Framework for CLIL materials for Russian heritage language learners

Anna Savinykh

Hokkaido University graduate school, Russian school in Sapporo, Japan
Email: savinanna@gmail.com,

2021

Anna Savinykh

Hokkaido University, Japan

Framework for CLIL materials for Russian heritage language learners

ABSTRACT

The increasing number of immigrants made heritage language learning a crucial issue of 21-st century education. The neediness for an effective educational approach in this field leaded to CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning). CLIL materials are high-contextualized by age, skills, language, subject content, etc. So, teachers ought to become materials designers to provide their learners with an effective tool of learning. Usually, teachers did not specifically train for materials design. Thus, easy-to-use framework for materials is essential to provide high-quality materials. This article provides a framework for CLIL materials design for Russian heritage language learners. The framework is based on the main materials design principles, heritage learners` pedagogical needs, and CLIL-specific materials design principles. It is written in the easy-to-use form of a checklist. The checklist has seven sections and 32 questions. The framework may be used in different contexts of teachers from different countries who use CLIL to teach the Russian heritage language.

Keywords: CLIL, heritage language, Russian, materials design, framework, pedagogical needs

1. Introduction

The increasing number of immigrants worldwide creates a need for dual-language education, where children have an opportunity to learn the language of the new country alongside their heritage language. The latest research shows that low proficiency in a heritage language - "mother tongue" - has a negative influence on overall educational achievement (Tegunimataka, 2021). To maintain and develop one's heritage language is therefore a crucial issue for the scholastic aptitude of immigrants.

The term "heritage language speaker" - as defined in North America - has both broad and narrow interpretations. The broad, sociolinguistic usage implies connections to the heritage language through

family or personal experience: "heritage language is a language of personal relevance other than English" (Fishman, 1999, cited in Van Deusen-Scholl, 2003, p. 216). The narrower usage is particularly relevant for bilingual speakers: "Heritage language learners are raised in a home where a non-English language is spoken; and to some degree bilingual in English and the heritage language" (Valdes, 2001). Whether English or otherwise, heritage language learners live in a country where the primary language differs from their mother tongue.

The exact population of the Russian diaspora, usually referred to as "compatriots" by Russian officials, is unknown. Estimates range from 25 to 150 million people; while 30 million is the figure most commonly cited (Gerasimova, 2019). The phenomenon is particularly prevalent in the past few decades. Increases in the number of Russian emigrants since the 1990s from the "third and fourth waves" (Pfandl, 1994) resulted in a significant growth in Russian heritage speakers across the world.

With the global increase in heritage language learners, there is an ever-greater need for developing successful educational methodologies that address their specific requirements. Among the proposals, Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) stands out. Although CLIL has been part of the heritage language learners discourse for nearly a decade, there is scant theoretical or applied research on the technique (Anderson, 2009; Kavanagh, 2020; Charalampidi et al., 2017). Still, pedagogy content creators have utilized CLIL features in their educational materials (Kumatrenko, 2020; Tulupova, 2021, etc.). In 2021, as CLIL became more widespread in Russian language education both for foreign language acquisition and for heritage learners, the first CLIL exam for teachers was offered at Saint-Petersburg State University, named "CLIL expert in Russian as a foreign language and for bilingual children" (in collaboration by Saint-Petersburg State University, Parma State University and Tel-Aviv University). In Russian, "bilingual children" usually means Russian-speaking children who live abroad, as well as the children of immigrants or ethnic minorities who live in Russia and may be polyglots.

Although CLIL techniques are being used in teaching Russian, there are no standardized, printed CLIL materials for teachers of Russian heritage learners to utilize. In most cases, teachers are expected to create the educational resources by themselves. As such, there remains a strong pedagogical need

for CLIL-specific materials for the successful education of Russian heritage learners. The role of a teacher as a materials designer has become crucial nowadays because materials are an essential tool of teaching and learning. Nevertheless, teachers usually do not take special training for writing materials, so they need an easy-to-use framework based on learners` needs, including the main principles of materials design and CLIL-specific features.

This research uses CLIL frameworks, criteria, principles, and checklists as a basis for creating the specific framework for CLIL materials for Russian heritage language learners.

2. Theory and method

The following is a literature review of three different fields - material designs, heritage language learning, and CLIL to provide a valuable pedagogical framework for Russian heritage language learners. Learning materials can be defined as information and knowledge represented in a variety of media and formats that support the achievement of intended learning outcomes (Mehisto, 2012). In this article, "learning materials" refers to a set of such materials for use in a lesson, a unit, or a course in the form of worksheets and coursebooks.

Snyder argues that a well-executed literature review grounds future research and theory. She suggests that it is "highly desirable" to conduct literature reviews that provide new theories or support well-grounded research agendas or propositions which other researchers can utilize to advance the field (Snyder, 2019, p. 339). Watson and Webster posited that the most challenging but necessary element is "extending beyond the literature search and summary of past research to the development of theoretical directions for the future" (Watson & Webster, 2020, p. 129)   In other words, literature reviews are critical towards the creation of new theoretical knowledge.

Furthermore, Snyder (2019) defined the classification of literature reviews as systematic, semi-systematic, and integrative. The classification is based on objectives, research inquiries, search

strategies, sample characteristics, analysis and evaluations, and contributions of reviewers. This article is based on the integrative classification of research, including:

· To critique and synthesize relevant research articles and books

· Analysis of qualitative sample characteristics

· Analysis of critical features vis-à-vis an overall framework

Toracco (2005) states that most integrative literature reviews address two general topics—mature versus emerging topics. This research addresses the new, emerging topic: how to design a framework for CLIL materials for heritage language learners. Although researchers have considered CLIL perspectives in the education of heritage language learners (Anderson, 2009, Kavanagh, 2020, Charalampidi et al., 2017, etc.) as well as materials designers use CLIL features (Kumatrenko, 2020; Tulupova, 2021, etc.), there has not been adequate research into defining specific CLIL characteristics for a specific subset of learners, i.e. Russian heritage language learners.

The following is based upon the "checklist for writing an integrative literature review" proposed by Torocco. The research consisted of positing questions, selecting literature, analysis, synthesizing results, and finally, creating the framework through logic and conceptional reasoning (Torocco, 2005, p. 365).

The literature review will help to answer the following questions:

1. What are the main principles of materials design we can use to create the educational framework Russian heritage language learners?

2. What specific features of Russian heritage learners do we have to consider in the creation of the framework?

3. What varieties of CLIL materials design principles exist, how have they changed over time, and which type is currently preferred by teachers who utilize CLIL?

The answers to these questions will be the basis for providing a new framework, and will assist in extrapolating valuable findings from one field of research to another.

The literature to be analyzed is a data of an integrative literature review (Torocco, 2005), so the parameters of the selected articles and books need to be clarified. Selections were sourced from the database of JSTOR, Researchgate, and Semantic Scholar (cited more than once) by the keywords "materials design," "CLIL+materials," "heritage+learners+needs," "heritage+learners+materials." Also, we reviewed all relevant articles from the "Heritage Language Journal" which is published by the National Heritage Language Resource Center at UCLA. This journal is published up to three times annually, which amounts to 38 issues cumulatively from 2003 to 2020, including two special issues focused on Russian heritage learning published in 2008 and 2019. Further issues focused on the "Problems of Ontolinguistics" (in Russian, from 2008 to 2018, missing only 2010) to define heritage language learners, their general pedagogical needs, as well as the specific needs of Russian heritage language learners. Ontolinguistics in the Russian context is a field of research related to children's speech development among native, second or heritage language development. Furthermore, EFL (English as a Foreign Language)/ESL (English as a Second Language) materials design and CLIL materials-related articles and books were selected on the following basis: did they have articulated guidelines, criteria, or principles for materials design? Searches were conducted in English for EFL/ESL and CLIL materials design, and in English and Russian for heritage language learner research.

The research will provide primary materials design principles for foreign and second language education, materials design principles for heritage language learners, and CLIL materials design principles as a basis for a framework for CLIL materials for Russian heritage language learners.

3. Principles of materials design in foreign and second language teaching

3.1 Main principles of materials design

Materials are an essential tool to language learning. Many materials are available in the fields of EFL and ESL. However, materials development remains necessary for implementing new theoretical

and evidence-based findings. Mishan and Timmis harped on the dangers of "cloning" materials from previous practices and argued on the importance of principles-based materials design (Mishan and Timmis, 2015).

Hall argued that there is one crucial question we need to ask ourselves before planning and writing materials for language teaching: "How do we think people learn languages?" (Hall, 1995, p.8, cited in Tomlinson, 2013). This question is essential as it highlights that one of the departure points of the materials design paradigm depends on the educational approach. An approach is defined by Anthony (1963) as a set of correlative assumptions dealing with the nature of language teaching and learning; it is axiomatic. Most of the materials in EFL and ESL use the communicative approach, which considers interaction as both the goals and means of language learning.

Analyzing different frameworks for materials design in literature, we found that most of them include one or more of the following:

- requires analysis as the starting point

- articulates the main principles to guide the writing of materials

- include components of a unit or a lesson

Next, we revised some of the frameworks to find out what principles they propose.

For example, one of the most cited articles - Howard and Major (2004; 36,873 reads and 76 citations in Researchgate, 258 citations in Google scholar), essentially inspired by Nunan (1988a) - iterates these guidelines for designing effective EFL materials:

1. English language teaching materials should be contextualized to the curriculum they intend to address, to the experiences, realities, and first languages of the learners, and also to topics and themes that provide meaningful, purposeful uses for the target language

2. Materials should stimulate interaction and be generative in terms of language

3. English language teaching materials should encourage learners to develop learning skills and strategies

4. English language teaching materials should allow for a focus on form as well as function

5. English language teaching materials should offer opportunities for integrated language use

6. English language teaching materials should be authentic in terms of the text and in terms of the task (real-world tasks)

7. English language teaching materials should link to each other to develop a progression of skills, understandings, and language items

8. English language teaching materials should be attractive

9. English language teaching materials should have appropriate instructions

10. English language teaching materials should be flexible

As we can see, these guidelines focus on the materials themselves (attractive, flexible, authentic), the purposes of learning (progression of skills, understandings, developing learning skills and strategies), and the specificities of tasks (authentic, appropriate instructions, stimulating interactions).

There are also authors who use lesson plans as a framework. Rozul provides a lesson format with components such as starter, input, general information, language focus, and tasks (Rozul, 1995; cited in Tomlinson, 2013).

Other authors focus on skills of which the materials are expected to develop. Flores outlines a lesson format with primary stages such as listening with understanding, using grammar in oral interaction, reading for understanding, writing, and literature (Flores, 1995; cited in Tomlinson, 2013).

Tomlinson argues that the framework must be more "principled, coherent, and flexible" than many other frameworks found in the literature of material development, many of which do not "justify their staging and sequencing" (Tomlinson, 2013). He proposed 20 material design paradigms based on six principles of language acquisition (Tomlinson, 2010).

Tomlinson offers another approach to classifying teaching materials: text-driven, task-based, and CLIL-based. A core written/spoken/visual text is used in a text-driven approach to drive the unit of

materials to a predetermined teaching point. Tomlinson proposes these guidelines for text-driven materials: selecting and experiencing the text as a reader while reflecting on the teacher`s own experience of the text, followed by activities such as readiness, initial response, intake response, development response, and input response. He also provides a framework for a task-based approach: learners are set tasks based on meaning rather than form. The goal is thus successful task completion rather than explicit language learning. A task-based approach focuses on non-linguistic outcomes, sets an achievable challenge, requires language be put to use to achieve specific outcomes, replicates real-life use of language, and has both a learner-goal and a teacher-target. The framework includes readiness activities, task-related experiences, personal responses to the experiences, task specifications, task performances, and the discovery of language features. Tomlinson notes that he utilizes both text-driven and task-based approaches for CLIL too, but, as we will see below, the approaches are understood differently by CLIL material design writers and researchers (Tomlinson, 2013).

Thus, the main principles of language teaching materials are:

- Dependent on theories of educational approach (how language is supposed to be learned according to educational approaches)

- Text-driven, task-based, project-based or content-based

- Dependent on analysis of the learners

- Contextualized to the curriculum and educational features of the learners

- Used to develop different language skills and strategies

- Employed via specific lesson components in set orders

- Based on providing specific tasks to maintain lesson goals

These principles will also provide a basic framework for CLIL materials for Russian heritage language learners.

3.2 Principles of materials design for heritage language learners

3.2.1 Pedagogical needs of heritage language learners

As mentioned above, analysis remains crucial for material design. Therefore, before planning and writing CLIL materials for Russian heritage learners, we have to clarify the pedagogical needs of heritage language learners and Russian heritage language learners in particular. "Pedagogical needs" of heritage language learners is defined by specific needs in the teaching process related to the learners` linguistic proficiencies, attitudes, and educational context.

The importance of needs analysis was introduced in the 1960s and grew in popularity in the 1980s, especially in connection with the ESP (English for Special Purposes) movement. As there are different types of needs analysis, for the basis of this article, the "needs" are understood to be the pedagogical needs of learners. Richards argues that the first step of needs analysis is to set the purpose. Considering the CLIL is an approach mainly used for foreign language learning, the purpose is to find the difference between the pedagogical needs of foreign language learners and heritage language learners (Richards, 2001).

Revising Montrul (2012), Valdes (2001), Kudryavtseva (2009), Beaudrie et al. (2014), and Carreira and Kagan (2011) provide a model of language features of heritage language speakers.

Table 1. Comparing model of language features of monolingual native speaker,
heritage language speaker, and foreign language learner

	Monolingual native speaker	**Heritage language speaker**	Foreign language learner
The order of language acquisition	First language	**First language**	Second language
The way of acquisition	Unconscious, in the natural environment (family and society)	**Unconscious, in the natural environment (mostly in the family)**	Conscious, in the classroom
The language input	Unlimited	**Limited (only family**	Limited (mostly in the

		or family and limited community and travels to the language speaking country)	classroom)
The order of skills acquisition	First oral, later literacy	**First oral, later literacy or only oral**	Oral and literacy at the same time
Language of formal learning	Mother tongue	**Usually, the language of the living country, sometimes the heritage language or/and another language (English or other language of international schools)**	Mother tongue, sometimes foreign language (immersion, EMI, CBI, CLIL, etc.)
Language proficiency	Age appropriate	**Varies**	Varies
Metalinguistic knowledge	Have some (from the school learning age)	**Most often don`t have**	Have some

The analysis shows that heritage language speakers need to develop their literacy, academic language and be aware of various metalinguistic concepts that support language learning.

Unlike typical EFL/ESL learners, there exists a complex range of language proficiency among heritage language learners. Some learners can only understand the heritage language when they hear it, others can understand and speak, while others can also read and write (Nakajima, 2016). For example, Carreira (2004) defines four different types of heritage language speakers depending on their language proficiency on a spectrum of non-speaking learner to nearly monolingual. Valdes (2005) defines a heritage language speaker as a bilingual person whose language level is between monolingual A and monolingual B with the same level of language proficiency in the middle. Although language

proficiency has many dimensions, the picture is not flat; it is multi-dimensional. Teachers should understand and embrace a diversity of skills to provide learning support on different levels based on the learners` actual proficiency.

Usually listening and speaking skills are more developed than literacy, while there remains a big gap between the receptive versus the productive skills (Polinski, 2018). Heritage language teachers may be well served to provide more output time for learners as compared foreign language learners.

There exist two phenomena which may influence heritage language learners. First is the incomplete acquisition that is caused by a lack of frequency and quality of input across various stages of language acquisition (Montrul, 2008). Second is language attrition: a loss of "morphological complexity, phonetic and phonological processing, lexical and morphosyntactic influence from the dominant language, and a reduction in registers of use" (Flores, 2010). Therefore, heritage language teachers ought to provide textured methodologies for incomplete internalization of language skills along with "revitalizing" features which weakened language acquisition through attrition.

Kagan and Dillon provide the following heritage language learners` pedagogical needs:

- Pronunciation: typically not required

- Vocabulary: age-appropriate, literary, academic, formal

- Grammar: macro-approach (i.e. by concept)

- Reading: relatively large and complex texts almost from the very beginning

- Writing: high degree of internal grammar which allows expansive writing at the early stages of instruction; macro-approach to writing which concentrates on the content and gradually improves spelling, grammar, and stylistics

- Speaking: macro-approach, i.e., emphasis on monologue and discussion

- Listening: macro-approach, i.e., full range of native language input, i.e., movies, documentaries, lectures

- Culture: macro-approach, i.e., full range of native language input, audio, visual, and print

These pedagogical requirements are most language-related, although motivation, identity-related issues, and attitude are also essential in their learning process. While acknowledging the importance

of identity and outlook inputs, these factors will not be included in the framework for materials design for heritage language learners at this time and should be the aim of subsequent research (Kagan & Dillon, 2003, p. 81-82).

Before creating the framework, a clarification of the pedagogical needs of Russian language learners is required.

3.2.2 Pedagogical needs of Russian heritage language learners

Specific pedagogical needs of Russian heritage language learners may include the following:

- Linguistic: connected with Russian language development

- Cultural: connected with ethnic and cultural influences

- Contextual: connected with the educational context of international Russian schools

The leading journals on Russian heritage language are currently Heritage Language Journal and Problems of Ontolinguistics. The latter is mainly in Russian and was explored specifically for data-based issues reseaching the features of Russian heritage language speakers who live in countries other than the post-Soviet countries where there are strong traditions of Russian language teaching and many Russian-speaking people within the local populaces. There are 76 Russian heritage language-related articles in Problems of Ontolinguistics (24 in the German context, 18 – Finnish, 13 – English, 9 – Dutch, 5 – Sweden, and 12 – another language context); while the Heritage Language Journal has 18 articles on Russian heritage language (15 – in English context, 1 – Hebrew, 1 – Finnish, and 1 is based on English, Hebrew, Finnish, and German context). Research in Problems of Ontoliguistics is mostly about children, as only three of the articles are based on adult heritage learners` data (all from the USA). On the other hand, the Heritage Language Journal provides information mainly about adolescent and adult heritage language speakers; only one article is based on children learners.

Of the articles in Problems of Ontoliguistics, there are various focuses, including morphosyntax (21), especially gender; vocabulary (11), input strategies (10), phonetics (9), language transfer (5),

reading (5), writing (5), and impaired speech (5). Three articles are longitude studies. Research focuses in the Heritage Language Journal are morphosyntax (9), especially gender; heritage language acquisition features (5), writing (2), and phonetics (1).

The findings show a difficulty of acquisition of the Russian morphosyntax system (Minkov et al., 2019, Kagan&Dillon, 2003, Polinsky, 2008, Protassova&Rodina, 2018 etc.) and issues with literacy (Kolodina, 2013, 2018, Korneev&Protassova, 2013, Bragina, 2018, etc.). The synthetic-inflectional structure of Russian language can be more understandable when children use their internal grammar sense, or teachers can - in the case of children with incomplete grammar acquisition - focus on when to use prefixes and suffixes during lessons and in everyday life. "Focus on form instruction" maintains a balance between "focus on forms" and "focus on meaning" by calling on teachers and learners to attend to form, when necessary, yet within a communicative classroom environment" (Saeidi et al., 2012). Functional reading of different texts supports understanding texts that may be more difficult than children could understand without using these strategies.

Cultural needs relate to ethnic and cultural backgrounds that are often diverse in the context of Russian heritage learners. Ivanova-Sullivan (2019) describes the diversity of USA Russian heritage speakers as some of them have Ukrainian, Belarus, and other post-Soviet country`s roots, as opposed to purely Russian origins. Moreover, Russian-speaking learners born in Russia does not always mean they are ethnic Russians as there are approximately 180 ethnicities across greater Russia. An example can be seen in the Japanese repatriates from Sakhalin who are ethnically Korean Japanese citizens, yet consider Russian as their mother tongue, as described by Paichadze (2018).

Russian schools abroad provide heritage language learning in different forms. However, research made in 2021 across 150 schools in 30 countries shows that most of the schools have the following features (Results of research of Russian schools abroad, 2021):

- Small number of classes (28-30 hours a year per subject)

- Module teaching: topics are grouped in blocks

- Fewer subjects than schools in Russia

- Integrating various subjects in multi-discipline courses

- Student autonomous learning requiring homework

- Involvement of parents as an essential part of the educational process

- Broad array of complementary activities such as learning Russian through art, drama, astronomy, science, projects, contests, etc.

The features of Russian schools are not specifically a part of the pedagogy, although they must be considered when creating a framework for Russian heritage language learners, because they are a part of teaching context.

3.2.3 Framework for materials for Russian heritage language learners

Upon analysis of the above Russian heritage language learners' needs and principles of materials design, I propose the following pedagogical framework:

- Rely on theories of educational learning (language acquisition with regards to educational approaches)

- Be text-driven, task-based, project-based or content-based

- Be contextualized on actual learners` skill levels and cognizant that skills may developed unevenly

- Pronunciation: dependent on the needs of particular learners

- Vocabulary: age-appropriate, literary, academic, formal

- Grammar: macro-approach (i.e., by concept), "focus on form instructions"

- Listening: provide rich and authentic input, full range of native language input, i.e., movies, documentaries, lectures

- Speaking: macro-approach, i.e., emphasis on monologue, discussion, and other genres which are not used in typical daily communication

- Reading: relatively large and complex texts almost from the very beginning, using techniques of functional reading and various reading strategies

- Writing: high degree of internal grammar allowing for expansive writing assignments at the early stages of instruction; macro-approach to writing concentrating on content and gradually improving spelling, grammar, and stylistics

- Paying more attention to output activities than materials for foreign language learners

- Culture: macro-approach, i.e., full range of native language input, audio, visual, and print; developing cultural awareness with consideration to the diversity of the cultural and ethnic backgrounds of learners

- Developing diverse learning skills and strategies

- Providing specific lesson components and their progression

- Providing specific tasks to achieve lesson goals

- Using the integration of various subjects and content-based teaching

- Be developed for small number of classes

- Consider implementing homework for autonomous learning

This framework is based on the principles of materials design, the pedagogical needs of Russian heritage language learners, and the features of Russian schools abroad so that it may be used not only in the CLIL approach but also in different contexts of Russian heritage language teaching.

3.3 Principles of CLIL material design and their evolution

3.3.1 Key features of CLIL approach

CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) is an educational approach born in Europe, where David Marsh proposed the acronym "CLIL" in 1994. The approach has its roots in immersion teaching in Canada, LAC (Language Across the Curriculum: exploring connections between language and cognition and the role of language in the curriculum for native speakers) in England, American content-based teaching, and other practices based in Europe (Hanesova, 2015). CLIL has varied definitions but, in this article, we will use the one proposed by Coyle et al. (2010): "CLIL is a dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language."

Key features of CLIL help to understand which principles of materials design are CLIL-specific and which are not. CLIL is dual-focused on subject content and language. However, in the planning stage, we should plan across "*three dimensions*" of content, cognition, and language (Ball et al., 2015). Also, we can enact the "*4Cs*": content, cognition, communication (language), and culture/community (Coyle et al., 2010).

CLIL is theoretically based mainly on constructivism (especially such features as the zone of proximal development, scaffolding, active learning, the role of dialogue and group, the context of community, etc.) and cognitive theory (especially such features as higher-order and lower-order thinking skills of Bloom taxonomy (HOTs and LOTs), basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) and cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP) of Cummins, etc.). The main aim from a constructivist point of view is the development of a learner. In CLIL, the development bases on content and language.

CLIL is first and foremost an educational approach. Returning to the axiomatic nature learning definition by Anthony (1963), CLIL`s understanding of language learning is based on two principles:

1) language is learned when it is used: "learn as you use, use as you learn" – not "learn now, use later" (Mehisto et al., 2008, p. 11)

2) language is learned naturally through subject content

Thus, returning to Hall`s question "How do we learn a language?" CLIL offers a different answer than the communicative approach where interaction is simultaneously the principle means and the goal of language learning. In the CLIL approach, interaction is also the means, but the main goal is learning new subject content through applied language acquisition.

Mehisto et al. (2008) define the core features of the CLIL methodology as multiple focuses, in a safe and enriching learning environment, learned authentically, through active learning, scaffolding, and co-operating.

Active learning, scaffolding, and co-operating are considered an essential part of materials design because, as will be shown later, CLIL is task-driven. So, active learning and scaffolding in some parts ought to be reflected in materials.

Active learning is "a method of learning in which students are actively or experientially involved in the learning process and where there are different levels of active learning, depending on student involvement" (Bonwell & Eison, 1991). Often it is correlated with group work or work in pairs where the main feature is alternating roles. The teacher is not the primary source of knowledge, but instead becomes the facilitator of the learning process. The main advantages of active learning are the high motivation of students and high efficiency. There are many valuable lists of activities with examples and theoretical explanations in "CLIL activities" espoused by Dale and Tanner (2012).

Scaffolding "is a process that enables a child or novice to solve a problem, complete a task, or achieve goals that are beyond their individual efforts (capabilities)" (Wood et al., 1976). In other words, it makes it possible to make the zone of proximal development a zone of actual development. Scaffolding helps students understand and use subject content and language, which is beyond their level of knowledge and language skills. It is crucial in CLIL because learners have to develop three dimensions (content knowledge, language skills, and cognitive skills) at the same lesson. Scaffolding is usually understood as a part of the interaction of teacher and learner (Van de Pol, 2010). In the CLIL context, it can be valuable to use the terms "hard" (embedded in materials) and "soft" (through interaction on the lesson) scaffolding (Saye & Brush, 2002).

Embedded (hard) scaffolding is carried out by visualization and instructions. *Visual or graphic organizers and language frames* become essential for CLIL materials (Bentley, 2010). They support understanding of input and provide help for output.

Language is a crucial feature for CLIL and usually is described as language triptych: *"language of learning," "language for learning,"* and *"language through learning"* (Coyle et al., 2010). "Language of learning" is the language needed for learners to access basic concepts and skills relating to the subject theme or topic (terms, functional vocabulary, necessary language structures). Language for learning focuses on the language needed to operate (the language of instructions, expressions for discussion, work in pairs, etc.) Language through learning is the language required by individual learners during the learning process; it cannot always be predicted and is born in communication between learners or learners and teacher (feedback from the teacher, the evaluative statement of the working partner, etc.).

CLIL gives particular attention to two different types of language: everyday language, or *basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS)*, and academic language, or *cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP)*. These definitions were primarily invented for immersion education by Cummins (1979). CALP is crucial for learning concepts of subject content; still, BICS are necessary for communication between learners and between learners and teachers.

Language is a vehicle for subject content, but both language and content are vehicles for cognitive skills (Ball et al., 2015). CLIL uses the terms of cognitive Bloom taxonomy, usually in the revised form of Anderson et al. (2001). *Lower-order* (remembering, understanding, applying) and *higher-order* (analyzing, evaluating, creating) *thinking skills of Bloom taxonomy (HOTs and LOTs)* became goals for lesson planning in CLIL (Bentley, 2010). Thus, CLIL does not have a monopoly for its key features taken one by one. Still, the set of them, framed appropriately for this approach, make CLIL an effective way to learn.

3.3.2 Main criteria, principles, checklists for CLIL materials and their evolution

Principles of CLIL materials design were proposed in different books and articles. By analysis of literature, 12 articles and books were selected that provide articulated principles, criteria, framework, checklist, or scheme for materials design.

We can suppose that two reasons had caused strong interest in the materials design: vary of context (national curricula, different subjects, age of learners, target languages) and a lack of materials from the beginning. The scarcity of materials was caused by the relatively fast implementation of CLIL lessons in Europe.

As Marsh noticed,

> *"Though often driven by grassroots demand for grater multiple language proficiency, its* (CLIL`s) *growth has also resulted from top-down measures in certain countries. It has become a socio-pedagogical means by which to adapt one part of educational delivery to achieve the best performance in the learning of languages that suits the times, particularly in relation to the labor markets, social cohesion, and the changing aspirations of young people, within the border-free European context"* (Marsh, 2002, p.10).

Marsh also points out the neediness of Internet Material Bank (Marsh, 2002, p. 202). Mehisto et al. (2008) also mention the shortage of materials as a hurdle for good practices in CLIL. Nowadays, this number significantly increased; nevertheless, there is still a lack of materials, and materials design is considered as a sign of competence of CLIL teachers (Gondoavá, 2015).

This situation led to the need for CLIL materials design principles. The main principle of materials design is that they are content-based, and there is a difference between text-driven or task-based materials for EFL/ESL.

Cambridge ESOL developed an additional module for Teaching Knowledge Test (TKT): CLIL that provides certificates "for teachers who teach different curricular subjects through the medium of English and for English teachers who use curriculum content in their teaching" (Bentley, 2010, p.1).

There are no material design principles; still, it provides CLIL lesson planning framework and principles of materials selection and adaptation. These principles, written in checklist form (Bentley, 2010, p. 52), can be used to understand what materials characteristics are essential. Some of them can be used in any language classroom: "appropriate for the age of the learners and the stage of learning," "fit the purpose, match the learning outcomes," "varied in skills, tasks, interaction." Others are more CLIL-orientated but still not CLIL-specific: "collaborative, challenging and achievable," "motivating and complete." CLIL-specific principles are "linked to CLIL aims, consider content, communication, culture," "progressive in subject content, in language, in cognitive demands, in task demands," "supportive, have word banks, language frames, and visuals."

The lesson plan includes the introduction of content (theme), teaching aims, and ten extensive zones of planning: learning outcomes based on know/be able/be aware model; assessment; communication including revised and new vocabulary, structures, and functions; examples of communication; cognition; examples of cognition; citizenship; examples of citizenship; resources; procedures (the content of activities) (Bentley, 2010, p. 32-33). Creating detailed plans helps to visualize particular parts and stages of planning lessons but make it hard to focus on the main characteristics of the materials design.

In the same year, Coyle et al. (2010) provided a template for planning in CLIL: a Tool Kit "to map CLIL practices for their own context and learners," a lesson plan with teacher's notes, a unit checklist, a checklist for text, and a variety of materials examples. As Tomlinson (2013) considered necessary, these steps were based on theoretical issues of CLIL. Also, the lesson plan and the checkpoints are realistic and clearly articulated.

Critical questions for generating a Tool Kit consist of the following six stages that include 78 questions:

1. Vision (constructing global goals): creating a team of teachers and setting goals

2. Context (school, learners, community): creating one's own model for CLIL based on a specific context. In this case we can analyze only from the perspective of the school; there is no need to analyze from the learners' perspective

3. Unit planning consisting of 4 steps ("4Cs" planning): considering content, connecting content and cognition, communication (defining language learning, using language of learning, language for learning, and language through learning), developing cultural awareness and expanding opportunities.

4. Preparation (design of appropriate materials and tasks). Although here we can see the word "design," the focus is about finding and adapting materials, not specifically the creation of materials

5. Monitoring and evaluating (monitoring the progress of learners and evaluating the effectiveness of classroom practices): building summative and formative feedback, use CLIL matrix for materials and task audit, etc.

6. Reflection and inquiry: the connection between theory and practices, reviewing the results, sharing practices and materials with other teachers, etc.

Thus, the material design for CLIL purposes in 2010 was primarily understood as lesson planning using theoretical principles of CLIL. The materials and resources are expected to be researched, accumulated and adapted, rather than created.

This situation changed in 2012 when Mehisto (2012) proposed the following 10 CLIL-specific criteria for producing CLIL learning materials:

1. Make the learning intentions (language, content, learning skills) and learning process visible to students

2. Systematically foster academic language proficiency

3. Foster learning skills development and learner autonomy

4. Include self, peer, and other types of formative assessment

5. Help create a safe learning environment

6. Foster cooperative learning

7. Seek ways of incorporating authentic language and authentic language use

8. Foster critical thinking

9. Foster cognitive fluency through scaffolding of a) content, b) language, c) learning skills development, helping students to reach well beyond what they could do on their own

10. Help to make learning meaningful

1, 3, 4, 10 have metacognitive aims, 2 and 7 – language aims, 8 – cognitive aim, 6 and 9- about procedures on the lesson. The small number of materials criteria supports a general view on materials design and helps focus on the essential features of materials, so these criteria may be hard to use in practice.

Some researchers provided only a small but significant part of materials planning. Banegas (2017) proposed a "micro-framework" for activities planning: they should move from lower-order to higher-order thinking skills, and materials should also scaffold new language and content based on familiar language and content. The following framework is based on this view: from familiar language to familiar content, to new content, to new language.

A few years later, after Mehisto`s criteria, Ball et al. (2015, 2018) proposed seven materials design principles:

1. The primacy of "task" (task-text relationship)

2. Prioritizing the three dimensions of content

3. Guiding input and supporting output

4. Scaffolding and embedding

5. Making key language salient

6. The concept of "difficulty"

7. Thinking in sequences

The most important part of the principles is that they consider CLIL lessons as a part of the extensive educational process and connect to the previous knowledge and follow-up usage of learned conceptions, language, and procedures. The principles are very conceptional and clear, which helps teachers focus on the most essential points. The task is a priority for Ball (2015, 2018), so returning to

Tomlinson (2013), CLIL may be called a content-based task-driven approach. The concept of difficulty relied on relativeness of task difficulty more than on difficulty of text (Ball, 2018): teacher can use effortless task for difficult text (e.g., to find the letters A) or a very difficult task for a simple poem (e.g., discuss the poem regarding English Civil War).

The simpleness of this framework, on the other side, expects a teacher to know well all the key principles of CLIL. Active involving different teachers in materials design began to provide in last five years more long but easily readable checklists for creation and evaluation of materials (Wood, 2020, Lopez-Medina, 2021, The Guidelines on How to Develop CLIL Materials and Lesson Plans in Primary Schools, 2016, McLoughlin, 2021) or schemes (Suhandoko, 2019, Sarip et al., 2018).

Thus, the framework for CLIL materials for Russian heritage language learners relies on principles and criteria of CLIL materials, reflects the considerations of being easily applied by not very experienced CLIL teachers, and is provided in the form of a checklist.

4. Framework for CLIL materials for Russian heritage language learners

Revising the main principles of material design, the pedagogical needs of Russian heritage language learners, the principles of CLIL materials design, I propose the following framework made in checklist form (32 questions).

➢ Is it CLIL materials?
  ✓ Are the materials content-based?
  ✓ Is the content authentic?
  ✓ Are they planned in three dimensions: 1) content, 2) cognition skills, 3) language?
  ✓ Do they use procedures based on LOTs and HOTs? Are they age-appropriated?
  ✓ Is the lesson planned from familiar language to familiar content, to new content, to a new language?
➢ Are the materials made for heritage language learners?

- ✓ Are they contextualized on actual learners` skills and knowledge level and considered that different skills might be developed unevenly?

- ✓ Are they developed for small hours of lessons in a year?

- ✓ Are the output activities more than input-related tasks?

- ✓ Do the materials consider homework support?

➢ Do they develop metacognitive skills?

- ✓ Do the materials make the learning intentions (language, content, learning skills) and process visible to students?

- ✓ Do the materials consider the sequences of concepts?

- ✓ Do the materials support age-appropriate metacognitive skills and developing effective learning strategies?

➢ Language

- ✓ Is the language authentic?

- ✓ Is the language planned as "language of learning," "language for learning," and "language through learning"?

- ✓ Is the language planned as BICS and CALP language?

- ✓ Do the materials use different types and genres of texts?

- ✓ Pronunciation: is it correlated with the needs of learners?

- ✓ Vocabulary: age-appropriate, literary, academic, formal

- ✓ Grammar: macro-approach (i.e. by concept), "focus on form instructions"

- ✓ Listening: provide rich authentic input, full range of native language input, i.e., movies, documentaries, lectures

- ✓ Speaking: macro-approach, i.e., emphasis on a monologue, discussion, and other genres which are not used in typical daily communication

- ✓ Reading: relatively large and complex texts from the beginning, using functional reading techniques and different reading strategies

- ✓ Writing: high degree of internal grammar allows expansive writing assignments at early stages of instruction; macro-approach to writing concentrating on the content and gradually improving spelling, grammar and stylistics

- ➢ Culture

- ✓ Culture: macro-approach, i.e., full range of native language input, audio, visual, and print

- ✓ Develop cultural awareness and consider the diversity of cultural and ethnic backgrounds of learners

- ➢ Tasks and activities

- ✓ Are the materials task-driven?

- ✓ Is the difficulty of the tasks appropriate?

- ✓ Do they help to make learning meaningful?

- ✓ Are they engaging and motivating?

- ✓ Do most activities provide active learning?

- ➢ Embedding and scaffolding

- ✓ Is the content input supported well by embedding graphic organizers and other types of visualization?

- ✓ Do the materials foster cognitive fluency through scaffolding of a) content, b) language, c) learning skills development, helping students to reach well beyond what they could do on their own?

5. Discussion

In the last ten years, the number of learning materials for Russian heritage learners have increased significantly. Some of the materials are printed by publishers, but most are customized for the learners` specific context. Teachers who design materials in some cases use CLIL techniques, but since large-scale standardization of CLIL is lacking, the outcomes are uncertain. Like was the case in Europe where CLIL was first conceived, the fast implementation of this educational approach caused a paucity

of learning materials across subjects, age-groups, skill levels, language proficiency, and the cognitive skills of learners. We are now witnessing the same CLIL materials design shortcomings in Russian education, both in the fields of Russian as a foreign language and Russian heritage language learning.

CLIL requires highly-customized learning materials. Most teachers are not familiar with CLIL approach principles, including CLIL materials design, and thus the pedagogical outcomes are uncertain. The availability of an easy-to-use framework would help teachers design effective materials in less time with better results. As there is no such framework now in use, we advocate the creation and adoption of a CLIL framework based on the analysis of materials design concepts, heritage language learners` contexts, and CLIL-specific principles.

The proposed framework for CLIL materials for Russian heritage language learners is based on conceptual, theoretical and practical findings in the fields of language acquisition, heritage language, and CLIL educational approach. The materials are content-based and task-driven, using different text genres to provide the learners with age-appropriate knowledge of content, language, and cognitive skills. The framework supports metacognitive and cognitive skills development, provides the order of planning materials, and sets the language parameters based on heritage language learners' pedagogical needs. It considers specific characteristics of the Russian heritage language and supports cultural awareness which is essential for heritage language learners. This framework also has such CLIL-specific features as supporting active learning, embedding (graphic organizers and other kinds of visualization), and scaffolding that helps to make authentic input comprehensible. The framework utilizes a checklist format to provide a quick overview of the crucial principles of CLIL materials design. Along with the innate customization possible within the framework, it can be a valuable resource for both Russian heritage language teachers and international Russian schools.

6. Conclusion

The relatively new fields of heritage language teaching (only defined about 20 years ago) and the CLIL educational approach (existing by this name for less than 30 years) have a commonality: they

are both rising to prominence in a rapidly changing world. The need for a more effective foreign language educational pedagogy has paved a path for CLIL adoption especially for learners of foreign languages and the same is expected for heritage language learners. Increasing rates of global migration have shown a spotlight on the importance of foreign language acquisition and native language retention for minority language children. Understanding and implementing the specificity of features of heritage languages learners and their pedagogical requirements will lead new, more effective educational approaches. Just as CLIL introduced an improved methodology for teaching foreign-language and second-language education, CLIL could be similarly adapted to the field of heritage language education.

The above framework was developed based on theoretical research. Thus, there are limitations related to the implementation of practical application. The effectiveness of CLIL materials created using the proposed framework must be proven by experimental-based research in the classroom, among sufficient numbers of teachers and learners. Importantly, future research should take into account the attitudes and motivations of heritage language learners through the implementation of CLIL pedagogy.

ORCID

Anna Savinykh   0000-0003-0781-1116

References

Anderson, J. (2009). Relevance of content and language integrated learning (CLIL) in developing pedagogies for minority language teaching. In D. Marsh, P. Mehisto, D.Wolff, R. Aliaga, T. Asikainen, & M. J. Frigols-Martin (Eds.), *CLIL Practice: Perspectives From The Field* (pp. 124-132). Jyväskylä: CCN: University of Jyväskylä.

Anderson, L. W., Krathwohl, D. R. & Bloom, B. S. (Eds.) (2001). A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. Allyn & Bacon. Boston, MA (Pearson Education Group).

Ball, P., Keith, K., & Clegg, J. (2015). Putting CLIL into Practice. Oxford University Press.

Banegas, D. L. (2017). Teacher developed materials for CLIL: Frameworks, sources, and activities. *Asian EFL Journal, 19*(3), 31-48.

Beaudrie, S., Ducar, S., & Potowski, K. (2014). Heritage Language Teaching: Research and Practice. Columbus, OH: McGraw-Hill Education.

Bentley, K. (2010). *The TKT Course. CLIL Module*. Cambridge University Press.

Bonwell, C., & Eison, J. (1991). *Active Learning: Creating Excitement in the Classroom AEHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1*. Washington, D.C.: Jossey-Bass.

Bragina, E. A. (2018). Брагина Е. А. К вопросу о письменной речи русско-немецких детей-билингвов [On the issue of writing of Russian-German bilingual chindren]. *Проблемы онтолингвистики. Материалы ежегодной международной научной конференции. 20–23 марта 2018, Санкт-Петербург. РГПУ им. А. И. Герцена.* Иваново: ЛИСТОС, 205-207.

Carreira, M. (2004). Seeking Explanatory Adequacy: A Dual Approach to Understanding the Term «Heritage Language Learner». *Heritage Language Journal, 2*(1), 1-25.

Carreira, M., & Kagan, O. (2011). The results of National Heritage Language Survey: Implications for Teaching, Curriculum Design, and Professional Development. *Foreign Language Annals. 44*(1), 40-64

Charalampidi, M., Hammond, M., Hadjipavlou, N., & Lophitis, N. A. (2017) Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) Project: Opportunities and Challenges in the Context of Heritage

Language Education. T*he European Conference on Language Learning 2017. Official Conference Proceedings. The International Academic Forum.* Available from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Marina_Charalampidi/publication/319165119_A_Content_and_Language_Integrated_Learning_CLIL_Project_Opportunities_and_Challenges_in_the_Context_of_Heritage_Language_Education/links/59969e8c0f7e9b91cb0f387a/A-Content-and-Language-Integrated-Learning-CLIL-Project-Opportunities-and-Challenges-in-the-Context-of-Heritage-Language-Education.pdf?origin=publication_detail (Access 23.01.2020)

Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). CLIL. Content and Language Integrated Learning. Cambridge University Press.

Cummins, J. (l979). Cognitive/academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimum age question and some other matters. *Working papers on bilingualism, 19*, 121-129.

Cummins, J. (2000). *BICS and CALP: clarifying the distinction*. ERIC Digest website. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED438551.pdf (Access 23.09.2021)

Dale, L., & Tanner, R. (2012). CLIL Activities: A resource for subject and language teachers. Cambridge University Press.

Flores, C. (2010). The effect of age on language attrition: Evidence from bilingual returnees. Bilingualism: *Language and Cognition, 13*(4), 533-546.

Gerasimova, V. A. (2019). Герасимова В. А. Соотечественники: российские соотечественники за рубежом [Compatriots: Russian compatriots abroad]. *Постсоветские исследования. Т. 2.* № 1, 904-922.

Gondoavá, D. (2015). Selecting, adapting and creating CLIL materials. In S. Pokrivcáková, (Ed.), *CLIL in foreign language education* (pp. 151–163). Nitra, SK: Constantine the Philosopher University.

Hanesova D. (2015). History of CLIL. CLIL in Foreign Language Education. Nitra. Available from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Dana_Hanesova/publication/338718980_History_of_CLIL_Hanesova/links/5e2739eaa6fdcc70a13dec36/History-of-CLIL-Hanesova.pdf?origin=publication_detail (Access 07.01.2021)

Howard, J., & Major, J. (2004). *Guidelines for designing effective English language teaching materials*.

Available from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/237476568_Guidelines_for_ Designing_Effective_English_Language_Teaching_Materials/citations (access 02.10.2021).

Ivanova-Sullivan, T. (2019). Heritage Russian in the US and the new type of pluricentricity in the context of immigration. *The Soft Power of the Russian Language: Pluricentricity, Politics, and Policies*. Chapter: 19. Publisher: Routledge.

Kagan, O., & Dillon, K. (2003) A New Perspective on Teaching Russian: *Focus on Heritage Learner*. *Heritage Language Journal*, *1*(1), 76-90.

Kavanagh, B. (2020). The Potential of CLIL for Heritage Language Learners in the UK: A Case Study of a Japanese Language Supplementary School for Bicultural Bilingual Children. *The Journal of the Japan CLIL Pedagogy Association (J-CLIL)*: *JJCLIL* Vol. 2, 126-146

Kolodina, N. N. (2013). Колодина Н. Н. Трудности в обучении чтению англо-русских дошкольников и младших школьников в США [Difficulties in reading teaching to English-Russian preschoolers and elementary school students]. *Проблемы онтолингвистики. Материалы международной научной конференции 26–29 июня 2013 г.* Санкт-Петербург. СПб.: РГПУ им. А. И. Герцена, 457-459.

Kolodina, N. N. (2018). Колодина Н. Н. Важна ли русская субботняя школа? Ошибки в письменной речи русско-английских детей-билингвов из США: *Проблемы онтолингвистики. Материалы ежегодной международной научной конференции. 20–23 марта 2018*. Санкт-Петербург. РГПУ им. А. И. Герцена. Иваново: ЛИСТОС, 467-471.

Korneev, A. A., & Protassova E. Yu. (2013). Корнеев А. А., Протасова Е. Ю. Особенности чтения вслух и письма на двух языках у восьмилетних двуязычных школьников [Features of reading aload and writing on two languages of eight-years old bilingual students]. *Проблемы онтолингвистики. Материалы международной научной конференции 26–29 июня 2013 г.* Санкт-Петербург. СПб.: РГПУ им. А. И. Герцена, 425-429

Kudryavtseva E.L. (2009). Кудрявцева Е.Л. Основные различия в преподавании русского языка как иностранного, как родного и как второго родного: *Русский язык как второй родной и методика его преподавания в диаспоре: Сборник статей*. Отв. ред. В.В. Молчановский. Peter Lang. 27–35.

Kumatrenko, D. (2020). Куматренко Д. Начальная школа для билингва. Первый класс. Полный курс. [Elementary school for bilingual child. First grade. Complete course] Available from https://www.teacherspayteachers.com/Product/--6917280 (access 20.09.2021)

López-Medina, B. (2021). On the Development of a CLIL Textbook Evaluation Checklist: *A Focus Group Study. Teaching English as a Second Language Electronic Journal (TESL-EJ), 25*(1), 1-17.

Marsh, D. (2002). *CLIL/EMILE European dimension: Actions, trends and foresight. Jyvaskyla*. University of Jyvaskyla, Finland. Available from https://jyx.jyu.fi/bitstream/handle/123456789/47616/david_marsh-report.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (Access 11.01. 2021)

McLoughlin, A. (2021). How to write CLIL materials. ELT teacher 2 writer

Mehisto P., March D., & Frigols M. J. (2008). Uncovering CLIL. Content and Language Integrated Learning in Bilingual and Multilingual Education. Oxford: Macmillan

Minkov M., Kagan O., Protassova E., Schwartz M. (2019). Towards a Better Understanding a Continuum of Heritage Language Proficiency: *The Case of Adolescent Russian Heritage Speakers. Heritage Language Journal, 16(2), 211-236.*

Mishan, F., & Timmis, I. (2015). Materials development for TESOL. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.

Montrul, S. (2008). Incomplete Acquisition in Bilingualism: Re-examining the Age Factor. *(Studies in Bilingualism; Vol. 39). John Benjamins Publishing Company*

Montrul, S. (2012). Is the heritage language like a second language? *EUROSLA Yearbook, Volume 12,* Issue 1, 1 – 29.

Nakajima, K. (2016). Bailingaru kyouiku-no houhou: *12sai-made-ni oya to kyoushi ga dekirukoto* [The ways of bilingual education: what can parents and teachers do]. Alc (in Japanese)

Nunan, D. (1988a). Principles for Designing Language Teaching Materials. *Guidelines: A Periodical for Classroom Language Teachers*, *v10* n2, 1-24.

Nunan, D. (1988b). Syllabus design. Oxford University press.

Paichadze, S. (2018). Saharin kikokusya-no wakai sedai-no jiko aidentiti to gengo siyou gakusyuu

nikansuru kousatu. [Ethnic Self-identity and Awareness of Language among Younger Generations of Sakhalin Returnees]. *Imin-kenkyuu nenpou, 6*. 45-63 (in Japanese)

Pfandl, H. (1994). Пфандль, Х. Русскоязычный эмигрант третьей и четвертой волны [Russian-speaking migrant of third and fourth wave]. *Русский язык за рубежом,   5-6*, 101-108.

Polinsky M. (2008). Gender under incomplete acquisition: Heritage speakers` knowledge of noun categorization. *Heritage Language Journal, 6*(1). P. 40-71.

Polinsky M. (2018). *Heritage Languages and Their Speakers.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Protassova, E. Yu., & Rodina, N. M. (2018). Протасова Е. Ю., Родина Н. М. Овладение множественным числом у монолингвов и финско-русских билингвов [The plural form acquisition of monolinguals and Finnish-Russian bilinguals]. *Проблемы онтолингвистики. Материалы ежегодной международной научной конференции. 20–23 марта 2018.* Санкт-Петербург. РГПУ им. А. И. Герцена. Иваново: ЛИСТОС, 143-148

Results of research of Russian schools abroad (2021), available from https://schoolresearch.ru/results (access 10.07.2021)

Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Saeidi, M., Zaferanieh, E., & Shatery, H. (2012). *On the Effects of Focus on Form, Focus on Meaning, and Focus on Forms on Learners' Vocabulary Learning in ESP Context. English Language Teaching, 5*(10), 72-79.

Sarip, M., Rafli, Z., & Rahmat, A. (2018). Arabic Speaking Material Design Using Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies. Volume 5* (1), 272-286.

Saye, J. W., & Brush, T. (2002). Scaffolding critical reasoning about history and social issues in multimedia-supported learning environments. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 50*, 77-96.

Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research, Vo. 104*, 333-339.

Suhandoko (2019). CLIL-Oriented and Task-based EFL Materials Development. *ELT Worldwide Volume 6* Number 2, 144-162.

Tegunimataka, A. (2021). Does First-Language Training Matter for Immigrant Children's School Achievements? Evidence from a Danish School Reform. *Nordic Journal of Migration Research, 11*(3), 316–340.

The Guidelines on How to Develop CLIL Materials and Lesson Plans in Primary Schools. CLIL for children. (2016).   Available from http://www.clil4children.eu/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/Guidelines-CLIL-materials_1A5_rel01.pdf (Access 10.09.2020)

Tomlinson, B. (2010). Principles and Procedures of Materials Development for Language Learning. In N. Harwood (ed.) *Materials in ELT: theory and practice*. (pp. 81-108). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Tomlinson, B. (2013). Developing principled frameworks for materials development. In Tomlinson, B. (ed). *Developing Materials for Language Teaching*. (2nd ed) London: Bloomsbury.

Tomlinson, B., & Masuhara, H. (2017). *The Complete Guide to the Theory and Practice of Materials Development for Language Learning*.   Wiley-Blackwell.

Torraco, R. J. (2005). Writing integrative literature reviews: Guidelines and examples. *Human Resource Development Review, 4*, 356–367.

Tulupova, L. (2021). Первая часть курса «Ордынский период. Восток-Запад. 13-15 век» [First part of course "Golden Horde epoch. East-West. 13-15 century"]. Available from https://www.teacherspayteachers.com/Product/-13-15-11-5810806 (Access 20.09.2021).

Valdes G. (2001). Heritage language students: profiles and possibilities. In J. K. Peyton, D. Ranard, & S. McGuinnis (Eds.), *Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national recourse*. (pp. 37-80). Washington, D. C..: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Van de Pol, J., Volman, M., & Beishuizen, J. (2010). Scaffolding in teacher-student interaction: A decade of research. *Educational Psychology Review, 22*(3), 271–296.

Van Deusen-Scholl, N. (2003). Toward a definition of heritage language: Sociopolitical and pedagogical considerations. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 2*(3), 211-230.

Watson, R. T. & Webster, J. (2020). Analysing the past to prepare for the future: Writing a literature

review a roadmap for release 2.0. *Journal of Decision Systems, 29*(3), 129-147.

Wood, K. J. (2020). CLIL in the Canaries: An Analytical Framework and Critical Evaluation of Teaching Materials. *Folio, 20*(1), 30-44. Retrieved from MATSDA homepage: https://www.matsda.org/folio-samples.html) (access 01.10.2021).

Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem-solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 17*(2), 89–100.