopping, local geography, employment). Can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar and routine matters. Can describe in simple terms aspects of his/her background, immediate environment and matters in areas of immediate need.

B1.
Can understand the main points of clear standard input on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc. Can deal with most situations likely to arise whilst travelling in an area where the language is spoken. Can produce simple connected text on topics, which are familiar or of
personal interest. Can describe experiences and events, dreams, hopes and ambitions and briefly give reasons and explanations for opinions and plans.

Coonan (idem) highlights that B1 level is the breakpoint between BICS and CALP competence and, as regards the development of the latter, she emphasises the importance of two factors: the context and the cognitive complexity of the task. Indeed, much of the research on the quality of the learning that takes place in the CLIL environment is particularly concerned with the type of activities planned by teachers to promote both content and language learning (Coonan, 2007). As Coyle (1983 quoted in Coonan, 2007: 153) emphasizes, all activities in the content classrooms are tasks (see paragraph 2.3.5., Learning activities) and need to be carefully designed, because “the students will learn what a task leads them to do (…)” (idem: 154). In particular, Smith and Paterson (1998:1 quoted in Coyle, 1999: 49) argue that if the task is contextually poor and cognitively undemanding, the student’s language learning and non-linguistic content access are seriously denied.

As regards the context, Coonan (idem: 91) claims that the context of the task refers to the group of features, such as gestures, facial expressions, realia and so on, that help the FL students in connecting the signified to the signifier. Indeed, the context plays a pivotal role both for the student’s comprehension and production in the FL, because it gives all the information, both verbal and non-verbal, necessary for the message to be understood and communicated effectively. According to Coonan (ibid.), the type of context varies both in relation to the subject and the school level. Cummins (quoted in ibid.), in particular, distinguishes between context embedded and context reduced messages. The context embedded messages are those which are deeply contextualised and can be divided into:

1. **visually-aided**: messages that use images to support the comprehension
2. **visually-based**: messages that use visual tools, such as tables, flow sheets and maps, to report the outcomes of an activity

The context reduced messages are those that make little use of images to convey meanings and to support the student’s comprehension and learning and, consequently, oblige him/her to: create meaning only from and through words.
As regards the cognitive complexity of the task, Cummins (quoted in ibid.) differentiates between two types of tasks: cognitively undemanding and cognitively demanding. Whereas in the traditional FL lesson, the tasks are usually cognitively undemanding because the focus is on the language, in the CLIL lesson it is the opposite because the focus is on the content. However, the teacher can play with the variables of cognitive complexity and context, amplifying the role of the context if the task is cognitively demanding or reducing the role of the context if the task is cognitively undemanding (Coonan, 2012: 94). The relationship between the two variables is well explained by Cummins and Swain (1986 quoted in Coyle, 1999: 49)’s model below:

![Diagram](image)

In this model, quadrants A and C refer to a BICS competence and include tasks in which the language is used to communicate “fatti concreti, personali, ‘qui e ora’ e per motivi pragmatici” (Coonan, 2012: 94; see Coonan, 2012: 95 for a description of BICS language functions). On the contrary, quadrants B and D refer to a CALP competence and include tasks in which the language is used to talk about abstract concepts “non legati a una situazione concreta e presente” (idem; see Coonan, 2012: 95 for a description of CALP language functions).

It is particularly interesting to highlight how it is possible for the CLIL teacher to make the task more or less difficult through the manipulation of various features. However, the characteristics of and the factors involved in planning a task will be further discussed in paragraph 2.3.4..
2.3.2. Planning and implementing CLIL

When planning and implementing a CLIL curriculum, teachers and curriculum designers are faced with challenges resulting from both the intrinsic characteristics of CLIL (see paragraph 2.3.5.) and the wider learning and socio-political context in which a CLIL programme is implemented. In particular, Coyle (quoted in Meyer, 2010: 12) individuates four facets of CLIL, which interrelation needs to be taken into consideration when planning and implementing a CLIL curriculum (Coyle, 2006: 9): content (the subject matter), cognition (the thinking integral to high quality learning), communication (the language of and for learning) and culture (the global citizenship agenda). On the base of these four “Cs”, Coyle develops a framework, labelled as the 4Cs-Framework, which she asserts is an ideal tool to support both theoretically and methodologically the planning and implementation of a CLIL curriculum (ibid.). In order for quality CLIL to take place, students need to be provided with opportunities to progress in the knowledge, skills and understanding of the content, engage in associate cognitive processing, interact in the communicative context, develop appropriate cognitive language knowledge and skills “as well as acquiring a deepening intercultural awareness through the positioning of self and <<otherness>>” (Coyle, 1999: 53).

In La lingua straniera veicolare, Coonan (2012) asserts that in order to plan a CLIL curriculum, the following components need to be taken into consideration:

1. Context
2. Learning situation
3. Aims
4. Objectives
5. Linguistic needs
6. Contents
7. Methodology
8. Timetable
9. Evaluation

These nine components are listed in a coherent and cohesive order and are interrelated on the base of a cause and effect relationship (idem: 121).
As regards the context, Coonan considers the following variables: school type, students, parents and teachers. The identity of and the relationship and communication among these entities are fundamental for the success of the CLIL curriculum. In particular, when considering the school type, the curriculum designer needs to ponder over school level and type, available resources and the connections between the school and the surrounding political and social environment. In considering the students, attention needs to be focussed on the following factors: age, socio-cultural background, FL level and learning history, motivation and decision in taking part in the CLIL programme. In considering the parents, the question is whether to involve them or not in the decision to implement a CLIL module or take part in one. In considering the teachers, factors that need attention are: the relationship among the teachers involved in the planning and implementation of the CLIL curriculum, the support received by the head master and the teacher’s competence in the FL. Of course, when the CLIL curriculum is planned and implemented outside of the formal environment, the actors to take into consideration change as do the factors involved. It must be highlighted that for CLIL to work, there needs to be a high level of communication between the parties involved.

As regards the learning situation, aspects that need to be taken into consideration are those that will most likely affect the contents and the methodology. Coonan (idem: 125; my translation) identifies the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>how many teachers are involved in the planning and implementation of the CLIL curriculum? What kind of collaboration exists between them?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the students have the same competence in the FL? How many are they?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What contents?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the CLIL programme part of the school curriculum or is it a non-formal activity?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many hours are dedicated to the CLIL programme?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it part of a longer project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what language is the CLIL programme carried on?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the base of what principle does the language switching happen?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As regards the aims of a CLIL curriculum, it is important to remember that they are twofold, related to the learning of both the linguistic and non-linguistic contents. Therefore, when planning a CLIL programme one has to bear in mind that its
implementation is based upon the will to foster students’ development of both language and content knowledge and skills.

As regards the objectives of a CLIL curriculum, they fall into three categories: content objectives, transversal objectives and language objectives. If in the traditional FL teaching context, the language objectives are primary, in CLIL they are secondary because they are defined on the base of what language competence the students need to access the contents (needs of the CLIL curriculum). However, given that CLIL aims also at fostering students’ competence in the FL, it is not wrong to believe that a CLIL programme could also have language objectives. Finally, the transversal objectives refer to the cognitive and study skills that the students need to have developed at the end of the CLIL programme.

As regards the linguistic requirements of the CLIL curriculum, these are selected and defined in relation to the non-linguistic contents, so as to support students learning. The linguistic requirements can be defined by speaking to the subject teacher, by selecting the language skills necessary to answer to certain questions and fulfil certain tasks and activities and by consulting students and their work (Coonan, 2012: 130).

As regards the contents of the non-linguistic subject, when the CLIL programme is a non-formal activity, they need to be chosen on the base of criteria, such as relevance, usefulness, interest and need. However, the leading criteria will always be that of feasibility, meaning that studying a non-linguistic subject requires the use of certain thinking skills, which define the students’ linguistic requirements (Mohan, 1986 quoted in Coyle, 1999: 47). According to Mohan (idem: 48), thinking processes can be identified as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structures of knowledge</th>
<th>Thinking processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>classifying, defining, using operational definitions, understanding, applying or developing concepts, definitions or classifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles</td>
<td>explaining and predicting, interpreting data and drawing conclusions, formulating, testing, establishing hypotheses, understanding, applying or developing generalisations (causes, effects, means, ends, motives, norms, strategies,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methods, techniques, impacts, influences, responses, results

| Evaluation | Evaluating, ranking, appreciating, judging, criticising, expressing, justifying preferences and personal opinions, understanding, analysing and deciding on goals, values, policies and evaluation criteria |

Each one of these thinking processes is associated with specific language structures, which are necessary for their execution (Mohan, 1986, quoted in Coonan, 2012: 129). As regards the methodology, the teaching strategies and learning tasks and activities will be looked at in more details in paragraph 2.3.3. and 2.3.4., while in this section attention will be given to the operational model, based on Bloom (quoted in idem: 132)’s model to plan quality CLIL. According to Bloom’s Taxonomy, there are six levels of Higher Level Thinking Skills (Bloom’s Taxonomy):

- Knowledge: recall or locate information
- Comprehension: understand learned facts
- Application: apply what has been learned to new situations
- Analysis: “take part” information to examine different parts
- Synthesis: create or invent something; bring together more than one idea
- Evaluation: consider evidence to support conclusion

These skills can be placed in a model as follows (Coonan, 2012: 132):

Motivazione > conoscere > comprendere > applicare > analizzare > creare > valutare

| Creare curiosità e interesse | Fare lavorare sui nuovi contenuti | Proporre gamma articolata di attività per approfondire e consolidare le conoscenze e le competenze |
This model is built on three consequential stages. The first stage highlights the importance of preparing students by motivating them. In the second stage, students use their comprehension and knowledge skills to access the new contents. In the last stage they use higher order skills to reinforce and consolidate the skills and knowledge they have acquired.

As regards the language switching, teachers can select one of the following options: *alternanza separata* and *alternanza concomitante*. The former refers to the situation in which the two languages are alternated on the base of criteria, such as subject, person, time and space. The latter refers to the situation in which the two languages are used in the same communicative context and take up different forms (skill, non didactic function, presentation or summary, reinforce and expansion).

As regards evaluation, both students and teachers should be involved in this phase. What to evaluate and how are two very common questions and can only be answered by taking into consideration the aims and conditions of the CLIL programme to evaluate (see Serragiotto, 2007).

### 2.3.3. Listening in CLIL

According to Liubinienė (2009: 89), listening is a complex and vital process and does not simply involve “extracting meaning from incoming speech” but also “matching speech with the background knowledge, i.e. what the listeners already know about the subject”. Indeed, listening comprehension is characterised by two processes:

1. **Top-down**: when learners rely on prior linguistic, encyclopaedic or cultural knowledge “in order to understand the meaning of a message” (interpretation) (ibid.)

2. **Bottom-up**: when learners construct the meaning of a message “proceeding from sounds to words to grammatical relationships in lexical meanings” (decoding) (Morley, 2001 quoted in ibid.)

While the L1 listener does not have difficulties in discriminating the words in the speech, decoding the meaning of the single words and interpreting the meaning of the message through activating his/her prior knowledge, the FL learner lacks both the knowledge and competence to successfully use either one or both of the *top-down* and
\textit{bottom-up} processes (Coonan, 2012: 140-141). This is why, in traditional FL teaching classrooms, teachers teach students how to use these processes efficiently (see ibid.). However, listening in the CLIL environment is made even more difficult by the fact that students need to apply these processes to learn non-linguistic contents.

In outlining the difficulties encountered by students in listening comprehension in CLIL contexts, Coonan (idem: 142-143) lists three categories of factors:

\textit{Aspetti esterni}

- Insufficiente o scarsa familiarità con l’argomento
- Mancanza di conoscenze culturali
- Mancanza di un contesto immediate

\textit{Aspetti linguisticì}

- Microlingua specifica
- Insufficiente o scarsa familiarità con il tipo testuale oppure il genere
- Difficoltà intrinseca del testo stesso:
  - statici (facili): descrivono oggetti o forniscono istruzioni
  - dinamici: raccontano eventi
  - astratti (difficili): parlano di idee e credenze
- Densità dell’informazione
- Complessità linguistica (sintassi e lessico)
- Lunghezza del testo
- Organizzazione testuale (coerenza e coesione)

\textit{Aspetto cognitivo}

- Complessità concettuale dei contenuti

Furthermore, when the input is oral, the following factors can also impede the comprehension of the FL (Liubinenë, 2009: 90): “rate of speech, phonological features (e.g. dialects or foreign accents, different speakers), lack of visuals,
background noise and occasional lapses of concentration or hearing”. Finally, CLIL students are likely to have more listening comprehension problems than traditional FL learning students in relation to the following elements (Coonan, 2012: 144; my translation):

- They deal with oral texts that present a high percentage of the characteristics listed above
- The oral input is mainly transactional (see Brown & Yule, 1983)
- Their attention is also focussed on learning the non-linguistic contents

**Comprehensible Input**

Researchers in the Second Language Acquisition (henceforth SLA) field have studied the role played by the input in the learner’s acquisition of a FL or L2. According to Krashen (1987 quoted in Coonan 2012: 144; 1982), both the quantity and quality of the input is highly important in order for the learner to acquire the FL/L2. He calls this aspect of second language acquisition the Input Hypothesis, claiming that: we acquire by understanding L2 input that is comprehensible and is a bit beyond our current level of competence \((i + 1)\) (Krashen, 1982: 23). The comprehensibility of the input refers to the assumption that the learner acquires\(^3\) language only when he/she concentrates on the meaning and not on the form. Furthermore, as Krashen highlights, \(i + 1\) is acquired only if the affective filter is off (see Affective Filter Hypothesis in idem: 29). Even though Krashen’s Secon Language Acquisition Theory (SLAT) has been highly criticised for not giving enough importance to the role played by the output (White, 1987 and Gregg, 1984 quoted in Coonan 2012: 144), in a CLIL environment the comprehensibility of the input is highly pivotal in order for the

---

\(^3\) In his Theory of Second Language Acquisition (SLAT), Krashen distinguishes between Acquisition and Learning of a L2 in adults. Acquisition is a subconscious, implicit learning, similar to the ability children develop in their first language. Adults are not aware they are acquiring the new language and their resulting L2 competence is also subconscious. “Grammatical sentences "sound" right, or "feel" right, and errors feel wrong, even if we do not consciously know what rule was violated” (Krashen, 1982: 13-14). On the other hand, learning is “conscious knowledge of a second language, knowing the rules, being aware of them, and being able to talk about them” (idem: 14).
student to learn the non-linguistic contents and develop his/her language competence (Coonan, 2012: 145).

The oral input is produced by three different sources: the teacher, the audio or video recording and the students. As regards the teacher’s output, it is important to highlight that the teacher can either apply a transmission or interpretation style, where the former refers to the input being oriented towards monologue and the latter towards dialogue (idem: 146). Ideally, in a CLIL context, the teacher is a transmission teacher who “delega parte della responsabilità dell’apprendimento allo studente, creando delle condizioni per il dialogo” (ibid.). As regards the students, there is the need in the CLIL classroom to create multiple opportunities for them to produce language, and this can only happen if the teacher adopts a collaborative teaching approach and designs group tasks (see paragraph 2.3.4. for a description on CLIL collaborative approach and task methodology).

Within the context of the current research, particular attention needs to be given to the strategies that the teacher can embrace to facilitate students’ listening comprehension. In particular, it is worth pointing out that research on input discourse has examined “the special kind of ‘register’ that is used when speakers address language learners” (Ellis, 1994: 246), individuating three different registers: caretaker talk, foreigner talk and teachers talk (see ibid.). These registers are different from a native-speaker talk directed to native speakers both on the formal and interactive level. On the formal level, they are characterised by “ritmo rallentato, articolazione più chiara, semplificazione sintattica, frasi brevi” (Coonan, 2012: 148). On the interactive level, they are characterised by interactional modifications, which means that the input is not formally simplified, but is communicated in a simpler way (Ellis, 1994: 257). Interactional modifications can be either of a discourse management or discourse repair type. The former refer to the “attempt to simplify the discourse so as to avoid communication problems”, while the latter “occur when some form of communication break-down has taken place (…)” (ibid.). According to Krashen (quoted in Coonan, 2012: 148), it is this dimension that L2 teachers should focus upon, constantly monitoring their students’ comprehension of the input, through using discourse management and repair strategies, such as (Coonan 2012: 148-149):

- Marcatori di discorso
- Ripetizioni di concetti importanti
In a CLIL environment, the use of these strategies is even more important because the input is not simplified in a way that makes it less rich, language or content wise, and possible language difficulties or content misunderstandings are monitored strategically (ibid.).

**Teachers’ methodology: support materials and listening activities**

According to Coonan (idem: 150), there are two types of methodological and didactic strategies that teachers can apply to make the input comprehensible: using materials to support the listening comprehension and using appropriate methodological procedures.

As regards the materials to support the listening comprehension, teachers can (ibid.):

- hand notes out to the students with a list of contents, key terms, concepts and definitions he/she will use during the class
- use *realia* and images
- use body gestures
- act out or use activities that illustrate the content
- use graphic organisers to visually present consequences, sequences, associations etc.
As regards the methodological procedures, in order to help and support and scaffold students’ listening comprehension in a CLIL environment, teachers should plan pre-, during- and post- listening activities.

In relation to the pre-listening activities, Coonan (idem: 156) highlights how this phase is very important for the students to recall what they already know (background knowledge) and give them direction as to what they are going to listen to, but also for the teacher to plan the kind of support she/he will need to provide (see idem: 157 for a list of pre- listening activities).

In relation to the during-listening activities, Coonan (idem: 157) emphasises the importance of guiding and supporting listening comprehension in itinere. In particular, she lists the following possible during-listening activities (idem: 159): selezionare, disegnare, mettere in ordine, prendere appunti, collegare, completare, costruire, eliminare, mettere in sequenza, riconoscere/identificare, costruire etc.

In relation to the post-listening activities, they are necessary as to give the students the necessary tools to use cognitive/linguistic functions, such as giving definitions, comparing, classifying, making hypothesis etc., to orally produce language (idem: 160). In this last phase, the teacher works to consolidate what has been learnt through activities such as questions and summaries (ibid.).

2.3.4. Speaking in CLIL

A wide range of SLA research has concentrated on how to get students to talk the L2/FL in formal teaching situations, claiming that their oral output plays a pivotal role in their acquisition of the L2/FL (Coonan, 2008: 16). Indeed, according to Swain (2000: 99), “output pushes learners to process language more deeply – with more mental effort – than does input”, because when they speak they do something, they create “linguistic form and meaning, and in so doing, they discover what they can and cannot do”, positively stretching their interlanguage. Swain (1988 quoted in Lyster, 2007: 71) well explains this very important function of output in what he calls the Output Hypothesis, which affirms that learning/acquisition may occur through producing either spoken or written language (Swain, 1988 quoted in Lyster, 2007: 71). In defining the Output Hypothesis, Swain (ibid.) attributes the following roles to the output:
• Output pushes learners to notice what they do not know or know only partially
• Output has a metalinguistic function that enables learners to use language in order to reflect on language
• Learners use output as a way of testing hypotheses about new language forms and structures
• Output is a means for learners to develop fluency in the L2/FL

In consideration of the importance of oral production for the acquisition and competence development of the FL (Coonan, 2008: 16), it is thus very important that students enrolled in a CLIL programme are provided with quantitative and qualitative opportunities to speak the FL. As Menegale (2008: 106) points out, CLIL represents an ideal contest for students’ natural use of a L2/FL, which is very important in building up their motivation towards learning that language. The reason is that in a CLIL lesson “learning focus is on content and the FL is used merely to learn about that content”, thus providing students with “meaningful contexts through which their language skills are naturally promoted” (ibid.). Nevertheless, as Coonan (2008) claims, the promotion of students’ oral production in the FL in CLIL classrooms is not problem-free. Indeed, Coonan (idem: 16) highlights that difficulties in getting students to speak are both related to the intrinsic characteristics of the CLIL environment and to more general ones of the traditional FL teaching environment. As regards the former, the CLIL context is inherently difficult because “it requires the student to carry out higher-order thinking processes in the L2 on new, unfamiliar content and in unfamiliar way”, resulting in either the failure to successfully complete the higher-order cognitive processes or to pay attention to the form of the FL (idem: 18). As regards the latter, more general difficulties in promoting students’ speaking in the FL are related to the:

• organisation of the students in the classroom
• reluctance on the part of the teacher to allow interaction unless of the ‘question and answer type’
• absence of the types of activities that allow for and effectively stimulate oral communication and interaction
In her study on the quality and quantity of students’ oral production in the FL in five different high schools in Italy, Coonan (idem) comes to the conclusion that, in order for students to speak in the CLIL lesson, as so to develop their competence in the FL, the teaching style needs to include the following features:

- Greater provision for pair/group work, through which students can produce language, focus on form and negotiate meaning
- Greater focus on form by the teacher
- Greater attention to pronunciation of specialist vocabulary
- Provide language structures or get pupils to identify them themselves, prior to the group/pair task for potential use during the task

From the perspective of the current piece of research, the first of these teaching style features is the most interesting one, because it highlights the need of teachers to integrate the teacher-fronted lesson with student-centred learning. According to Coonan (2012: 167; my translation), this integration “needs to be supported in different ways: types of question, interaction and learning activities”, which will be explored in the following sections.

*Question types: purpose, form and cognitive complexity*

Despite the general idea that a large amount of lesson time should be student-learning focussed, the teacher-fronted mode is still the most commonly used, occurring (Menegale, 2008: 107):

- at the beginning of a lesson: the teacher introduces new content and/or reviews what has already been done
- during the lesson: the teacher explains problematic concepts or clarifies a request or complex activity
- at the end of the lesson: the teacher sums up the new content studied an/or gives feedback
Even though this kind of teaching has positive aspects (see Menegale 2008: 107), students are not motivated to participate if they are only asked closed questions (idem: 108). Indeed, these types of question do not promote discussion and “students are completely passive and often inhibited when answering, scared of making a mistake” (ibid.). As Menegale underlines, “good teaching depends exactly on good questioning” (Degarmo quoted in Menegale, 2008: 108). It is undeniable that asking open questions to students means to promote their active role during the lesson, through collaborating in discussing topics, developing new ideas and negotiating towards a solution (ibid.). It is very important to stress that questions respond to different aims and need to be used accordingly (idem: 109). In particular, if the lesson is about presenting new contents, questions are necessary “to find out what students already know about it in order to avoid repetition and deal with the content at the right level” (ibid.). On the other hand, questions can also be used to revise a topic, helping students reinforce it, or to attract students’ attention, “by stimulating their thinking and raise their consciousness about the topic and encouraging discussion as a result” (ibid.). Depending on the purpose, form and cognitive complexities, questions can be classified under different labels.

As regards the purpose, questions can be divided into (idem: 110; Dalton-Puffer, 2006: 191):

1. **Display** questions: the teacher already knows the answer and wants to test the student’s knowledge and understanding. These questions are also called “didactic questions” (Nunan, 1989b quoted in Coonan, 2012: 168)

2. **Referential** questions: the teacher does not know the answer and is genuinely interested “in hearing the students’ responses” (Menegale, 2008: 110). These questions originate from a “vuoto di informazione” (Coonan, 2012: 168) and encourage “authentic language production” (Menegale, 2008: 110)

According to Brock (quoted in Coonan, 2012: 169), referential questions prompt students to answer with longer and grammatically more complex answers than do display questions. Referential questions are, thus, pivotal for the students’ acquisition of a FL and need to be highly used by teachers (Coonan, 2012: 169).

As regards the form, questions can be classified into *yes/no* (closed) and *wh-* (open) questions. The former, also called convergent questions, are easier to understand and
to answer, because they do not require original thought or critical reflection and the possible answers are limited (…) short and recall previously memorised information” (Menegale, 2008: 112). On the other hand, wh- (open) questions, also called divergent questions, are more demanding (Dalton-Puffer, 2006: 192) for both the student and the teacher, because they require “a higher level of thinking, like interpreting, evaluating, inquiring, making inferences and synthesising” (ibid.). However, they encourage students to produce longer and more challenging answers in terms of linguistic encoding skills (ibid.), thus representing a great tool to promote students’ speaking competence.

Finally, as regards the cognitive complexity, questions can be catalogued into low order and high order. While the former require the student to simply repeat facts and notions, the latter provide him/her with an opportunity to use notions “in attività cognitive-linguistiche d’analisi, sintesi, valutazione, speculazione ecc.” (Coonan, 2012: 169; see also Menegale, 2008: 111). The following quadrant can help in situating the questions in terms of both purpose and cognitive complexity (Coonan, 2012: 170):

```
                      Low-order
                      |               |
                      | Display       | Referential |
                      |               |
                      High-order
```

It is important to point out that, as Menegale (2008: 112) highlights, display questions are only convergent (high- or low-order), whereas referential questions can either be convergent or divergent (high- or low-order).
**Interaction**

The teacher-fronted mode explored in the last section often involves a type of teaching, generally referred to as *IRF* (*initiation-response-feedback/follow up*; Sinclair and Coulthard quoted in Coonan, 2012: 167), in which the student simply responds to the teacher’s questions, playing a totally passive role in the interaction (Coonan, 2012: 172):

\[\text{Teacher} \rightarrow \text{Student}\]

Therefore, for the student to play an active role in interacting with the teacher, he/she needs to have the opportunity to negotiate the meaning, notice what he/she does not know and use the language to construct new knowledge (ibid.):

\[\text{Teacher} \rightarrow \text{Student}\]

Even though this type of interaction involves a more active role on the part of the student, it is still connected to a teacher-led type of lesson. On the other hand, what it seems to be necessary in a CLIL environment is the adoption of a cooperative learning approach (henceforth CL) (Guazzieri, 2008).

According to Cohen (quoted in idem: 84), CL can be defined as:

\[\text{…} \text{any type of small group work where students can take part in accomplishing a collective task, which has been assigned by a teacher, but not carried out under the teacher’s direct supervision.}\]

The benefit of adopting a CL approach is both quantitative and qualitative (Coonan, 2012: 174). As regards the quantity of students’ interaction in CL, students, working into groups or pairs, are all simultaneously and actively engaged in solving a task (Coonan, 2012: 174). At the same time, in terms of quality of students’ interaction,
adopting a CL approach means that students have to negotiate the meaning of the message and, thus, plan their output, developing their dialogic competence in the FL (idem: 174). Nevertheless, the success or failure of adopting a CL approach, and the resulting interaction among the students, depends on how the types of tasks are planned and implemented in the CLIL context.

Task design represents a backbone of CLIL methodology and will be discussed in the next section.

Learning Activities

According to Coonan (idem: 178), the activities that teachers plan and use to promote students’ competence in the FL are the “building blocks” of learning. Indeed, it is generally accepted that the student learns what the activity leads him/her to do, both in terms of acquiring new information (facts, concepts etc.) and practicing operations (memorising, classifying etc.) (Coyle, 1983 quoted in ibid.). In language pedagogy, a distinction is usually made among exercise, activity and task. The term exercise refers to “an activity that focuses on form, is elaborated for purely linguistic considerations with the primary intention of getting the learner to ‘learn’ the forms” and is usually completed individually (Coonan, 2008: 20). On the other hand, an activity is more meaningful, because it focuses on communicating, both socially and pragmatically, with the language and usually involves more than one person (Coonan, 2012: 179). However, the primary objective of an activity is still linguistic (ibid.). While exercises and activities have a discrete focus, only concentrating on a language skill or a discrete linguistic form, tasks “offer opportunities for holistic language use” Coonan, 2008: 17). According to Ellis (2003: 16), a task can be defined as:

(…) a workplan that requires learners to process language pragmatically in order to achieve an outcome that can be evaluated in terms of whether the correct or appropriate propositional content has been conveyed. To this end, it requires them to give primary attention to meaning and to make use of their own linguistic resources, although the design of the task is intended to result in language use that bears a resemblance, direct or indirect, to the way language is used in the real world. Like other language activities, a task can engage productive or receptive, and oral or written skills and also various cognitive processes.
Coonan (2012: 180) claims that the positive aspects of a task are related to the fact that:

- si focalizza sull’apprendimento di contenuto e non di lingua
- consente un apprendimento collaborativo
- consente di introdurre una dimensione esperienziale nel percorso di apprendimento
- fornisce una meta all’uso della LS

From the point of view of the components of a task, Coonan (idem: 183) lists the following:

- objective: every task has a primary purpose, which is directly linked to the content, and, sometimes, a secondary purpose, still linked to the content, which promotes either students’ abilità di studio or terminology
- input: the verbal/non verbal materials used as the starting point of the task
- activity: what the students need to do with the input
- outcome: it refers to the fulfilment or not of the task objective

As regards the structure, a task can be one-way or two-way (interactional structure), convergent or divergent (orientation structure) and open or closed (outcome structure). In a one-way task, only one of the participants has all the information and has to share it with the others, with a limitation in terms of interaction and negotiation (Coonan, 2008: 17). On the other hand, in a two-way task, the information is equally divided among the participants, but they have to interact and negotiate with each other “to get the information they need from the others” (idem: 18). With regard to the orientation structure, a convergent task is one in which the students work together to arrive at a common solution, whereas a divergent (open) task is one in which the students have a wide range of possible solutions to choose from (ibid.). Convergent tasks are usually closed, because the students know that “they have to find a single outcome e.g. make a final decision” (ibid.), and thus promote more negotiation.

According to Coonan (2012: 185), tasks can be planned or not, meaning that the students can be or not provided with time to plan the task. The planning time has an
effect on the type of language produced by the students, which can be less or more linguistically complex, resulting in less or more opportunities for the development of students’ interlanguage (ibid.).

In terms of task difficulty, Coonan (2012: 187) claims that a task is less or more difficult on the base of the interrelation of its linguistic and cognitive factors. The table below, taken from Coonan (2008: 19), well explains this interrelation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input</th>
<th>+ easy</th>
<th>+ difficult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Code used:</td>
<td>Image è</td>
<td>writtenoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Code complexity:</td>
<td>High frequency words;</td>
<td>Low frequency words; Complex sentences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short simple sentences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cognitive complexity:</td>
<td>-type of information: static è dynamic;</td>
<td>-abstract;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-quantity information: few elements;</td>
<td>-many elements;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-structure:</td>
<td>-little structure;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-context:</td>
<td>-there and then.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions</td>
<td>-two-way.</td>
<td>-one-way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Interaction</td>
<td>-dialogic.</td>
<td>-mono-logic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Discourse mode</td>
<td>-time to plan;</td>
<td>-no time to plan;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-extended time to carry out task.</td>
<td>-reduced time to carry out task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes</td>
<td>Cognitive operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-type</td>
<td>-exchange of information;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-need for reasoning</td>
<td>-few moves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-exchange opinions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-many moves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>1. Code:</td>
<td>-image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-writtenoral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Discourse mode</td>
<td>-list;</td>
<td>-instruction;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-description;</td>
<td>-argumentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-narration;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-classification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hence, Coonan (idem: 18) highlights that teachers can graduate the difficulty of a task, manipulating the features outlined in the table above. For example, a teacher might ask the students to produce a grammatically oral complex text, though asking
them to talk about a familiar topic and providing them with time to plan and a visual support (Coona, 2012: 187).

In the current piece of research, Willis (1996 quoted in idem: 191)' model of how to implement a task in a CLIL setting is of particular importance. Willis’ model is articulated in the following three stages:

1. Pre-task: the teacher introduces the topic and the objective of the task, provides the students with the terminology and outlines the instructions necessary to successfully complete the task
2. Task: the students, divided into groups, complete the task, plan how to present the outcomes and then present them to the rest of the class
3. Post-task: the teacher and the students check if the contents of the group presentation are appropriate and correct and decide whether to reinforce the linguistic and subject contents with supplementary work or not

2.3.5. Conclusion

In this chapter, the dynamics and factors involved in the museum and CLIL learning experiences were explored.

In paragraph 2.2., attention was given to learning in the museum context with the aim of highlighting both the dynamics and interrelation of the personal, socio-cultural, physical and instructional contexts (see Eshach’s model in paragraph 2.2.1.) responsible for learning in museums and the issues related to school-museum collaboration (see paragraph 2.2.3.). Moreover, it was the intention of the author to underline the methodology to use when teaching with objects and to point out that even though contemporary art works are more difficult to approach than modernist art works, they respond to the particular psychological needs and forms of consciousness of teenagers (see Illeris, 2005 in paragraph 2.2.2.).

In paragraph 2.3., the CLIL methodology was outlined, paying particular attention to the intrinsic characteristics of CLIL and the problems that students encounter in relation to using the FL as a medium of instruction and to listening comprehension and oral production in the FL. In particular, both the factors to take in consideration when planning a CLIL curriculum and the methodology and strategies to use to support students’ learning of the non-linguistic contents were investigated. Finally, it
was highlighted that planning quality CLIL mainly depends on the successful designing of tasks.
3. The Study

3.1. Introduction

In the current chapter the methodology of the present research will be outlined. Attention will be paid to the research questions and the hypotheses that generated them will be presented (paragraph 3.3.). Thus, the paradigm and method of the current research will be discussed and the research design employed will be visually presented in a diagram, through explaining the role and substance of the data collection tools. In particular, it will be said that the current research belongs to the Constructive paradigm and is a case study (see paragraph 3.4.), which focuses on the features of the CLIL Museum Programme at the Museum. It will also be highlighted that the current research employs a mixed methods, in which both qualitative and quantitative data are collected, through observation, interviews and questionnaires, “to produce well-validated conclusions” (Triangulation Design, Creswell et al., 2003 quoted in idem: 145). Therefore, the categories of participants taking part in the study will be described with attention to their role in the project and their “professional” identity (paragraph 3.5.). The difficulty in gathering data from Teachers and Students’ will be here mentioned, even though it will be then looked at in more details in chapter 5. In paragraph 3.6., the data collection tools will be looked at in depth. Both the way they were designed and the procedure with which they were administered will be explained and discussed. Thus, the method of data analysis will be outlined (paragraph 3.7.) and the ethical philosophy at the base of the current research will be briefly presented (paragraph 3.8.). Finally, in the conclusion the issues related to the need of designing different sets of questions in the interviews and the impossibility of gathering data through the questionnaires to Teachers and Students will be described, highlighting that they do not undermine the validity of the study.
3.2. Context of the research

The current research project focuses on the CLIL Museum Programme at a private museum (henceforth Museum) in the present academic year^4. In order to better investigate the research questions (see paragraph 3.3.), an overall background picture of both the CLIL Museum Programme and the Museum institutions will be provided.

About the Museum

The Museum institutions are two sister contemporary art museums, which host major temporary exhibitions, some of which are based in whole or in part on a private art collection. The Museum first opened in June 2009, after being renovated by a private foundation, which was selected by the municipality to undertake the transformation of its historical venue.

Despite the lack of a permanent art collection, the foundation has employed a permanent Education Department Staff, who has been responsible for the planning and implementation of all the educational services offered by both institutions. Since its establishment, the Education Department of the Museum has placed great efforts in addressing both the needs of a growing young intercultural community and of those groups of the society, such as the Deaf community, who have always been less represented in museums.

About the CLIL Museum Programme

It is indeed this philosophy and this educational mission of the Museum that have prompted the planning and implementation of the CLIL Museum Programme. Specifically, the project was first developed in 2010 thank to the collaboration between the Education Staff of the Museum and the Director of one of the local French Language Institutes, who is also Professor of French Language at the local university and an expert in the CLIL methodology. Through the involvement of this French Language Institute, the Museum has been able to offer CLIL tours in French. In 2011, a local English Language Institute was involved in the project for the

^4 2013/2014
provision of CLIL tours in English and has been collaborating with the Education Staff of the Museum ever since. Finally, this academic year, a Spanish Language Institute entered the programme for the provision of the CLIL tours in Spanish.

The CLIL Museum Programme is aimed at primary and secondary school students and consists of museum tours led in English, French and Spanish. Whilst the offer for primary schools is that of structuring the CLIL tour around the story of either “The hungry caterpillar” or the “Little Blue and Little Yellow”, secondary schools have the opportunity of exploring the contraposition between Abstract and Figurative art through engaging with the works of art on show either at the Museum or its sister institution. Secondary schools (both scuola media and scuola superiore) can opt between level A2 and B1.

It is worth illustrating the system of relationships at the base of the project through the following visual diagram:

See paragraph 3.5. for details on the participants to the research.
While triangle 1 exemplifies the planning stage of the programme, triangle 2 refers more directly to its implementation stage. As regards the planning stage, the Education Staff of the Museum is responsible for the training of the Museum Foreign Language Educators in relation to the Museum art contents and represents the point of contact for the School Teachers (i.e. information regarding all aspects of the CLIL programme). On the other hand, the Language Institute Staff is responsible for the selection of the Museum Foreign Language Educators, who are usually language teachers employed at these Institutes. Moving to the centre of the diagram, the Museum Foreign Language Educators design and deliver the tours in the FL. At the bottom, the School Teachers, who can be either FL teachers or Art teachers, get in contact with the Education staff of the Museum to book and plan the CLIL tour, which is then followed by the Students.

As regards the numbers of school groups that attended the CLIL Museum Programme, the Language Institutes provided the following numbers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Institute</th>
<th>Number of CLIL Tours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French Language Institute</td>
<td>0 CLIL tours delivered to secondary school students for the current exhibition at the Museum (2013/2014)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| English Language Institute          | 28 CLIL tours between November 2011 and June 2012  
13 CLIL tours in 2012/2013  
4 CLIL tours in 2013/2014 |
| Spanish Language Institute          | 3 CLIL tours delivered to secondary school students for the current exhibition at the Museum (2013/2014) |

*Current Exhibition*

The exhibition on show at the Museum is strongly curated around the idea of art as a tool to investigate the relationship between the prime matter, encompassing earth, fire, water and air, and social issues, such as images of war, social equality, protests,
promise of technological solutions for longevity, renewable energy, and technological terrorism. The exhibition manly consists of works of art from the 1960s and sees the use of several media, such as video and sound installation, lights installations, paintings and sculptures, and of a wide variety of materials.

3.3. Research Questions

The aim of the current research is to answer the following research question:

2- What are the difficulties encountered in planning and implementing a museum study programme in a non-native tongue?

In order to answer this question, the CLIL Museum Programme at the Museum was investigated taking into consideration the issues encountered in relation to Coonan (2012)’s CLIL curriculum categories:

i. Context
j. Learning Situation
k. Aims
l. Objectives
m. Language Needs
n. Contents
o. Methodology
p. Evaluation

As the hypothesis was that the major issue would be found in the Museum-School Collaboration (Context), this second research question was formulated:

2- How can museum and schools efficiently collaborate in relation to the CLIL Museum Programme?

Given the complex web of relationships at the basis of the CLIL Museum Programme and the issues encountered in the collaboration and communication between museum and schools, a model was developed to answer the second research question.
3.4. The methodology of the research

In planning a research project, researchers are always faced with the decision of which epistemological paradigm⁶ to employ to help them “solve defined problems” (Usher, 1996 quoted in Creswell, 2013: 97). In particular, the current research belongs to the paradigm of Constructivism, which is based on the belief that “meaning is socially constructed by individuals in interaction with their world” (Merriam, 2002 quoted in ibid.) and that reality, far from being unique, is “person-, context-, and time-bound” (ibid.). The current research can also be defined as a “case study”. According to Yin (2009 quoted in ibid.), “a case study research involves the study of a case within a real-life, contemporary context or setting” and focuses on the features of this case. In this research project, the “case” is specifically represented by the CLIL Museum Programme at the Museum, and the intent is that of describing its dynamics, in order to formulate generalizations in regard to the issues encountered in planning and implementing a museum study programme in a non native tongue in other museums. In order to do so, a mixed methodology was employed with the aim of providing a more detailed picture of the CLIL Museum Programme studied and of assuring accuracy of the data collected. According to Creswell (2008 quoted in ibid.), “mixed methods” is a procedure for gathering, analysing, and mixing both quantitative (numeric) and qualitative (text) data “at some stage of the research process within a single study in order to understand a research problem more completely”. This specific methodology is labelled “mixed” because is concerned with integrating and/or connecting the findings, “at one or several points within the study” (ibid.). It was felt that a Triangulation Design would represent the best choice to respond to the first research question, given that it compares quantitative and qualitative data series “to produce well-validated conclusions” (Creswell et al., 2003 quoted in idem: 145).

The following data collection tools were used:

- Observation (6 CLIL tours)
- Interviews (7 participants)
- Online Questionnaires (6 teachers and 120 students)

---

⁶ A paradigm is “the sum of conceptions of problems and methods shared by different research communities” (Walker and Evers, 1970 quoted in Terlektsi, 2009: 79).
Indeed, interviews of the Education Staff of the Museum, Language Institute Staff and Museum Foreign Language Educators were used to investigate the issues they encountered in planning and implementing the CLIL programme, while questionnaires were used to collect School Teachers and Students’ feedback, especially highlighting the issues encountered in the implementation stage. Thus, observation helped in double-checking the results gathered through interviews and questionnaires. Finally, after analysing and discussing the data, a model was developed to answer the second research question about Museum-School Collaboration. Hence, the design of the current research project can be visually presented as follows:
It is important to highlight that the qualitative and quantitative data were gathered concurrently, but much greater weight was given to qualitative data. Finally, qualitative and quantitative data were integrated in the discussion (see chapter 5).
3.5. Participants

In paragraph 3.2, the context of the research was described, paying attention to the complex system of relationships among the individuals and institutions involved in the planning and implementation of the CLIL Museum Programme at the Museum. Thus, it was decided to divide the actors involved in the CLIL project in the following categories of participants:

- Education Staff of the Museum (Museum Educator 1 and 2)
- Language Institute Staff (French Director and English Director)
- Museum Foreign Language Educators (Spanish Educator 1 and 2 and English Educator)
- School Teachers
- Students

As regards the first category, the Museum Educational Staff refers to the two full time employees (Museum Educator 1 and Museum Educator 2) of private foundation, who coordinate the planning and delivery of all the educational services of both sister museum institutions. They were the first participants to be interviewed. Both museum educators have a background in Modern and Contemporary Art History and have been involved in the provision of the educational services of the two sister institutions since their opening in 2009.

As regards the second category, the Language Institute Staff refers to the director of the French Language Institute and the director of the English Language Institute involved in the programme (French Director and English Director). They have been working in collaboration with the Education Staff of the Museum both in the planning and implementation of the CLIL Museum Programme and are responsible for the selection of the Museum Foreign Language Educators.

As regards the third category, the Museum Foreign Language Educators refers to two Spanish Educators and one English Educator. The two Spanish Educators were contacted by the Spanish Language Institute and have two different backgrounds. One of them is a teacher of Spanish language (lettore) at the local university (Spanish Educator 1), while the other has taught History of Art at university level in Spain for
many years and holds a certificate for teaching Spanish as a FL (Spanish Educator 2). They collaborated in both the planning and delivery of the CLIL tours. On the other hand, the English Educator holds a Bachelor in Art and Design and a PGCE (teaching certificate) in Art and Design from the UK and has taught English as a second/foreign language for many years. She was mainly responsible for the planning of the CLIL tour, but she also collaborated in delivering it with other English Educators. While the English Educator is part of the full time teaching staff of the English Language Institute, the two Spanish Educators only collaborates with the Spanish Language Institute for this specific project.

As regards the fourth category, both FL and Art School Teachers took part in the project, but only the ones teaching at scuola media and scuola superiore were taken into consideration for the current research. As stated before, the original methodology plan involved administering 6 online questionnaires to 6 School Teachers, but, for reasons that will be looked at in more detail in chapter 5, it was only possible to administer one online questionnaire to a Spanish teacher of a local liceo linguistico.

As regards the last category, students of scuola media and scuola superiore took part in the project, but it was only possible to observe two groups of high school students (group A: 22 students of 17 years old; group B: 25 students of 15/16 years old) attending two different local licei linguistici. The same issues encountered with the administration of the online questionnaires to School Teachers became evident in relation to Students. Indeed, it was only possible to administer 25 online questionnaires to the students of group B, instead of the originally planned 120, but none of these were completed. Thus, the only data that it was possible to get with regard to the students’ experience of the CLIL Museum Programme was collected through the author’s observation.

3.6. Data collection: design and procedure

Data were gathered over a period of six months (November-April), through observation, face to face interviews and online questionnaires.
Observation

As regards observation, field notes were taken during two CLIL tours of the current exhibition at the Museum. Even though the original methodology plan involved observing six CLIL tours, it was only possible to observe two visits due to a lack of school bookings (see paragraph 3.2. and 5.2.). The first tour observed was a Spanish CLIL tour for a school group of 22 students (3rd year of liceo linguistico; group A), which took place on 11 December 2013 and was delivered by Museum Spanish Educator 2. The second and last tour observed was a Spanish CLIL tour for a school group of 25 students (2nd year of liceo linguistico; group B), which took place on 26 February 2014 and was delivered by Museum Spanish Educator 1. It was decided to undertake the role of a non participant observer, and field notes were taken by hands and then transcribed.

Interviews

The interviews involved 7 participants and it was only possible to organise a single session for all of them. They were semi-structured and took place in the form of a relaxed conversation. Indeed, questions were not always answered following the original order and freedom was allowed to facilitate the production of information that might not be derived from a more structured situation (Terlektsi, 2009: 91). Furthermore, in some cases, respondents felt they did not have enough practical experience of the project to answer certain questions and these were thus avoided. All of the 7 interviews were face to face and they were audio-recorded and then transcribed.

Museum Educator 1 and 2 were the first participants to be interviewed. The interview was in Italian, took place with both Museum Educators in November 2013 and lasted for an hour. The following 12 questions were posed:

7 English translation:

1) What is the idea behind the CLIL Museum Programme? How did it start?
2) With which institutions did you collaborate to plan and implement the CLIL Museum Programme?
3) How does the project respond to the educational mission of the Museum?
1) Com’è nata l’idea del programma museale CLIL?

2) Con quali organi istituzionali, istituti di lingua o altre realtà avete collaborato nella progettazione e realizzazione del percorso museale CLIL?

3) In che modo il programma museale CLIL risponde alla missione educativa del museo?

4) Quali sono gli obiettivi, i contenuti, le strategie didattiche, le attività didattiche e i materiali del programma museale CLIL?

5) Quali difficoltà sono emerse nel delineare gli obiettivi e comunicare i contenuti della visita museale CLIL, in relazione all’uso della lingua straniera?

6) Quali difficoltà sono emerse nel selezionare le strategie didattiche e creare le attività didattiche, in relazione all’uso della lingua straniera?

7) Quali difficoltà sono emerse nel creare i materiali della visita museale CLIL, in relazione all’uso della lingua straniera?

8) Quali difficoltà sono emerse nella selezione e formazione degli educatori museali madrelingua?

9) Che tipo di training ricevono gli educatori museali madrelingua in termini di didattica museale da parte dello staff museale?

4) What are the objectives, contents, educational strategies, educational activities and materials of the CLIL Museum Programme?

5) What issues did you encounter in planning the objectives and communicating the contents of the CLIL museum tour, in relation to the use of the FL?

6) What issues did you encounter in selecting the educational strategies and planning the educational activities of the CLIL museum tour, in relation to the use of the FL?

7) What issues did you encounter in planning the materials of the CLIL museum tour, in relation to the use of the FL?

8) What issues did you encounter in selecting and training the Foreign Language Museum Educators?

9) How did you train the Foreign Language Museum Educators?

10) What is the link between the CLIL Museum Programme and the school curriculum of the scuola secondaria di primo and di secondo grado?

11) How do you train school teachers in relation to the CLIL Museum Programme (i.e. workshop, collection catalogue etc.)

12) What kind of support do you provide school teachers with in planning and implementing pre- and post-visit activities?
10) Che relazione esiste tra il programma museale CLIL e il curriculum scolastico di scuola secondaria di primo e secondo grado?

11) In che modo vengono formati gli insegnanti sul programma museale CLIL? (es. workshops, catalogo collezione ecc.)

12) Che tipo di supporto è offerto agli insegnanti nella preparazione delle attività didattiche prima e dopo la visita guidata CLIL?

Question 1 and 3 aimed at understanding the reasons and intentions behind the planning and implementation of the CLIL Museum Programme. Question 2 aimed at exploring the collaboration between the Education Staff of the Museum and the Language Institute Staff. Question 4 inquired about the objectives, contents and methodology of the CLIL tour. Questions 5 to 7 had the purpose to answer the research question on the issues encountered in planning and implementing the CLIL programme, as regards the design and delivery of the CLIL tour. Questions 8 and 9 served to answer the research question on the issues encountered in planning and implementing the CLIL programme, as regards the collaboration between the Education Staff of the Museum and the Museum Foreign Language Educators. Questions 10 and 12 aimed at answering the research question on the issues encountered in planning and implementing the CLIL programme and as regards the collaboration between the Museum and the schools.

As regards the Spanish Educators and the French Director’s interviews, two sets of questions were prepared, taking Coonan (2012)’s CLIL curriculum as a model. Both questions sets addressed the following categories of the CLIL curriculum:

a. Context
b. Learning Situation
c. Aims
d. Objectives
e. Language Needs
f. Contents
g. Methodology
h. Evaluation
Indeed, Spanish Educator 1 and the French Director were interviewed using “Intervista-Responsabili Istituti di Lingua” (see Appendix A), and mainly focussed on the design and planning of the CLIL tour, while Spanish Educator 2 was interviewed using “Intervista-Educatori Museali Madrelingua” (see Appendix b), which mainly focussed on the implementation and the delivery of the CLIL tour. Spanish Educator 1 and 2 were interviewed in two different occasions. Spanish Educator 1 was interviewed on 20 February and the interview lasted for 1 hour (ca) and Spanish Educator 2 was interviewed on 9 March and lasted for 48 minutes. The French Director was interviewed on 6 March 2014 and the interview lasted for 25 minutes.

The “Intervista-Responsabili Istituti di Lingua” (see Appendix A) consisted of 20 questions. Questions 1 to 6 addressed the issues related to the Context of the CLIL programme, as regards the physical context (museum), the collaboration between the Museum and the schools and the selection and training of the Museum Foreign Language Educators. Questions 7 to 9 addressed the issues related to the Learning Situation of the CLIL programme, as regards the dimension of the school groups, the duration of the tour and the alternation between L1 and FL. Questions 10 to 11 addressed the issues related to the Aims of the CLIL programme, in relation to the art and language contents of the tour. Questions 12 to 14 addressed the issues related to the Objectives of the CLIL programme, as regards the selection of the art contents, the planning of the FL and the transversal objectives. Question 15 addressed the issues related to the Language Needs of the CLIL programme, as regards the students’ competence in the FL. Questions 16 considered the issues related to the selection of Contents in regard to students’ motivation, interest and relevance. Questions 17 to 19 inquired about the issues related to the Methodology used in planning and implementing the CLIL programme, as regards the lesson plan (activities), strategies and activities to make the input comprehensible and design of the support materials. Question 20 aimed at understanding the issues related to the Evaluation of the programme.

The “Intervista-Educatori Museali Madrelingua” (see Appendix B) consisted of 24 questions, so divided:

- Questions 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 17 and 23 were closed questions
- Questions 1, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 21 and 22 were open questions
• Questions 13, 14, 20 and 24 were multiple choice questions in which the respondents could choose more than one answer

Question 1 to 9 aimed at responding to the research question on the issues encountered in planning and implementing the CLIL programme, as regards the physical context, the collaboration between the Museum Foreign Language Educators and the Education Staff of the Museum and between the Museum Foreign Language Educators and the schools. Questions 10 to 12 had the purpose to investigate the issues related to the dimension of the school groups, duration of the CLIL tour and the alternation between L1 and FL. Questions 13 and 14 aimed at addressing the issues related to the Aims of the CLIL programme. Questions 15 and 16 enquired about the issues related to the content and language Objectives of CLIL programme. Question 17 was formulated to highlight the issues related to the students’ Language Needs. Question 18 had the purpose to identify which contents and works of art were less interesting for the students. Question 19 enquired about the issues encountered by the Museum Foreign Language Educator in following the lesson plan. Question 20 served to identify the strategies used in scaffolding the oral input. Questions 21 and 23 aimed at understanding the issues encountered in relation to the activities proposed, identifying the most interesting/less interesting and more difficult/less difficult for the students. Question 23 aimed at defining the importance of the use of support materials. Question 24 was formulated to understand which strategies were used to evaluate the CLIL tour and the related issues.

The last interviews to be administered were the ones involving the English Director and the English Educator. They were interviewed together on 10 April 2014 and the interview lasted for an hour. In this case, one set of questions in English was prepared, addressing both planning and implementation issues, given that they collaborated on both stages of the project. The interview consisted of 23 questions (see Appendix C), which resulted from the combination and translation of the questions presented in “Intervista-Responsabili Istituti di Lingua” and “Intervista-Educatori Museali Madrelingua”.
Online Questionnaires

As regards the online questionnaires, the Teachers’ Questionnaire (see Appendix D) particularly aimed at highlighting the issues of the collaboration between school and museum and at receiving feedback on the experience of the CLIL tour. It consisted of 11 questions, so divided:

- Questions 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11 were open-ended questions
- Questions 4, 7 and 9 were closed questions

Question 1 aimed at getting school teachers’ information of the subject taught and the age and type of students’ participating in the programme. Question 2 aimed at investigating school teachers’ aims and objectives in participating with their students in the CLIL programme. Question 3 was proposed to highlight the link between the CLIL tour and the school curriculum. Question 4 had the purpose to investigate whether school teachers collaborated with other school teachers in planning the CLIL tour. Question 5 aimed at investigating whether school teachers prepared their students before the CLIL visit and how, while Question 6 had the intent to explore if and how school teachers would follow up on the CLIL visit in the classroom. Question 7 and 8 wanted to get school teachers’ feedback on the training, information and support provided by the Museum in planning the CLIL visit. Question 9 aimed at getting school teachers’ feedback on the Museum Foreign Language Educator’s language level and methodology. Question 19 and 11 aimed at getting school teachers’ feedback on the CLIL tour.

The School Teachers’ Questionnaire was created and administered using Google Docs, and the link to this questionnaire was copied on a Facebook page, which was open with the plan of posting themes of discussion for the school teachers. School teachers were provided with a printed document in which aim and guidelines of how to fill in the questionnaire were clearly stated.

The Students’ Questionnaire (see Appendix E) was particularly aimed at getting students’ feedback on the CLIL experience and at understanding their perspective. It consisted of 10 questions, so divided:
• Questions 1, 5, 7, 9 and 10 were open-ended questions
• Questions 2, 4, 6 and 8 were multiple choice in which the respondent could only give one answer
• Question 3 was a Likert scale with four degrees of answers

Question 1 aimed at getting students’ information (age, date of visit and FL of the visit). Question 2 had the purpose of investigating students’ expectations of the CLIL tour. Question 3 wanted to understand the students’ perspective on the clarity of the objectives, contents and methodology of the CLIL tour. Question 4 was intended at getting students’ feedback on the overall difficulty in taking part in the CLIL visit. Question 5 enquired about the works of art the students liked the most and the least. Question 5 aimed at understanding what students found most difficult to do in the CLIL visit. Question 6 enquired about the activities that students liked the most and the least. Question 7 wanted to understand what represented the best support in comprehending the FL during the CLIL visit. Questions 9 and 10 had the purpose to get students’ open feedback on two aspects they liked the most and the least about the CLIL tour.

The Students’ Questionnaire was prepared and administered through Google Docs, and the link was copied on a Facebook page only addressed to the students’, to attract and motivate their participation in the research project. The students’ were provided with a printed document in which aim and guidelines on how to fill in the questionnaire were clearly stated.

3.7. Method of data analysis

As regards the observation, it was decided to adopt a research narratives approach (see Cowie, 2009: 175). In particular, a number of pivotal moments that emerged from observation were explained in detail and specific quotations from the participants were included to support the author’s claims (Cowie, 2009: 175).

As regards the interviews, key themes were identified for each category of participants and showed diagrammatically using a diagram, to help readers
understand how they relate to each other in responding to the first research question (Richards, 2009: 193). Thus, these themes were illustrated with quotations from the interviews. In particular, whereas in some cases they were presented by using quotations that captured slightly different aspects of the same topic, in others the most meaningful and evocative quote was chosen to stand for all (ibid.).

As regards the questionnaires, as mentioned in paragraph 3.5, only one school teacher completed the online questionnaire, while no response was gathered from either other teachers nor from the students. Thus, it was decided to use the school teacher’s responses as a confirmation of the data gathered through the interviews.

3.8. Ethics

All the participants involved in the current research project were informed of the research questions investigated and the tools of data collection that would be used before collecting the data. They all received a copy of the dissertation project, in which they were assured that their privacy would be protected and that no data would be published without their consent. In particular, they received the following communication:

“Mi impegno a:

- tenere sempre informati i partecipanti al progetto di tesi sulle modalità di raccolta dei dati e sul trattamento di questi dati in luogo di tesi
- inviare una copia dei questionari e interviste ai partecipanti al progetto di tesi prima di sottoporli agli stessi
- fornire una copia delle interviste ai soggetti intervistati, prima che queste vengano discusse in luogo di tesi
- rispettare la volontà dei partecipanti al progetto nel caso in cui negassero il consenso alla pubblicazione di determinati dati”

Furthermore, all the participants interviewed were sent a copy of the questions before the interview session and thank you e-mails after the session. All the participants interviewed were informed that they were being recorded. However, the two school groups observed and the school teacher and the students to whom the questionnaires
were administered had not been informed of the author’s presence during the CLIL tour, for lack of communication on the part of the Museum.

3.9. Conclusion

In this chapter, the methodology of the current case study has been looked at in detail, discussing both the design and procedures of the data collection tools and the complex variety of the participants. In order to better describe the intricate nature of the relationships at the basis of the CLIL museum project, a flexible approach had to be adopted especially in the design and administration of the interviews. Given that these interviews had the intention to explore the participants’ professional practice, they had in many cases to be adapted to the specific situation. This is the reason why three different sets of questions were prepared. However, it is interesting to highlight that despite the lack of a solo set of question, the same themes of issues were identified in the data collected, and in some cases, interesting responses were given that would have not been possible if the same set of questions had been administered to all the participants.

It is also important to highlight to the validity and credibility of the current study as regards the Observation and the Students’ and Teachers’ Questionnaires. Indeed, the fact that only two tours could be observed and that only one Teachers’ Questionnaire was filled in, while no Students’ Questionnaire was compiled should not be considered as a limitation of the research project. It is opinion of the author of the current research that the flaw in collecting these data are a confirmation of the problematic Museum-School Collaboration and will be interpreted in detail in chapter 5.
4. Analysis

4.1. Introduction

In order to answer the first research question *What issues are encountered in planning and implementing a museum study programme in a non native tongue?*, data were collected through observation, interviews and questionnaires. As explained in chapter 4, in the interviews, the first research question was investigated by asking questions related to Coonan (2012)’s CLIL curriculum categories (see paragraph 3.2.). Given that issues were found in all of Coonan (idem)’s CLIL categories it was decided to adopt them as themes to organise the data (see Fig. 1 below):
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For each of the theme in Fig. 1, sub-themes were specifically identified and will prove very useful in presenting the data (see Fig. 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8). It is particularly interesting to highlight that the themes presented in Fig. 1 are deeply interrelated and in some cases it was difficult to organise the data under a specific theme. This is the
reason why, when necessary, the data will be presented taking in consideration the cause-effect relationship among the themes. Finally, it was decided to illustrate the different themes through extracting quotations\(^8\) from the interviews, while the observation and questionnaire data were used as confirmation of the data from the interviews.

4.2. Context

As regards the Context, three sub-themes were identified as particularly problematic: the Museum Context, the Museum-School Collaboration and the Museum-Language Institutes Collaboration. For each of these sub-themes, the analysis of the interviews showed that issues related to specific features, which are outlined in Fig. 2.

![Fig. 2](image)

As regards the Museum Context, one of the issues encountered by the Museum Staff in planning the CLIL museum programme was the lack of a permanent art collection. Indeed, the fact that the museum only hosts temporary exhibitions, which change

\(^8\) The quotations from the interviews and questionnaire will be presented in the original language they were produced in and translation in English will be provided in footnote.
every year or every two years, means that the Museum Staff has to revisit the CLIL programme every time there is a new exhibition, which results in the selection of new works of art and routes, the training of the Museum Foreign Language Educators on the new art contents and the production of new mini-guides in French, Italian and English. As the Museum Staff reported:

“Noi abbiamo il problema che ci cambiano le mostre sotto il naso e non è come [in un museo con una collezione permanente] che tu hai preparato il tuo bel pacchetto CLIL, ci lavori un anno e va benissimo (...) noi quando apre la mostra dobbiamo fare il catalogo in tre lingue (...) tutti i percorsi nuovi, tutta la formazione, quindi ci cambia tutto (...)”\(^9\)

This is probably the reason why the Museum Staff opted for providing a single theme “Abstract-Realistic”, which addresses the pivotal dichotomy between Abstract and Realistic art in contemporary art and can be easily adapted to different exhibitions. Indeed, the decision to have a single theme for the CLIL programme also took into consideration the most suitable of the two museums and the role of the Museum Foreign Language Educators in planning and leading the CLIL activities:

“Nel fare il lavoro sul CLIL, abbiamo scelto Astratto-Realista, ne abbiamo scelto uno che sia un po’ esemplificativo della nostra maniera di procedere e normalmente lo facciamo a [Museum x] perché la mostra dura due anni e questo fa sì che i nostri collaboratori delle nostre scuole di lingua non debbano studiarsi cinquanta volte mostre diverse a cavallo dello stesso anno scolastico per poche visite”\(^10\)

\(^9\) Translation: “We have the problem that the exhibitions change almost without us realising it and it’s not like [in a museum with a permanent collection] where you just prepare your CLIL programme and you work on it for a year (...) In our case, when an exhibition opens we need to write the catalogue in three languages (...) we need to think about the new routes, the educators’ training, so everything needs to be changed (...)”

\(^10\) Translation: “In working on the CLIL contents we chose the theme Abstract-Realist, we chose this one because it shows best our way of working and normally we do it at [the Museum] because there every exhibition lasts for two years, and that way our collaborators from the Language Institutes don’t have to study fifty different exhibitions during the same academic year”
Another issue that was encountered in relation to the Museum Context regarded the need to develop a route that would be both coherent, in terms of contents, and physically suitable, in terms of physical context. Indeed, factors such as the size of the room, the presence of noises and the quality of the view had a strong impact on the decision to whether include a particular work of art or not. For example, both the English Educator and Spanish Educator 2 decided to avoid James Lee Byars’ *Byars is Elephant* (1997) because of both the size of the room, in which the work of art is placed, and the location, just in front of the museum café. Indeed, according to Spanish Educator 2:

“*Si scelgono senz’altro quelli [spazi] più grandi, perché quelli più piccoli non ci riesci a stare dentro. Quello della stanza d’oro [Byars is Elephant] è impossibile.*”

Of the same opinion was Spanish Educator 1, who highlighted the need to use rooms big enough to allow students to work on the group activities but also to explore and observe the art in a comfortable and free manner:

“*Ci sono attività in cui loro devono essere liberi di muoversi, ad esempio cercare i materiali, sistema le preposizioni di luogo. Ma anche per l’osservazione, che si sentano liberi di osservare, vedere e fare. Ovviamente ti servono gli spazi grandi.*”

As regards the location, other works of art resulted problematic to explore, and Spanish Educator 2 specifically mentioned Dominique Gonzales-Foerster’s *Raining (Sound Piece)* (2012), which is a sound installation placed in the cloakroom. In particular, in discussing the delivery of the original CLIL plan, which included the investigation of this installation, she afterwards dismissed it as impossible and messy to deliver because:

---

11 Translation: “Of course we select the rooms that are bigger, because the smaller ones are just difficult to fit in. The one in which the [Byars is Elephant] is is impossible.”

12 Translation: “There are activities in which they [the students] need to be free to walk around, for example, searching the materials, the prepositions of place. But also for observing, they need to be able to observe, see and do. Obviously, we need big rooms.”
As regards the relationship between the location of the works of art and the duration of the tour, it came across quite often during the interview with the English Educator that she had some “practical problems”, as she claimed herself, in selecting which works of art to visit. She particularly insisted on the decision to skip the works of art on the first floor “because you can't go up and down the stairs, you waste ten minutes just doing that”. However, an issue was also identified in the quality of the view that one has of a work of art. The same educator described as pivotal the ability of the students to see a work of art well enough:

“(...) now, you know they've got the [Adel Abdessemed’s Décor (2011-2012)], the crux effect. Now you can only go into the entrance and not inside (...) so you can't really talk about that, because they can't really see it very well, not with 25 people.”

A factor that was interpreted as particularly difficult to handle during the implementation stage was the presence of other groups in the museum and the resulting need to change the lesson plan of the CLIL visit on the spot. The English Director commented:

“Some days there have been so many different tours that it has had an impact on [the English Educator] because you can't physically get into that room with 25 kids (...)”

13 Translation: “(...) because they [the students] are so many (...) because usually they are twenty, eighteen, fifteen, so even the cloakroom where there is the lady, it’s small (...) no no, it’s chaotic, in the sense that it doesn’t really engage with the installation that you’re trying to listen to. Also because there are people that arrive, that are arriving to the museum and they have to pass through this room, so it’s chaotic.”
Interestingly, the “space” issue was also confirmed by the observation of a CLIL tour directed at primary school group. In particular, while the group was doing the practical workshop, another group led by another tour guide entered the room and started discussing the works of art with the result of distracting and delaying the CLIL workshop.

As the French Director pointed out, another element to take into consideration with regard to the Museum Context is the presence of individual visitors, and in this case, the decision as to how much time to spend in a room depends on the need of “non disturbare la gente”\textsuperscript{14}.

As regards the Museum-School Collaboration, the Museum Staff described the experience of most of the teachers to approach contemporary art with their students as daunting. Indeed, even when discussing the possibility of providing teachers with further materials, such as the mini-guides prepared for the exhibition on show, the Museum Staff said:

“Se gli mandi quella roba li [mini-guides] non capiscono (...) ed è una cosa drammatica perché non si trovano a loro agio con l’arte contemporanea e sono pochi gli appassionati quindi convincerli è un lavoro improbo.”\textsuperscript{15}

The Museum Staff also commented on the lack of teachers’ confidence in their students’ ability to comprehend art contemporary contents:

“In alcuni casi, le scuole superiori vogliono cose da far leggere ai ragazzi e in quel caso abbiamo delle guide brevi, quindi dei materiali brevi sulla mostra e quindi glielo mandiamo ma solo se insistono, nel senso che alla fine (...) sono sempre terrorizzate che i ragazzi non siano all’altezza.”\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{14} Translation: “to not disturb other people”.

\textsuperscript{15} Translation: “If you send them that thing there [mini-guides] they don’t understand it (...) and it’s dramatic because they don’t feel at ease with contemporary art and there are very few people that are passionate about it so it’s very difficult to convince them”

\textsuperscript{16} Translation: “Sometimes, high schools require materials for students to read and in this case we have mini-guides on the exhibition and we send them to them but only if they insist, because at the end of the day (...) [the teachers] are always terrified that their students won’t be able to understand [contemporary art].”
Given the issues perceived by teachers in investigating contemporary art with their students, the Museum Staff pondered the possibility of creating materials and mini-guides especially targeted to the school audience and to make them available online. However, given the results of the feedback forms administered to the teachers at the end of every school group visit, they decided it was not worth the effort. They claimed that most of the teachers claim that they were satisfied with the materials provided and that they did not need further guidance:

“Ci siamo anche chieste se fosse il caso di mettere dei materiali semplificati, adattati per le scuole, ma visto che nei feedback loro [gli insegnanti] dicono che non hanno bisogno di altri materiali (...) [domanda] ‘avreste gradito ricevere altri materiali, documentazioni legate alla mostra?’ [risposta] Mai.”

In responding to this result, the Museum Staff claimed that the museum visit is often perceived as a fun activity to do outside of the classroom and most of the teachers place little effort in structuring the museum tour as a meaningful learning experience:

“[gli insegnanti hanno] un approccio consumistico che è un po’ un peccato, perché loro avrebbero un sistema per fare un sacco di lavoro un po’ più di qualità.”

However, it is important to highlight that when specifically talking about the CLIL Museum Programme, the Museum Staff mentioned that some teachers do ask to see the support materials that will be used during the CLIL tour before the visit. Thus, it seems likely that teachers have a slightly different approach towards the CLIL Museum Programme and that there is the need to support the teachers taking part in...

---

17 Translation: “We’ve asked ourselves if we should put online materials especially adapted for school students, but given that in the feedback forms they [the teachers] always say that they don’t need other materials (...) [question] ‘would you like to have received more materials or support on the exhibition?’ [answer] Never. ”

18 Translation: “[teachers have] a consumer-like approach, which is a pity because they’d have a system to do a much more qualitative work”
this project with an Education Pack. For example, the English Educator and the English Director suggested:

“I think that if there was something more tangible for them supplied by the museum, I mean we could make it, create it, but if the museum supplied it as a kind of post-tour thing maybe they [the teachers] would have more confidence.”

It is interesting to point out that even though a presentation of the educational projects on offer is organised at the beginning of every academic year, no specific training is provided for teachers interested in the CLIL Museum Programme. Moreover, because the project has been running for four years and every year a different Language Institute has been asked to step in and present it, a variety of information has been given and not always based on the practical experience of the project. To be clearer, this is what the English Educator reported about the talk she had to give about the CLIL Museum Programme, in comparison to the one given by the Spanish Language Institute:

“I had to present what the whole idea of the CLIL tour was to teachers at the beginning of the year and so I didn't do it last year because the Spanish people presented theirs, because it was the new thing last year. Well, (...) the Spanish people (...) hadn't done it yet, because they asked me to do the presentation the first year before doing it so it was actually very difficult. ‘Listen, look this is what the theory is but we'll see what happens’, so I can understand they really didn't focus too much on this experience”

A second pivotal issue encountered with regard to the Museum-School Collaboration was the connection between the CLIL Museum Programme and the school curriculum. The Museum Staff highlighted the difficulty of linking the museum contents with the school curriculum by saying that:
Of the same opinion were also the English Director, the English Educator and the French Director. As a result, the trend that the English Educator has seen this academic year has been that of teachers requesting “much more specific tours relating either to specific works of art or a particular theme which isn’t really related to the original CLIL curriculum we came up with (…) or maybe something related to what they were doing in school”. The fact that contemporary art is not part of the school curriculum was seen as negatively affecting the quality of the CLIL Museum Experience and was linked to the need for teachers to do some preparation work with the students. Indeed, the English Educator said:

“This [the CLIL Museum Programme] is not linked to the national curriculum (…) and I find that a problem when I’ve been trying to talk about works. They don’t know the inspiration for the work that we’re looking at and this is something that their teacher could do pre-visit (…) so that they have an idea of what they're going to look at”

Interestingly, all the participants acknowledged the specific nature of learning in museums and the importance of planning 3-part school trips to museums. However, the lack of both preparation and follow-up of the CLIL museum visit in the classroom were said to be widespread among the groups. In particular, in talking about the preparation stage, the Museum Staff said:

“C’è anche un dato che emerge dai feedback che sono generali e alla domanda ‘i ragazzi erano preparati ai contenuti della visita? mai’ (…) e la preparazione è

---

19 Translation: “The problem we always have in relation to all our programmes is that contemporary art is not part of the school curriculum (…) there’s no link (…) they don’t study it so we struggle (…)”
With regard to the missing parts of the CLIL museum visit, the English Educator asserted that the fact that the teachers often do not prepare the students has a negative impact on the educational value of the CLIL tour also in consideration of its short duration:

“Time is short and what we need to rely on is that teachers have done some kind of (...) preparation but also that they have taken it and used it up a bit and we have no idea if they do that”

In considering this aspect of the Museum-School Collaboration, the Spanish Educator claimed that:

“Non è che arrivino molto preparati, almeno i due gruppi che io ho avuto (...) cioè sapere un minimo, perché questi [...] sono proprio spaesati (...) non sanno di che cosa si sta parlando, perché non hanno anche quei (...) riferimenti culturali, cioè non hanno niente e allora sono spaesati, cioè con cosa collego questo? Impossibile, allora così è impossibile che quello ti dia qualche beneficio culturale ed educativo (...) è impossibile.”

However, even when the teachers do prepare the students, it seems likely that the preparation is minimal. Indeed, in responding to the question “How did you prepare

---

20 Translation: “There’s also a result that emerges from the feedback forms which are general and in answering to the question ‘Were the students prepared with regard to the contents of the visit?: Never (...) and the preparation is necessary (...) but on our feedback form they [the teachers] always say that they didn’t prepare anything. ”

21 Translation: “They [the students] don’t come to the museum well prepared, at least the two groups I had (...) I mean at least to know something, because they [the students] are completely disoriented (...) they have no idea of what we’re talking about, because they don’t have even those (...) cultural references, I mean they have nothing and so they’re disoriented, I mean what do I connect this with? It’s impossible, this way it’s impossible that that will be of any cultural and educational benefit to them (...) it’s impossible.”
the students before the CLIL museum visit?” in the questionnaire (see Question 5 in Appendix D), the Spanish Language Teacher said:

“Purtroppo ho avuto solo una lezione di un'ora per prepararli: fotocopie sull'arte contemporanea e i maggiori artisti del XX secolo.”

Surprisingly, even though the planning of a CLIL activity always requires the language and the subject teachers to team up, this seems to rarely happen with the groups taking part in the CLIL Museum Programme. Indeed, issues with regard to the language spoken and the strategies used to make the input comprehensible were encountered when the school group was accompanied by only the art teacher. According to the English Educator:

“Sometimes you do the tour and they come with the Art teacher who often can't speak English or speaks very little English so they don't know what I'm saying to the students. So they don't get the tour and they also maybe telling their opinion in Italian next to me, so the whole idea, they don't get it. I've had some language teachers too, and they would speak in English with the students and some of them would have done preparation with the students. But I'd say that's quite rare, you can tell immediately that some of them just don't know where they are.”

Moreover, the fact that the teachers do not team up in the pre-, during- and post- part of the CLIL visit is evident also in the difference of objectives they have. As the English Educator and English Director explained:

“I think the problem also is that if they're coming with the language teacher is one thing and if they're coming with the art teacher they want to talk art, while in the other case the focus is on language and art is just a vehicle (…) that's why the idea is that they come together.”

---

22 Translation: Unfortunately, I only had one hour class to prepare them: photocopies on contemporary art and the most important artists of the XX century.”
As a confirmation of this data, in responding to the question “Did you collaborate with other teachers of other subjects in planning the CLIL museum visit” (see Question 4, Appendix D) in the questionnaire, the Spanish Language Teacher answered negatively.

Finally, as regards the Communication between the museum and the schools, which is characterised by pitfalls especially in terms of expectations and seems to be caused by a faded structure, the English Educator particularly claimed that:

“I got groups that were expecting a different product (...) Expectations are a huge thing to take into consideration, because they always have great expectations about museum visits.”

It is interesting to point out that a confirmation of the “expectation gap” was confirmed during the observation of the Group B CLIL tour (see paragraph 3.5.), during which the author of the current research reported:

“After the first two activities, the Spanish school teacher points out that Spanish Educator 1 hasn’t yet explained to the students the role of museums, why people go to museums and why they think their teacher has decided to take them there to do a tour in Spanish.”

Another element that was often reported as being pivotal in the collaboration between museum and schools was the cost of the visit. Many of the interviewees stated how it is probably the cost of the visit that discourages more schools in participating in the programme. For example, Spanish Educator 2 said that:

“Li c’è quel collegamento scuola museo che non sta funzionando (...) dal punto di vista economico (...) tu un progetto del genere lo devi offrire quasi gratis (...)”

On the same matter, both the French Director and the English Director explained that one of the reasons of the low rate of bookings (see paragraph 3.2.) is the fact that the

---

23 Translation: “the museum-school collaboration is not working (...) from the economical perspective (...) a project like this should be free of charge (...).”
majority of the visits are booked on Wednesday, because local school students do not pay the entrance to museums.

A last important sub-theme related to the Context is the Museum-Language Institute Collaboration. One of the issues the Museum Staff encountered in planning and implementing the CLIL Museum Project was the lack of a specific background in foreign language teaching and of museum educators trained in this area. This is the reason why they decided to collaborate with the local Language Institutes and they justified their decision by saying:

“Poi noi non abbiamo una formazione specifica e i nostri operatori non hanno una formazione CLIL, quindi abbiamo pensato che per dare credibilità a questo progetto, dovessimo appoggiarci su personale che invece è specificamente formato per l'insegnamento della lingua, o addirittura come le spagnole che hanno una formazione CLIL.”

The interesting fact about this collaboration is that when selecting the educators for the project, the Language Institutes either chose people that had both a background in Art History and in FL Teaching, as in the case of the English Educator, or decided to team up an expert in FL Teaching with one in Art History, as in the case of Spanish Educator 1 and 2. However, in both cases the Museum Staff had to train the Foreign Language Museum Educators in the museum contents, especially in relation to the issues intrinsic to approaching contemporary art. The Museum Staff well described the training process of the Foreign Language Museum Educators by claiming that:

“Abbiamo fatto per costruire il percorso una breve formazione agli operatori degli istituti. Noi abbiamo selezionato per loro una serie di cose che sono fondamentali per costruire un percorso sensato all'interno del museo, anche asciugando quello che è il nostro percorso tipico, poi il nostro percorso tipico è composto sempre di visita guidata più attività pratica finale che nel caso del CLIL è stata tolta perché non abbiamo il tempo e non si riesce, troppa roba. Loro hanno fatto una breve formazione

24 Translation: “We don’t have a specific background [in FL teaching] and our museum educators don’t have a CLIL background, so we thought that in order to give credibility to the project we’d have to collaborate with educators that are specifically trained in FL teaching or, as the Spanish people, that are specifically trained in the CLIL methodology.”
in cui evidenziamo le cose topiche della mostra, cioè li mettiamo in condizione di capire quello che hanno sotto il naso e poi loro adattano a seconda dei vari livelli di lingua delle schede che sono proprio sull'uso della lingua in un contesto non tradizionale con un oggetto anche abbastanza complesso, perché alla fine l'arte contemporanea non è sempre ritenuta immediatissima, quindi c'è tutta una discussione anche su quello.”

The Museum Staff also were very keen in highlighting that they also trained the Foreign Language Museum Educators on the strategies to adopt in leading a museum tour:

“Spieghiamo loro (...) il tipo di approccio che vogliamo avere al museo, quindi non frontale, loro sanno come ci muoviamo, i contenuti molto interlocutori, ma loro lo sanno già, perché in realtà l'approccio della scuola di lingua è già più vicino all'approccio del museo di quanto lo sia l'approccio scolastico. È più comunicativo, lo sanno che non devono tenere i ragazzi inchiodati (...).”

However, in interpreting the Foreign Language Museum Educators’ perception of the museum training, the Museum Staff stated that:

“(...) da una parte hanno [Foreign Language Museum Educators] il terrore cieco perché comunque la materia non è la loro, perché non è gente che ha una specifica

25 Translation: “To support [the Foreign Language Museum Educators] in constructing the CLIL tour we briefly trained them. We selected for them the most important contents to use to build a logical tour in the museum, even shortening our general tour, which is always composed of visit and workshop, which in the CLIL case has been avoided because we don’t have the time (...) too many things. So, we show them what the most important topics are and then they have to adapt them in relation to the different FL levels and the support materials, which focus on the FL use. This way we help them understand what contemporary art is, also because it’s not always easy to approach it and we also discuss it.”

26 Translation: “We explain to them (...) the kind of approach we’d like them to adopt in the museum context, so not a lecture, they know how we move about the contents, they have to spring a dialogue, but they know this, because the approach the Language Institutes people have is similar to the one used in the museum context than the one used at school. It’s much more communicative, they know they don’t have to bore the students.”
Despite the Museum Staff’s description of the museum training being detailed and inclusive, the Foreign Language Museum Educators expressed quite a different perception. Indeed, quite often, the Foreign Language Museum Educators described the museum training as “basic”. For example, this is how Spanish Educator 2 depicted the museum training:

“Basico (...) abbiamo fatto un giro, una guida (...) Forse loro pensano, cioè io sono insegnante di un altro tipo di arte, questo è molto diverso (...) anche le opere che abbiamo scelto sono quelle che trovandoci io e l’altro educatore dalla stessa parte, cioè che l’arte contemporanea è difficile, erano un po’ più approcciabili (...) è stato difficile sceglierle, perché qualcosa si deve scegliere (...)”

However, it is important to highlight that the same educator also described her FL Teaching education as being very basic, pointing out how she is not part of the full time teaching staff of the Spanish Language Institute and how she had very poor support as regards this particular project:

“Io con loro [the Spanish Language Institute] ho fatto un corso (...) l’anno scorso per insegnare Spagnolo agli stranieri. Però non è una cosa (...) cioè comunque l’ho fatto, ho anche il diplomino. Li allora mi hanno conosciuta, però io non appartengo al [Spanish Language Institute] per niente e allora non c’è stato un vero e proprio supporto formativo (...) nessuno.”

---

27 Translation: “(...) on one side [the Foreign Language Museum Educators] are terrified because it’s not their subject and because they don’t have a specific competence in art and history. So, on one side, panic, because they work on quicksand, but on the other, they love it.”

28 Translation: “Basic (...) we did a tour (...) Maybe they think, I mean I’m a teacher of another type of art, this is very different (...) even the works of art that we selected were the ones that were the most approachable, being me and the other Spanish educator of the same idea, that contemporary art is difficult (...) it was difficult to select the works of art but we had to choose something (...)”

29 Translation: “With them [the Spanish Language Institute] I followed a course (...) last year to teach Spanish Language to foreigners. But it wasn’t something (...) I mean anyway I did it, I even have my
In the case of the English Language Institute, the original pool of educators selected for the CLIL Museum Project was eventually reduced to just the English Educator interviewed. When asked about this “dropout” in the participation of the Foreign Language Museum Educators to the CLIL project, the English Director said:

“[The English Educator] is definitely the most qualified in terms of the art side. Others have been very interested but they don't feel confident with certain tours and because they lack the art background, they again feel (...) intimidated (...). The first year I've kind of put together a handbook for the teachers. It took a long time, I mean they had to go into it and study it, but they felt prepared enough to do it. But then after certain instances, completely unexpected things happening, [the English Educator] is the best person to be dealing with it. Because the others have had quite difficult experiences and they have lost quite a lot of confidence. We were all very enthusiastic at the beginning, because it was very interesting (...) that's become more of an issue as we've gone on.”

In this statement, another issue was touched on in relation to the difficult communication between the Museum and the Language Institutes. Indeed, the English Director claimed that it often happened that the wrong information about the age, language level and school level of the students participating in the CLIL tour would be provided to the Language Institute, resulting in the “completely unexpected things” she referred to. According to the English Director, it is the complex structure of relationships at the basis of the booking system, which makes it difficult to have a clear idea about the group, which booked the tour:

“There are so many actors involved and maybe that's part of the problem. As far as I've understood it, the schools book through [the Museum], we have no contact/no clue, we have very little information. We're lucky if we know whether they're coming from primary school or secondary school and then I think somebody else at [the certificate. That’s where we met, but I’m not a full time employee of [the Spanish Language Institute] not at all and so I didn’t get any educational support from them (...) none.”
Museum] tells me. So I'm not even talking to the people that booked the tour in the first place, so there have been lots of break downs”

In addressing the same issue, the English Educator said:

“I think I would like to know the age and the size of the group (...) if they just say there's a middle school class coming (...) there's a big difference between the first year and the last year (...) if the person that booked had key questions to get the basic information, that would solve a lot of problems”

To give an example of the kind of issues that the difficult communication has created the English Educator and the English Director shared the following experience:

[English Educator]: “I had to do a tour for a group of American Art History undergraduate students”

[English Director]: “(...) And we thought we were going to meet Italian school children (...)”

[English Educator]: “so that was (...)” [shaking her head]

[English Director]: “thank God Sally was doing it” [laugh]

In discussing their perception of such experience, both the English Educator and the English Director agreed that:

“Because we're offering the language support, we're also asked to do tours, which are certainly not CLIL tours. You know, guided tours in English. And again, I get the feeling that for [the Museum] it doesn't make any difference (...) whereas obviously for the teacher doing the tour for the planning is very different (...) and the research that has to go into it is completely different”

It is very interesting to note that the situation that was depicted through the interviews is that of a very problematic Museum-Language Institutes Collaboration both from the perspective of the information given to the Language Institutes about the school groups and of the role that the Foreign Language Museum Educators are asked to play.
4.3. Learning Situation

As regards the Learning Situation, three sub-themes - the duration of the visit (Time), the Group Dynamics and the L1/FL Alternation (see Fig. 3 below) - were identified as presenting issues in terms of both the planning and the implementation of the CLIL Museum Programme.
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Fig. 3

When discussing the first sub-theme, almost all the participants in the interviews found that Time represented one of the biggest issues in planning and implementing the CLIL Museum Programme. For example, the Spanish Educator 1 said that:

"Il tempo è un grosso problema. Si perché non è come una guida in L1 che a un certo punto sconnetti e poi ti riconnetti (...) cioè loro sono ragazzi giovani che hanno un limite di attenzione e dopo un certo limite non riusciranno mai a continuare a lavorare. Anche perché è impegnativo, non è soltanto imparare, ma anche parlare, scrivere, fare gli esercizi ecc. Quindi oltre l'ora, il livello d'attenzione cala."

This is the reason why, after delivering the first Spanish CLIL tour, the original plan of investigating nine works of art was reduced to five:

---

30 Translation: "Time is a big problem. Because it’s not like a visit in L1 that you can disconnect and then reconnect (...) I mean they are young students who have a certain limit of attention after which you can’t go on. Also, because it’s a challenge, it’s not only about learning but also about speaking, writing, do the exercises etc. So, after an hour their attention drops."

---
“Ci siamo resi conto che avevamo tanti esercizi e c’era poco tempo per fare così. Però il problema è appunto quello che non dovrebbe andare oltre l’ora e quindici. Adesso abbiamo ridotto a 5 stanze, 5 attività. Più o meno quindici minuti ciascuna.”

In commenting on the Time issue, Spanish Educator 2 highlighted that in many cases the duration of the CLIL visit is too short when considering that the students have to learn about contemporary art through the FL. She claimed that:

“È proprio il rapporto tempo con le conoscenze che devono essere date, non c’è quel rapporto, sono troppe conoscenze, troppe informazioni per così poco tempo. Perché tu devi dare informazioni di arte, informazioni linguistiche, devi spostarti nelle sale, devi chiedere agli studenti, devi fare altri riferimenti culturali, cioè non c’è proprio tempo. Devono anche avere il tempo di esplorare, di analizzare (...) cioè fai delle domande, devi dargli il tempo (...) cioè dirgli 5 minuti è anche poco (...)”

The same educator touched on the relation between Time and Group Dynamics, explaining how sometimes there is not enough time to address every student in the group, as if they were in the classroom context, and only those that are more proactive, interested or have a higher competence in the FL are really involved in the CLIL museum activities:

“Quello che succede succede in tutti i gruppi, ci sono sempre due che parlano ma quella è una situazione normalissima (...) tu sai che se porti un gruppo, c’è sempre alcuni che hanno la voce importante (...) Certo fai domande a quelli che non parlano, cosa ne credi, cosa ne pensi, ma dimmi l’avverbio (...) o rimangono zitti perché non

31 Translation: “We realised that we had a lot of activities and we had a short time. The problem is that it shouldn’t be longer than an hour and fifteen minutes. Now we’ve reduced it to five rooms, 5 activities. More or less fifteen minutes each.”

32 Translation: “It’s the balance between time and the concepts that need to be given, there’s not balance, there are too many concepts, too much information in a short time. Because you need to give information about art, information about language, you need to move around the museum, you need to ask questions to the students, you need to make some cultural references, there’s really no time. They also need the time to explore, to analyse (...) I mean you ask them questions you need to give them the time to answer (...) I mean giving them five minutes is not enough (...)”
sanno e allora gli butti la domanda là, ma non puoi fare altro, perché non hai il tempo di fermarti più di tanto perché sennò il tempo passa e allora tutto è una velocità proprio del tempo che (...) quindi è più il tempo (...) non puoi soffermarti (...) non è come in classe che ti puoi fermare.”

Of a slightly different opinion was the English Educator, who, when asked about the Group Dynamics, interestingly claimed that:

“Because they all have mixed abilities, so you've got 20 kids and all different levels and you're not in the classroom and it's a challenge to reach all of them, but it can be done and everyone will get something out of the tour. Maybe it could just be someone asking "where's the toilet?"

Of course, here the issue seems to be in the Objectives of the CLIL museum activities, but these will be looked at in more detail in paragraph 5.4.

As regards the L1/FL Alternation, the idea that came across in all the interviews is that all the Foreign Language Museum Educators only use the FL both in talking about the art contents and in giving the instructions for the CLIL museum activities. However, it was briefly pointed out in the last paragraph that some of the School Teachers do translate what the Foreign Language Museum Educators say in the FL into Italian. Moreover, according to the Foreign Language Museum Educators’ perception, when the students work in groups they do not speak in English. For example, the English Educator said:

“They speak in Italian when they work together (...) and that's actually the problem in planning activities because we know that it's gonna break down (...) but the instructions to them and feedback from them is in English”.

Translation: “It happens in every group situation, there are always two that speak more and this is very normal (...) you know that if you take a group, there are always some that speak more (...) of course you ask questions to those who don’t speak, what do you think of it? Tell me the adverb (...) either they stay silent because they don’t know and so you throw another question at them, but you can’t do much more, because you don’t have the time to stop because otherwise time runs out and so everything must be quick (...) so there’s no time (...) you can’t stop (...) it’s not like you’re at school.”
4.4. Aims

As regards the aims of the CLIL Museum Programme, a distinction will be made between the planning and the implementation stage. In particular, from the perspective of the planning stage, participants expressed different interpretations of the CLIL methodology and the Museum Staff mentioned how some school teachers chose not to take part in the CLIL Museum Programme opting instead for a general guided tour in a FL. From the perspective of the implementation stage, Spanish Educator 2 provided a strong opinion about the relationship between the aims and the methodology of the project. The sub-themes briefly mentioned are organised in Fig. 4 below.
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In discussing the aims of the CLIL Museum Programme, both the Museum Staff and Spanish Educator 1 said that the focus of the project is on developing students’ competence in the FL. For example, the Museum Staff said:

“For noi CLIL è esclusivamente linguistico, cioè è mirato a metterli in condizione di usare la lingua straniera in una situazione che non è quella tipica della scuola.”

---

34 Translation: “For us CLIL is exclusively linguistic, that is it aims at giving the students the tools to use the FL in a context that is different from the typical school classroom.”
From this perspective, Spanish Educator 1 further explained the relationship between language and art contents, saying that:

“L’idea è quella di imparare lingua attraverso l’arte, non di imparare l’arte attraverso lingua. Quindi l’arte l’abbiamo usata in modo tale che possiamo spiegare la lingua.”35

However, not all the interviewees expressed the same opinion. For example, the French Director claimed that:

“Noi predisponiamo queste attività davvero come CLIL, non è una presentazione dei contenuti museali e delle opere. Ci sono degli esercizi, a partire dall’arte con lo scopo dell’arte che però vanno a lavorare sulla lingua.”36

The other interesting fact that was described by the Museum Staff is that many school teachers do not share the aims of the CLIL methodology and choose to book a traditional guided tour in a FL. However, even in this case the Museum Staff asks the Foreign Language Museum Educators to step in. In particular, the Museum Staff said:

“Abbiamo degli insegnanti di lingua (...) che non vogliono fare CLIL, ma vogliono fare la visita normale in un'altra lingua e anche in quel caso noi la facciamo fare ai prof di lingua, perché se ci vado io a parlare in Inglese che senso ha?! E questo è un aspetto su cui siamo inflessibili, benissimo se tu sei inglese e la guida è erogata dalla nostra guida italiana che parla inglese, va bene, fa anche colore locale, sull'uso della lingua all'interno di un percorso scolastico siamo un po' più duri.”37

35 Translation: “The idea is that of learning the language through art, not to learn art through language. We’ve used art to explain the language.”

36 Translation: “We really build these activities according to the CLIL methodology, it’s not a presentation of the museum contents and of the works of art. There are activities, that focus on the art with the aim of the art but that allow to work on the language.”

37 Translation: “We get some local teachers that don’t want to do CLIL, but they want to do a standard visit in a FL and even in that case we ask the Foreign Language Museum Educators to step in, because if I do the visit in English, what’s the meaning of it?! And this is something we feel very strong about.”
When trying to interpret this phenomenon, the Museum Staff claimed that, first of all, there are “più insegnanti di lingua straniera che di storia dell'arte (...) quasi tutti”\textsuperscript{38}, and second of all, “perché anche CLIL è una materia nuova e poi arte non è una delle prime materie che si fa in lingua straniera”\textsuperscript{39}.

When asked about the Language and Content Aims of the CLIL Museum Programme, Spanish Educator 2 gave an insightful description of what usually happens at the implementation stage. In responding to Question 13 (see Appendix B) “In relation to the museum contents, which of the following statements are true?”, she answered that students are not motivated in exploring the contemporary art contents, that students only sometimes answer questions on the art contents, that students comprehend very little about the art contents and that these are indeed very basic. In responding to Question 14 (see Appendix B) “ In relation to the use of the FL, which of the following statements are true?”, she answered that students find it difficult to orally comprehend the contemporary art contents because they have low competence in the FL, that students find it difficult to work in groups and when they do they speak in Italian and that students ask very few questions in the FL. Elaborating on these answers, Spanish Educator 2 said that in her opinion the project, in its current state, does not reach the aims planned because it is not organised thinking about the real language and art competence of the students. Thus, she suggested the project should be structured in two or more sessions to allow students more time to fulfil the aims planned together by the Museum Staff and the Language Institutes. This is how Spanish Educator 2 discussed the issue:

“(…) allora come progetto forse non funziona o devono essere studenti molto bravi (…) forse per un A2 una stanza basta, ma allora il motivo educativo è un altro, tu vuoi trasmettere un'altra cosa (...) ma vendi un progetto a più sessioni, una sala,

very well if you’re a native speaker of English and the visit is led by an Italian museum educator who speaks English, it gives some local colours, but on the language used in a school tour we’re more strict.”

\textsuperscript{38} Translation: “more FL teachers than art teachers (...) almost all of them”

\textsuperscript{39} Translation: “because CLIL is a new methodology and art is not one of the first subjects chosen to be studied in a FL”
4.5. Objectives

With regard to the Objectives of the CLIL Museum Programme, a distinction will be made between Art, FL and Transversal Objectives and, where possible, the issues encountered both in the planning and implementation stage of these objectives will be presented, highlighting important sub-themes where necessary (see Fig. 5).

---

Translation: “(...) so maybe in its current state the programme doesn’t work or they need to be incredible competent students (...) maybe for a A2 level one room is enough, but then the educational aim is different, you want to communicate a different thing (...) sell a project that is made of more than one session, one room, abstract art, you have different ways to understand (...) it’s not well thought out (...) too much information and young people these days are what they are (...) two things, a FL and art concepts (...) look, it’s impossible (...) too much information, they close up, off (...)”
From the perspective of the Art Objectives, Spanish Educator 1 highlighted how it was difficult to plan the Art Objectives in relation to the FL Objectives, claiming that:

“È stato anche un problema di riuscire a capire le opere d'arte. Di riuscire a trovare qualcosa da dire e che potesse essere tradotto in un'attività di lingua.”

Especially in relation to the Art Objectives, he decided to only consider very basic art contents (i.e. mixing of materials, the dichotomy reality-fiction and identity). One of the reasons he gave to justify his decision was that Italian students do not study contemporary art at school and have very little understanding of contemporary art themes/contents. In particular, he said that:

“Come fai a parlare di arte astratta con qualcuno che non l'ha mai studiata? Se non conoscono questi concetti in italiano, è anche difficile (...) L'opera viene un po' spiegata, cioè vengono dati i concetti basilari (...) Quindi ad esempio parole difficili come "decostruzione" non lo usiamo, "astratto" non lo usiamo (...) Sono parole difficili da spiegare, significano cose diverse a seconda di chi le ha usate. Quindi andiamo sui concetti più bassi.”

In addressing the same issue, the English Director claimed that planning the Art Objectives was problematic because students are unfamiliar with the contents and because they have to work on these contents in a FL. Indeed, she claimed:

“It's very quite difficult sometimes (...) to put that content in a way that you can put across in English to a non native speaker, because it's not traditional art, it's very conceptual and they find it hard (...) they do struggle sometimes.”

---

41 Translation: “It also was a matter of understanding the works of art, of finding something to say and that could be translated in a FL activity.”

42 Translation: “How can you talk about abstract art with someone that has never studied it? If they don’t know these concepts in Italian, it’s difficult (...) The work of art is explained, but only the basic concepts are given (...) So for example difficult words such as “Deconstruction” are not used, or “abstract” (...) They are difficult words to explain, they mean different things depending on who has used them. So we only focus on the more basic concepts.”
With regard to the FL Objectives, the French Director highlighted that the CLIL Museum Programme is not aimed at developing new FL skills and contents but at reinforcing the FL skills and contents that the students already have developed in school. In particular, she claimed that:

“Noi ci troviamo all'interno di un livello. L'obiettivo è legato alla disciplina, nel senso che se devo descrivere un quadro che è rosso e verde, avrò le parole rosso e verde (...) Ovviamente usano le competenze che fanno parte del livello A2-B1, ma non siamo in un percorso di apprendimento. È per forza un rafforzamento perché è un'attività complementare, in cui la lingua viene usata per fare, scoprire qualcos’altro (…)”

Of the same opinion was the English Director, who stated:

“There's not really time to do language teaching so let's use it as an opportunity to communicate what we can (…)”

However, in discussing the implementation stage of the Language Objectives, all the Foreign Language Museum Educators interviewed claimed that students find it quite difficult to fulfil the language objectives related to speaking and listening in the FL.

According to the English Director, the issues that the students encounter in speaking and listening in the FL during the visit come from the fact that the CLIL methodology is very different from the methodology they are used to in the FL classroom at school. Indeed, the English Director said:

“I think the idea behind the CLIL tour is that it's very different perhaps from the way they're used to learn the language in the classroom, so that is also why they find it difficult, they're under pressure when they're asked to give their opinion or to imagine

Translation: “We are within a language level. The Objective depends on the content subject, in a way that if I have to describe a painting that is red and green I’ll have the words red and green (...). Obviously they use the competences that are part of either level A2 or B1, but we’re not in a learning situation. It must be a reinforcement because it’s an extracurricular activity, in which the language is used to do, discover something else (...)”
something. I don't think they're used to doing that (…) it's very different from the teaching methods they're used to in the classroom.”

Another interesting perspective on the implementation stage of the FL Objectives was identified by the English Educator with regard to both the students’ oral comprehension and production in the FL. However, in her opinion, these issues were not simply related to the use of the FL but also, and mainly, to contemporary art contents. For example, in discussing students’ oral comprehension, she claimed:

“Yes, some students find it difficult to orally comprehend but not only for the language capacity, they're also very young to be thinking that way. There are quite complex reasons behind a piece of work and they just don't get it (…)”

While, in discussing students’ oral production, she touched on two issues, such as limited language capacity or shyness in speaking in front of others:

“There's a mix, someone finds it quite difficult because their language is pretty limited, and someone just doesn't like speaking in a group.”

As regards the Transversal Objectives, the Spanish Educator highlighted that the issues encountered in implementing these objectives are particularly related to the short duration of the CLIL visit. Indeed, she argued that:

“Noi gli chiediamo di analizzare, pensare criticamente, valutare e poi definire (...) e sono tanti processi mentali che loro devono fare in lingua straniera (...) troppi in poco tempo”.

4.6. Language Needs

As regards the Language Needs, the interesting fact is that none of the Foreign Language Museum Educators commented on the importance of clearly stating the

---

44 Translation: “We ask them to analyse, think critically, evaluate and then define (...) and they’re a lot of mental processes that they have to do in a FL (...) too many in a short time.”
language structures and vocabulary the students would need to take part in the CLIL museum activities. For example, Spanish Educator 1 said that:


However, in analysing the data from the observation of one of the CLIL tours delivered by Spanish Educator 1 (see Group B in paragraph 3.5), this is what the author of the current research reported:

“Spanish Educator 1 asks the students to complete Activity n. 10 exercise 2 [see Fig. 6]. Not all the students have understood the instructions and the Spanish school teacher walks around to translate the instructions in Italian. Some of the students ask for the meaning of some of the words [prepositions of place] in Italian and say that they haven’t done the prepositions with their Spanish school teacher yet.”

45 Translation: “We constructed it [the CLIL Museum Programme] so that they wouldn’t have to do anything before. So all from zero. Or better, we’ve had some problems because maybe the level was different. The only thing we’ve worried about is the language level of the students. We’ve constructed the CLIL tour as an experience in its own.”
As regards the Contents of the CLIL Museum Programme, four interesting sub-themes were identified through analysing the data from both the interviews and the observation, and they are organised in Fig. 7 below:

4.7. Contents

Activity 10, Exercise 2

Utilizando las expresiones del recuadro, intenta contestar a las preguntas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a la izquierda de</th>
<th>a la derecha de</th>
<th>al lado de</th>
<th>enfrente de</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>delante de</td>
<td>detrás de</td>
<td>encima de</td>
<td>debajo de</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¿ Dónde están los auriculares?
¿ Dónde están las maletas?
¿ Dónde están los sillones?
¿ Dónde están las carretillas?
¿ Dónde están la arena?
¿ Dónde están las ventanas?
¿ Dónde están los cojines?
From the perspective of Complexity, Spanish Educator 1 discussed in detail why in his opinion contemporary art is very difficult to approach with young people. The following extract is quite long but well represents the educator’s insight on contemporary art:

“L’arte contemporanea è davvero molto difficile da capire per uno studente di scuola media. Forse l’arte figurativa è più approcciabile, hanno già gli utensili per capirla. Con l’arte contemporanea questi utensili in realtà non ci sono. C’è un problema con l’oggetto museale. L’arte contemporanea ha un problema di per sé: l’opera non parla (...) ha bisogno di interpretazione e non si vede la qualità. Il problema è molto importante. perché quando esiste la qualità, puoi dire, ‘vabbe forse a me non piace, però è bravo, guarda che cosa è riuscito a fare’. Però quando un’opera manca di qualità è molto difficile capire, perché ovviamente c’è il rifiuto. Questo dicono che è bravo, ma a me non sembra. Insegnare l’arte contemporanea ha un doppio filo: questi sono bravi perché te lo dico io che sono al museo. Quindi chi non è dentro ha scetticismo e sfiducia. Quando lavori con persone giovani, è difficile lavorare con un’arte aggressiva, che dice sei con me o sei contro di me.”

Translation: “Contemporary art is very difficult to understand for a middle school student. Maybe figurative art is more approachable; they already have the tools to understand it. With contemporary
It is very interesting to point out that Spanish Educator 1 also described the task of selecting the works of art, during the planning stage of the CLIL tour, as very problematic. He claimed that some works of art, such as Thomas Schütte’s *Fratelli* (2012), had to be avoided because “non ci parlava”\(^47\), while others, such as James Lee Byars’ *Byars is Elephant* (1997) did not suggest possible and interesting CLIL activities. As regards the last comment, Spanish Educator 1 said:

“*Per difficoltà degli esercizi, quello della stanza d’oro* [James Lee Byars’ *Byars is Elephant* (1997)] *ci siamo riusciti ma a fatica. non riuscivo a capire.* [Spanish Educator 2] *vede Danae, io vedeva una pioggia dorata. Siamo andati al centro. Siamo andati sulla mitologia perché abbiamo una formazione artistica che non c’entra niente. Abbiamo faticato perché non sapevo che attività potessimo fare lì. Alla fine ce l’abbiamo fatta.*”\(^48\)

When asked about which works of art were interpreted as too complex for the students and were thus not included in the CLIL tour, the English Educator said:

“All in all, these tools don’t exist. There’s a problem with the museum object. Contemporary art is problematic because the contemporary work of art doesn’t speak (...) it needs to be interpreted and you can’t see the quality. The problem is quite an important one, because when there’s quality you can say ‘well, maybe I don’t like it, but he’s good, look at what he was able to do’. But when quality is missing, it’s very difficult to understand because obviously there’s rejection. ‘They say that he’s good but it doesn’t seem like he is to me’. To teach contemporary art has two aspects: these artists are good because I work in the museum and I say so. So who doesn’t work in the contemporary art field is sceptical and discouraged. When you work with young people it’s difficult to work with art that is aggressive in saying you’re with me or against me.”

\(^47\) Translation: “it didn’t speak to us.”

\(^48\) Translation: “About the issues with the activities, the [James Lee Byars’ *Byars is Elephant* (1997)] we succeeded but we struggled. I couldn’t understand it. [Spanish Educator 2] interpreted it as Danae, I saw a gold rain. We went to the essence of it. We thought about mythology because we both have a different kind of artistic background. We struggled because I had no idea of what kind of activity to plan with that work of art. Eventually, we succeeded.”
It is important to highlight how this educator also touched on the issue of the appropriateness of the works of art, which seems to be of great concern for all the actors involved in the CLIL Museum Programme, especially the school teachers. Indeed, when commenting on this issue, the Museum Staff said:

“Noi abbiamo scelto quello che ci sembrava cruciale per rendere il senso della mostra in pochissime tappe (...) Recentemente ci è stata fatta una domanda da parte di un insegnante di inglese se il messaggio morale era adatto a una scuola media (...) morale che comunque viene sempre legato al sesso, però quello è l'unico problema (...) ci sono delle opere di una violenza inaudita (...) ma siccome non c'è sesso non è considerata amorale.”

As regards the sub-theme of Interest, Spanish Educator 2 affirmed that:

“Il problema che io trovo è la mancanza di curiosità e quello non va con l'età (...) non c'è la curiosità, l'interesse (...) non è tanto la lingua quanto il contenuto che è difficile, perché la lingua straniera, se tu vuoi esprimerti ti esprimi male, ma ti esprimi, ma se non ti interessa, non ti esprimi neanche in italiano neanche nella tua lingua, il problema è che non hai niente da dire che è diverso (...)

Moreover, she further elaborated giving a detailed report of the works of art the students were and were not interested in (implementation stage):

“Secondo le mie esperienze hanno avuto grande successo quella [di Lizzie Fitch/Ryan Trecartin] e [Loris Gréaud], perché questa stupisce e invece quella di

49 Translation: “We chose what we thought was crucial for giving an overall idea of the exhibition in a few stops (...) Recently an English language teacher asked us if the moral message of the works of art was appropriate for a middle school (...) moral message always in the sense of sex, because that is the only problem (...) there are works of art which are very violent (...) but because there's no sex they're not amoral.”

50 Translation: “I think the problem is the lack of curiosity and this is not connected with the age (...) there’s no curiosity, interest (...) it’s not the language as much as the content that is difficult, because the foreign language, if you want to communicate you do it bad, but you do it, but if you’re not interested, you don’t communicate, not even in Italian, in your first language, the problem is that you have nothing to say which is different.”
[Lyn Foulkes], che non ha colpito e io avrei detto invece di si, e invece per niente e quelle di [Roni Horn] niente anche (...) insomma le due stanze sono quella [di Lizzie Fitch/Ryan Trecartin] e [Loris Gréaud], basta (...) per due motivi diversi. [Lizzie Fitch/Ryan Trecartin] perché si buttano lì, perché c’è il video, che interessa, si incollano proprio al video, si sono persino messi le cuffie, a quello erano interessati e [Loris Gréaud] perché era troppo diverso, anche perché c'era il suono..però anche [con Lizzie Fitch/Ryan Trecartin], insomma gli ho detto, mettete le parole etc nell'attività e invece si sono buttati là sulle sedie (...) è l'età ma manca anche un po' di curiosità, di interesse (...) tu vedi proprio che si muovono non ti sentono più sono già annoiati (...)."^{31}

The English Educator made similar remarks about other works of art with which the students do not connect. In particular, she said:

“[They show very little interest in the] Japanese artist [Arakawa] because it's all based on philosophy and eternal life and it's quite heavy (...) they're 15, they don't care about eternal life (...) they think they are eternal”

In commenting about a temporary exhibition on show at the second museum, the English Educator further explained:

“The [Stingel] didn't work with the teenagers either. ‘It's three floors of carpet’. The other educator had a terrible group (...) I mean they were interested in parts of the

^{31} Translation: “In my experience, the works of art that are more successful with the students are [di Lizzie Fitch/Ryan Trecartin] and [Loris Gréaud], because this one astonishes, while [Lyn Foulkes], which I thought it would engage and instead it didn’t, and those by [Roni Horn] not at all (...) in short the two rooms are the ones in which [Lizzie Fitch/Ryan Trecartin] and [Loris Gréaud] are shown, and that’s it (...) and for two different reasons. [Lizzie Fitch/Ryan Trecartin] because they throw themselves there, because there’s the video that interest them, they’re really into the video, they even wear the headphones, they got very interested in it and [Loris Gréaud] because it was too different, also because of the sound (...) but also [with Lizzie Fitch/Ryan Trecartin], I asked them to put the words etc in the activity and instead they just threw themselves onto the chairs (...) it’s their age but there’s also a lack of curiosity, interest (...) you really see that they walk around without listening to you anymore, they’re already bored (...).”
exhibition, but a very limited number and then at the end it seemed it wasn't really related to the rest of the ideas. It didn't work at all (...) not with teenagers (...) I mean with the primary students it worked because we planned a treasure hunt (shapes and colours) (...) it was really hard.”

It is interesting to highlight that during the observation of Group A (see paragraph 3.5.), the author of the current research reported that, whilst the works of art by Lizzie Fitch/Ryan Trecartin and Loris Gréaud really attracted students’ attention, the Mono-Ha did not engage the students and they showed no curiosity in knowing more about it. In discussing students’ lack of interest in this work of art with Spanish Educator 2, she confirmed the author’s perception and said that she had had a similar experience with another group of students.

With regard to the Cultural and Historical References, in selecting the works of art Spanish Educator 1 decided to avoid the one by Theaster Gates because of students’ lack of background in American History:

“Abbiamo scartato subito (...) quello afro-americano, Theaster Gates [perché] per farlo serviva una conoscenza della storia degli Stati Uniti che forse loro non hanno.”

Of the same opinion was Spanish Educator 2 who, in commenting about Piero Manzoni’s Achrome (1962 C.), said:

“(…) questa cosa del Manzoni [Achrome (1962 C.)] è una sala che si salta, perché (...) ti accorgi che questi ragazzi non sanno neanche chi sia il Manzoni, neanche per collegarli con il barattolo di merda (...) allora non c’è il riferimento culturale, non potrebbe essere un aggancio, ‘oh guarda questo è l’artista che ha fatto il barattolo di merda negli anni 60’, cioè qualcosa che ti attiri, non c’è conoscenza (…)”

52 Translation: “We immediately rejected (...) the Afro-American one, Theaster Gates [because] to talk about it they needed a knowledge of the history of the US that they probably don’t have.”

53 Translation: “(…) this thing by Manzoni [Achrome (1962 C.)] is in a room that we avoid, because (...) you realise that these teenagers don’t even know who Manzoni is, not even to link it to the Artist’s
The fact that students often lack the cultural background to understand and engage with the works of art was also confirmed by the data collected through the observation of Group B (see paragraph 3.5.). The author of the current research reported the following issues in discussing the symbol of Mickey Mouse in the works by Llyn Foulkes:

“Students find it very hard to answer the Spanish Educator’s question on what the Mickey Mouse symbol stands for. After been elicited, one of the students says that Mickey Mouse is a symbol of the “old art”. The Spanish Educator tries to reformulate the question and asks the students where Mickey Mouse is from, but because no one answers he explains that he is a symbol of American consumerism. Then, the Spanish Educator asks the students to walk around the room and to look for other famous characters in the paintings. They only find one famous character (Elvis Presley) but have not seen Donald Duck. The Spanish Educator then asks where Donald Duck is, but because it has a different name in Spanish, the students do not know who/what they should be looking for in the paintings. Finally, the Spanish Educator has to translate it in Italian “Paperino”. Students all express their surprise (“ahhhh”).

4.8. Methodology

As regards the Methodology, whilst some issues were already mentioned when talking about the Language and Art Objectives, in this paragraph, attention will particular given to issues found in planning and implementing the Lesson Plan, the Scaffolding Strategies (Listening and Speaking), the Activities (Questions and Group Tasks) and the Support Materials (see Fig. 8 below).

Shit (...) so there’s not that cultural reference, that link, ’oh look this is the artist that did the Artist’s Shit in the ’60s”, I mean something that would engage them, there’s no background knowledge (...)”
In discussing the Lesson Plan, the French Director highlighted how the Lesson Plan of the CLIL visit needs to both reflect the logical layout of the exhibition and the logical plan of a FL lesson, and it is often difficult to implement given the time available for the CLIL tour and the number of students. In particular, she said:

"Il piano non è né come una lezione di lingua né come una lezione di arte. Segue un percorso geografico all'interno della mostra. Ogni mostra ha sempre un suo percorso che ha una logica. Si segue il percorso obbligato del museo, dopodiché all'interno, in base alla tematica si va a selezionare delle opere che sono più pertinenti. All'inizio, c'è il momento di introduzione alla tematica e alla fine un momento di conclusione delle attività. Nel mezzo, dipende (...) Diversifichiamo le competenze, quindi hanno delle piccole attività scritte da fare, devono mettere una parola che manca insomma le attività che abbiamo di solito, poi c'è un momento di confronto con la persona che fa il percorso, per farli parlare (...) si si cerca (...) ma sono tanti quindi è difficile."  

54 Translation: “The lesson plan is not like a FL lesson nor as an art lesson. It follows the layout of the exhibition. Every exhibition has its logical layout. We follow the mandatory route, and then within it, we select those works of art that are more coherent with the theme chosen. At the beginning, there’s an introduction of the theme and at the end some concluding remarks about the activity. During, it depends, we diversify the skills, so they have short writing activities, they need to insert a word that’s
In describing the Spanish Lesson Plan, Spanish Educator 1 explained how he planned tasks that would allow students to work on the vocabulary (i.e. materials and colours) present in the immediate context (works of art) first, before moving to tasks in which, through using abstract vocabulary and knowledge, they would interpret and express their opinions. Thus, the original Spanish Lesson Plan was structured on the basis of nine tasks (nine works of art), starting from the less cognitively demanding and context embedded to the more cognitively demanding and context reduced. In particular, this is what he said:


In implementing the lesson plan, Spanish Educator 1 and 2 realised that the number of the activities and works of art to explore, their order but also the types of activities proposed had some issues. As regards the first two elements, after the first visit (Group A, Spanish Educator 2; see paragraph 3.5.), the two Spanish educators decided to reduce the activities from nine in the original lesson plan to five, avoiding the works of art which had been less successful with the students in the previous CLIL tour. However, they also realised that the order of these activities was not ideal

missing, so the activities that we usually have, than there’s a moment of discussion with the Foreign Language Museum Educator to let them speak (...) yes, we try (...) there are so many of them, it’s difficult (...)”

55 Translation: “The work of art is explained, I mean the basic concepts are given (...) low-key concepts. The activities aims at something (...) so that they could express themselves in front of the work of art. The only work we want them to interpret is the one by [di Loris Gréaud], because we wanted (...) to work on the vocabulary and on the abstract concepts (...) I mean we wanted to work on feelings (...) of course you put [students] inside the installation and ask them 'what did you experience?', there’s no need to be explained, you just need to feel it and everyone gives his/her own interpretation [and] the interpretation is free.”
and had to be changed. For example, in the tour delivered to Group B (Spanish Educator 1; see paragraph 3.4.) they decided to move the last activity (see Fig. 6) to the beginning of the tour, because when delivered at the end of the tour its engaging potential had been completely lost due to the students’ tiredness. From the data collected through the observation of Group B (ibid.), another issue was identified as regards the order of the activities. After implementing the changes to the original lesson plan, Spanish Educator 1 realised that Activity n. 2 (see Fig. 9) was essential for the completion of Activity n. 8 (see Fig. 10). Without first working on the “materials” vocabulary in Activity n. 2, it was quite difficult for the students to answer to the question in Activity n. 8, which asked them to recognise the materials in the works of art.

Activity n. 2
Arte Povera-Mono Ha
¿Qué materiales reconoces en las obras?

- hierro - agua - piedra - cera - pintura - cerámica - papel
- madera - tela - alambre de espino - vidrio - cuerda - arena - cuerdas
- oro - barro - plata - cemento

Fig. 9

Activity n. 8
El arte comprometido-Llyn Foulkes
El cuadro en el que aparece Mickey Mouse asesinado está hecho con varios materiales, ¿Cuántos materiales consigues identificar?

Fig. 10
As regards the Scaffolding Strategies, all the Foreign Language Museum Educators interviewed claimed that they do use several strategies, such as repetition, practical examples, synonyms, reformulations, elicitation of questions, slow speech, words well elicited and emphasis, to make the oral input comprehensible. The only strategy that was always claimed to be avoided was “translation in Italian”. However, the author of the current research wrote the following report after observing Group A (see paragraph 3.5.):

“Spanish Educator 2 asks students to complete Activity n. 2 (see Fig. 9). The students look confused and ask each other what they have to do. Spanish Educator 2 tells them that they should walk around to complete the activity. The students start walking around very slowly, but some of them ask the Spanish school teacher to translate the instructions in Italian because they haven’t understood them.”

It is here evident how even though the Foreign Language Educators do not translate neither the concepts nor the instructions in Italian, in many cases it is the school teachers that switch the language of the interaction.

In discussing the Scaffolding Strategies of students’ oral production, the English Director highlighted that students often do not feel confident in speaking in the FL during the CLIL tour, both because they are not familiar with the contents and because they are not familiar with the CLIL methodology/situation. For example, the English Director said:

“We give them [the students] phrases that can be adapted to all of the works just to get them started (...) it just gives them the chunks of language to introduce their opinions and then the educators have to supply specific vocabulary, but it depends also on what age group we have (...) because there's no focus on the language, the structure or the grammar, they just need to be given the phrases to be able to produce their opinions (...) it's not about repeating something from a book, I mean you need to come up with something. The idea is that they have to express something and it's really quite different from what they’re used to.”

As regards the Questions, according to the English Educator, these are often used to scaffold students’ oral discussion. In particular, she claimed that:
“(…) the aim is that everyone expresses something about being in the exhibition (…) and I ask them a lot of questions to scaffold the discussion, do lots of prompting, generally they do the work and I’ll be in the background, and then I ask them ‘what do you see? What do you think he's doing? What do you think it is? Do you like it? How does you make you feel?’ (…) and they just feedback to me and then they discuss (…)”

However, through the observation of Group A and B (see paragraph 3.5.), issues were identified in the implementation of the questions Spanish Educator 1 had planned for the Spanish Museum CLIL tour. Indeed, what often happened was that Spanish Educator 1 and 2 had to repeat the question several times before students answered or they received no answer at all. For example, the following interaction in Spanish was extracted from the report of the observation of Group A (ibid.):

**Spanish Educator 2:** Do you know the meaning of the vocabulary?
**Students:** no answer

**Spanish Educator 2:** what does “alambre de espino” mean?
**Students:** no answer

**Spanish Educator 2:** what is the difference between “barro” and “ceramica”? [this question was asked twice]
**Students:** no answer

**Spanish Educator 2:** “what does the “ceramica” have that is different from “barro”?”
**Students:** one student gives an example of an object made out of “ceramica”

**Spanish Educator 2:** nods and gives a definition of “ceramica”

As regards the Group Tasks, the Foreign Language Museum Educators well discussed the need of planning group tasks both because of the number of the students and the short duration of the tour. For example, the English Director stated that:

“They really need to be doing group things, at least at the planning stage that's what we've tried to include because they can't work on massive 25 people. So they need to break down (…) [but] they do speak in Italian when they work together (…) and that's
"actually the problem in planning activities because we know that it's gonna break down (…)"

In further elaborating this topic, the English Educator connected the difficulty of students in talking in English during the group activities to both the unnatural effort of talking in a FL with their Italian peers and, very interestingly, to the different learning context:

"They find it difficult to work in groups in English, they just go straight back to Italian. I mean obviously they can try and be encouraged to try but there's a point in which it's quite natural that there's a break down. They're not in a classroom situation, but it's like the rules change (…)"

Especially in relation to the sub-theme of Time, Spanish Educator 2 commented on the same topic saying that:

”(...) anche attività di gruppo piace, ma il tempo è molto breve, scrivete lì, discutete tra voi (...) cioè dicono anche qualche cosa, ma è poco tempo.”56

The same educator also commented on the Support Materials, saying that even though they are useful in delivering the CLIL Museum Programme, they are too ambitious.

4.9. Evaluation

With regard to the Evaluation of the CLIL Museum Project, it is pivotal to highlight that the Museum does not have a feedback form specific for this project. Indeed, the Museum Staff said:

"Valutare poi in realtà quali sono le ricadute di questo lavoro, minimo ci vogliono dieci anni (...) noi abbiamo un feedback sull'esperienza (...) poi il nostro feedback non è specifico per il CLIL."57

56 Translation: “(...) they also like the group activities, but the time is so short, write there, discuss it (...) I mean they even say something, but it’s too short of a time.”
In talking about the issues related to the Evaluation of the programme, the English Director and the English Educator particularly commented on how useful it would be to have some sort of feedback from the school teachers, especially in relation to how they follow up on the CLIL Museum visit. Indeed, they stated that:

“(…) another thing is that we never see the feedback forms (…) I asked for feedback but we have no idea (…) you only know from teachers that come back the next year or the next week with another group. And they say, yes they did this at school (…) I mean it would be good to know about how they plan on fitting the museum into the classroom so that it can be a collaboration work. In this way it's more of an isolated experience that really has no follow up (…)”.

4.10. Conclusion

In analysing the data, great importance was placed on letting the voices of those involved in the CLIL Museum Project emerge. Because of the introspective and narrative nature of the data, long extracts were in some case selected from the interviews to highlight the interviewees’ perspectives in relation to the first research question.

Despite the variety of question sets used in the interviews, the same themes emerged from the interview data. However, not all the interviewees placed the same importance on the same themes. Moreover, in some cases, the author of the current research had to report extracts from the interviews, which did not directly address the first research question but were important to understand the interviewees’ perspectives on the issues encountered in planning and implementing the CLIL Museum Project. Finally, an effort was particularly made in highlighting the connection between the different points of view and the cause-effect relationship between the different themes.

37 Translation: “To actually evaluate what the outcomes of this work are, you’ll probably need ten years (…) we have a feedback form on the experience [but] it’s not specific for CLIL.”
5. Discussion

5.1. Introduction

In the current chapter, the data analysed in chapter 4 will be discussed in two different sections. In the first one (paragraph 5.2.), the issues encountered in collecting the data will be outlined, explaining the reasons behind the lack of responses to Teachers and Students’ Questionnaires and the impossibility of observing 6 CLIL tours as originally planned. In the second section (paragraph 5.3.), the issues encountered in planning and implementing the CLIL Museum Programme will be discussed to answer the first research question: What are the difficulties encountered in planning and implementing a museum study programme in a non-native language?

In paragraph 5.4., a Model will be developed to offer a valid solution to the issues discussed in relation to the Museum-School Collaboration (paragraph 5.3.1.), responding to the second research question: How can museum and schools efficiently collaborate in relation to the CLIL museum programme?

In paragraph 5.5., some remarks will be made about the limitations of the study and the implications for further research will be discussed.

5.2. Issues in collecting the data

In chapter 3, the methodology of the current research was described and some remarks were made as regards the issues encountered in collecting data through the observation of the CLIL tours and the teachers and students’ online questionnaires. Indeed, it was briefly pointed out that, despite the original methodology plan of observing 6 CLIL tours, it was only possible to observe two CLIL tours. Furthermore, it was only possible to administer one Teachers’ Questionnaire, instead of the 6 planned, and 25 Students’ Questionnaires, instead of the 120 planned. It is important to also highlight that of the 25 Students’ Questionnaires, none of these were complete. The reasons behind these data collection pitfalls were both the lack of bookings of CLIL tours in the current academic year\(^{58}\) and the way the online questionnaires were designed and administered.

\(^{58}\) Current academic year 2013/2014.
With regard to the first reason, never through the years was a very high number of CLIL tours booked in any of the FL offered (see Table 1 in paragraph 3.2.). Indeed, when looking at the French CLIL Tour provision, 0 tours were booked\(^{59}\), at least at the Museum\(^{60}\), and as regards the Spanish CLIL Tour provision, only 3 Spanish CLIL tours were booked and delivered\(^{61}\). In discussing the French numbers, the French Director claimed that it is not surprising that there has been so little request of French CLIL tours when considering the position nowadays occupied by the French language in the Italian school curriculum. Indeed, according to Cavalli (2014), Italy is one of the European countries in which, despite recent efforts in promoting multilingualism in formal education, there is the general idea that English is the only FL worth investing into. The same could be said for Spanish, which, like French, is second to the teaching of English in Italian schools. However, the French Director also highlighted that those few French language teachers interested in taking their students on a French tour do prefer other much more traditional museum venues (i.e. museum of renaissance art). Of the same opinion was the Museum Staff, who, when discussing the interest in the CLIL Museum Programme, stated that the low number of groups taking part in the project is probably due to it being about engaging students with contemporary art.

Researches in the field of museum education have found that contemporary art has two intrinsic issues regarding museum-school collaboration. First of all, it is not part of the school curriculum and second of all, school teachers find it very hard to approach this kind of art. As regards the second issue, it is very interesting to highlight that one of the reasons why teachers do not feel at ease with contemporary art is that it is produced by artists living today and it is not yet historically studied and accepted, that is it does not share the same official role as the art of other periods. In explaining this phenomenon, Dallari (2005: 50), claims that:

“La scandalosa ruota di bicicletta di Marcel Duchamp, così come in tempi lontani, le opere di Caravaggio, rifiutate dai contemporanei meno acculturati che le ritenevano offensive e blasfeme, sono ufficialmente e definitivamente ‘arte’ quando ricevono tale consacrazione dai committenti, dalla critica e dalla storia.”

\(^{59}\) Since the academic year 2010/2011.

\(^{60}\) It is possible that French CLIL tours were planned and delivered at the other sister museum institution with regard to other exhibition, but the current research only takes into consideration CLIL tours delivered at the Museum.

\(^{61}\) The current academic year is the first year the CLIL tours are offered in Spanish.
Surprisingly though the most difficult issue for school teachers in approaching contemporary art is not so much its historical value as its intrinsic representation of strong emotions and its relationship with the contemporary world. When exploiting his/her role as an educator, the school teacher has to draw a line between his/her emotions as a human being and his/her role as a teacher. However, contemporary art does not allow this distinction of roles between being a person and a teacher and challenges the teacher to express and engage with the artwork and the students at a deeper level regardless of her/his social role (ibid.). Moreover, because contemporary art is a reflection of the contemporary world, it is often difficult to interpret it, because people lack the ability of comprehending the current social situation fully, in reason of them being too close to it, without being able to handle contemporary truths (ibid.). It is thus understandable why school teachers may find contemporary art too challenging or inappropriate for them and their students (see also paragraph 5.3.6.).

As regards the first issue, the Museum faces the challenge of promoting contemporary art content that is not part of the school curriculum. The importance of what Anderson, Kisiel & Storksdieck (2006) call the “curriculum fit” is well discussed in their study of school field trips to museums in three different countries. In particular, they highlight how the decision to do a field trip is always influenced by the relevance of the field trip experience to the school curriculum. Specifically, the authors claim that in all the three studies “curriculum fit was ranked” by teachers “the highest priority issue of trip planning” (idem: 377). Given that school groups “are unlikely to make much use of museums unless their provision relates fairly closely to the areas which are being studied” (Hooper-Greenhill, 1993), it is then possible, that the CLIL Programme is not content-wise responding to the needs of the school groups, at least at the marketing stage. This is also confirmed by what the Museum Staff said in their interview, that is the project would have been much more successful if the Museum hosted renaissance art.

Another reason behind teachers’ lack of interest in the project could be the cost of the visit. Indeed, in paragraph 5.2., the cost of the visit was listed among the sub-themes that emerged from the analysis of the issues regarding the Museum-School Collaboration. In particular, the fact that school groups have to pay both the entrance ticket and the guided visit could be the reason why there have been so few bookings (see paragraph 2.2.3.). Indeed, the English Educator claimed that even in the first year, all of the schools that participated in the project booked a guided tour on a
Wednesday because this is day of the week when the local students do not pay the entrance at the local museums. However, given that in other very popular Italian museums, the cost does not stop school groups from booking a guided tour and paying the entrance, some other factor must be the reason for discouraging schools from taking part in the project. Could it be that the school teachers, at least those that decided not to take their students anymore after the first time, decided that the CLIL tour was not worth its cost? It is difficult to say, but it is possible, specifically because, among the issues outlined in relation to the Museum-School Collaboration, a very important one seemed to be the discrepancy between school teachers’ expectations and the reality of the project (see paragraph 4.2.). When looking at the section on the Museum Website dedicated to the “CLIL Workshop” project, the information given on the theme “Abstract or Realistic” is very basic and it does not help art and language teachers understand how they can link contemporary art to what they are doing in school. Of course this is just a hypothesis, but it seems to be shared by some of the Foreign Language Museum Educators, who in the interviews said that there is no a clear presentation of the CLIL Museum Programme anywhere, which results in widespread confusion about the objectives, contents and methodology of the project (ibid.). The importance of clearly communicating what the goals, contents and methodology of the CLIL Museum Programme are is confirmed by the literature on teachers’ perceptions of museum visits. According to Weber (2003: 38), teachers are not always aware of their expectations and they have different purposes, which often do not match those of museums (Griffin quoted in Bailey, 1999). Moreover, Griffin (ibid.) claims that given that teachers’ expectations in organising a field trip to a museum affects students’ own expectations of the museum visit, it can be said that “il buon esito di una visita dipende in larga misura dalla sua preparazione e dalla chiarezza degli obiettivi che con la visita si vuol raggiungere” (Weber, 2003: 38).

Indeed, the hypothesis that it is the lack of communication on the project that is mostly responsible for teachers’ ill-defined expectations is supported by the situation of the English CLIL Tour provision. Whereas no tours seem to have ever been booked in French and only 4 tours were booked in Spanish in the current academic year, the attendance situation of the English CLIL tour provision is quite different, with tours booked that went from 28 the first year to just 4 this year. In commenting on this situation, the English Director reported that the first year, schools seemed enthusiastic in participating in the CLIL Museum Programme, especially because of the use of this
methodology. However, half way through the third year, the number of bookings dramatically decreased. Thus, it seems likely that the interest in the project faded away after the first year. Moreover, the English Director reported that the trend this year has been of school teachers specifically asking for tours in a FL that are not CLIL tours\(^62\) and are more tailored to what they are doing in school. It can be thus claimed that the CLIL Museum Programme is not responding, in its actual form, to the school teachers’ needs and expectations.

Another factor that played against the collection of data through the Students’ Questionnaires was that of the 25 online questionnaires administered of which none were completed (Group B, see paragraph 3.5.). The reasons why it was decided to design and administer online questionnaires instead of pencil-and-paper ones were the lack of time available for the completion of the questionnaires at the end of the school visit and that the Museum need to have the school groups complete their feedback form. However, the author of the current research also thought that by giving students more time to complete the questionnaires their responses would be more detailed and thought through. Furthermore, it was believed that the use of a web questionnaire would be more attractive for students, considering their young age and their particular relationship with technology (Van Selm & Jankowski, 2006: 437). Unfortunately, both the information provided on where to find and how to complete the questionnaire and the creation of a Facebook Page where to post comments and ask for further assistance did not motivate the students to take part in the research project. Indeed, Van Selm & Jankowski (idem: 448) claim that respondents to online questionnaires do tend to postpone and then forget about filling out the questionnaires. Furthermore, in the case of the current research, it was not possible to send any reminder to the teacher or students given the anonymity of both (see ibid.). However, when reflecting on the issue of the lack of students’ responses, it is important to highlight that the concern whether the online questionnaire was safe for minors to participate in or the need to communicate the date of the visit, which could lead to the understanding of which group gave which information, might have played against anonymity and thus against students’ participation (idem: 445). It is also possible that the teacher asked his students not to fill in the online questionnaire, given that their participation in the research project had not been previously approved by their parents or the school.

\(^62\) Unfortunately, it was not possible to further investigate this data, but some hypotheses on teachers’ expectations and perceptions of CLIL will be explored in the current chapter, tackling this issue.
administration. This was an issue that the author of the current research had taken into consideration but had no chance to solve given both the missed opportunity on the part of the Museum to keep the schools informed about the research project and the lack of further school bookings.

5.3. First research question

When analysing the data regarding the issues encountered in planning and implementing the CLIL Museum Programme, the themes that emerged reflected Coonan (2012)’s CLIL Curriculum categories and these were thus used to organise the data. In the current paragraph, it was decided to keep the same categories, highlighting how the issues in every category and among the other categories are all connected by a cause-effect relationship.

5.3.1. Context

In relation to the context, three sub-themes, such as the Museum Context, the Museum-School Collaboration and the Museum-Language Institute Collaboration, were identified in the data analysis as problematic.

As regards the Museum Context, the physical context has some intrinsic difficulties, which were explained by the interviewees as relating to the size of the rooms, the background noise but also the location of the works of art and the logical layout of the exhibition (ibid.). According to Falk and Dierking (2000: 58), “both psychological and neuroscience research have confirmed that learning is always rooted in the realities of the physical world, even if abstractly, though typically the relationship is extremely concrete”. Thus, as the interviewees pointed out, in planning and implementing the CLIL Museum Tour, they had to consider the quality of the view that one has of an art work, as much as the size and the location of the room in which the art work is, because visitors’ learning suffers if the space is not appropriate or not comfortable enough in relation to the size of the group (idem: 196). As Falk and Dierking claim (idem), even the presence of adequate seating plays a vital role in visitors’ learning. Indeed, museum contexts have the potential to foster learning by offering visitors the opportunity to “see how things are connected, to understand visually, aurally, and even through smell and touch what something looks and feels
like (…))” (idem: 195), and if any of these opportunities is lacking, then the quality of the learning is compromised. Moreover, when considering that in the CLIL context, oral comprehension is intrinsically difficult because of the role played by external, linguistic and cognitive aspects (Coonan, 2012: 142-143, see paragraph 2.3.3), it is obvious that any physical impediments, such as the lack of visuals and background noise, must be avoided (Liubinienė, 2009: 90). In relation to the size of the museum rooms and the social dimension of learning (see Falk and Dierking’s Contextual Model of Learning in paragraph 2.2.1), it is interesting to point out that in planning and implementing the CLIL Museum Programme, the educators had to take into consideration the interrelation between the two features. In particular, they claimed that one of the issues was to find rooms big enough to allow students to walk around, observe freely and work together (see paragraph 4.2.). This confirms Falk and Dierking (2000: 194)’s claim that educators should “design experiences and programs that permit more than one person to share the experience socially and physically”.

As regards the Museum-School Collaboration, some of the sub-themes that emerged in the analysis of the data were already touched on in paragraph 5.2., however here they will be looked at in detail.

In relation to Teachers’ Support, the Museum Staff claimed that, because the miniguides created for every temporary exhibition are quite challenging to comprehend, they only give them to teachers if they expressively request them (see paragraph 4.2.). Despite the need for creating materials especially adapted to the school group audience, the Museum Staff decided against this practice, because, in the feedback forms, teachers always claim that they do not need further support and/or materials (ibid.). In discussing this issue, Anderson, Kisiel & Storksdieck (2006: 380) claim that “easy access to materials and experiences that support field trips is critical, as teachers with extensive pedagogical responsibilities and limited time are unlikely to track down ways to blend the field trip with their curriculum” (see paragraph 2.2.3.). However, these researchers also claim that even when materials are supplied to teachers, either on paper or online, “many studies show that teachers use such materials sparingly” (see Griffin and Symington 1997 and Griffin 2004 quoted in Anderson, Kisiel & Storksdieck, 2006: 380). As the Museum Staff pointed out in their interview (see paragraph 4.2.), the truth is that teachers often perceive the field trip as a “general enrichment” (Falk and Dierking, 2005: 925) and adopt a “passive consumer like stance” (Mathewson-Mitchell, 2007: 3) towards the planning of a
museum visit. Moreover, even when materials and pre- and post-activities are posted online, studies confirm that very few teachers use them in preparing and following up students’ learning in museums (Anderson, Kisiel & Storksdieck, 2006). The reason is often the discrepancy between teachers and museum educators’ perceptions of “what a successful field trip really is” (idem: 381), which accounts for the need of museums to provide teachers with “pedagogical support in the form of training or professional development”, so that they can “better understand how they can effectively use” museums “to promote learning related to the school curriculum” (ibid.). Indeed, the organisation of a well-structured workshop for teachers is one of the issues of the CLIL Museum Programme. Even though the Museum always presents the CLIL project at the beginning of the academic year, there seems to be confusion, also among the Directors of the Language Institutes, who are in charge of it, of what information to communicate to teachers. For instance, given that the English Director (see paragraph 4.2.) claimed that because the presentation was organised before anyone had any idea of what the CLIL tour would be like, it seems likely that the objectives, contents and methodology of the CLIL tour were not clearly expressed, at least in this year presentation, and that teachers were neither provided with ideas of how to integrate the CLIL tour into the curriculum nor were they provided with opportunities to practice with the planning of pre- and post-visit activities. This situation well reflects Anderson, Kisiel & Storksdieck (2006: 380)’s claim about how in their experience as educators, they “are acutely aware that discussion of any kind of field trip pedagogy that would assist future teachers to think critically and creatively about field trip design is typically lacking within teacher preparation programs”. However, they also argue that if museums do not re-examine “how they can provide ways for teachers to recognize that field trips can create important affective experiences” (ibid.), then such issues are likely to continue. In relation to the CLIL Museum Programme, it must be highlighted that a teachers’ training on the aims and methodology of the project needs to be provided especially given teachers’ confusion in relation to the aims of the CLIL methodology and the necessity of language and subject teachers to collaborate in taking part in the CLIL project. In particular, the English Educator reported that most of the time, the group is prepared and accompanied to the Museum by either the language teacher or by the art teacher and almost never by both (see paragraph 4.2.). The lack of collaboration between FL and art school teachers reflect the issues that both Coonan (2003) and Lucietto (2008)
have found with regard to the Team Teaching idea at the basis of CLIL. Indeed, Italian teachers find it challenging to “talk to each other, as their professional viewpoints are often worlds apart” (Dahl, 2000 quoted in Lucietto, 2008: 87). Furthermore, “in secondary schools graduate teachers do not share a sound pedagogical basis but only separate, subject-specific professional skills”, which makes it difficult for them to collaborate and trust each other’s point of view (Lucietto, 2008: 87). Another issue is that CLIL is still interpreted, at least in Italy, as something pertaining only to the FL curriculum and even though universities around Italy have been training subject and FL teachers in CLIL, in lieu of the prescription of the Riforma Moratti which says that since the current year one subject in the final year of high school should be taught in a FL (see paragraph 2.3.), there is still a lot of confusion about what CLIL actually is. This is confirmed by the diversity of objectives that teachers taking part in the CLIL Museum Programme have and their attitude towards the visit (see paragraph 4.2.).

As regards the three-part format of the museum visit, the interviewees in the current research well highlighted how teachers very rarely integrate the CLIL visit into their classroom through designing and delivering pre- and post-visit activities (see paragraph 4.2.). Indeed, the Foreign Language Museum Educators all made clear that students arrive at the museum very badly prepared, almost looking “lost” and that they have no idea if the teachers will follow up the CLIL visit with more activities in class (ibid.). These finding are not surprising though. Indeed, the same picture is drawn by much research in the field of school visits to museums (see for example Griffin, 2004 and Falk and Dierking, 2005), and Falk and Dierking (2005: 921) claim that even those teachers that do prepare their students only focus on “schedules and instructions regarding clothing and food” and, almost never “enact pre-visit activities that aim to reduce innovation and to connect the museum visit to the class curriculum” (idem: 932). In the case of the CLIL Museum Programme, the lack of preparation and follow up of the visit is even more dramatic, because students are asked to follow a guided tour in a FL. How are students supposed to listen to and speak about art contents in a FL if they are not familiar with the objectives, contents and the methodology of the CLIL visit and have not previously developed the language skills necessary to actively participate in the CLIL tour? Whilst it is known that preparation can decrease the effects of the Novelty Phenomenon (see paragraph 2.2.1.) and increase students’ learning in the museum, in the situation of the CLIL
Museum Programme preparation is fundamental in helping students build the language and content competence they will need to perform the listening and speaking tasks during the CLIL visit. Indeed, it will be said throughout the chapter that the CLIL museum visit is an opportunity for students to practice cognitive and language skills that should have already been developed. However, follow up is also important when thinking that the museum experience becomes actual knowledge only when it is reinforced by subsequent experiences (see paragraph 2.2.3). According to Falk and Dierking (2000: 200), “learning is a continuous process that begins before the visitor arrives at the museum door and continues long after”, and there are almost infinite possibilities as to how to extend students’ interests and experiences, developed during the visit, “beyond the temporal and physical confines of a single experience” (idem: 202). Unfortunately, it seems likely that the learning potential of following up the museum experience with more work in the classroom is not exploited in the CLIL Museum Programme.

As regards the Museum-Language Institute Collaboration, the most important issues that emerged from the analysis of the data related to the Training of the Foreign Language Educators and the Communication between the Museum and the Language Institutes (see paragraph 4.2.). In particular, the Foreign Language Educators claimed that the training they received from the Museum was very basic and, in some cases, they did not feel prepared enough, at least content wise, to plan and implement a CLIL tour. Even though the Museum Staff do lead a tour of the exhibition prior to the opening of any new exhibition, highlighting both the contents to explore and the strategies to use in doing so, it is felt that the support offered to the Foreign Language Museum Educators lacks structure. First of all, there is a misconception about the identity and role of the Foreign Language Museum Educators. Despite them being primarily FL teachers and having thus no background in museum education, when leading a museum CLIL tour they also become museum educators. This is due to the museum context itself, which is completely different from the FL classroom context and has its own very specific dynamics. According to Taboys (2011: 31):

Museums are unique establishment with unique sets of working environments, methods, skills and priorities. It is not enough for example to know the major theories of education; the museum educator must understand how they apply to both general and specific museum situations.
Thus, it is clear that the training of the Foreign Language Museum Educators should also include some tips about how to lead a museum tour, how to engage students through exploring art works and some knowledge of the priorities and dynamics of museum education. Indeed, as Falk and Dierking (2000: 194-195) claim, “good facilitators require training, not just in the content, but also, and most important, in the art of communication” (Falk and Dierking, 2000: 194-195). For example, both Spanish Educators claimed to be little used to working with teenagers. This is something that could be approached at the training level by both discussing with the Museum Staff the best way to engage this particular audience and by following other general guided tours, to get more acquainted with guided tour modalities. Indeed, during the CLIL tours observed and included (see paragraph 3.5.) or not included in the data analysis, it was often noticed how the Foreign Language Museum Educators often forget to introduce themselves. Also a pattern emerged as relating to the objectives of the tour not being explained or the context not being drawn or, very important, conclusions not being made. These are all strategies that a museum educator must be aware of in order for the guided tour to really work. Of course “much competence in this comes from practical experience but, there is a great deal that can be learnt about it from other practitioners” (Taboys, 2011: 32).

Apart from the museum teaching strategies, the issue that emerged from the interviews regarded the Foreign Language Museum Educators’ competence in the contemporary art concepts. Indeed, both the Museum Staff and the English Director claimed that the Foreign Language Museum Educators do not feel at ease with contemporary art. It must be highlighted here how there should be much more collaboration at the planning stage in selecting the art content, both art works and concepts, to explore during the CLIL tour and how to present them. It seems likely that the training that the Museum Staff delivers to the Foreign Language Museum Educators is simply that of a 3-hour guided tour of the exhibition, which is not tailored to the aims and objectives of the CLIL tour itself, and only helps in giving the educators an overall idea of the artists and themes of the exhibition. Thus, the same issue of the Teaching Team in CLIL in relation to school teachers also applies to the Museum Staff and Foreign Language Museum Educators working together. However, there is the feeling that this collaboration is not felt necessary because of the aims and objectives of the CLIL Museum Programme not being formulated in accordance to
the CLIL methodology, but this hypothesis will be dealt with in more detail in paragraph 5.3.3. and 5.3.4.

Finally, a very important issue emerged in the data analysis with regard to the difficult communication between the Museum and the Language Institutes. As the English Educator pointed out, most of the times they have no idea of the age, language level and number of students that have booked the tour or, in some cases, they even get the wrong information about the student group, which leads to unexpected and uncomfortable situations. Whereas in a traditional museum tour situation the lack of information about the school group would be difficult but not impossible to handle, in a CLIL tour situation it means not only to fail teachers’ expectations but also to put the Foreign Language Museum Educator in a very problematic position. Indeed, planning a CLIL activity for a group of 11 year olds is very different from planning an activity for 18 year olds. The language level but also the cognitive skills and background knowledge are completely different as are the types of activities and questions appropriate for the age groups.

5.3.2. Learning Situation

In analysing the data related to the Learning Situation (see paragraph 4.3), the issue that emerged most strongly was the time constraint of the CLIL Museum Programme. All the Foreign Language Museum Educators and the Language Institute Directors made it clear that the fact that the CLIL visit only lasts 90 minutes really makes it difficult sometimes to go through all of the contents and activities and make everyone at any level speak in the FL. It is important here to highlight that in implementing the CLIL Museum Programme, the Spanish Educators realised that the number of the art works to explore and the tasks to perform were too many in the time available and had to be reduced from 9 to 5. Specifically, Spanish Educator 2 clearly stated that the short duration of the tour is problematic especially because students are asked to learn and talk about contemporary art in a FL. The necessity to limit the inputs in the CLIL context is well addressed by Rubio & Vazquez (2010: 54) who assert that “special attention should be paid to ensure that the amount of material to be covered is adequate for the time allowed, that is that special care should be taken to avoid adding the difficulty of understanding the contents, and a rush to cover them, to the innate difficulty of understanding explanations in a foreign language”. It is interesting to
note that the time constraint is even more problematic because the Foreign Language Museum Educators meet the students for the first time at the Museum and they have very little idea about the students’ language and content competence, but also about their learning strategies and group behaviour. When considering the combination of all these factors and the short duration of the CLIL visit, the importance for the Foreign Language Museum Educators to have basic information about the group is obvious and a suggestion will be offered as how to provide it when discussing the Museum-School Collaboration Model for the CLIL Museum Programme (see paragraph 5.4.1.).

As regards the group dynamics, a vast literature has discussed the need to have students do pair/group works so as to extend their use of the FL and develop cooperative learning skills (see for example Menegale, 2008a, Lucietto 2008 and Guazzieri, 2008). It is interesting to highlight that group work was used in the planning of the CLIL Museum Programme, in order to both give all the students the chance to speak in the FL and maximise the time spent on a task. However, and this will be particularly looked at in paragraph 5.3.7., the Foreign Language Museum Educators all claimed that students speak in Italian when working in pairs/groups, thus not fully exploiting the benefits of this type of learning.

The other big issue that was touched on by the Foreign Language Museum Educators regard the L1/FL alternation during the CLIL visit. Specifically, the Foreign Language Museum Educators claimed that whereas they always plan to only use the FL during the CLIL visit, it is often the school teacher, especially the art teacher, that changes the language of the interaction to Italian. This situation rarely presents itself when the school group is accompanied by the FL teacher. A pattern can be here identified as regarding the issue of Team Teaching (see paragraph 5.3.), and the fact that often subject teachers prefer to discuss the content topic in the L1 first and then in the FL (Meyer, 2010). However, this is not the point of CLIL and it also why subject and language teachers should work together in planning the CLIL visit. Indeed, there seems to be a great confusion about the aims and objectives of the CLIL Museum Programme and the CLIL methodology in general, as already said in paragraph 5.2., and the issues specifically related to these categories will be looked at in more detail in paragraphs 5.3.3., 5.3.4. and 5.3.7..
5.3.3. Aims

It was already pointed out that one of the major issues encountered in planning and implementing the CLIL Museum Programme is its ill-defined aims and objectives. As regards the former, many of the interviewees claimed that the aim of the CLIL project is simply linguistic and, in the case of the Spanish Educator 1, he claimed that the aim is that of learning the FL through art. However as it was highlighted in paragraph 2.3.2., the aims of a CLIL curriculum is that of fostering students’ both FL and non-linguistic subject competence. According to Rubio & Vazquez, CLIL “involves a style of teaching that does not focus specifically on the progression of the foreign language but sees it as an opportunity to encourage its use and, in this way, promote its development” (Krahne, 1987:65; Marsh, 1994:23; Richards & Rodgers, 2003:201 quoted in Rubio & Vazquez, 2010: 47). The same view of CLIL is supported by Coonan (2003), who claims that in the CLIL context “the L2 is the vehicle whereby the content objectives are reached”. A slightly different opinion is brought about by Dalton-Puffer (2007: 5), who claims that:

(…) CLIL programmes may actually have different motivations and settings: they may be either content-driven or language-driven and the question is not which one is ‘better’ in absolute terms, but whether everyone is quite clear about which kind of programme they are in, because the implications in terms of objectives and reasonable expectations of outcomes are far-reaching.

The issue of the Museum CLIL Programme is exactly that of clarity in planning and communicating the aims of the project. Indeed, the aim can very well be that of promoting students’ oral listening of and production in the FL, but CLIL is not about working on adverbs and prepositions of places, unless they are needed to support students’ exploration of the non-language subject contents. This is the reason why CLIL is more authentic as a context than the traditional FL classroom and why the CLIL Museum Programme has so much potential (see paragraph 2.3.). The museum context provides educators and students with the opportunity to explore themes and contents that go beyond the mere art work and thus to use the FL to talk about the relationship between one self and the others, between man and contemporary society, and between man and nature (see paragraph 2.2.2.). The possibilities are endless, but
they are all based on the assumption that the art works and contents are the starting point from which the discussion in the FL can spring. Indeed, according to Coyle (2005), “whatever kind of model, it is fundamental to CLIL that the content of the topic, project, theme, syllabus leads the way. This means that: the content is the starting point of the planning process”. Thus, to be really CLIL, the primary focus of the CLIL tour should be the contents and the FL should be used to explore the art works and not the other way round. There are of course museum study programmes in which the art works are used to learn the L2, such as the Getty ESL Program or the Geoffrye ESL Programme, but they are not CLIL.

The other important issue is that school teachers seem to have a wrong perception of what CLIL actually is, which results in a majority of FL teachers taking part in the project without consulting their art teaching colleagues. There is indeed still a general conception of CLIL as a methodology only attaining to FL teaching, especially in Italy (Lucietto, 2008: 88), and this misconception is intertwined with the issues still affecting teacher training in the CLIL methodology (see Di Martino & Di Sabato, 2012). Overall, it could be said that the issues regarding the aims of the CLIL Museum Programme and the perception that the actors involved in the project have of the CLIL methodology as only promoting FL teaching and learning is actually a reflection of the wider issues that the methodology still encounters in the formal educational context. Thus, a well-structured teachers’ training workshop should be devised in order to support teacher understanding of the CLIL methodology (see Museum-School Collaboration Model for the CLIL Museum Programme in paragraph 5.4.1.). Finally, the support of the local university, as the leading provider of CLIL training to school teachers, could be sought in planning both the programme and the teachers’ workshop.

5.3.4. Objectives

In paragraph 4.4., data were analysed with regard to the issues encountered in planning and implementing the art, FL and transversal objectives of the CLIL Museum Programme. It is very interesting to highlight that, as for the aims discussed in the last paragraph, the art objectives are seen as secondary to the FL objectives. Whereas in a typical CLIL situation, the FL objectives are decided on the base of the non-language subject contents, in the CLIL Museum Programme it seems to be the
opposite, at least in the case of the Spanish language provision. However, the issue is generalised to all the FLs offered when one thinks that even when the art content objectives are formulated as primary, these are not decided by the art experts, the Museum Staff, but by the FL experts, the Foreign Language Museum Educators. Of course there needs to be integration, in the sense that the FL experts should discuss the art contents with the Museum Staff and decide what can be done in the time available, what language issues the students are likely to experience and how they can be approached, but it is the Museum Staff that should open the way to the definition of the art content objectives. Unfortunately, this collaboration in planning and implementing the objectives of the CLIL project is not felt as necessary by the Museum Staff, because, once again, the programme is language-driven, which means that the Foreign Language Museum Educators are left alone in planning the art and FL objectives and the lesson plan of the CLIL activity. There is the idea that a one-time tour of the art exhibition to train the Foreign Language Museum Educators on the art contents is not enough when planning a CLIL activity, and that the Museum Staff’s insight is pivotal when planning the art objectives. Indeed, it is not a coincidence that the issue that was brought about more often by the Foreign Language Museum Educators was that of defining the art objectives in relation to contemporary art (see paragraph 4.4.).

In discussing the transversal objectives, Spanish Educator 2 claimed that the CLIL activity requires students to practice a lot of higher level thinking skills, such as analysing and evaluating, in a very short time. Indeed, the development of the higher level thinking skills (see Bloom’s Taxonomy in paragraph 2.3.2.) needed by students to engage in the CLIL museum activity, would be spaced out in multiple lessons in a traditional CLIL formal context. Indeed, in Coonan (2012: 132)’s operational model, the student is slowly and methodologically supported in exploring the non-language contents through three consequential stages, each involving different higher level thinking skills:
It is obvious that if students are not familiar with the art contents and with the language structures and vocabulary necessary to support the above cognitive and study skills, all of these stages have to be compressed in the 90 minutes of the CLIL activity, there will be in frustration on both students and educators’ side. Ideally, the first two stages of the model should be developed in school before the visit, so that when the students take part in the CLIL museum visit, they have the opportunity to apply, analyse, create and evaluate those contents that have already been explored and towards which the students have already been motivated.

It is the author’s opinion that the major issue in planning and implementing the aims and objectives of the Museum CLIL Programme regards its format as a one-time, one-off experience and this is one of the factors that will be taken into consideration when developing the Museum-School Collaboration Model for the CLIL Museum Programme (see paragraph 5.4.).

5.3.5. Language Needs

In paragraph 4.6., the issues that emerged from the data as regards the language needs related to the format of the CLIL visit as a single and separate experience. Whereas some of the Foreign Language Museum Educators claimed that there are no language requirements in taking part in the CLIL visit, the truth is that there should be, because in order for students to produce language they need to already have those language structures and vocabulary they will have to use during the CLIL activity. Of course, the CLIL museum activities should be planned, as they already are in some cases, in a way that they guide the students from an easy task, such as that of recognising the vocabulary, to more difficult ones, as evaluating what the students see, but the
vocabulary and language structures should not be learnt during the visit. As the French Educator well said, the CLIL museum tour should be seen as reinforcement and an “extracurricular activity in which the language is used to do, to discover something else (…)” (see paragraph 4.4.) and it should not be used to develop new FL structures and vocabulary or to develop new cognitive skills.

The other interesting issue that could be derived from the interviews is that whilst it is true that when referring to the language levels of the CEFR (see paragraph 2.3.1.) educators can have a clear idea of what the students are able to do with the language at that level, it is also true that saying that a group has an A2 level is not really enough information about the students’ language competence. First of all, to know whether a group has a beginning A2 or an advanced A2 is pivotal. Second of all, it may be the case that these students have not practiced with certain structures or have not explored certain topics, thus do not know the appropriate vocabulary. To clearly communicate the language needs to the school group taking part in the programme is necessary because CEFR levels exist as a theoretical guideline, but do not tell much about the specific students’ competence.

However, it needs to be pointed out that there seems to be confusion about the kind of competence that these students need in order to take part in the programme. As discussed in paragraph 2.3.1., students taking part in a CLIL activity needs a CALP competence, but it seems likely that the majority of the groups arrive at the museum with a BICS competence. This hypothesis is supported by the fact that most of the school groups that decide to take part in the CLIL museum project do so as part of their FL curriculum. How can it be asked to students to analyse, synthetise, evaluate and so forth during the CLIL museum visit, if they have never done it before in the FL? This is where the pre-activities in school would come in handy and this is the reason why this issue will be further looked at in paragraph 5.3.7., when discussing the methodology.

5.3.6. Contents

The issues related to the contemporary art contents of the CLIL Museum Programme have already been tackled from the school teachers’ point of view in paragraph 5.2.. In this paragraph, attention will be given to the issues encountered by the Foreign Language Museum Educators in engaging students through contemporary art by
reflecting upon their attitude towards these contents. Moreover, attention will also be
given to students’ attitude and personal evaluation of these contents and how these
need to be taken into consideration when planning and implementing CLIL
programmes.
In paragraph 4.7., Spanish Educator 1 well highlighted that there are multiple reasons
why people in general, and young people more specifically, find it hard to connect
with contemporary art. First of all, there is the fact that contemporary art gives no
information about how to approach it; Second, there is a quality issue: can this really
be art? Who has decided so? Should I believe these people that claim that this is art
and that I should even be interested in it? In discussing the way young people engage
with contemporary art, Illeris (2005; see paragraph 2.2.2.) claim that whereas
modernist artworks are “imbued with a very special aura” and are historically
accepted as art (see Dallari, 2005 in paragraph 5.2.), contemporary artworks require
viewers to put aside questions related to their quality or pleasantness and to accept
their ambiguity and discussion of traditional art ideas as a challenge. The interesting
thing is that every museum educator who attempts to explore contemporary art with
young people will experience resistance and scepticism at first. For example, during a
recent tour of a contemporary art collection, an 18 year old student asked the writer
the following question: “Why do these artists make it so difficult for the viewers to
understand the subject of their artwork? I mean now that you’ve explained it, yes it
makes sense, I mean I don’t like it that much, but it makes sense. Why is it so difficult
to understand it?”. Indeed, despite Illeris (2005; see paragraph 2.2.2.)’ assumption
that it is through engagement with art that challenges young people’s conceptions of
reality that they can “adopt a curious and sensitive attitude”, it is also important to
highlight that teenagers look for artworks they immediately feel an emotional
connection with and only engage in the process of learning when they are intrinsically
motivated (see Csikszentmihalyi’s description of Flow in paragraph 2.2.1.). The
Foreign Language Museum Educators very well discussed how students only engage
with specific artworks and are instead totally unimpressed by others. This is quite
natural in a museum tour situation, but it becomes very problematic within the CLIL
Museum Programme, because if students are not interested in and curious about the
artworks, they are certainly not willing to listen and speak in the FL. Indeed, in
discussing the factors involved in the selection of contents for a non-formal CLIL
activity, Coonan (2012; see paragraph 2.3.2.) claims that one of them is certainly
“interest”. Thus, the question is: are students taking part in the CLIL Museum Programme motivated towards contemporary art? Unfortunately, the answer can only be based on the interviewees’ perspective and this is not totally positive. It is opinion of the author that the issue is that school teachers do not prepare and motivate their students towards what they will see during the CLIL visit, before coming to the museum. Students need to be provided with time to explore these contents and to find their personal connections with and interpretations of the artworks. Furthermore, as Spanish Educator 2 claimed, without engaging in pre-visit activities, students are unfamiliar with the contents and thus lack the cultural and historical background of the contemporary artworks, which would facilitate their listening comprehension and oral production in the FL during the CLIL visit.

Another issue is certainly related to the theme chosen for the CLIL Museum Programme. It is indeed felt that this theme is not characterised by “relevance” and “need” to what students are doing in school (see paragraph 2.3.2.). An important point was made in this regard by the Foreign Language Museum Educators, who claimed that the Museum’s artworks are complex and some of them speak about concepts, such as eternity, that young people find difficult to relate to. In discussing this issue with a fellow museum educator, an agreement was found towards the necessity of proposing themes that are less general and complex than the “Abstract and Realistic” proposed. Thus, an example of a possible theme and pre- and post-activities will be offered when discussing the Museum-School Collaboration Model for the CLIL Museum Programme (see paragraph 5.4.1.).

Finally, the last important issue is that some of the Foreign Language Museum Educators do not find themselves at ease with contemporary art. The educators’ perception of contemporary art is indeed important because, as Dallari (2005: 159; my translation) points out, “only in the situation in which the educator is in love with the object of teaching then he/she is able to pass this passion onto his/her students and to teach them how to welcome and use it, so that their encounter with that knowledge results in the increase of aesthetic quality of their life”.

5.3.7. Methodology

In analysing the data related to the methodology adopted in planning and implementing the CLIL museum tour, issues were identified with regard to the lesson
plan, the scaffolding strategies of students’ oral comprehension and production in the FL, the questions and the group tasks (see paragraph 4.8).

The Spanish Educators interestingly claimed that the issue in planning the lesson plan of the CLIL activity lay in the need to take into consideration both the logical layout of the exhibition and the operative model of a FL lesson. With regard to the logical layout of the exhibition, the curator obviously designs the exhibition on the base of both the relationships she/he wants to draw between the works of art and the route that she/he thinks visitors should follow in order to grasp the meaning of the exhibition. Of course, depending on the aim of a guided tour, the museum educator can change the order in which the works of art are explored but, for practical reasons, he/she can also decide to only concentrate on some works of art and avoid others. In the case of the CLIL Museum Visit, the fact that the visit is in a FL and only lasts for 90 minutes is very problematic. For example, after delivering their first CLIL tour, the Spanish Educators realised that to ask students to explore nine works of art and engage in nine group tasks in the FL was cognitively too demanding for them and they thus decided to reduce the works of art and tasks to five. Interestingly, issues were also encountered in defining the order of the works of art to explore. Indeed, whereas in the original plan Gréaud’s installation had been placed at the end of the tour, subsequently, this work was moved to the beginning of the tour. The reason is that the Spanish educators realised that when delivering the original plan students did not engage with this installation because too tired, thus missing out on its potentially attractive nature.

As regards listening, the Foreign Language Museum Educators claimed that students find it quite difficult to follow the CLIL museum tour, especially because they are not familiar with the CLIL methodology. Indeed, the students that take part in the programme seem to be not prepared in dealing with the external, linguistic and cognitive factors (Coonan, 2012: 142-143) that make listening in the CLIL context more challenging than in the traditional FL learning context. Of course, the Foreign Language Museum Educators use a variety of support materials to help students’ listening comprehension (see paragraph 2.3.3.), but the time is such that they do not have the time to lead pre- and during-listening activities (see Teachers’ methodology: support materials and listening activities in ibid.). Moreover, for the CLIL museum visit to really be a reinforcement of students’ listening skills, they should already be familiar with the genre and characteristics of the oral text and the contents they will
engage with during the visit. These listening issues are indeed pivotal when considering that the non-linguistic contents are learnt only if the input is comprehensible, that is only if it is a bit beyond the students’ current level of competence \((i + 1)\) (Krashen, see paragraph 2.3.3.). Of course, the same applies to the FL, because there is language acquisition only when FL students comprehend the input. According to Falk and Dierking (2000: 24), for students to be deeply involved in the museum experience the task they are provided with “must match or be attainable” by their present ability to perform. Could the listening issues be the reason why few students have been observed to really engage in the tour? It is hard to say. However, the observation of Group A analysed in paragraph 4.8. gives an idea of the issues encountered by students in answering oral questions related to vocabulary.

As regards the scaffolding listening strategies, the Foreign Language Museum Educators claimed that they use various discourse management and discourse strategies to make the oral input comprehensible (see Krashen quoted in Coonan, 2012: 148; paragraph 2.3.3.), but translation in Italian. However, it was already pointed out in paragraph 5.3.2. that it is often the teachers that translate the instructions or concepts from the FL in Italian, thus missing the whole point of the CLIL museum visit. Is this a general behaviour of all school teachers, or does it mostly happen with art school teachers? According to the English Educator, art school teachers are mostly the ones that translate in Italian, because their focus is on their students’ absorbing the art contents, whereas FL teachers often support students’ comprehension by either reformulating in the FL what the Foreign Language Museum Educator said or providing students with further examples. Unfortunately, the data is not so viva to allow clear generalisations on the use of teachers’ strategies to make the FL input more comprehensible, but it seems pretty safe to say that FL and art school teachers act very differently. Indeed, Coonan (2012: 107) claims that subject teachers do not have a strong background in the language of their subject, that they have a scarce competence of issues and dynamics related to FL learning and that they are not competent in the FL education strategies to use to support students’ learning of the subject in a FL. Thus, if not specifically trained on the CLIL methodology, the behaviour they seem to adopt during the CLIL museum visit is not that surprising. This is the reason why, first of all, a training on the CLIL methodology should be provided to teachers at the beginning of the academic year and, second of all, why it
is very important that subject and FL teachers collaborate in integrating the CLIL museum visit into the school programme (see paragraph 5.2.).

As regards students’ oral production, issues were particularly encountered in implementing questions and group tasks. Indeed, the Foreign Language Museum Educators claimed that students find it difficult to answer the questions and engage in the group activities because they have a limited language capacity but also because they do not like to talk in a group.

In relation to the questions, the Foreign Language Museum Educators claimed that they planned both display and referential questions to spark a discussion with the students. However, when implementing these questions, students hardly reply, even when questions are of the display and cognitively low order type (i.e. Activity n.2, Fig. 9 in paragraph 4.8.). Is it because they are not interested or because they find these questions too hard to answer? Unfortunately, no students’ responses were collected and their perception of the matter cannot be used to answer this question. However, it could be hypothesised that students very rarely reply to questions because they are not used to this kind of interaction, because they lack the vocabulary and art concepts competence and because they do not feel at ease in interacting with the museum educator.

As regards the group activities, despite their large use in the planning stage of the CLIL tour, both the English Director and the Foreign Language Museum Educators claimed that even when performing the task students speak in Italian. Two issues were identified in this regard, the fact that students do not see the point in talking in the FL to their Italian peers and the fact that they struggle with the linguistic and cognitive factors responsible for the more or less difficulty of a task (Coonan, 2008: 19; see paragraph 2.3.4.)

As regards the second issue, Spanish Educator 2 claimed that students find it particularly difficult to perform the group tasks because they are provided with no time to plan and reduced time to carry out these tasks. Indeed, according to Coonan (ibid.), the time factor plays a pivotal role in increasing and decreasing the difficulty of a task. However, when considering that students taking part in the CLIL Museum Programme have usually an A2 or B1 level and are not familiar with the contents and the CLIL methodology, it can easily be said that time is not the only issue that students encounter in performing the Museum CLIL tasks. Indeed, it can be argued that the lack of students’ pre-visit preparation both in terms of their FL and art
competence and knowledge of the CLIL methodology affects their ability to perform tasks in which linguistic and cognitive factors seem to be mostly placed in the “+Difficult” section of Coonan (ibid.)’s task difficulty model.

As regards the first issue, if students are not used to interacting in the FL during group activities at school it is very difficult that they start doing it at the Museum. Truth is that students do tend to speak in Italian when performing group tasks (Coonan, 2012: 321), but they can be motivated to use the FL if prepared in advanced. Moreover, if students are provided with opportunities to practice Willis (see paragraph 2.1.4.)’ pre-task, task and post-task format at school, they would find it less daunting to share the task results with the other students and the Foreign Language Museum Educator during the CLIL museum tour.

5.3.8. Evaluation

In discussing the issues encountered in the evaluation stage of the CLIL Museum Programme, it must be pointed out that, in the current research, evaluation refers to the learning value of the programme itself and does not focus on students’ actual learning outcomes.

In particular, the Museum Staff well highlighted that it is difficult to “measure” visitors’ learning outcomes of a museum experience. In debating evaluation methods of museum programmes, Hein (1993: 15) claims that whatever methods are used to evaluate visitors’ learning outcomes, “they are not adequate to explore fully all the meaning making that takes place (can take place) in museums”. The reason is that, as Falk and Dierking (2000; see paragraph 2.2.1.) say, it is very difficult to track what people actually learn from a museum visit: it can even take years before a visitor is able to make meaning out of what he/she has experienced in the museum. However, the issue related to the evaluation of the CLIL Museum Programme does not only result from the inner difficulty of evaluating learning in museums, but also, and mainly, by the lack of a specific feedback form. In discussing this issue, the English Educator claimed that it would be very helpful to understand how teachers plan to fit the CLIL museum visit into their curriculum. Furthermore, she said that to receive clear feedback on the project by both students and teachers would mean to be able to adapt her teaching objectives to their actual needs. Despite the pitfalls of both quantitative and naturalistic methods (see Hein, 1993), it can be said that when
evaluation is well structured, a lot can be understood about the outcomes of Museum Staff’s teaching objectives. Thus, to have a specific feedback form for the CLIL Museum Programme, which takes into consideration the specificity of the project and the Foreign Language Museum Educators’ work, would represent a step forward in understanding both teachers and students’ expectations and perceptions of the programme and the actions that need to be made to successfully respond to them.

5.4. Second Research Question

In order to answer the second research question, a Model was developed aimed at offering possible solutions to the issues encountered with regard to the Museum-School Collaboration (see paragraph 5.3.1.). The table below shows the correspondences between the sub-themes identified as problematic in the analysis of the data related to the Context (see paragraph 4.2.) and the categories in the Model63:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context Issues</th>
<th>Model Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Curriculum</td>
<td>Contents and Themes (paragraph 5.4.1.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ Support</td>
<td>Teachers’ Workshop (paragraph 5.4.3.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers’ Guide (paragraph 5.4.4.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Website or Blog (paragraph 5.4.5.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Part Programme</td>
<td>Pre- and Post-visit Activities (paragraph 5.4.2.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Teaching</td>
<td>Teachers’ Workshop (paragraph 5.4.3.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Marketing of the Programme (paragraph 5.4.6.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Booking Process (paragraph 5.4.7.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Participation Form (paragraph 5.4.8.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

63 It is important to point out that this Model takes into consideration the pre- and post-visit stages and does not focus on the during-visit stage. Thus, no activities will be developed with regard to the during-visit stage. However, this could be an interesting point to develop in future research, and an example of a complete CLIL trail will be explored in paragraph 5.5.
5.4.1. Contents and Themes

In paragraph 5.3.6., it was claimed that one of the issues of the Museum-School Collaboration is the offer of a single theme “Abstract or Realistic” for both middle and high schools. Despite this theme being widely representative of the representational dilemma and dynamics of contemporary art, it is complex to implement both at middle and high school level unless inscribed in more concrete and less broad themes. A solution could be that of proposing three/ four themes, that have strong cross-curricular potential and connections with the school curriculum objectives, both in terms of students’ knowledge (sapere) and competence (saper fare), can be easily drawn in order to facilitate teachers to fit them in the school curriculum (see paragraph.). Ideally, each theme would suit a particular age and language level group, so to address the variety of students’ content, cognitive and language skills. Indeed, it is believed that by offering 3 or 4 standard themes, in which the contents and objectives of the CLIL tour but also the students’ language needs are clearly stated, teachers would be more likely to take part in the programme and more clear about the importance of the three-part format of the visit (see paragraph 5.4.2.).

An interesting theme for middle school students, both at biennio and third year, could be that of exploring how contemporary artists have interpreted and represented the relationship between man and nature. The title of this theme could be: “Am I Nature?: the dialogue between man and nature in contemporary art”. Artists, present in the current exhibition, such as Penone, Merz and Grotjahn could be used to investigate how the relationship between man and nature has changed through the centuries and how these changes have been represented in art. This is a theme, which is ideal for first and second year middle school students, especially when looking at the objectives they are required to fulfil at the end of the biennio. In particular the Indicazioni Nazionali per i piani di studio personalizzati nella Scuola Secondaria di 1° grado states that, as regards the art subject, students need to be able to:
Leggere e interpretare i contenuti di messaggi visivi rapportandoli ai contesti in cui sono stati prodotti. Utilizzare criticamente immagini di diverso tipo; riconoscere e visualizzare le metafore visive, cogliendo il valore simbolico di oggetti, animali, paesaggi; individuare e classificare simboli e metafore utilizzate nel campo dell’arte e della pubblicità. Inventare e produrre messaggi visivi con l’uso di tecniche e materiali diversi.

It can be argued that taking part in a museum visit in which students are actively involved in reading and interpreting the meaning of the works of art and at the same time understand the metaphors used by artists to discuss their personal relationship with nature fits perfectly within this objective (Saper fare). Moreover, this theme also responds to the objective of the *Indicazioni Nazionali per i piani di studio personalizzati nella Scuola Secondaria di 1° grado*, which states that, as regards the art subject, students need to be able to analyse:

(...) opere d’arte del periodo storico considerato, attraverso le varie componenti della comunicazione visiva, i fattori che determinano soluzioni rappresentative e compositive, il contesto sociale, le tecniche.

The fact that both Penone and Merz, both members of the Arte Povera movement, play with unconventional materials respond to the objective in the *Indicazioni Nazionali per i piani di studio personalizzati nella Scuola Secondaria di 1° grado*, which states that second and first middle school students need to know about:

Gli strumenti, i materiali e le metodologie operative delle differenti tecniche artistiche; i processi di manipolazione materica; le tecniche di manipolazione tecnologica.

It is believed that to explore Penone’s *Alpi Marettima. Mi sono aggrappato a un albero (1968-1985)* would provide students with the chance of both understanding that “the artistic representation of nature is closely linked with the social perception of the natural world” (Fowkes & Fowkes) and of investigating how materials can be used as signs of the artist’s relationship with nature. Indeed, in Penone’s artwork, the bronze hand that stops the tree from growing in the point where it is placed is a reflection of the artist’s will to present his body as integral part of Nature. That bronze hand, a symbol of artificial creation, defines how the tree will grow, its future and its essence. Isn’t it the same thing that happens when the environment is shaped by
human actions? An interesting link could be drawn here, maybe post-visit, between Penone’s artistic intervention on the tree and men’s intervention on the environment, especially because, in the *Indicazioni Nazionali per i piani di studio personalizzati nella Scuola Secondaria di 1° grado*, students are asked to:

Riconoscere e leggere le tipologie principali dei beni artistico-culturali (zone archeologiche, complessi architettonici, collezioni pittoriche, ...); individuare i beni artistici e culturali presenti nel territorio, compreso l’arredo urbano, riconoscendo le stratificazioni dell’intervento dell’uomo.

As regards third year middle school students, Grotjahn’s *Turkish Forest* (2012) offers an invaluable opportunity to explore a contemporary interpretation of perspective and movement. Indeed, in his paintings, Grotjahn revisits the origin of image-making and the creation of the illusion of depth by questioning the development of perspective. Moreover, he recalls his characteristic butterfly motif and modifies it to fit his idea of nature and movement. Investigating the way the space, the movement and nature are represented in the *Turkish Forest* perfectly responds to the objective in the *Indicazioni Nazionali per i piani di studio personalizzati nella Scuola Secondaria di 1° grado*, which states that third year middle school students need to deeper their knowledge of (*Sapere*):

(…) rappresentazione dello spazio nelle tre dimensioni e sull’uso della prospettiva; gli effetti dell’illuminazione; il movimento e la composizione; staticità e dinamismo; il ritmo e l’aritmia; la composizione e le leggi del peso visivo; simmetria ed asimmetria; il fenomeno dello spettro solare e le onde luminose; la spazialità, la luminosità e la temperatura del colore; armonie e contrasti cromatici; le simbologie cromatiche.

It is important to highlight that these are complex contents and in order for students to perform higher level cognitive skills, required when “reading” an artwork, in a FL the number of artworks included in the tour should not be more than 3 for the A2 level and 4 for the B1 level.
5.4.2. Pre- and Post-visit Activities

In order to facilitate the integration of the CLIL Museum Programme into the school curriculum, examples of pre- and post-visit activities could be provided to school teachers. It is important to highlight that art and FL school teachers should collaborate in planning and implementing both pre- and post-visit activities.

As regards the pre-visit activities, art teachers could be given the following guidelines:

Display three-four images of paintings from different art periods (medieval, renaissance, modern and contemporary), which all represent nature, and ask students to identify the subject of the paintings and to match them to the right period (pair task).

Ask students’ to list the differences between the medieval, renaissance, modern and contemporary artworks (pair task) and discuss them as a group.

Display the image of Merz’ *Se la forma scompare, la sua radice è eterna* in your classroom so that all students can see it. Without telling students anything about the artwork, ask them to:

- Spend two minutes studying the artwork silently and list what they see.
- Spend two minutes describing what the artwork reminds them of.
- Look at the artwork again. List anything about the artwork that they might not have noticed before.

As a group discuss their observations:

What do they see? Encourage students to describe what is in front of them, and save speculation about what it means for a later time.

What is the installation made of?

Discuss what they think the artwork means. The meaning of an artwork is open ended. There are no wrong or right answers, but it is important for students to ground their answers in what they see in front of them:

Why do you think the artist uses this material? Is it natural or artificial?

What did the artist want to tell us?

What do you think this phrase tells us about the relationship between man and nature?

Is it similar or different from the representation of nature that we have seen in other paintings (i.e. medieval, renaissance art or modern art)?

What adjective can we use to describe it?
How does it make you feel?  
Do you like it?

The language needs of such a task are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Language structures and verb tenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art vocabulary (materials, colours, abstract, realistic etc.)</td>
<td>Simple present (to see, to think, to mean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives (dramatic, funny, strange etc.)</td>
<td>Simple past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions (happy, sad, anxious etc.)</td>
<td>(I think) it’s..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is/there are..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It’s made of..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I like it/I don’t like it because..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It reminds me of..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think this work is about..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It makes me feel..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ideally, before the art pre-activity, FL school teachers could recall with the students art vocabulary (materials, colours, landscape, portrait, abstract, realistic etc.) and provide them with the language chunks they will need to interact in the discussion about the artworks. This could be done according to the CALLA methodology (Coonan, 2012: 130), so to ease students that are not used to CLIL methodology from a FL traditional classroom context into a CLIL one.

As regards the post-visit activities, school teachers could ask students to enter a photographic context, taking pictures of situations in which nature and artificial borders have been challenged and to present their picture in the FL either through a written or oral presentation.

5.4.3. Teachers’ Workshop

In the case of the CLIL Museum Programme, there are three reasons why it is pivotal that the Museum plan a well-structured workshop for teachers. First of all, Italian school teachers are still unfamiliar with the CLIL methodology and the workshop could be an opportunity to explain them the dynamics of such a learning context (i.e. aims and methodology). Second of all, Italian school teachers are not used to working collaboratively and the workshop could help them understand the importance of Team
Teaching in the CLIL context. Third of all, school teachers think about the CLIL visit as a “leisure activity” and the workshop could help them understand the importance of planning and implementing pre- and post-visit activities. The Museum could provide both an onsite and an online version of the Teachers’ Workshop:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Onsite</strong></th>
<th><strong>Online</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Presentation of the CLIL Museum Programme (Aims, CLIL Methodology and Team Teaching)</td>
<td>A power point presentation or short-videos that explain the different areas of the workshop could be uploaded online so to give teachers that could not attend the onsite training the chance to have an online support tool for planning their CLIL visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Levels and Themes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Language Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Methodology (3-part programme, lesson plan and support materials, pre- and post-visit activities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How to complete the School Participation Form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Further Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Closing Remarks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It could be argued that the same strategy that Hooper-Greenhill (1994: 163) advocates in creating teaching materials and teachers’ packs, that is the necessity to trial and pilot them before they are released, could be applied to the organisation of the Teachers’ Workshop. Indeed the Museum could pilot the workshop to a selected group of teachers, in order to understand if the topics and the strategies covered respond to teachers’ needs and expectations.

**5.4.4. Teachers’ Guide**

A Teachers’ Guide could be developed, giving a detailed description of the following topics:
• Description of the CLIL Museum Programme and aims
• Information about the exhibition and artists
• Levels and Themes
• Language Needs
• Lesson Plan of the visit
• Pre-visit Activities
• Post-visit Activities
• Guidelines for CLIL Guided Visits
  (Booking your Visit, School Participation Form, Storage, Food, Photography and Manners)

5.4.5. Website or Blog

A website or blog linked to the formal website of the Museum could be created in order to share information with teachers about workshops, conferences etc. Also, a Facebook Page could be created where teachers can leave their feedback, discuss pre- and post-visit activities with other teachers and share their experiences.

5.4.6. Marketing of the Project

The following strategies could be used, if not already in place, to market the project:

• Online (see paragraph 5.4.5.)
• e-mail and fax to schools
• other channels and institutions (ex. local university, Language Institutes etc.)

5.4.7. Booking Process

Given that one of the main issues regarding the Museum-School Collaboration was identified in the quality of information given to the Language Institutes about the school group, the customer service personnel could be given set questions to ask teachers booking a CLIL tour, such as:
– Name and contact of the teacher (e-mail and phone number)
– Number, Age and Language Level of the students
– Name of the School

The customer service personnel could refer the teachers to the CLIL section on the website, asking them to complete the School Participation Form (see paragraph 5.4.8.) and e-mail it to the Museum and Language Institute. Also, further information on the existence of the Teachers’ Guide (see paragraph 5.4.4.) and of the Facebook Page (see paragraph 5.4.5.) could be provided.

5.4.8. School Participation Form

School teachers could be asked to complete the following form so that the Museum Foreign Language Educators could customise the CLIL visit to the specific dynamics of the group and expectations of the school teachers. This form could also act as a reminder for teachers to plan and implement pre- and post-visit activities in their school curriculum.

• Name of the school:
• Name of the teacher and contact (e-mail address and phone number):
• Subject taught by the teacher:
• Group information (number, age and language level of the students):
• Aims for participating in the CLIL Museum Programme:
• Please, describe what your students are currently studying, or what they have studied in the past:
• Please, describe how you plan to integrate the CLIL tour in the school curriculum, giving practical examples of any pre- and post- activities you’re planning to implement in your classroom:
• Please, list any other teacher you have collaborated with in participating in the CLIL Museum Programme:
• Problems and dynamics of the students:
• Other comments:
5.4.9. Before the visit

The Language Institute could call the teacher a week before the tour and check and confirm with them the information given at the time of the booking about the school group. Also, they could ask teachers if they have used the pre-activities suggested or how they have prepared the students and if the language needs necessary to take part in the CLIL visit have been met.

5.4.10. After the visit

An Education Pack with examples of post-activities could be given materially to school teachers after the visit. Moreover, given the need of the Foreign Language Museum Educators to have a specific feedback for the CLIL Museum Programme, the following Evaluation Forms could be administered to teachers and students at the end of the tour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Form (teachers)</th>
<th>Evaluation Form (students)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- What is the best aspect/s of the CLIL Museum Programme?</td>
<td>See Appendix E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What area do you think needs to be improved the most?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do you think that the language and activities used by the educator were appropriate to your students’ language competence?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What other changes to the programme would you suggest?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How have you integrated the CLIL museum visit in the school curriculum?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is there anything else you would like to share or comment on?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.5. Limitations of the study and Further Research

As regards the limitations of the study, the first one concerns the data collection procedures. The flaw in collecting school teachers and students’ responses to the online questionnaires resulted in this study being exclusively qualitative, whereas the original plan employed a mixed methods, based on the collection of both quantitative and qualitative data. However, it is opinion of the author that the validity of the study was not compromised by the lack of quantitative data, given that the issues in the data collection procedures confirmed the problematic Museum-School Collaboration and were thus discussed in paragraph 5.2.. It was demonstrated that the main issue in collecting data through the questionnaires was the small number of school bookings of CLIL Museum Tours in the current academic year, and strategies as to make the programme more appealing to schools were outlined in the Model discussed in paragraph 5.4.. Despite the lack of teachers’ and students’ perspective on the programme, it is felt that the dynamics of the CLIL Museum Programme were grasped and some insightful suggestions were given to better its marketing, planning and delivery.

Finally, another limitation is the fact that the Model developed to enhance the Museum-School Collaboration did not take into consideration the cost involved in implementing the best practice strategies. However, it is believed that some of the strategies discussed in the Model would motivate more school teachers to participate in the project and thus sustain financially the cost of its implementation.

As regards ways in which this study could be followed, it would be very interesting to study the results of the implementation of the Museum-School Collaboration Model developed in paragraph 5.4., especially with regard to schools’ participation.

As regards students’ learning, it would be particularly interesting to research how students are motivated towards learning a FL through engaging in such a programme. Moreover, after the implementation of pre-visit activities, another interesting topic of research could be students’ qualitative and quantitative oral output during the CLIL Museum visit.

It is interesting to point out that, in a different occasion, a CLIL trail was designed and delivered by the author to a group of 14 Canadian university students at the end of an intensive course of Italian as a foreign language (level A2) in Italy. In specific,
the CLIL trail was designed around the theme of “portraits” in a modern art museum and five paintings, both abstract and figurative, were included in the trail together with concepts of what a museum is and how visitors should behave in a museum environment. Despite the students being of different ages, academic and personal backgrounds, mother tongues and language competences in Italian, the museum activity proved very successful, especially because of the organisation of pre- and post-visit activities. Indeed, the author delivered a 90-minute pre-activity during which students brainstormed about the art they would see in the museum and went through the vocabulary they would need to take active part in the discussion in the gallery. Students were given support materials for all the three stages of the CLIL trail and a creative workshop was organised after the visit in the gallery in which they were given instructions as to how to represent themselves by using different materials. Both pre- and post-visit activities were suitable for the students’ language level, but some of the during-visit explanations and questions were slightly beyond their language competence. However, the self-portrait workshop was very exciting for the students and even those that had no art background felt inspired to reflect on their identity and on how to convey it in a self-portrait. Students were also asked to write an essay of 100-150 words, answering the following questions:

- Which of the artists we talked about did you like the most?
- Was it difficult to make this self-portrait? What did you enjoy the most?
- Did you find out something new about yourself? What?

It is thus possible to claim that when the CLIL museum activity is structured with pre-, during- and post-activities and the museum educator has information about the students, especially with regard to their language competence in the FL, the students’ language, cognitive and psychological outcomes in participating in the CLIL trail in a museum are significant.

This experience was briefly described to demonstrate that future research in the field of museum study programmes in a non native language is indeed necessary and that the results from the current study could be used, together with the outcomes of the Canadian students’ experience, to develop best practice in the field.
5.6. Conclusion

Every research is a journey and this one in particular started from the author’s interest in museum and FL education. The decision to focus on the CLIL Museum Programme came from the belief that museums are ideally placed to promote multilingualism through museum study programmes that support young people to become citizens of the wider Knowledge Society. It is indeed believed that contemporary Art is a powerful tool when it comes to understanding how human beings and, especially, artists relate to the social, political, natural and cultural context, and exploring this deep set of relationships through a FL would empower young people with transversal knowledge and skills.

The literature on planning quality CLIL has widely discussed how difficult it is to plan and successfully implement a CLIL module or curriculum in formal settings. However, from the discussion brought on in this chapter it could be said that it is even more challenging to plan and implement an extracurricular CLIL activity, especially if the provider of such activity is a museum. If on one hand, the museum context, with its dynamics and specific characteristics, offers invaluable learning opportunities, on the other, it is very different from formal settings and thus present issues which, if not tackled, can undermine the value of a CLIL experience. Indeed, issues were identified and discussed in relation to all the categories of Coonan (2012)’s CLIL Curriculum, particularly highlighting their cause-effect relationships. First of all, the CLIL Museum Programme should be seen as an opportunity to practice FL and art contents and skills and not to learn new ones. For this reason, school teachers need to plan and implement pre- and post-visit activities, especially because CLIL intrinsically involves the gradually development of study and cognitive skills that students will need in order to explore non-language contents in a FL. Time is indeed one of the main issues of the CLIL Museum Programme, but one that can be solved if the museum visit is seen as an integral part of the school curriculum. However, the issue of the ill-defined aims and objectives can also be identified in the methodology and it was particularly discussed how in some cases the tasks planned are not CLIL. Second, the theme “Abstract or Realistic” may be representative of contemporary art but is probably too complex to approach both for teachers and students and, in paragraph 5.4.1., an alternative was offered. It is interesting to point out that whereas in this
research attention was particularly given to the study of art contents through a FL, other subjects could also be interestingly involved in the project, such as science, history and religion. For example, a programme was recently developed at the Guggenheim Museum in New York with the aim of studying maths through engaging young people with contemporary artworks. A similar idea could be applied within the CLIL Museum Programme, providing school teachers with the opportunity of creating cross-curricular CLIL lessons. Third, one of the most interesting categories discussed was certainly the context of the CLIL Museum Programme and the problematic communication both between the Museum and the schools and the Museum and the Language Institutes. With regard to the Museum-School Collaboration, a Model was developed in order to offer possible solutions to the issues already discussed.

It is important to highlight that in some cases hypotheses had to be made where the data were not such to allow generalisations. Moreover, in paragraph 5.2., the reasons why it was not possible to fully apply the research plan were discussed especially pointing at the lack of school bookings and the decision to administer online questionnaires to students and teachers.
6. Conclusion

The current research should be seen as the first step in developing strong partnerships between museums and schools in relation to the planning and implementation of museum study programmes in a non-native language. It is strongly believed that if well structured, the collaboration between these two institutions would lead students, teachers and museum staff towards being active citizens of the Knowledge Society. In order to reach this goal, a partnership between the Museum and the local schools could be created, through piloting a CLIL Museum Programme whose entire cycle, pre-, during- and post-visit, is studied and reported. It is believed that school teachers and students should be involved in and collaborate with the Museum in revising the actual structure of the CLIL Museum Programme and that the local university could act as a bridge of best practice among the actors involved in the project.

To conclude, despite the issues identified and discussed in relation to the Museum CLIL Programme, it is believed that for its full potential to be released there should simply be better planning. Indeed, when striving for best practice in all fields of education, no issue is a failure but an opportunity for improvements.
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APPENDIX A

Intervista-Responsabili Istituti di Lingua

Contesto

1) Quali problemi hanno creato le caratteristiche fisiche del luogo museale (grandezza degli spazi, luci, rumori ecc) in sede di progettazione del percorso museale in LS?
2) La mancanza di risorse didattiche proprie degli ambienti educativi formali (es. lavagne) ha creato problemi in sede di progettazione del percorso museale in LS?

NO  SI

Perché? (facoltativo)

3) Quali problemi di collaborazione sono emersi con le scuole in sede di progettazione ma anche di realizzazione del progetto museale CLIL?
4) Quali problemi di progettazione sono emersi in relazione alla diversa età, competenza LS e motivazione degli studenti?
5) Quali problemi sono emersi nella selezione degli educatori museali madrelingua per il progetto CLIL?
6) Quali sono stati i problemi riguardanti la formazione degli educatori museali madrelingua dal punto di vista della didattica museale e della didattica della LS?

Situazione d’apprendimento

7) La dimensione dei gruppi ha rappresentato un problema in fase di progettazione?
   In che modo lo avete risolto?
8) Quali problemi di progettazione ha comportato la durata ridotta dell’attività museale CLIL?
9) Quali sono stati i problemi legati all’alternanza L1/LS in fase di progettazione? Si è optato per l’alternanza o per il solo uso della LS?

**Finalità**

10) Quali difficoltà avete riscontrato nel cercare di avvicinare gli studenti all’arte contemporanea attraverso la LS?
11) Quali difficoltà avete riscontrato nel cercare di promuovere l’uso della LS da parte degli studenti in relazione ai contenuti di storia dell’arte contemporanea?

**Obiettivi**

12) Quali sono stati i problemi nel selezionare i contenuti e le opere d’arte legate al tema arte astratta/realista in relazione all’uso della LS?
13) Quali problemi si sono riscontrati nel pianificare gli obiettivi linguisticì del curriculum museale CLIL? (solo se vi sono)
14) Per quanto riguarda i processi cognitivi (analizzare, definire, valutare, giudicare), quali di questi hanno rappresentato un problema in fase di progettazione del programma in LS?

**Requisiti linguisticì**

15) Quali problemi si sono riscontrati nell’individuare e soddisfare i prerequisiti linguisticì?

**Contenuti**

16) Quali problemi si sono riscontrati in riferimento alla motivazione, rilevanza e bisogno dei contenuti museali per gli studenti in relazione all’uso della LS?

**Metodologia**

17) Quali problemi si sono riscontrati nel progettare il lesson plan in relazione all’uso della LS? (attività)
18) Quali problemi si sono riscontrati nel rendere l’input orale in LS comprensibile?
19) Quali problemi si sono riscontrati nel progettare i materiali di supporto in relazione alla lingua straniera?

**Valutazione**

20) Quali sono i problemi legati alla valutazione del programma museale CLIL?
APPENDIX B

Intervista-Educatori Museali Madrelingua

Contesto

21) Quali problemi creano le caratteristiche fisiche del luogo museale (grandezza degli spazi, luci, rumori ecc.) durante lo svolgimento della visita museale CLIL?
22) La mancanza di risorse didattiche proprie degli ambienti educativi formali (es. lavagne) crea problemi durante lo svolgimento della visita museale CLIL?

   NO   SI

Perché? (facoltativo)

23) Quali sono i problemi legati alla collaborazione con gli insegnanti prima e durante la visita museale CLIL?
24) Quali problemi sono emersi in relazione alla diversa età, competenza LS e motivazione degli studenti?
25) Mi può descrivere brevemente la sua formazione accademica e professionale?
26) Dal punto di vista dell’educazione museale, crede di aver ricevuto un supporto formativo adeguato da parte staff di the Museum?

   NO   SI

Perché? (facoltativo)

27) Dal punto di vista dell’educazione linguistica, crede di aver ricevuto un supporto formativo adeguato da parte dell’istituto di lingua?

   NO   SI
Perché? (facoltativo)

28) Dal punto di vista organizzativo, crede di ricevere un supporto adeguato da parte dello staff di the Museum?

[ ] NO  [ ] SI

Perché? (facoltativo)

29) Dal punto di vista organizzativo, crede di ricevere un supporto adeguato da parte dell’istituto linguistico?

[ ] NO  [ ] SI

Perché? (facoltativo)

**Situazione d’apprendimento:**

30) Quali problemi sono legati alla dimensione dei gruppi di studenti?

31) Quali problemi comporta la durata ridotta dell’attività museale CLIL?

32) Quali problemi riscontra nell’usare esclusivamente la LS con i ragazzi? Ricorre mai alla L1 (Italiano)?

**Finalità:**

33) In relazione ai contenuti museali, quali di queste affermazioni sono secondo lei vere?

a. gli studenti sono motivati a investigare i contenuti di arte contemporanea attraverso la LS
b. gli studenti non sono motivati a investigare i contenuti di arte contemporanea attraverso la LS
c. gli studenti non fanno domande né in L1 né in LS  
d. gli studenti riescono a comprendere abbastanza bene i contenuti di arte contemporanea durante la visita CLIL  
e. gli studenti non riescono a comprendere i contenuti di arte contemporanea quasi per niente durante la visita CLIL

34) In relazione all’uso della LS, quali di queste affermazioni sono secondo lei vere?

a. gli studenti trovano difficile comprendere oralmente i contenuti di arte contemporanea  
b. gli studenti trovano difficile rispondere in LS alle domande sui contenuti di arte contemporanea  
c. gli studenti trovano difficile lavorare in gruppo sui contenuti di arte contemporanea attraverso la LS  
d. gli studenti ricorrono spesso all’uso della L1 per rispondere alle domande e/o lavorare in gruppo  
e. gli studenti non fanno domande in LS

Obiettivi

35) Quali contenuti legati al tema arte astratta/realista sembrano risultare troppo difficili per gli studenti in relazione all’uso della LS?  
36) Quali contenuti legati al tema arte astratta/realista sembrano risultare troppo facili per gli studenti in relazione all’uso della LS?

Requisiti linguistici

37) Ritiene che gli studenti abbiano generalmente i requisiti linguisticì per prendere parte alla visita museale CLIL?

[ ] NO  [ ] SI
Contenuti

38) Quali opere producono minore interesse negli studenti?

Metodologia

39) Quali difficoltà incontra nel seguire la struttura standard della visita CLIL?
40) Quali tra le seguenti strategie usa per farsi capire dagli studenti?

a. Ripetizioni di concetti importanti
b. Esempi concreti
c. Spiegazioni di significati in L1
d. Sinonimi
e. Parafrasi
f. Riformulazioni
g. Richiesta di domande
h. Eloquio più rallentato
i. Parole scandite più chiaramente
j. Intonazione enfatizzata per indicare i punti più importanti

41) Quali attività didattiche producono maggiore interesse negli studenti? Quali producono minore interesse?
42) Quali attività didattiche risultano più difficili per gli studenti? Quali più facili?
43) I materiali di supporto sono utili nello svolgimento della visita museale CLIL?

[ ] NO  [ ] SI

Valutazione

44) Quali strategie usa per ricevere feedback dagli studenti e dagli insegnanti sull’andamento della visita CLIL?

a. Osservazione
b. Domande a studenti e insegnanti

c. Scheda di feedback

d. Nessuna

e. Altro____________________________
APPENDIX C

Interview-English Director and Educator

1. Overview:

- Who designed the CLIL curriculum?
- When did you start collaborating with the Museum on the CLIL project?
- How many tours have you delivered?
- How many foreign language educators have been involved in the project?

2. CLIL Curriculum

a. Context

1. What issues have you encountered in planning the CLIL tour as regards the physical features of the museum? (ex. Have you skipped any room because of the size or the quality of the lights or the presence of background noises?)
   In this regards, have you noticed any particular issue during the CLIL visits?
2. Has the absence of the traditional didactic tools, such as boards and so on, represented an issue in planning the CLIL visit?
3. What issues have you encountered in communicating and collaborating with teachers? What kind of information would you like to receive of the students before the visit?
4. What issues have you encountered in planning for students of different ages, language competences and interest/motivation? What about in the implementation stage?
5. Have you had any issues in the selection of the educators for the project? (background in art or not)
6. Do you think you received enough information about the museum contents, context and museum education practice from the Museum?
7. Do you think that both the communication and organisation between the language institute and the Museum are efficient?

b. **Learning situation**

8. Has the size of the groups represented an issue in planning the CLIL tour? What about in the implementation stage?

9. Has the short duration of the CLIL tour represented an issue as regards the planning? What about in the implementation stage?

10. Have you opted for the use of both Italian and English or just for the use of English?

c. **Aims**

11. What issues have you encountered in engaging students in learning about contemporary art through the FL?

• In your opinion, which of the following statements are true?

  - students are motivated to explore the art contemporary contents through English
  - students are not motivated to explore the art contemporary contents through English
  - students don’t ask questions neither in English nor in Italian
  - students can comprehend enough of the tour
  - student have a very hard time comprehending during the tour

12. What issues have you encountered in promoting the students’ use of the FL as regards the art contents?

• In your opinion, which of the following statements are true?

  - Students find it difficult to orally comprehend the contents
  - Students find it hard to answer in English to the questions on the art contents
  - Students find it difficult to work in groups on the art contents using English
Students very often communicate in Italian instead of in English
Students don’t ask questions in English

d. Objectives

13. What issues have you encountered in selecting contents and works of art to explore in English? What about in the implementation stage?
14. What issues have you encountered in planning the language objectives?
   Do you think that students generally have the language competence communicated at the time of booking?
15. What issues have you encountered in relation to the transversal skills needed by students in planning the CLIL activities?

e. Contents

16. What issues have you encountered in selecting contents and works of art that responded to students’ needs, interest and were relevant to the school curriculum?

f. Methodology

17. What issues have you encountered in planning the lesson plan? (types of activities, order)? Do you have any problem in following the structure of the lesson plan?
18. What issues have you encountered in making the input comprehensible? Which of the following strategies do you usually use to make the oral input comprehensible?

- Repetition of important
- Practical examples
- Translation in Italian
- Synonyms
- Reformulations
- Elicitation of questions
• Slow speech
• Words well elicited
• Emphasis

19. Which activities are more/less engaging for students?
20. Which are activities are more/less difficult for student
21. What issues have you encountered in designing the materials? Do they help during the CLIL tour?

g. Evaluation

22. What issues have you encountered in evaluating the project?
23. What strategies do you usually use to collect feedback from students and teachers on the CLIL visit?

• Observation
• Questions to teachers and students
• Feedback form
• Nothing
• Other
APPENDIX D

Teachers’ Questionnaire
*Campo obbligatorio

1. Che materia insegna alla classe con cui ha partecipato al progetto CLIL a The Museum? *

3. Per quale motivo ha scelto di partecipare con la sua classe al progetto museale CLIL? *

4. In che modo la visita guidata CLIL si inserisce nell’attività scolastica curriculare?  
   * (relazione tra curriculum museale CLIL e curriculum scolastico)

5. Ha collaborato con altri insegnanti di altre materie nel pianificare la visita museale CLIL? * Contrassegna solo un ovale.

   SI                     NO

6. In che modo ha preparato i suoi studenti prima della visita museale CLIL? * (es. materiali, attività didattiche)

7. Farà seguire la visita museale CLIL con delle attività in classe? Quali? *

8. Crede che la formazione ricevuta dal museo sul progetto museale CLIL fosse adeguata?  * (workshops introduttivi, catalogo collezione museale, catalogo progetto CLIL ecc.) Seleziona tutte le voci applicabili.

   SI                     NO

9. Che tipo di informazioni e/o supporto didattico le sarebbe piaciuto ricevere dallo staff museale sul progetto museale CLIL? *

10. Crede che la lingua, le attività e strategie didattiche usate dall’educatore museale madrelingua fossero appropriate per il livello linguistico dei suoi studenti? *

   SI                     NO

10. Che cosa le è piaciuto di più della visita museale CLIL?
11. Che cosa le è piaciuto di meno della visita museale CLIL?
APPENDIX E

Students’ Questionnaire
*Campo obbligatorio

1. Dati studente (Età, Sesso, Data della visita, Lingua straniera della visita)

2. Quando l’insegnante ti ha comunicato che avresti seguito una visita guidata al museo in lingua straniera (LS), hai pensato che: * Contrassegna solo un ovale.
   - Avresti potuto migliorare la tua competenza in LS
   - Avresti potuto migliorare le tue conoscenze di Storia dell’arte
   - Avresti migliorato entrambe le discipline
   - Avresti fatto una tremenda confusione

   1 2 3 4

   - Molto più facile del previsto
   - Più facile del previsto
   - Più difficile del previsto
   - Molto più difficile del previsto

5. Quali opere d'arte ti hanno interessato e coinvolto di più? Quali di meno? Perché? *

6. Cosa è stato più difficile fare nella visita museale in LS? *
   Contrassegna solo un ovale.
   - Capire la guida che parla la LS
• Leggere e capire i materiali in LS
• Rispondere in LS alle domande della guida
• Lavorare in gruppo
• Rispondere per iscritto in LS ai quesiti sui materiali
• Altro:


8. Cosa pensi ti abbia aiutato maggiormente nel seguire la visita museale in LS?
   * Contrassegna solo un ovale.

• I materiali di supporto
• La preparazione in classe prima della visita
• Lavorare in gruppo con i tuoi compagni
• L'aiuto del tuo insegnante durante la visita
• Il modo di spiegare della guida

9. Commenta su 2 aspetti della visita museale CLIL che ti sono piaciuti
10. Commenta su 2 aspetti della visita museale CLIL che non ti sono piaciuti