



*Asesorías y Tutorías para la Investigación Científica en la Educación Puig-Salabarría S.C.
José María Pino Suárez 400-2 esq a Lerdo de Tejada. Toluca, Estado de México. 7223898475*

RFC: ATI120618V12

Revista Dilemas Contemporáneos: Educación, Política y Valores.
<http://www.dilemascontemporaneoseduccionpoliticaervalores.com/>

ISSN: 2007 – 7890.

Año: IV.

Número: 2.

Artículo no.27

Período: Octubre, 2016 - Enero, 2017.

TÍTULO: La visión de expertos acerca de los principales papeles sociales del idioma inglés en Rusia: hacia la identificación del paradigma educativo.

AUTORA:

1. Dra. Mariia Pavenkova Rubtcova

RESUMEN: Este estudio investigó los principales roles sociales del idioma inglés en Rusia. Los datos provienen de investigaciones de expertos en dos etapas con profesores universitarios para el Aprendizaje Integral de Contenidos e Idiomas (CLIL en inglés) e Inglés como Segunda Lengua (ESL en inglés). Se les preguntó acerca de los roles sociales del idioma inglés en las universidades rusas de hoy en día y la concepción preferible para el futuro desarrollo del programa de la Universidad CLIL. Cuatro concepciones fueron elegidas por los expertos: inglés global, inglés ruso, concepción multilingüe e inglés como inversión. Las características de cada concepto fueron identificadas y discutidas en términos de su influencia en el proceso de la educación CLIL. Las "concepciones-líderes" fueron determinadas por la clasificación. Son conceptos en inglés, ruso y multilingüe. A pesar de que el concepto de inglés ruso se considera apropiado ahora, las preferencias futuras están asociadas con el concepto de multilingüismo.

PALABRAS CLAVES: La educación universitaria CLIL, roles sociales de la lengua inglesa, multilingüismo, variedades de inglés en el mundo, Rusia.

TITLE: The experts' view on the main social roles of English language in Russia: toward to identifying educational paradigm.

AUTHOR:

1. Dra. Mariia Pavenkova Rubtcova

ABSTRACT: This study investigated the main social roles of English language in Russia. Data comes from two stage expert researches with Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) and English as Second language (ESL) university teachers. They were asked about the social roles of English language in the nowadays Russian universities and preferable conception for future development of CLIL university program. Four conceptions were chosen by experts: Global English, Russian English, multilingual conception, and English as an investment. The features of each concept were identified and discussed in terms of their influence on the process of CLIL education. The «conceptions-leaders» were determined by ranking. They are Russian-English and Multilingual conception. Despite the fact that the concept of Russian-English is considered appropriate now, future preferences are associated with the concept of multilingualism.

KEY WORDS: CLIL university education, social roles of the English language, multilingualism, World Englishes, Russia.

INTRODUCTION.

In this paper, we will explore the main social roles of English language in Russian society in their connection with CLIL university teaching. Despite the many contradictions inside and outside of the scientific community (Rubtsova & Martianova, 2014; Rubtcova, 2015), some Russians universities support the idea of using English as one of the working university languages (SPBU, 2016; HSE, 2016).

The Russian government expects from education in English a growth of economic well-being. On this way, English has a competition with Asian languages, primarily with Chinese.

Ministry of Education has decided to include a second foreign language in the secondary school program and informally recommend Chinese as the second foreign language (Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, 2016). From this point of view, we need to return to the discussing about the main social roles of English language and possibility of using CLIL conceptions in the Russian Higher (tertiary) Education.

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is one of the main educational parameters in Europe during last ten years and deals with the linguistic status of English, firstly as an additional language, then as the main language of instruction (Dalton-Puffer, 2011; Hüttner, Dalton-Puffer & Smit, 2013; Dafouz & Guerrini, 2009; Fortanet-Gómez's, 2013).

DEVELOPMENT.

The first ideas of CLIL were humanistic and multicultural. The CLIL supporters thank that the aim of the CLIL curriculum is to arouse curiosity and tolerance to foreign cultures and to encourage pupils to know them better. At the same time, teachers were obliged to highlight and name the paths that link different school subjects in their syllabuses, i.e., to show during which lesson they are going to teach other subject content (Luczywek, 2009). However, if only English is the preferred language in CLIL curriculum so students can study only Anglo-Saxon culture, some attempts of World Englishes conception (Kachru, 1986, Halliday, 2003, Proshina 2006, 2014) to discuss this question are not popular in CLIL scientific group.

The Russian CLIL implementation experience also has some contradiction. From one side, English is a popular language. It is easy to find many examples of its influence in areas related to commerce and popular culture from music and films to names of shops and job titles (see e.g.

Rivlina, 2015). In Russian education, English is predominant as the main foreign language at secondary schools and universities throughout the all-Russian regions. English has a political support from the Russian government (Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, 2016). In result, it has affected many areas of Russian economic and social life.

However, in contrast to the European experience, English has not a teachers' support as the medium of instruction. Not all teachers entering state schools and universities met the requirements regarding the competence of a second language. Russia still faced with a lack of qualified teachers that fit CLIL tasks (Rubtcova, 2015).

There were some differences in teacher methods. The growing mobility of the Russian population has had its impact on foreign language teaching. Whereas the Soviet grammar-translation method laid a solid basis for those engaged in writing and reading skills, it turned out to be insufficient to satisfy the need for adequate spoken skills, which is why the focus on teaching formal language rules and practising translation exercises shifted to a focus on communicative skills. This idea had no full realization and some Russian linguists evaluate new methodic as «pidginisation» (Safonova, 2000). However, pidginisation can be everywhere (Sokolova, 2015) and it is not a feature of Russia per se.

With English as the lingua franca in business, economics and science, Russian government has given special attention to the teaching of English language. Its international importance has led to the introduction of CLIL, bilingual education with English as the language of instruction for a number of non-language university subjects such as economics, social science and management, but also Public Administration (HSE, 2016). However, at the same time, there is another political process.

Many social groups and some political parties announced the salvation of the Russian language as one of the main objectives of the activity. They conducted round tables and conferences, including

round tables in the Kremlin, dedicated to improving the quality of teaching of the Russian language (see e.g. Yarovaya, 2015). Education in the English language does not correspond to that mainstream. In result, the scientific communities with big differences in ideological traditions are involved in this process.

In our preliminary studies on the implementation of CLIL programmes in Russia, we faced serious resistance from professors (Rubtcova, 2015). They noted several problems including the idea of untranslatability of Russian concepts into English, loss of significant contexts and development of the foreign culture to the detriment of the Russian. It was assumed that students won't be able to use Russian fundamental science in a foreign language, and foreign concepts without serious analysis will be perceived superficially (Ibid). Russian linguists Kogut (2014) and Proshina (2006, 2014) have shown that the Russian academic genres, both written and oral, are considerably different from the English.

In spite of the government's decision to introduce "Western standards", we began to seek for what the concept of English language spread could find support, or at least, would be faced with less resistance of professors. The fact is that in the Russian society, the professors and university scientists perform the function of the experts. We need the expert opinion in order to gain an insight into the background of Russian CLIL and the factors that make this type of learning successful or not. The aim of our research is to collect data on opinion of experts - different ESL/CLIL university teachers – about their visions on social roles of English language, preferable conception of education in English and methodology of CLIL lessons/lectures/courses, with a view to contributing to the future development of this type of bilingual learning in Russia.

Our research questions are the following: *What are the social roles of English language in the nowadays Russian universities in their connection with the process CLIL university education and classroom interaction? What conception is preferable for future development?*

Data collection.

The experts' interviews aimed to identify the opinion of CLIL/ESL teachers about social roles of English in Russian educational system, and the researcher asked people who have experience with CLIL lessons in Management and Social Sciences (public relations, Advertising, Communication studies, Media studies, Sociology of management, Psychology of management, Economics and Management, etc.) in university.

Why these disciplines are important to our study? Management and Social Sciences' fields of disciplines had been chosen because they have a positive international dynamics, there are many new publications and ideas, and English can be useful for access to this knowledge. At the same time, there is a serious tension about the priority of the English language in the fields of Mass media, Communication, Economics and Management. Some groups of patriotic Russian professors demand priority for the Russian language with reference to an information war between Russia and the West. Therefore, we can see a discussion in these fields about priorities in future development and understanding of social roles of English in Russia. In addition, we can take into account that these disciplines are very important because of their influence on public opinion. From this point of view, the professors' vision of social roles of English in Russia is important as they can spread it using mass media and business-management channels. Another reason for this choice of disciplines has links to universities' administration opinion. Some St. Petersburg universities have concerns about courses in English vs Russian in these disciplinary fields and have an interest in research and their results. According to Russian code of ethics for sociologists, these universities cannot be named.

Participants and study process.

According to Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann (1967), when looking for an expert opinion, sociologists should ask people who can answer the questions based on practical experience according to

question. The researcher did not ask teachers without any CLIL experience because we need to explain them first what CLIL is, describe situation with the English language spread, situation with international professors and students in Russian universities, criteria for worldwide university ranking, etc. It can be difficult for them to be involved in so much new information and give an expert opinion about social roles of English in Russia. At the same time, the CLIL teachers are involved in the process, know current discussions and have a personal experience. However, it should be named as a limit of research, because we describe only opinion of teachers who can be more favorable for courses in English.

According to the Russian experts and government tradition, an expert's group can have a crucial influence on administrative decision-making processes. An opinion of other people who are not involved is not so important, despite the fact that administrative decisions can influence their work in the future. This order of decision-making processes was well developed in the Soviet Social Planning system. It saved through time and it seems will be main in the future. The idea of this decision-making process is that we should find a leading (the most developed) social group in the field and ask the expert's opinion (Voltchkova, 1996). All experts should have a good theoretical background and practical experience. Based on Soviet planning experience from one side and Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann from another, the researcher started to find experts for the research.

It is a quiet little group in St. Petersburg universities, because one professor can be a teacher of 10-15 courses in different fields of Management and Social Sciences and work in several universities. In order to find experts, the researcher used university websites. The researcher opened the pages with teachers' presentations, and then mail them a letter with suggestion to participate. If some of them agreed, the researcher asked them about other professors. This sampling method is called «snowball technic». This process yielded 20 CLIL teachers of the chosen disciplines. However, during our correspondence, they drew my attention to their collaboration with ESL teachers. Then,

the researcher asked how they collaborate with ESL teachers and if collaboration was devoted to the CLIL lessons, the researcher tried to find these ESL teachers. In order to have data for comparison the researcher has found 20 ESL teachers who collaborated with the CLIL teachers. These previous stage gives to the researcher two groups of experts: group A and B.

Group A.

Group A was composed of 20 CLIL teachers. All of them are Russians, their native language is Russian or Russian and a regional language (Buryat - 1 person, Tatar - 1 person). They all are professors of the CLIL courses in the Saint Petersburg's universities. Most of them are studying English as a foreign language in Russia. Only one person has had special English language education (USA). Some of them are studying German, Spanish or French as a foreign language (5 persons). Their ages range from 25 to 63. There are 2 men and 18 women in the group.

Group B.

Group B was composed by 20 ESL teachers. All of them are Russians, their native language is Russian or Russian and regional/family language (Tatar - 2 persons, Udmurt – 1 person, Korean – 1 person, Armenian – 1 person). They are ESL professors in the Saint Petersburg's universities. Their age ranges from 22 to 68. There are one men and 19 women in the group.

It was not possible to establish contact with the international ESL/CLIL teachers working at the universities in St. Petersburg, as one had no e-mail, and the other two did not reply the invitation to participate in the study.

The participants received a preliminary questionnaire by email which he/she returned to the researcher through the same means. The questions were a combination of closed questions and an open question for comments and conceptions of the English language roles in Russia.

The preliminary questionnaire was devoted to several questions about the teacher experience in the CLIL field, socio-demographical characteristics, conceptions of the roles of the English

language in Russia and possible time for semi-structured interview. The main aim of the preliminary questionnaire was to check possibilities to be an expert in the CLIL field, to create a list of conceptions and to find time for «face to face» meeting.

A list of conceptions was opened and was oriented on any idea about social roles of the English language in Russia, it was controversial. Two CLIL teachers and four ESL teachers did not answer; while one ESL teacher answered that she had no CLIL experience and therefore could not complete the questionnaire. Overall then, the researcher collected 18 questionnaires from CLIL and 15 from ESL teachers containing a great number of responses to the open questions. These comments had many suggestions for the list of the conceptions of the English language roles in Russia. The researcher selected four conceptions:

- Political conception (Global English with the priority/ domination of English native-speakers and people with fluent English, creation of global people – the actors of global market under democratic ideology).
- Cultural conception (Russian-English as one of World Englishes).
- Multicultural conception (many languages in the curriculum, English is not the only and maybe not the main).
- Economic conception (education in English as an investment with a financial effect, the profit should be proved).

Two conceptions mentioned by respondents were removed by the researcher because all sociological researches in Russia should follow The Russian Constitution and the Sociologist's Code of Ethics. These two conceptions are «The English language is a language of enemies, that's why Russians should know it» and «The English language should be prohibited as a language of American influence». These conceptions have been proposed by the CLIL teachers, among other conceptions. Both can lead to the possible discrimination of the English native speakers as

«enemies»/«English speakers», so they cannot be discussed in sociological research. The researcher sent an email message about it and a list of chosen conceptions to all respondents (see list 1). None of the respondents refused to participate in the study, because these concepts were excluded, thus making it possible to conclude that these conceptions were not central or main for the respondents.

List 1. List of experts.

№	CLIL/ESL	The base education (the first university education)	Position
1	CLIL	Economics	Associate Professor
2	CLIL	Economics	Associate Professor
3	CLIL	Economics	Professor
4	CLIL	History	Associate Professor
5	CLIL	History	Professor
6	CLIL	Management	Senior Lecturer
7	CLIL	Management	Associate Professor
8	CLIL	Philosophy	Associate Professor
9	CLIL	Philosophy	Professor
10	CLIL	Philosophy	Professor
11	CLIL	Politology (Politics Sciences)	Senior Lecturer
12	CLIL	Politology (Politics Sciences)	Junior research fellow
13	CLIL	Politology (Politics Sciences)	Associate Professor
14	CLIL	Psychology	Senior research fellow
15	CLIL	Sociology	Associate Professor
16	CLIL	Sociology	Associate Professor
17	CLIL	Sociology	Associate Professor
18	CLIL	Sociology	Professor
19	ESL	Linguistics	Senior Lecturer
20	ESL	Linguistics	Associate Professor
21	ESL	Linguistics	Associate Professor
22	ESL	Linguistics	Associate Professor
23	ESL	Linguistics	Associate Professor
24	ESL	Pedagogics	Associate Professor
25	ESL	Pedagogics	Professor
26	ESL	Pedagogics (Chemistry in English)	Associate Professor
27	ESL	Pedagogics (Chemistry in English)	Professor
28	ESL	Philology	Senior Lecturer
29	ESL	Philology	Associate Professor
30	ESL	Philology	Associate Professor
31	ESL	Philology	Professor
32	ESL	Philology	Professor
33	ESL	Philology	Professor

Based on the answers from the preliminary questionnaire that help to create a list of conceptions and according to the research objectives the Guide to the semi-structured expert interview was created. It consisted of three parts:

Part 1. General questions about CLIL education in Russia, its history and traditions (5-10 min).

Part 2. Participants' opinions, attitudes, beliefs, feelings, doubts and emotions as a response to their CLIL experience (10-20 min).

Part 3. Participants' opinions about social roles of the English language in Russia through Participants' CLIL experience (10-20 min).

Part 4. Participants' rating of conceptions (5-10 min)

Part 5. Suggestions and recommendations for the development of a university CLIL programme adapted to the Russian context (10-15 min).

The interview was held in Russian, and took between 40 and 75 minutes. There were different places for the interview: the respondent's office, the researcher's office, the respondent's home, a room (auditorium) in a university and a café. In all cases, the researcher checked that atmosphere was friendly, with a good level of trust and fruitful for explanations, the respondents had enough time for answers, there were not reasons for rejections answers because of pressing or discrimination of opposing points of view.

Ethical considerations.

All studies were conducted according to the Professional Ethical Code of Sociologists by the Russian Society of Sociologists (RSS). It means that according to requirements of anonymity, the signed Participant Consent Agreement cannot be asked for.

All participants were asked to participate in the study and informed about the objectives of the research. Participant consent to participate was gained. They were assured of the anonymity of

their responses through the use of pseudonyms to report the results and were guaranteed the confidentiality of collecting data. They allowed using the data for research purposes.

Results.

In line with our objective in this section, we present the results of our study of the main social roles of English language in their connection with the conception of CLIL university teaching in Russian universities using data which was collected through our research.

We have not asked experts to evaluate the social roles of the English language in the Russian society and to select a conception that has been being eligible. In the first in-deep semi-structured interview, the experts found four conceptions for the building of bilingual program. They are the following: political, cultural, multicultural and economic conception.

In our in-deep interviews we discuss with the experts what links are between the conception, the aim of CLIL education, the image of relevant CLIL teacher, the character of ESL & CLIL teachers' interaction and the character of interaction in CLIL classroom. Experts can express different opinions and ideas about the conceptions when they are considered separately. For example, the idea of global English and English as a working language (multicultural concept) were often together and they are hardly distinguishable. However, experts were able to formulate clear viewpoint, when the four concepts were considered together with all features. In Table 1, we have reflected the view that can be taken from the majority of the total responses.

The main differences in the experts' responses were in the discussing about the conceptions of Russian-English and English as an investment. In this study, four from 33 experts refused to include the concept of Russian-English, saying that it does not exist. They all were ESL teachers. Two experts refused the concept of English as an investment, arguing that, in accordance with the

science about language («Yazykoznaniiye»), language is a cultural phenomenon, not an investment.

In the formalised interview, the experts ranked a priority of these conceptions (the second interview with all experts). The first place has the most preferable conception for the creating/support a CLIL programme in the field of university social sciences (see Table 2.)

Table 1. The links between the conception, the aim of CLIL education, the image of relevant CLIL teacher, the character of ESL & CLIL teachers interaction and the character of interaction in CLIL classroom.

Conception	The aim of CLIL education	The image of the main teacher	The character of ESL&CLIL teachers interaction	The character of interaction in CLIL classroom	Frequency of use
1	2	3	4	5	6
Global English	Students can work in international (mostly West) business inside or outside Russia	The ESL teachers with education in the field of Social Sciences and Economics are preferable. However the ideal is the English native-speaker professional with good knowledge of a subject.	ESL teachers can recommend CLIL teacher to dismiss and replace by another. There is greater control over the level of English proficiency of students also. NS teachers do not need interaction, as they combine both - CLIL and ESL skills	High-quality control of both the language and subject matters in the subject class. Students communicate only in English. At home they continue to communicate in English in social media (VKontakte) and when to have rest with friends. All skills should be well developed, but priority is given to oral interaction. Students have a lot of business games and discussions in the classroom, studying and discuss cases. Students speak during all lessons.	This education is elite and it is a very rare phenomenon.
Russian-English	Students can work in Russia, however they can be successful in Russian-Asian and Russian-East European communication	The CLIL teachers with some education in the field of Language and Linguistics are preferable. The idea of domination of the English native-speaker is not accepted, however NS teachers can find work as good	CLIL teachers want to have some control over ESL program in order to include the professional and subject tasks in it. ESL teachers are waiting for ideological defence against NS, since perceiving them (NS) as dangerous competitors. The relationship	CLIL teachers have no big concern and control of language skills in the subject class. As a rule, they have a focus on lexicon and writing on students. The more similar to CLIL thing happens in ESL classes when CLIL teachers control content and ESL teachers control English during the classroom interaction.	The wide spread practice, but it does not have any discussion and analysis. It is latent to some extent

		teachers of subject without emphasis are they NS or not.	between CLIL and ESL teachers are good, but both acknowledge that the level of English is not enough for both (CLIL and ESL).		
Multicultural conception	Students can live and work in multilingual society	The image of an ideal teacher has not yet formed. It is expected that he/she will know more than one language or at least special terminology in multiple languages. It is rather a subject teacher, not a language teacher	Since the idea of making education more Multilingual has been initiated by the Ministry of Education recently, the mechanism of interaction between a teacher of subject and a teacher of language has not yet been formed. It is expected that ESL teachers will interact with teachers of other languages, and together create some multilingual educational materials. CLIL teacher can use them with own materials.	There is a small practice, which shows that this interaction takes place in Russian with switching to other languages and commentary in several languages. In this case, a more electronic presentations are used. The lesson has a focus on the study of professional terminology and the ability to read and translate into Russian. Oral discussions in foreign language are held in English. Knowledge of the third language is usually insufficient for discussion	This model has just appeared
English as an investment	CLIL education should promote the growth of the student's income. The choice of a foreign language by means of economic calculation of optimal choice (usually on the basis of microeconomic models)	The student selects a language and teachers on the basis of economic calculation. Typically, a student is guided by business requirements	ESL& CLIL teachers' interaction depends on the choice of a student.	Depends on the choice of a student. In the process of classroom interaction, the student will receive only those skills that he/she needed as a good investment	This model is generally common in private practice. Private teachers fully focused on the students' problems. However, in the case of a model English as an investment, the prove of cost-effectiveness study of the English language should be more detailed, while many Russians learn English without this calculation under crowd influence.

Table 2. The most preferable conceptions of social roles of English for the creating/support a CLIL programme in the field of Russian university social sciences.

№	CLIL/ESL	The base education (the first university education)	Position	priority
1	CLIL	Economics	Associate Professor	1432
2	CLIL	Economics	Associate Professor	4132
3	CLIL	Economics	Professor	4213
4	CLIL	History	Associate Professor	2341
5	CLIL	History	Professor	2431
6	CLIL	Management	Senior Lecturer	4231
7	CLIL	Management	Associate Professor	4312
8	CLIL	Philosophy	Associate Professor	2341
9	CLIL	Philosophy	Professor	2314
10	CLIL	Philosophy	Professor	2341
11	CLIL	Politology (Politics Sciences)	Senior Lecturer	4312
12	CLIL	Politology (Politics Sciences)	Junior research fellow	1342
13	CLIL	Politology (Politics Sciences)	Associate Professor	2341
14	CLIL	Psychology	Senior research fellow	3214
15	CLIL	Sociology	Associate Professor	1324
16	CLIL	Sociology	Associate Professor	2341
17	CLIL	Sociology	Associate Professor	2341
18	CLIL	Sociology	Professor	4321
19	ESL	Linguistics	Senior Lecturer	1234
20	ESL	Linguistics	Associate Professor	1234
21	ESL	Linguistics	Associate Professor	3214
22	ESL	Linguistics	Associate Professor	1243
23	ESL	Linguistics	Associate Professor	1342
24	ESL	Pedagogics	Associate Professor	2341
25	ESL	Pedagogics	Professor	2314
26	ESL	Pedagogics (Chemistry in English)	Associate Professor	3241
27	ESL	Pedagogics (Chemistry in English)	Professor	3241
28	ESL	Philology	Senior Lecturer	3214
29	ESL	Philology	Associate Professor	1243
30	ESL	Philology	Associate Professor	3214
31	ESL	Philology	Professor	3214
32	ESL	Philology	Professor	3214
33	ESL	Philology	Professor	2341

The scale of ranks was distributed by the same experts. It is the following:

✚ Rank 1: +50%.

✚ Rank 2: +25%.

✚ Rank 3: +15%.

✚ Rank 4: +10%. Total: 100%.

In results, we have the following results of ranking (see Tables 3 and 4):

Table 3. The results of ranking of conceptions.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Conception1 (Global English, English is the main)	33	121,6667	16,56741	2,88402
Conception2 (Russian English-Russian variation of English)	33	130,1515	15,23179	2,65152
Conception3 (Multiculturalism: English among others)	33	127,8788	13,69479	2,38396
Conception4 (English as an investment)	33	120,3030	14,68095	2,55563

Table 4. The results of ranking of conceptions (Statistical significance of differences).

	Test Value = 0					
					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Lower	Upper
Conception1	42,187	32	,000	121,66667	115,7921	127,5412
Conception2	49,086	32	,000	130,15152	124,7506	135,5525
Conception3	53,641	32	,000	127,87879	123,0228	132,7348
Conception4	47,074	32	,000	120,30303	115,0974	125,5087

We can see that the concept of Russian English suddenly has the first place. Multiculturalism has the second place. The concept of global English and English as an investment have last position with quite big gap.

CONCLUSIONS.

During the current conflict between Russia and the West, there are many concerns associated with the fate of Russian and spread of the English language. We can confirm that all informants have serious concerns about the use of English language in the education system in Russia.

With regard to the objective, the experts have chosen main conceptions that present the social roles of English and can be a framework for CLIL education. It gives answer on our first research question: *What are the social roles of English language in the nowadays Russian universities in their connection with the process CLIL university education and classroom interaction?*

According to results, the following social roles of the English language and conception of CLIL teaching and classroom interaction can be acceptable in Russia (in order of preference):

1. Russian-English is a new conception with some internal contradictions, because it can be considered as the English language with typical Russian errors («mistaken English») or as one of World Englishes with its own rights. Russian-English can be studied in detail (that may eventually reduce the number of errors) and rebuilt in the variation of World Englishes aimed to service international communication with Russians. The main political objective of the conception is to reduce the dominance of the English native speakers and their priority with the attempt to separate International English language from Anglo-Saxon culture. This conception is officially unpopular (especially ESL teachers officially dislike it); however, it has quite wide spread and is the «mirror» of real practice. It has own features in organisation of CLIL interactions: subjects knowledge (and so CLIL teacher) is the main in ESL/CLIL teachers interactions. ESL teachers ask some advises how to improve professional lexicon in ESL courses. The last practice is the organization of the common evaluation of students' skills based on ESL classes. Therefore, the main focus is not on CLIL but on ESL classroom interaction in order to make it more relevant to CLIL. Subject CLIL courses are unmanageable for ESL teachers; however, CLIL teachers can have some concern about reading/translating/writing students' skills (not oral). That's why interaction has focused on discussing around scientific papers in English with future result in written papers (essay, final work, project of an article in English, translating to Russian). At the

same time, these students' papers are written according Russian, not English academic style, and can give nothing for understanding of English style.

2. English as one of the working languages of multilingual and multicultural society among many others with the same rights. The main political objective of the concept is to reduce the dominance of the English native speakers and their priority with the attempt to reduce using English and open doors for many working languages. This concept seems to be very attractive, but not very realistic. Experts have mentioned Chinese as the second required language, but none of them does not know the Chinese language. Since the practice is still very fragmented, experts tend to consider this concept as a guide to the future. It was named only one feature - the greater use of technology, electronic translators, distance education and new technologies, such as virtual reality for the organization of the multicultural dialogue.

3. English as the main Global language with the attempt to improve fluent English to the native-speaker level. Experts evaluate it as elite and as quite an utopian concept that reflects the dream of humankind of one common language and serves the interests of the global business, not interested in the differences in the labor force. As a result, it was suggested to leave it for the education of diplomats and business elite. Description of the lesson methodology reminds CLIL in Europe, but with more stringent requirements for the content of the subject.

4. English as an investment that should be assessed as an ordinary investment in financial instruments. It is a new attempt to separate English language from Anglo-Saxon culture and any culture, and to fit it into a financial model. The idea of experts is that the investments in English should bring more profit than, for example, in Chinese. Otherwise, Chinese should be selected for an investment. In spite of the general unpopularity, this conception has received tremendous support among CLIL teachers with basic economic and management education. Four from five experts gave it the first rank and one - the second rank.

With regard to the second research question «*What conception is preferable for future development?*» we cannot get clear answer.

According to experts, the Russian-English conception is preferable right now, but not *for the future*. This conception is highly stigmatized and it is regarded as a "false path", "the way of losers". Very few experts are inspired by the idea to build a Russian variation of English as one of the world Englishes. Despite its overall victory, only 11 of the 33 experts gave it the first rank. When they discussed it in the first interview, many experts stressed that this is what we can do, but it's not something that should be.

The main alternative for Russian-English is the Multilingual conception that fit English as a working language among others. It began to receive the government support in recent years. However, experts do not understand how to implement it in practice. They expressed hope for the development of high technologies, which will help make it more real. If they are right, we need to be prepared to working in distance, in virtual reality labs, and find a new way of classroom interaction in distance.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES:

1. Constitution of Russian Federation (2016). Moscow, Uridicheckaya literature.
2. Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content-and-Language Integrated Learning: From Practice to Principles. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 31: 182–204.
DOI:10.1017/S0267190511000092
3. Dafouz, E. and Guerrini. M. C. (2009). *CLIL across Educational Levels*. Madrid: Santillana Educación. Richmond Publishing, 2009. ISBN: 978-84-668-0259-8.
4. Fortanet-Gómez, I. (2013). *CLIL in Higher Education. Towards a Multilingual Language Policy*. Immaculada Fortanet-Gómez *Multilingual Matters*: Bristol.

5. Kachru, B. (1986). *The Alchemy of English: The Spread, Functions and Models of Non-native Englishes*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press
6. Kogut S. (2014). Discourse markers in Russian and German geological scientific papers. [In Russian]. *Tomsk State University Journal*. Tomsk. No. 380: 18-23.
7. Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation (2016). Official website of Ministry of Education of Russia. <http://минобрнауки.рф> <http://xn--80abucjiibhv9a.xn--p1ai>
8. Halliday, M.A.K. (2003). Written language, standard language, global language. *World Englishes*, 22(4): 405-418.
9. HSE. (2016). The official website of Higher School of Economics. URL: www.hse.ru
10. Hüttner, J., Dalton-Puffer, C., and Smit, U. (2013). The Power of Beliefs: Lay Theories and Their Influence on the Implementation of CLIL Programmes. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 16 (3): 267–84. DOI:10.1080/13670050.2013.777385.
11. Luczywek I. (2009). Three Models of Integrating School Subjects in Poland. In: *CLIL Practice: Perspectives from the Field*. David Marsh and Peeter Mehisto; Dieter Wolff, Rosa Aliaga, Tuula Asikainen, María Jesús Frigols-Martin, Sue Hughes, & Gisella Langé (eds.) University of Jyväskylä. P. 44-54.
12. Pavenkov, O., Pavenkov, V. & Rubtcova, M. (2015). The altruistic behavior: characteristic of future teachers of inclusive education in Russia. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. International Conference Psiworld 2014 - 5th Edition. Volume: 187 Pages: 10-15.
13. Proshina Z.G. (2006). Russia English: status, attitudes, problems the journal of Asia TEFL (3)2: 79-101
14. Proshina Z.G. (2014). Russian English: Myth or Reality? *Intercultural Communication Studies* XXIII: 1

15. Rivlina, A. (2015). Bilingual creativity in Russia: English-Russian language play. 34(3): 436–455.
16. Rubtsova, M. V., and Martyanova, N. A. (2014). Crisis of professional identity in the conditions of the market. [In Russian]. Vestnik St. Petersburg State University. Ser. 12. Psychology, Sociology, Education. 1, 177-182.
17. Safonova, O. (2000). Anglijskij lingvisticheskiy komponent v jazykovoј situacii sovremennoj Rossii. In: Teoreticheskaja i prikladnaja lingvistika. Jazyk i social'naja sreda. - Voronezh, 2: 68-77.
18. Sokolova A. (2015). O pidzhinizacii anglijskogo jazyka. Mir lingvistiki i kommunikacii. Izdatel'stvo: Tverskaja gosudarstvennaja sel'skohozjajstvennaja akademija (Tver') 1(42):113-118.
19. Yarovaya, I. (2015). Yarovaya offers to analyze current education standards. [in Russian] Official website of United Russia Party. Available at: <http://er.ru/news/127261/>
20. Voltchkova, L.T. & Minina, V. N. (1999). Strategies of studying poverty. SOTSIOLOGICHESKIE ISSLEDOVANIYA 1: 49-56.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Dafouz, E., Llinares, A., and Morton, T. (2010). CLIL across contexts: A scaffolding framework for CLIL teacher education. View(z) Vienna Working Papers, 19(3 - Special Issue), 12–20.
2. Dafouz, E. and Smit, U. (2014). Towards a dynamic conceptual framework for English-medium education in multilingual university settings, Applied Linguistics, doi:10.1093/applin/amu034.
3. El'meev, VY; Tarando, E.E. Social goods and socialization of property Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniya. 1: 41-48.

4. Europeans and Their Languages (2012). Special Eurobarometer 386/Wave EB 77.1.
5. Lorenzo García, A. & Mart, N. (2014). Coaching in organizations. Madrid: UNEC
6. Narayana Murthy, S.O. (2011). Communications in HRM. Noida: IASM
7. Pavenkov, O. & Pavenkova, M. (2016). Discourse analysis based on Martin and Rose's taxonomy: a case of promoting student discourse on the CLIL PhD programme in religion philosophy. *Revista Electrónica Espacio Teológico*. 10: 17 Pages: 129-139
8. Rubtsova, M. V. (2007). Manageability: Sociological theoretical analysis of notions. *Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniya*, 12, 32-38.
9. Rubtsova, M. V. (2011). Governmentability in interactions of subjects. Traditional and new practices. *Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniya*, 2, 46-53
10. Rubtsova, M. V. & Vasilieva, E. A. (2016). Conceptualization and operationalization of notion «trust» for applied sociological research. *Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniya*. Issue: 1 Pages: 58-65.
11. Rubtcova, M. P. & Pavenkov, O. V. (2016). Interaction of Russian and English academic genres in CLIL doctoral programmes of Management Sociology: a gap in the process of implementation. *Dilemas contemporáneos: Educación Política y Valores*.
12. Sanina, A. G. (2016). Patriotism of Russians and patriotic education in modern Russia. *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya*. 5, 44-53.
13. SPGU (2016). The official website of Saint-Petersburg State University. [In Russian] URL: <http://guestbook.spbu.ru/press-sekretar-spbgu/9364-komentarij-press-sluzhby-spbgu-gazete-delovoj-peterburg.html>
14. Usiaeva, A., Rubtcova, M., Pavlenkova, I.; et al. (2016). Sociological Diagnostics in Staff Competency Assessments: Evidence from Russian Museums. *International Journal of Production Management and Engineering*. 4: 1 Pages: 29-33.

15. Volchkova, L. T., & Pavenkova, M. V. (2002). Sociology of management. Theoretical principles. *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya*, 3, 141-144.
16. Yadov, V.A. (2003). *Strategija sociologicheskogo issledovanija*. M.: Akademkniga, Dobrosvet.

DATA OF THE AUTHOR:

1. Mariia Pavenkova Rubtcova. Associate Professor in the Department of Sociology at the Saint Petersburg State University, Russia. She got her Candidate (PhD) Degree in Sociology of Management in St. Petersburg State University and the Doctoral Degree in Herzen State Pedagogical University. Main research area is in the interdisciplinary approach to manageability. Author of *Sociological Theory of Manageability* (Book house, 2010), in addition to approximately 50 papers and articles in the field of social sciences. E-mail: infosoc@bk.ru

RECIBIDO: 10 de octubre del 2016.

APROBADO: 6 de noviembre del 2016.