

# A Brief History of the Concept of Language Education in Italy

PAOLA SOLERTI\*

**Abstract.** The concept of “language education” (*educazione linguistica*) is one of the fundamental concepts of Italian educational linguistics. Born in the Italian educational and linguistic cultural sphere a century and a half ago and defined, in its current contours, from the 1960s and 1970s onwards, it identifies – in its broadest sense – a process involving the teaching/learning of Italian and of other non-national mother tongues and of foreign, classical and ethnic languages. In this contribution, we intend to trace a brief history of the evolution of the concept of language education in Italy over the last century and a half, highlighting how, over time, it has been defined through theoretical, pedagogical, didactic and linguistic reflections, often ahead of their time, proposing extremely modern and current visions of language education.

**1. Introduction.** The concept of “language education” (*educazione linguistica*) is one of the fundamental concepts of Italian educational linguistics. Born in the Italian educational and linguistic cultural sphere a century and a half ago and defined, in its current contours, from the 1960s and 1970s onwards, it identifies – in its broadest, or according to Balboni’s (2009) “integrated”, definition – a process that unfolds “like

a *continuum* through the teaching/learning of the mother tongue as well as second, foreign, classical and ethnic languages” (Chini, Bosisio 2014, 25). In the current Italian school context, LE is, therefore, that “part of general education” (Balboni 2009) that includes Italian (understood as L1 and L2), other non-national mother tongues (i.e. minority languages and dialects), foreign languages, classical languages (Balboni 2009) and ethnic

---

\* School teacher, independent researcher, non-academic external member of the CIRF of the University of Udine and member of the *Società Scientifiche e Tecnologiche Furlane*, Udine, Italy. E-mail: paola.solerti@mail.com.

or immigrant languages, i.e. languages spoken by recently immigrated minorities.

This contribution, although not exhaustive, intends to trace a brief history of the evolution of the concept of LE in Italy over the last century and a half and how, over time, it has been defined through theoretical, pedagogical, didactic and linguistic reflections in the context of an increasingly complex linguistic reality, in which various social and political factors provoked a series of repeated and multiform sociolinguistic crises that also impacted on schools. The first of these crises occurred as a result of the decision, following the political unification of the peninsula, to transform Italian, hitherto a literary language, into a single national language, ignoring the varied multilingualism of Italian society, in which various minority languages and a large number of dialects coexist, often very different from Italian (or at least from literary Italian). A further choice, linked to the first, to adopt a strictly monolingual school model, obtained mediocre results in teaching Italian to the mass of citizens, contrary to its intentions. The second crisis occurred after the Second World War, when from the initial years following the end of the conflict and then, especially, in the 1950s and 1960s, large-scale internal migrations took place. At the same time, there was a consistent and rapid urbanisation of people and households, which led many Italians, who until then had been predominantly or solely dialect speakers, to use Italian almost

exclusively as the language of everyday communication. This epoch-making transformation of Italian society, the increasing diffusion of television, the institution (in 1962) of the unified middle school, and a new and growing interest in foreign languages, aroused a new wave of theoretical, pedagogical, didactic and linguistic discussions and reflections in the 1960s. Lastly, on the international level, the end of the Second World War saw two processes begin whose social, sociolinguistic and educational effects were to become increasingly disruptive, especially from the 1960s onwards. On the one hand, in Europe, the traumatic experience of the Second World War induced states to seek ever greater economic and political cooperation in the valorisation of diversity, including linguistic diversity. On the other hand, on a global scale, the increasing ease of travel, the unprecedented spread of communication means, the progress of the information society and the ever-increasing global interconnectedness, multiplied exponentially the opportunities for contact between people and, consequently, for interlinguistic contact, inducing, both on a global and European level, an unprecedented increase in the demand for language learning and bringing language education in its complexity to the centre of an impressive (and ever-growing) mass of studies and research.

## **2. Unification of Italy, the language question and language education.**

Attention to educational aspects is a characteristic feature of Italian linguistic studies. In 1980, De Mauro

identified a number of specific distinctive traits of Italian linguistics in the last century<sup>1</sup> and, among these, he highlighted “the attention to the theme of Italian linguistic and cultural regionalism”<sup>2</sup> (De Mauro 1980, 11); “the perception of the generally educational value inherent in acquiring a full command of the layers of the linguistic institution”; and “the consciousness [...] of the civil-political value of the facts of individual linguistic maturation” (De Mauro 1980, 12).

The varied multilingualism present on the peninsula and the need to spread Italian as the national language brought the question of language to the centre of the post-unification cultural debate. At the time of the Unification of Italy, the “language question” was anything but new in the Italian cultural and literary scene, yet the territorial unification of the peninsula and the birth of the Kingdom of Italy made it not only a linguistic, cultural and literary issue, but also an urgent social, educational and scholastic one. The dispute developed, therefore, around the choice of which Italian should be adopted as the national language and saw scholars of the time take sides on two opposing fronts. On the one hand, there were those who supported Manzoni’s theory, according to which the national language should take nineteenth-century Florentine as its

model. On the other hand, there were those who shared Ascoli’s view ([1872] 2008), who considered it neither realistic nor reasonable to impose nineteenth-century Florentine on all Italians, erasing all other Italian dialects on the one hand and the literary language on the other. This second group of scholars considered it rather necessary to raise, through widespread literacy, the cultural condition of the population in order to favour the diffusion of the literary language through all social strata, so that it could become, through use, a national language “without trampling on dialects” (De Mauro 2007, 45). Both sides agreed that the diffusion of the national language should pass through the school, and it is precisely within the cultural debate on the question of language that D’Ovidio, in tune with Ascoli’s ideas, introduced the expression “language education”, to affirm that the question of language concerns “the cultural elevation of the entire population” (De Mauro 2007, 45).

In the lively debate around the national language, the multiplicity of languages and dialects spoken by the Italian population was seen, with few exceptions, as an evil to be eradicated, an obstacle to the spread of Italian. Among the exceptions, the position of Ascoli stands out; himself multilingual, he stated that “science and experience” demonstrate “in a

<sup>1</sup> To be precise, De Mauro (1980, 11) identifies “nine specific features of Italian linguistic studies in the last century, several of which also date back to earlier phases of the tradition”

<sup>2</sup> “attention to the issue of Italian linguistic and cultural regionalism” (De Mauro 1980, 11).

hundred ways, that it is indeed a privileged condition, in the order of intelligence, this of *bilingual children*" (Ascoli [1872] 2008)<sup>3</sup>. The scholastic linguistic policies of the newly-born Kingdom of Italy, however, followed the perhaps more political than linguistic trend of those who saw the use of idioms other than Italian as an evil to be remedied and imposed Italian as the sole language of the school and teachers<sup>4</sup>. The languages actually spoken by schoolchildren – languages other than Italian and dialects – were completely ignored or taken into consideration simply as a source of error in the use of Italian. Their role in schools was solely as a comparison of analogies and differences between Italian and

dialect, which aimed at correcting the errors caused by the use of dialect and facilitating its abandonment in favour of the national language (Balboni 2009).

### 3. The concept of language education in Giuseppe Lombardo Radice.

A few decades later, language education became, in Lombardo Radice<sup>5</sup>, a complex, transversal and extremely topical concept. In *Lezioni di didattica e ricordi di esperienza magistrale* (first published in 1913), Lombardo Radice emphasises that the teaching of any subject coincides with LE, which is implemented by all teachers<sup>6</sup>, since "all teaching is language teaching, and not only grammar and the study of vocabulary, which are such to a

<sup>3</sup> Ascoli stands out for a point of view that does not oppose the use of dialects and the spread of the national language. In the *Proemio all'Archivio glottologico italiano* ([1872] 2008), he writes: "Thus we are told of the great harm of keeping our children almost bilingual, leaving them with their mother's dialect and forcing them to study, in the manner of a foreign idiom, the language that is said to be ours, with so much waste, they add, of their intelligence, and in such need of treasuring every last bit of the nation's mental faculties; as if science and experience did not prove in a hundred ways, that it is indeed a privileged condition, in the order of intelligence, that of *bilingual children*, and as if it were absolutely clear in our house that the increase in culture lies in direct reason for the proximity or greater proximity between the spoken and written word, whereas the truth is precisely the opposite". De Mauro (1980) emphasised how Ascoli supported the need for knowledge of the Italian language in primary schools to be built from dialect, on the basis of concrete reflections on the similarities and differences between dialect and national language. Reflections that could constitute, after primary school, the cognitive and grammatical basis for the study of foreign languages.

<sup>4</sup> The "Instructions and programmes for the teaching of the Italian language and arithmetic in primary schools" of 1867 recommend: "He [the teacher] always uses the national language of the country when teaching, and obliges the youngsters to do the same with frequent conversations, and corrects with loving patience the imperfections coming from the dialect of the province. And this is to be done from the first day the children enter the first class; and the dialect voices are to be used only for the necessary declaration of Italian words not yet known to the pupils" (Royal Decree no. 3895 of 10 October 1867).

<sup>5</sup> According to De Mauro, Lombardo Radice is "the truly great philosopher of language of the first quarter century, Croce aside" (1980, 102).

<sup>6</sup> "Teaching on whatever subject (indeed, all of life is a fusion within us of the infinite wealth of teachings it offers in the most diverse forms), constitutes our language education. Since the word is not without the thing, if speaking means expressing, and if expressing is the same as being clearly aware of one's world" (Lombardo Radice, 1968<sup>35</sup>, 167).

minimal extent and indeed often, abstractly understood, they achieve the opposite effect” (1968<sup>35</sup>, 168) and “every teacher, as an educator, in his special branch [...] is a language teacher” (Lombardo Radice 1968<sup>35</sup>, 169).

Lombardo Radice also juxtaposes the teaching of language, mimicry, singing and drawing, since they are all “language, expression; there is no essential difference, only an extrinsic difference” (Lombardo Radice, 1968<sup>35</sup>, 313)<sup>7</sup>. According to Lombardo Radice, therefore, LE occurs during every school moment, in all the lessons of every subject, and through the work of all teachers, who, regardless of the subject taught, are and must consider themselves language teachers who should promote LE as a tool for autonomous and creative thinking. What is more: in Lombardo Radice’s pedagogical thought, LE already extends to non-verbal language and communication education, from a semiotic perspective that resurfaces sixty years later.

Balboni (2009) emphasises that Lombardo Radice in his reflections on LE anticipated many of the hypotheses and concepts that would be elaborated during the 20<sup>th</sup> century by great linguists and developmental psychologists. In particular, he considered it unthinkable to accept that language learning began with

grammar; instead, he considered language learning as the result of an interaction between imitation and individual creation that implied a spontaneous formation of rules. According to Lombardo Radice, moreover, the error was to be seen as the result of incomplete competence in language and the school’s function was to help the pupil by speeding up and securing his spontaneous formation of linguistic rules. Finally, for the pedagogist, LE in primary education must start from the “*language of the pupil*” (Lombardo Radice 1968<sup>35</sup>, 183), i.e. from the dialects<sup>8</sup>.

Lombardo Radice was entrusted with elaborating the primary school programmes that, in 1923, became part of the overall framework of the Gentile Reform, which, among other things, included the introduction of the method *Dal dialetto alla lingua* (From dialect to language), the aim of which was to finally make the school “a laboratory of the Italian language, in which local varieties would not simply be eradicated but would take on the role of an effective didactic support, with a view to a language education that did not intend to cancel but to integrate, and overcome, the exclusive knowledge of dialect” (Capotosto 2013, p. 357). Very soon, the original programmatic text began to undergo adjustments, minimal in appearance,

<sup>7</sup> “Word, mimicry, singing, drawing, plasticity, construction were all part of his language, and not just the word!” (Lombardo Radice, 1968<sup>35</sup>, 313).

<sup>8</sup> Lombardo Radice attributes to dialects the status of expressions of worlds with “their own dignified coherent and compact ways of life, ways of acting, seeing, judging” (De Mauro 1980, 98).

substantial in fact, and certainly enough to affect the profound structure of the reform (Balboni, 2009), until, in 1934, they were replaced by another programme text.

The rapid replacement of the programmes developed by Lombardo Radice prevented his vision of LE from profoundly and permanently influencing the ideas and teaching practice of the majority of teachers. Certainly, many teachers come into contact with his theories and didactic suggestions through reading his writings<sup>9</sup>, but the effects on teachers' teaching practice remain fairly limited and linked to the individual culture and sensitivity of individual teachers.

Consequently, even in the decades that followed, language teaching in the vast majority of cases continued to be implemented according to an approach linked to extremely outdated, often ineffective and not infrequently harmful models.

At the end of the Second World War, the Italian school had to be reorganised and an important contribution to this reorganisation came from the actions of the Allied Commission, coordinated by the American pedagogist, Carleton Washburne<sup>10</sup>. The commission promoted, particularly in southern Italy, an extensive programme to promote literacy in the population,

especially adults, and at the same time, sought to satisfy the renewed interest in foreign languages that accompanied the end of the fascist regime and the arrival of the Allies. This promoted a renewal of the scholastic approach to foreign languages through the introduction of innovative foreign language teaching methods developed overseas, which however did not take root in the Italian school system (Balboni 2009).

#### **4. Language education from the post-war period to the 1970s.**

In the three decades following the end of World War II, Italian society underwent a social and sociolinguistic change of epochal proportions. From the immediate post-war period, and especially through the 1950s and 1960s, Italy once again became a land of significant migration. Emigration to foreign countries, but not only. Internal migration of great proportions took place, from the less industrialised to the more industrialised regions and, mainly, from the southern to the northern regions. At the same time, also due to these population movements, there was a substantial and rapid urbanisation of people and households. These phenomena bore a sociolinguistic consequence: many Italians who until then had

<sup>9</sup> *Lezioni di didattica e ricordi di esperienza magistrale*, first published in 1913 boasts an impressive number of editions and reprints.

<sup>10</sup> Washburne had been a disciple of Dewey's and promoted his ideas in Italy, contributing to the popularisation of pedagogical activism, the individualisation of learning, and the introduction of *problem solving* in teaching/learning, project work and the play methodology.



been predominantly or exclusively dialect-speakers, switched to the use of Italian.

In the meantime, on 3 January 1954, the first public television broadcasts by RAI began. Television became increasingly widespread in public places and in the homes of Italians, and – perhaps more than any other medium – succeeded in spreading Italian across the whole of Italy.

The languages of the Italians changed rapidly: Italian became the language of the people, alongside dialects and other languages. Popular Italian spread and regional Italians were born. For their part, dialects did not disappear, but in many areas began to blend into Italian.

In 1962, with the establishment of the unified middle school, LE faced a new challenge. The children of workers and peasants, who until then had been destined, with rare exceptions, to stop at elementary education or, at most, to continue their studies in vocational schools, were directed towards the new unified middle school, which allowed access to high school and university studies. The first school year of the unified middle school began in the autumn of 1963; however, “this radical transformation in the composition of the school public was not painless” (Lo Duca 2003, 22). In fact, while – as we have seen – language teaching in primary schools often failed to meet the real needs of pupils, especially the most disadvantaged, in middle schools language teaching was all the more inadequate. And the inadequacy, in this case, also concerned foreign

languages. As a compulsory discipline, all students had to study a foreign language (which could be French, English, German or even Spanish); however, there was a serious shortage of teachers with a degree in languages, and this meant that a language was often taught by teachers with little or poor knowledge of it as they had degrees in other disciplines, and generally lack an adequate methodology. The programmes themselves, although theoretically recommending a focus on orality, then provide practical methodological indications of an extremely traditional nature (Balboni 2009).

Within the social, linguistic and educational context we have described, a broad new debate on language arose in Italy in the mid-1960s, which was referred to as the “New Language Question”.

In an essay published in the 26 December 1964 issue of the PCI (Italian Communist Party) magazine *Rinascita*, Pier Paolo Pasolini, a keen observer of the social and sociolinguistic changes taking place in Italy, wrote of a new Italian – the Italian of real Italy – replacing the Italian of literature, the one taught in schools and which had become the language of the Italian bourgeoisie. In describing the advance of the new Italian, Pasolini identified two different movements: one determined by an initial Roman-Neapolitan wave, and another determined by a northern wave embodied in the language of industry, research, technological innovation and mass media. Pasolini’s intervention

provoked a wide-ranging cultural debate, in which Italo Calvino's position stands out. He, like Pasolini, believed that a new Italian was being born but, in seeking the causes of this transformation of the language, he dwelt above all on the relations between Italian and foreign languages (Calvino 1965). The debate went on for a long time, involving intellectuals, linguists and educationalists. In February 1966, *Rinascita* dedicated an issue of its monthly supplement, *Il Contemporaneo*, to the topic "How Italian is taught in Italy". In the articles published, many ideas emerged (or re-emerged) that were to characterise the debate on language education in Italy in the following years, including the idea that it is necessary to accept the diachronic development of language as a vital fact and the idea that language teaching should take into account the linguistic experience of the pupil.

The debate around the "New Question of Language", which focused mainly on Italian and its teaching, occurred in a climate of great turmoil around LE that characterised those years and of which we report some key moments below. In 1961, Renzo Titone published *L'insegnamento delle materie linguistiche e artistiche*, in which he put forward the idea of an integrated language education. In

1963, Tullio De Mauro's *Storia linguistica dell'Italia Unita* was published. In 1966 Maria Teresa Gentile reintroduced the expression "language education" into the Italian pedagogical discourse. In 1967, *Lettera a una professoressa* was published (written by the pupils of the Barbiana school under the guidance of don Milani); this ruthlessly highlighted the implicitly selective nature of the school, which – although compulsory and open to all – tended to expel, without managing to help at all, the very children who most needed support, given their disadvantaged (including linguistically) backgrounds. Also in 1967, De Mauro published the Italian edition of de Saussure's *Corso di Linguistica Generale* and again in 1967, the Council of Europe launched the *Modern Language Project*, thanks to which the *Threshold Level*<sup>11</sup> would be published in 1975. In the early 1970s, the theories of Dell Hymes arrived in Europe and Italy (who proposed the concept of communicative competence in a paper published in 1972). In 1973, the GISCEL, *Gruppo di intervento e studio nel campo dell'educazione linguistica*<sup>12</sup> was founded within the *Società di linguistica italiana*.

During the course of the 1960s, therefore, the concept of LE re-emerged powerfully in the field of educational sciences. However, at

<sup>11</sup> The *Threshold Level* is the detailed description (organised into a series of communicative functions and notions) of the language skills and content that one must possess in order to be independent in the use of a language.

<sup>12</sup> Group for Intervention and Study in the Field of Language Education.



least until the end of the 1970s, the expression “language education” was used according to two different meanings by two different groups of scholars (Balboni 2009).

The first group identified LE with the teaching of Italian. This was the approach of De Mauro, GISCEL and other scholars (including, for example, Berruto, Berretta, Simone, Sobrero, Renzi) who saw the teaching of Italian as a scholastic and social issue, a key factor in enabling the participation of all citizens in social and democratic life (Balboni 2009).

The second group, which included a number of scholars working in the field of foreign languages, including Titone and Freddi, enriched the concept of LE with further complexity and, as we have mentioned, proposed the concept of an integrated language education, including in LE the learning-teaching of all spoken languages (mother tongue, national, second, foreign, classical) and non-verbal languages and communication (Balboni 2009).

In fact, the two visions of language education were perhaps not so far apart. If one accepts, in fact, that the first group of scholars dealt mainly with the teaching of Italian, it is also true that for some of them language

education did not solely lie in the teaching of Italian. De Mauro, for example, did not strictly identify LE as the teaching of Italian, but understood it as a ‘plurilinguistic’ education<sup>13</sup> in a broad sense. He considered, in fact, that plurilingualism should be understood both as a multiplicity of idioms (dialects, minority languages, foreign languages) and as variability within the same language<sup>14</sup> (De Mauro [1975] 1981<sup>3</sup>). If we then consider the attention he paid to non-verbal languages, we could also say that to De Mauro (who, among other things, made a decisive contribution to the drawing up of the GISCEL *Ten Theses*) language education was “*plurilinguistic*” and “*plurisemiotic*”.

In the pedagogical field, between the 1960s and 1970s, a “Copernican revolution took place, both theoretical (the nature and aims of teaching Italian, minority languages, foreign languages) and operational” (Balboni 2009, 79): attention, previously focused only on the linguistic dimension, also turned to sociolinguistics, which assumed a leading role in the theoretical reflection and practice of teaching Italian, and to pragmalinguistics, which became the cornerstone of foreign language teaching (Balboni 2009).

<sup>13</sup> Here, the use of the definition “educazione plurilinguistica” (*plurilinguistic language education*) is resorted to in order to synthesise and unite the concepts of “language education” and “multilingualism”. However, it should be pointed out that the same definition of language education is proposed on several occasions by Bosisio (Bosisio 2005; Bosisio, Chini 2014, 41) as a synthesis of the concepts of ‘language education’, ‘plurilingualism’ and ‘plurilingual education’.

<sup>14</sup> “by *plurilingualism* we mean here, first of all, the coexistence of different types of semiotics, different idioms and different realisations of the same idiom. It appears to be a permanent condition of the human species and, therefore, of every human society” (De Mauro [1975] 1981<sup>3</sup>).

**5. GISCEL's Ten Theses for Democratic Language Education and the 1979 Secondary School Curriculum.** In 1975, GISCEL published the *Ten Theses for Democratic Language Education*, the result of a collective work of analysis and discussion, but elaborated with De Mauro's crucial contribution.

It is a fundamental document, reminding schools and language pedagogy of their civic function to help remove obstacles to the substantive equality of citizens 'without distinction of language'.

From an extremely current perspective, the *Ten Theses* highlight the rootedness of language maturation processes within the psychological, affective and social, biological and psychomotor reality of the individual.

The *Theses* also dwell on the limitations and errors of traditional language pedagogy, which, by failing to take into account the general scope of languagematuration processes, encloses language learning within the confines of the Italian classroom, whereas all subjects and all teachers should rather be involved in the development of language skills. Traditional language pedagogy, furthermore, sees language learning passes through spelling, grammatical and syntactic rules and focuses mainly on written production, ignoring receptive skills, which are actually at the root of productive skills. Lastly, it neglects attention to linguistic variability and the relationship between language and other languages.

In contrast to this approach, the *Ten Theses* list the principles of democratic language education, according to

which it is necessary to start from the linguistic-cultural background of the learner in order to enrich it; to develop productive and receptive written and oral skills; to promote the development of verbal competence "hand in hand with a correct socialisation, with healthy psychomotor development, and with the flourishing of every single expressive and symbolic capacity [...] Pupils should speak and write [...] with other individuals or groups in order to discover, discuss, research, share or create the knowledge that they authentically seek" (GISCEL 1975, VIII).

Finally, the *Theses* draw attention to the need for new teacher training, which integrates skills in language and languages: "a theoretical, sociological, psychological and historical knowledge of language in general and of the specific language(s) to be taught, a knowledge of the educational processes, a knowledge of classroom techniques" (GISCEL 1975, IX). According to the drafters of the *Theses*, however, the new teacher training requires "a nationwide network of local and regional centres in which [...] to rid themselves of the traditional views of language and of teaching" (GISCEL 1975, X).

The document did not take long to produce a number of effects. In 1979 the new programmes for the unified middle school came into force, in which, also thanks to Tullio De Mauro's active role in the elaboration and drafting of the programmatic text, the imprint of the *Theses* can be found. According to the 1979 programmes, LE was

not synonymous with the mere teaching of Italian, but was part of “the broader framework of linguistic education concerning, albeit to varying degrees, all disciplines and activities, and, in particular, sees the pupil acquire, as his fundamental right, the use of language in its full variety of functions and forms”. The 1979 programmes, moreover, for the first time recognised the specificity of the linguistic condition of Italian society, characterised by the presence of dialects, minority languages, and the existence of linguistic varieties within Italian<sup>15</sup>. It, therefore, sought to transfer the concept of an integrated LE into school practice, amplifying the uniqueness of LE also in relation to foreign languages<sup>16</sup>.

Finally, while maintaining the centrality of verbal language<sup>17</sup>, they also extended the integrated vision of LE to other languages: “All the languages proper to man – verbal and non-verbal – must be integrated within the educational process, even

if each of them is more specifically the subject of teaching in individual disciplines” (Ministerial Decree of 9 February 1979).

As is evident, therefore, the new middle school programmes took up many of the ideas from the debate that arose around language education in the Sixties and Seventies and included some of the solicitations proposed by the *Ten Theses*. Furthermore, in the text of the new programmes, the two meanings of LE, one linked to the teaching of Italian, the other including also other verbal and non-verbal languages and communication, met and merged into an explicitly integrated LE.

## 6. Language education, globalisation and European language policies.

Since the 1970s-1980s, the development of the LE concept has also been enriched by the influence of Anglo-Saxon linguistics (in particular the theories of Hymes and Halliday) and European language policy documents.

<sup>15</sup> “The particular linguistic condition of Italian society, with the presence of different dialects and other idioms as well as the effects of vast migratory phenomena, requires that schools take heed of this variety. These should therefore be considered, where they exist, as a reference for developing and promoting language education processes also for their practical and expressive function, as aspects of cultures and an opportunity for linguistic comparison. This is all the truer for all-language idioms. Similarly, the typical varieties, e.g. of colloquial and familiar language of the more formal and cultured language, will not be neglected, so that the pupil will be able to grasp their expressive characteristics in order to use one or the other linguistic variety according to the situation” (Ministerial Decree of 9 February 1979).

<sup>16</sup> “The foreign language serves to contribute, in harmony with other disciplines, in particular the Italian language, to pupils’ acquisition of expressive and communicative abilities [...] The main objective is the understanding of the importance of the foreign language as an instrument of communication, also taking into account that we live in an era in which relations with other countries are proving to be indispensable, especially within the European Community of which Italy is a full member” (Ministerial Decree of 9 February 1979).

<sup>17</sup> “Verbal language [...] has its own evident centrality; in fact, all disciplines make use of it to elaborate and communicate their own processes and contents” (Ministerial Decree of 9 February 1979).

Plurilingualism is “a permanent condition of the human species and, therefore, of every human society” (De Mauro [1975] 1981<sup>3</sup>). However, if, on the one hand, the diversity of languages (and cultures) is an undeniable richness for societies and for the personal development of the individual, that same diversity can, in certain situations, also give rise to phases of social and sociolinguistic crisis, such as those that have been repeated in Italy over the last century and a half.

While this is true for communities both large and small but nonetheless relatively circumscribed as nation-states, it is even more true in today’s global society, where ease of travel, the spread of media and new media, the swirling advance of the information society and the increasingly pervasive global interconnectedness, have exponentially multiplied the opportunities for interlingual contact.

These phenomena greatly increased the demand for language learning, especially English, which for decades now has become an international lingua franca and an indispensable part of LE. In turn, the growing demand for language learning has given an unprecedented impetus to studies and research in the field of language learning and teaching. In the last few decades,

the migrations of ever-increasing numbers of people have taken on such proportions and paths as to create new and – in terms of the number, variety and type of languages involved – unprecedented situations of multilingualism and plurilingualism (Bagna, Barni, Vedovelli 2007; Barni, Vedovelli 2009; Vedovelli 2014), which inevitably have a considerable impact on the education systems of many countries in Europe and around the world.

With respect to the global framework we have mentioned, the European socio-political-economic context experienced a further impulse towards the spread of plurilingualism. In Europe, the traumatic experience of the Second World War induced states to seek reciprocal political and economic cooperation in the post-war period and to create, on the one hand, the Council of Europe<sup>18</sup> and, on the other, a community between states that, through a series of steps aimed at ever greater unity, in the last decade of the 20th century became the European Union.

The progressive economic and political interdependence of the European states created, on a much larger and more complex scale, a situation in some respects similar to that which occurred in Italy in the post-unification period: the confluence

---

<sup>18</sup> The Council of Europe is the first international organisation established in Europe after the Second World War, founded by the Treaty of London in 1949. It is committed to ensuring respect for human rights, parliamentary democracy and the rule of law, as well as to enhancing the cultural identity of the continent. It works in defence of minorities, including linguistic minorities, and is actively engaged in the dissemination of plurilingualism.

in a single economic-political and, in this case, supranational entity of economic and political-administrative apparatuses and, especially, of populations with different languages. And, over and above the multiplicity of official state languages, one must also consider the historical multilingualism within the European countries.

Between the Italian and European situation, there are naturally also profound differences, not only in time terms, but also in terms of politics and language. As the languages in this case are the official languages of countries that have voluntarily joined the unification process, it is therefore unthinkable to implement a language policy that imposes a single official European language<sup>19</sup>. European language policies are, thus, geared towards respecting and maintaining multilingualism and spreading plurilingualism.

The attention to multilingualism put into practice by the European Union, on the other hand, is rooted in the actions and language policies promoted by the Council of Europe. As part of its work in defending human rights, the Council has always been committed to the defence of minorities, including linguistic minorities, through the design of tools and interventions aimed at preserving and enhancing the European linguistic heritage and promoting and

disseminating multilingualism and plurilingualism.

The language policy documents and actions of the European Union, and even more so the documents of the Council of Europe, exert a fundamental influence on language learning and teaching in Europe and also outside the European continent (thinking of the dissemination of the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages*<sup>20</sup>).

For both the Council of Europe and the EU, one of the main objectives of European educational-linguistic policies is the dissemination of plurilingual and pluricultural education, which aims to develop plurilingual and intercultural communicative competence in citizens (Chini, Bosisio 2014, 42).

The idea of plurilingualism that characterises European documents, actions and projects is the same as that found in Béacco (2003), Grosjean (2015) and Weinreich ([1953] 2008), according to whom plurilingualism does not consist in the perfect knowledge of several languages, but rather in possessing a certain degree of usage competence in more than one language variety, where competence can be of different degrees in several languages and also of different degrees in different skills in each language. Understanding plurilingualism in this sense, we can easily imagine that the

<sup>19</sup> As of 2013, there are 24 official EU languages. In practice, however, there is a growing affirmation of the use of certain languages, notably French and especially English as the language of communication within European bodies.

<sup>20</sup> Henceforth abbreviated to CEFR.

possible combinations of languages and degrees of proficiency in use are innumerable.

This idea of plurilingualism is intimately linked to the concepts of plurilingual competence and pluricultural competence. According to Daniel Coste (2001), for example, plurilingual competence is a complex and plural yet, simultaneously, unitary and dynamic competence, which takes shape through knowledge assimilated in both institutional and natural contexts and is intimately connected to the cognitive dimension.

The CEFR (2002) defines plurilingual and pluricultural competence as the ability to use several languages (in which one may have different levels of proficiency) to communicate, as well as the ability to participate in intercultural interactions through experiences in several cultures. It is a complex competence, encompassing linguistic-communicative competence in all the languages the individual knows and the ability to engage with all the cultures the individual experiences. However, this ability to interact with other cultures does not necessarily develop simultaneously and alongside communicative competence.

To summarise, we can therefore state that, according to the perspectives we have examined, plurilingualism encompasses not just all cases in which a speaker possesses a certain degree of competence (albeit at very different levels) in several languages, but also an individual's plurilingual and pluricultural competence. This is a complex, dynamic system, in

that it is subject to continuous modification simultaneously plural and unitary, which encompasses all the communicative abilities in the various languages known to that individual and all his experiences of contact, immersion or interaction with other cultures.

It is, of course, a competence that, in certain circumstances in life, can also mature in a natural and non-formal context. This happens, for instance, to those who, for various reasons, live in different cultural and linguistic contexts at different times of their lives, or to plurilingual families or people living in multilingual environments. Beyond these specific situations, however, the context in which plurilingual and pluricultural competence can consciously arise and mature in all citizens is that of plurilingual education, i.e. (*pluri*) linguistic language education that integrates the teaching and learning of different language varieties.

## 7. Plurilingual (Language) Education. Bèacco and Byram (2007, 116) define plurilingual education as a

manner of teaching, not necessarily restricted to language teaching, which aims to raise awareness of each individual's language repertoire, to emphasise its worth and to extend this repertoire by teaching lesser used or unfamiliar languages. Plurilingual education also aims to increase understanding of the social and cultural value of linguistic diversity in order to ensure linguistic goodwill and to develop intercultural competence.



In this definition, therefore, we find some aspects that we have repeatedly encountered in tracing the evolution of the concept of language education. These include, in the first place, the need to make citizens aware of their language repertoire and the value it has irrespective of the language varieties it contains, to increase it, starting from the language varieties it already includes, and to promote a positive attitude towards all language varieties. Secondly, we find the concept of integrated language education, in which all the varieties that make up an individual's linguistic repertoire contribute to enriching the individual's plurilingual and pluricultural competence, in all its dimensions, including the cognitive one. Finally, we rediscover the transversal nature of language education since plurilingual and pluricultural competence is built transversally, through all schooling and life experiences.

Notwithstanding the distinctive features we have mentioned, multilingual education can be realised according to a wide variety of models, which can also be implemented in very different contexts.

Of these, perhaps the best known and most widespread, is CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning), which aims at the parallel and integrated acquisition of the language and the proposed subject

content. CLIL teaching makes manifest the role that each teacher plays in language education, as it cannot (or should not) take place by re-proposing in another language the same disciplinary lesson plan that would be proposed in the language of schooling, but requires the teacher to pay particular attention to the language, through the use of facilitation strategies and the adoption of foreign language teaching techniques (Council of Europe 2016)<sup>21</sup>.

Then there are the *pluralistic approaches*, i.e. approaches that aim to develop plurilingual and pluricultural competence through the simultaneous or complementary use of several languages or the conscious juxtaposition with different cultures. These are approaches that make positive use of the comparison and identification of similarities and differences between several languages and cultures<sup>21</sup>.

The Council of Europe's *Framework of Reference for Pluralistic Approaches to Languages and Cultures* (FREPA, also known by its French acronym CARAP<sup>22</sup>) is dedicated to pluralistic approaches and proposes descriptors that include "a table of competences" (FREPA/CARAP 2012, 14), "which the pluralistic approaches contribute to developing" (CARAP 2012, 13), and "three lists of descriptors of resources, concerning, respectively, knowledge,

<sup>21</sup> Pluralistic approaches include: the *intercultural approach*, the *awakening to languages*, the *intercomprehension of related languages* and the *integrated didactic approaches to different languages*.

<sup>22</sup> CARAP stands for *Cadre de référence pour les approches plurielles des langues et des cultures* (Council of Europe 2012).

attitudes and skills” (CARAP 2012, 14). The FREPA/CARAP (2012) aims to support the creation of links between different areas of the curriculum, between the various pluralistic approaches and between these approaches and communicative language competences.

All these models of plurilingual education have found application, albeit with varying degrees of diffusion and systematicity, in many European and Italian schools, but their dissemination and integration in LE is unfortunately too often a variable dependent on the individual teacher or on a circumscribed school context.

**8. Conclusions.** In this contribution, we have briefly retraced the evolution of the LE concept in Italy and the debate that has arisen around it on several occasions since Italian Unification. The concept of LE is one of the fundamental concepts of Italian educational linguistics and this brief history of its evolution has allowed us to highlight how a number of Italian scholars have been ahead of their time, proposing extremely modern and up-to-date visions of language education. Ascoli already emphasised (sadly unheeded) the educational and cognitive value of educating children, keeping them “almost bilingual” and helping them learn Italian without trying to erase their dialect from their minds. Also extraordinarily contemporary was the vision of LE conceived by Lombardo Radice, according to whom LE occurs in every school moment, in every lesson

of every subject, through the work of all teachers. In the second half of the 20th century, the concept of LE re-entered the field of educational sciences and the Italian cultural debate. Between the 1960s and 1970s, several Italian scholars dealt with LE. Among them, De Mauro, Berruto, Berretta, Simone, Sobrero, Renzi and the members of GISCEL addressed LE mainly in the sense of teaching Italian; in contrast, Titone and Freddi elaborated an integrated vision of LE that encompassed the learning-teaching of all verbal languages (mother tongue, national, second, foreign, classical languages) and non-verbal languages and communication in a single process. Subsequently, beginning in the 1970s-1980s, the evolution of the LE concept was further enriched both by the influence exerted by Anglo-Saxon linguistics and, in particular, the theories of Hymes and Halliday, and by the research and reflections that matured in the European sphere, also thanks to the action of European bodies and, in particular, the Council of Europe. It is precisely the documents of the Council of Europe and the European Union that spread the concepts of plurilingual competence and plurilingual education, in which the *plurilingual* and *plurisemiotic* dimensions of LE are found in many respects.

The research and reflections that have arisen in Italy around the concept of LE have not always been taken up in school language policies and even when they have been transposed into projects or

programmatic documents, they have not always reached teaching practice. The reasons for this are manifold and deserve to be investigated in depth. However, food for thought in this sense certainly comes from

the tenth of the *Ten Theses for Democratic Language Education*, in which the fundamental importance of the linguistic (as well as educational) training of teachers is emphasised. Of all teachers, we might add.

## Bibliografie / References

- AA.VV. (1968). *L'Educazione linguistica. Prima ricerca sulle condizioni dell'insegnamento delle lingue moderne in Italia*. Roma: Pubblicazioni del Centro Europeo dell'Educazione, Palombi Editori.
- AA.VV. (1999). *Le lingue straniere oggi. Strumenti per la qualità dell'insegnamento nella scuola elementare*. Milano: Arnoldo Mondadori Scuola - Roma: Ministero della Pubblica Istruzione, Direzione generale dell'istruzione elementare.
- Arcangeli M. (2007). *Lingua e identità*. Milano: Meltemi.
- Argentin G. (2018). *Gli insegnanti nella scuola italiana. Ricerche e prospettive di intervento*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Ascoli G.I. (2008). *Scritti sulla questione della lingua*. C. Grassi (Ed.). Torino: Einaudi.
- Bagna C., Barni M., Vedovelli M. (2007) Italiano in contatto con lingue immigrate: nuovi modelli e metodi per il neoplurilinguismo in Italia. In Consani C., Desideri P. (Eds.) *Minoranze linguistiche. Prospettive, strumenti, territori*. Roma: Carocci.
- Balboni P.E. (1985). *Lingue alle elementari: i risultati del progetto veneziano*. Padova: CLEUP.
- Balboni P.E. (1988). *Gli insegnamenti linguistici nella scuola italiana*. Padova: Liviana.
- Balboni P.E. (Ed.) (1996). *Educazione bilingue*. Perugia: Guerra.
- Balboni P.E. (1999). *Dizionario di Glottodidattica*. Perugia: Guerra.
- Balboni P.E. (2008). *Le sfide di Babele*. Torino: UTET.
- Balboni P.E. (2009). *Storia dell'educazione linguistica in Italia. Dalla legge Casati alla riforma Gelmini*. Torino: UTET.
- Balboni P.E. (2013<sup>2</sup>). *Fare educazione linguistica. Insegnare italiano, lingue straniere e lingue classiche*. Torino: UTET.
- Balboni P.E., Margiotta U. (Eds.) (2008). *Formare on line i docenti di lingue e italiano L2*. Torino: UTET.
- Barni M., Vedovelli M. (2009). L'Italia plurilingue fra contatto e superdiversità. In Palermo M. (Ed.) *Percorsi e strategie di apprendimento dell'italiano lingua seconda: sondaggi su ADIL2*. Perugia: Guerra Edizioni.
- Bason O. (Ed.) (2007). *Progetto Info. Individuazione di un modello di formazione per insegnanti operanti in aree plurilinguistiche con presenza di lingua minoritaria, I parte, La ricerca e il modello di formazione europeo*. Trento: Istitut Pedagogich Ladin, Ntendenza per la scola di loesc ladins, Ministero della Pubblica Istruzione, Direzione generale degli affari internazionali; Commissione Europea, Direzione generale formazione e cultura.
- Beacco J.-C. (2003). L'europe des langues aujourd'hui. De technique en politique. *Synergies Italie*, 1:42-50.
- Beacco J.-C. (2015). *Elementi per un profilo delle politiche linguistiche della scuola della Provincia Autonoma di Trento. Rapporto di Consulenza*. Trento: Provincia Autonoma di Trento - IPRASE.

- Beacco J.-C., Byram M. (2007). *From linguistic diversity to plurilingual education: Guide for the development of language education policies in Europe*. Strasburgo: Consiglio d'Europa.
- Bianchi C. et al. (2004). *L'inglese nella scuola primaria. L'insegnamento della lingua straniera in una dimensione europea*. Roma: Carocci Faber.
- Bloomfield L. (1933). *Language*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Borello E. (2014). *Val più la pratica che la grammatica. Storia della glottodidattica*. Pisa: Pacini.
- Borghetti C. (2016). *Educazione linguistica interculturale. Origini, modelli, sviluppi recenti*. Cesena: Caissa Italia.
- Bosisio C. (2005). *Dagli approcci tradizionali al Quadro comune europeo di riferimento. Riflessioni glottodidattiche e applicazioni per l'insegnante di italiano L2*. Milano: EduCatt.
- Bosisio C. (Ed.) (2011). *Ianuum linguarum reserare. Saggi in onore di Bona Cambiaghi*. Firenze: Le Monnier Università.
- Bosisio C. (2012). *Interlingua e profilo d'apprendente. Uno sguardo diacronico tra linguistica acquisizionale e glottodidattica*. Milano: EduCatt.
- Brewster J. et al. (1992). *The Primary English Teacher's Guide*. London: Penguin.
- Buccino G., Mezzadri M. (Eds.) (2015). *Glottodidattica e neuroscienze. verso modelli traslazionali*. Firenze: Franco Cesati Editore.
- Calvino I. (1965). L'Italiano, una lingua fra le altre lingue. *Il Contemporaneo*, I, 1: 5-6.
- Cambiaghi B. et al. (Eds.) (2005). *Europa plurilingue. Comunicazione e didattica*. Milano: Vita e Pensiero.
- Cangia C. (2011a). Conoscerle e coltivarle. Vol. 1 di *Lingue altre*. Brescia: La Scuola.
- Cangia C. (2011b). Insegnarle e impararle. Vol. 2 di *Lingue altre*. Brescia: La Scuola.
- Caon F. (2008). *Educazione linguistica e differenziazione. Gestire eccellenza e difficoltà*. Torino: UTET.
- Capotosto S. (2012-2013). Dal dialetto all'errore. Un'indagine sul metodo "dal dialetto alla lingua". *Studi di grammatica italiana*, 31-32: 355-374.
- Cenoz J. (Ed.) (2008). *Teaching through Basque. Achievements and Challenges*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Cenoz J. (2009). *Towards Multilingual Education. Basque Educational Research from an International Perspective*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Cenoz, Jasone; Genesee, Fred (Eds.) (1998). *Beyond Bilingualism. Multilingualism and Multilingual Education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Cenoz J., Durr G. (Eds.) (2015). *Multilingual Education. Between language learning and translanguaging*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chini M., Bosisio C. (Eds) (2014). *Fondamenti di glottodidattica. Apprendere e insegnare le lingue oggi*. Roma: Carocci.
- Coonan C.M. (Ed.) (2008). *CLIL e l'apprendimento delle lingue. Le sfide del nuovo ambiente di apprendimento*. Venezia: Libreria Editrice Cafoscarina.
- Coonan C.M. (2012<sup>3</sup>). *La lingua straniera veicolare*. Torino: UTET.
- Colombo A. (Ed.) (1979). *Guida all'educazione linguistica. Fini, modelli, pratica didattica*. Bologna: Zanichelli.
- Colombo A. (Ed.) (2008). *Il curriculum e l'educazione linguistica. Leggere le nuove indicazioni*. Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Colombo A., Romani W. (Ed.) (1996). *È la lingua che ci fa uguali. Lo svantaggio linguistico: problemi di definizione e di intervento*. Firenze: La Nuova Italia.
- Compagnoni I. (1979). *Lingua straniera ed educazione linguistica*. Brescia: La Scuola.
- Corno D. (Ed.) (1993). *Vademecum di educazione linguistica*. Firenze: La Nuova Italia.

- Coste D. (2001). La compétence plurilingue et ses implications possibles. In AA.VV. *L'enseignement des langues vivantes, perspectives*. Versailles: CRDP Académie de Versailles (29-38).
- Council of Europe (2002). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Council of Europe (2012). CARAP. *Cadre de Référence pour les Approches Plurielles des Langues et des Cultures*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Council of Europe (2016<sup>2</sup>). *Guide for the development and implementation of curricula for plurilingual and intercultural education*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Covi L., Dutto M.G. (Ed.) (2017). Rapporto TLT 2016. Trentino Language Testing. Trento: Provincia Autonoma di Trento - IPRASE.
- De Mauro T. ([1975]1981<sup>3</sup>). Il plurilinguismo nella società e nella scuola italiana. In: *Scuola e linguaggio*. Roma: Editori Riuniti.
- De Mauro T. (1980). *Idee e ricerche linguistiche nella cultura italiana*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- De Mauro T. (1998). *Passato e futuro dell'educazione linguistica*. In Ferreri S., Guerriero A.R. *Educazione linguistica vent'anni dopo e oltre. Che cosa ne pensano De Mauro, Renzi, Simone, Sobrero*. Firenze: La Nuova Italia, pp. 13-35.
- De Mauro T. (2007). Le Dieci tesi nel loro contesto storico: linguistica, pedagogia e politica tra gli anni Sessanta e Settanta. In: GISCEL (a cura di). *Educazione linguistica democratica. A trent'anni dalle Dieci tesi*. Milano: Franco Angeli.
- De Marco A. (2000). *Manuale di Glottodidattica. Insegnare una lingua straniera*. Roma: Carocci.
- Dell'Aquila V., Iannaccaro G. (2004). *La pianificazione linguistica*. Roma: Carocci.
- Dogliani P. (2002). *L'Europa a scuola. Percorsi dell'istruzione tra Ottocento e Novecento*. Roma: Carocci.
- Dutto M.G. (1990). *Bilinguismo potenziale e bilinguismo possibile*. Vigo di Fassa: Istitut Cultural Ladin,
- ECML. European Centre for Modern Languages of the Council of Europe (2004). *LEA Teachers Questionnaire*. Reperibile all'indirizzo:  
[https://archive.ecml.at/mtp2/Lea/pdf&doc/Teachers-ENG\\_web%20version.rtf](https://archive.ecml.at/mtp2/Lea/pdf&doc/Teachers-ENG_web%20version.rtf)
- Ewing K.P. (1990). The Illusion of Wholeness: Culture, Self and the Experience of Inconsistency. In *Ethos* 18, 3: 251-278.
- Fabbro F. (2004). *Neuropedagogia delle lingue. Come insegnare le lingue ai bambini*. Roma: Astrolabio.
- Fabbro F. (1996). *Il cervello bilingue. Neurolinguistica e poliglossia*. Roma: Astrolabio.
- Fari F. [Fabbro F.] (2005<sup>2</sup>). *Il cjâf dai furlans. Neuropsicologie dai sentimenti*. Udine: Kappa Vu.
- Freddi G. (1999). *Psicolinguistica, Sociolinguistica, Glottodidattica. La formazione di base dell'insegnante di lingue e di lettere*. Torino: UTET.
- Freddi G. (2010). *Lingue: strumenti di humanitas*. Milano: EduCatt.
- Gentile M.T. (1966). *Educazione linguistica e crisi di libertà*. Roma: Armando Editore.
- Goglia F. et al. (2004). *Il soggetto plurilingue. Interlingua, aspetti di neurolinguistica, identità e interculturalità*. Milano: Franco Angeli - Bolzano: Provincia Autonoma di Bolzano.
- Griffiths C. (Ed.) (2008). *Lessons from Good Language Learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Krashen S.D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press
- Lo Duca M.G. (2004<sup>2</sup>). *Esperimenti grammaticali. Riflessioni e proposte sull'insegnamento della grammatica dell'italiano*. Roma: Carocci.

- Lo Duca M.G. (2013<sup>2</sup>). *Lingua italiana ed educazione linguistica: Tra storia, ricerca e didattica*. Roma: Carocci.
- Lombardo Radice G. (1968<sup>35</sup>). *Lezioni di didattica e ricordi di esperienza magistrale*. Firenze: Sandron.
- Luperto A. (2013). *Educazione linguistica nella scuola primaria*. Roma: Editoriale Anicia.
- Mandelli F. (Ed.) (1981). *Educazione linguistica nella scuola dell'obbligo*. Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Mezzadri M. (2004). *Il Quadro comune europeo a disposizione della classe. Un percorso verso l'eccellenza*. Perugia: Guerra Edizioni.
- Mezzadri M. (Ed.) (2006). *Integrazione linguistica in Europa. Il Quadro comune di riferimento per le lingue*. Torino: UTET.
- MIUR (2010). *Lingue di minoranza e scuola. A dieci anni dalla Legge 482/99*. Roma: MIUR, Direzione generale per gli ordinamenti scolastici e per l'autonomia scolastica.
- Nalesso M. (Ed.) (2007). *Progetto Info. Individuazione di un modello di formazione per insegnanti operanti in aree plurilinguistiche con presenza di lingua minoritaria, II parte, Il corso di formazione e la pratica didattica*. Trento: Istitut Pedagogich Ladin, Commissione Europea – Direzione generale formazione e cultura.
- Pasolini P.P. (1964). Nuove questioni linguistiche. *Rinascita*, XXI, 51: 19-22.
- Porcelli G., Balboni P.E. (Eds.) (1991). *Glottodidattica e Università. La formazione del professore di lingue*. Padova: Liviana.
- Porcelli G., Balboni P.E. (1992). *L'insegnamento delle lingue straniere nella scuola elementare. Fondamenti metodologici modelli operativi*. Brescia: La Scuola.
- Renzi L., Cortelazzo M. (Eds.) (1977). *La lingua italiana oggi: un problema scolastico e sociale*. Bologna: il Mulino.
- Ricucci M. (2014). *Storia della glottodidattica*. Roma: Armando Editore.
- Ricuperati G. (2015). *Storia della scuola in Italia*. Brescia: La Scuola.
- Russo D. (Ed) (2006). *Questioni linguistiche e formazione degli insegnanti*. Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Sabatini F. (1980). *Lingua e linguaggi*. Torino: Loescher.
- Sabatini F. (1984). *La comunicazione e gli usi della lingua*. Torino: Loescher.
- Sabatini F. (1991). *La 'riflessione sulla lingua' in un'ipotesi di curricolo complessivo*. In Marelllo C., Mondelli G (Eds.). *Riflettere sulla lingua*. Firenze: La Nuova Italia, pp. 15-24.
- Sale G. (2008). *Il laboratorio delle parole. Insegnare a leggere e a scrivere*. Roma: Carocci.
- Schiavi Fachin S. (Ed.) (2003). *L'educazione plurilingue: Dalla ricerca di base alla pratica didattica*. Udine: Forum.
- Schiavi Fachin S. (2004). *Cressi cun plui lenghis. Une guide pai gjenitòrs e pai mestris*. Udine: Kappa Vu.
- Scuola di Barbiana (1967). *Lettera a una professoressa*. Firenze, Libreria Editrice Fiorentina
- Serra Borneto C. (1998). *C'era una volta il metodo. Tendenze attuali nella didattica delle lingue straniere*. Roma: Carocci.
- Serragiotto G. (2003). *CLIL: Apprendere insieme una lingua e contenuti non linguistici*. Perugia: Guerra Edizioni.
- Strassoldo M. (1977). *Lingue e nazionalità nelle rilevazioni demografiche*. Trieste: CLUET.
- Titone R. (1974). *Introduzione alla metodologia della ricerca nell'insegnamento linguistico*. Bergamo: Minerva Italica.
- Titone R. (1990). *La lingua straniera nella scuola elementare. Guida didattica*. Roma: Armando Editore



- Titone R. (Ed.) (1996). *La personalità bilingue. Caratteristiche psicodinamiche*. Milano: Bompiani.
- Vedovelli M. (2014). Il neoplurilinguismo italiano: una risorsa per il sistema produttivo, una sfida per la linguistica educativa. In Balboni P.E., Coste D., Vedovelli M. *Il diritto al plurilinguismo*. Milano: Unicopli.
- Vedovelli M., Casini S. (2016). *Che cos'è la linguistica educativa*. Roma: Carocci.
- Vertecchi B. (2012). *Parole per la scuola*. Milano: FrancoAngeli.
- Wandruszka M., Paccagnella I. (1974). *Introduzione all'interlinguistica*. Palermo: Palumbo.
- Weinreich U. (2008). *Lingue in contatto*. Nuova edizione a cura di V. Orioles. Trad. G.M. Cardona. Torino: UTET. Trad. it. di Weinreich U. (1953), *Languages in Contact*. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.
- Wolff D. (2017). *Piano Trentino Trilingue. Decalogo per un CLIL di qualità*. Working Paper 3/2017. Trento: Provincia Autonoma di Trento; IPRASE.
- Wright E.W. et al. (Eds.) (2015). *The Handbook of Bilingual and Multilingual Education*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.