

UDC 378.147:811.111'243:808.5

Viktoriia Drobotun (Ukraine)
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5628-6381

COLLABORATIVE WRITING IN HIGHER EDUCATION ENGLISH-LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION: A REVIEW OF RESEARCH AND PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICE

This article examines collaborative approaches to developing English-language academic writing skills in higher education, with particular attention to similarities and differences between international and Ukrainian pedagogical contexts. The study explores contemporary conceptualisations of academic writing as a multidimensional, socially situated, and discipline-specific competence shaped by globalisation, digitalisation, and intercultural communication. Drawing on international and Ukrainian scholarship, the review analyses theoretical perspectives on academic literacy, disciplinary writing and collaborative learning and synthesizes empirical research on collaborative writing practices, including peer review, brainstorming, group writing, joint text production, and digitally mediated interaction.

The findings indicate that collaborative approaches support the development of writing proficiency, genre awareness, critical thinking, learner autonomy, and intercultural competence; their effects on writing fluency, while historically debated, appear positive when collaboration is carefully structured. International studies emphasise the importance of interaction, negotiation of meaning, and shared responsibility in fostering academic literacy and language development. The Ukrainian scholarship increasingly aligns with international competence-based and genre-oriented approaches while preserving a strong focus on methodological structuring and digital integration in higher education.

Keywords: *academic writing skills, collaborative writing, English-language instruction, higher education, pedagogical practice.*

Background

In contemporary higher education, English-language academic writing has become a fundamental academic and professional competence for students across disciplines. It enables effective participation in scholarly communication, supports academic success, and facilitates integration into the global academic community. Developing academic writing skills, however, remains a complex and demanding process that requires not only linguistic knowledge but also the ability to organise ideas, construct arguments, synthesise information, and adhere to academic conventions.

The importance of this competence is reinforced by global educational priorities articulated in the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (United Nations, 2015), particularly SDG 4 (Quality Education), which emphasises

inclusive and equitable education and the development of relevant skills for lifelong learning, and SDG 17 (Partnerships for the Goals), which highlights the significance of collaboration, international cooperation, and knowledge exchange across institutions and countries. This article treats these goals not merely as a policy but as an analytical lens: collaborative writing pedagogy can be understood as an implementation of both SDGs, as it fosters inclusive, high-quality learning environments (SDG 4) and develops the collaborative and communicative competences required for international academic partnership (SDG 17). Within this framework, higher education institutions are increasingly expected to create learning environments that foster both academic excellence and collaborative engagement in global contexts.

Contemporary educational and professional realities are increasingly shaped

by digital communication and technology-enhanced collaboration. Students, teachers, researchers, and professionals are often required to co-author texts in real time using shared digital platforms and online collaborative tools. Such practices require not only linguistic competence but also the ability to negotiate meaning, coordinate ideas, provide constructive feedback, and participate effectively in digitally mediated communication.

In response to these developments, collaborative learning has gained increasing recognition as an effective pedagogical approach in language education. Grounded in social constructivist theory, it is understood as a socially mediated process in which knowledge is constructed through interaction, dialogue, and collaboration. This view is supported by educational theorists who emphasise learning as an active process of meaning-making (Bruner, 1996), experiential engagement in social contexts (Dewey, 1938), and participation in communities of practice (Wenger, 1998). Within this framework, collaborative learning emphasises interaction, shared responsibility, and the co-construction of knowledge. Within academic writing instruction, collaborative practices such as group writing, peer review, collaborative editing, and discussion-based tasks create opportunities for learners to refine their written output through feedback, reflection, and active engagement with peers.

International and national educational practices demonstrate growing interest in integrating collaborative approaches into academic writing instruction. Research indicates that collaborative learning contributes not only to the development of writing proficiency, including coherence, linguistic accuracy, and genre awareness, but also to the enhancement of critical thinking, learner autonomy, self-reflection, and intercultural communication skills. At the same time, differences in educational traditions, pedagogical priorities, and

technological integration influence the implementation of collaborative writing practices in different national contexts.

Against this background, this article reviews international and Ukrainian scholarship on English-language academic writing instruction in higher education. The study aims to identify key theoretical perspectives, empirical findings, and contextual challenges associated with collaborative learning in academic writing, and to situate Ukrainian pedagogical research within the broader international landscape. In particular, the article seeks to answer the following research question:

What are the similarities and differences between international and Ukrainian theoretical frameworks and research findings on developing English-language academic writing skills through collaborative learning?

Methodology

This article is a narrative literature review examining collaborative writing in English-language academic instruction in higher education. Sources were selected purposively to represent key theoretical frameworks, empirical studies, and recent research in both international and Ukrainian scholarship. International sources were drawn primarily from the applied linguistics literature, with particular attention to peer-reviewed journal articles and edited volumes published from 2010 to 2025; foundational theoretical works, cited for their influence on the field, were included regardless of publication date. Ukrainian sources were identified through targeted searches in Ukrainian academic databases and institutional repositories, supplemented by citation tracking from key Ukrainian publications. The review is organised thematically around three areas: theoretical conceptualisations of academic writing, international empirical research on collaborative writing, and Ukrainian pedagogical scholarship and practice.

Findings

Academic writing as a global competence

Academic writing has increasingly been conceptualised in applied linguistics and higher education research as a global academic competence shaped by disciplinary, social, and digital dimensions rather than a purely linguistic skill. Recent studies emphasise that academic writing functions as a form of disciplinary discourse through which students actively participate in knowledge construction within specific academic communities (Hyland & Hyland, 2019), while also engaging with evolving global and digital communication practices (Hanušová et al., 2020; Schmied et al., 2023). From this perspective, writing extends beyond grammatical accuracy and lexical control to include the ability to engage with genre conventions, develop argumentation, and construct an appropriate academic stance within disciplinary dialogue (Thaksanan & Chaturongakul, 2024; Sun & Jiang, 2024).

A key theoretical development in this area is the shift from viewing writing as a technical skill to conceptualising it as a socially situated practice. The academic literacies approach, developed by Lea and Street (1998, 2006), has been particularly influential in this regard. This framework argues that academic writing is embedded in broader institutional, cultural, and epistemological contexts, shaped not only by linguistic rules but also by power relations, disciplinary norms, and expectations regarding what counts as valid knowledge (Hyland, 2022; Lea & Street, 1998; Lea & Street, 2006). From this standpoint, students entering higher education are not simply learning how to write correctly; they are learning how to participate in academic communities and develop disciplinary ways of meaning-making. Writing becomes a process of identity construction, in which students gradually position themselves as participants in academic discourse communities.

Building on this conceptualisation, Hyland (2008, 2022) argues that academic writing is fundamentally shaped by genre conventions that vary across disciplines. Academic texts differ in terms of structure, argumentation patterns, use of evidence, and rhetorical strategies, requiring students to develop genre awareness and learn how disciplinary communities construct and communicate knowledge. Wingate (2016) further argues that academic literacy should not be treated as an isolated or remedial skill but should be explicitly integrated into disciplinary teaching, given the difficulties students experience when transferring writing skills across different academic contexts.

The importance of academic writing has been further amplified by the internationalisation of higher education. As universities increasingly operate in multilingual and globally connected environments, English-language academic writing functions as a form of global academic literacy required for participation in international research networks, scholarly collaboration, and academic mobility (Lillis & Curry, 2010; Hyland & Jiang, 2025). Publication in English-language journals often determines academic visibility and professional advancement, yet EAP research consistently highlights that writing practices are not standardised but vary significantly across disciplines (Hyland, 2022). This variability challenges the idea of a single "standard" academic writing model and reinforces the need for flexible, discipline-sensitive pedagogical approaches. Students must therefore learn to navigate different rhetorical expectations and adapt their writing to diverse academic contexts.

Overall, academic writing in higher education can be understood as a multidimensional literacy practice that integrates linguistic, rhetorical, cognitive, and social dimensions. It involves the development of language proficiency, but also the ability to engage critically with sources, construct disciplinary arguments, and participate meaningfully in academic

discourse communities. It is shaped by institutional expectations, disciplinary conventions, and global academic standards, making it a central competence in contemporary higher education. Moreover, if writing is a process of disciplinary socialisation and identity construction, as Lea and Street propose, then collaborative writing practices (in which students negotiate meaning, challenge each other's interpretations, and co-produce genre-appropriate texts) provide precisely the kind of interactional environment in which that socialisation occurs. Collaboration, in this view, is not merely a pedagogical technique but a vehicle for the genre awareness and epistemic participation that academic literacies theory describes.

Ukrainian research on academic writing

Ukrainian research on teaching academic writing has developed significantly over the past decades, particularly in response to the world's internationalisation of higher education (de Wit, 2011; 2011a; Knight, 2008) and the growing role of English-medium academic communication. Within Ukrainian pedagogical and applied linguistics scholarship, academic writing has increasingly been recognised as an essential component of students' professional and academic development (Tarnopolsky & Storozhuk, 2020; Kozolup et al., 2020; Kvasova, 2024; Svyrydova & Ameridze (2016), and this recognition has gradually extended to collaborative dimensions of writing instruction.

Ukrainian scholarship has explored a range of collaborative and structured approaches to writing pedagogy. Bigunova et al. (2025) propose an eight-stage model for teaching academic writing in English that explicitly incorporates peer review and collaborative revision as core stages. After introducing genre conventions and guiding students through text analysis and language-focused practice, the model incorporates peer and teacher feedback, as

well as self-correction, before final submission. The authors argue that these collaborative stages support the development of students' academic writing competence, critical thinking, and independent learning skills: outcomes that closely mirror those reported in international collaborative writing research.

Summary writing, another important direction in Ukrainian research, has also been approached through collaborative and dialogic means. Kvasova (2024) develops and evaluates an improved methodology for teaching summary writing as a transferable academic skill, combining structured instruction with peer interaction. The findings suggest that summarisation skills developed through such approaches in English may be transferable to academic writing in the first language, with potential implications for multilingual learners.

A notable alignment between Ukrainian and international practices is evident in the integration of digital technologies and blended learning tools into collaborative writing instruction. Recent Ukrainian studies indicate that platforms such as Google Classroom, Google Docs, ZenGengo, PaperRater, and WordWall are increasingly used to facilitate peer collaboration, revision processes, and formative feedback (Kavytska & Drobotun, 2022; Kvasova, 2024). These tools replicate the digitally mediated collaborative environments described in international EAP research, suggesting that Ukrainian higher education is actively incorporating the same digital collaborative turn identified in the broader literature.

Tarnopolsky & Storozhuk, 2020 (2020) investigate a project-computer technique for teaching English academic writing that combines collaborative project work with digital technologies and internet resources, demonstrating the effectiveness of integrating these modes into writing instruction. Kozolup and Komar (2024) similarly argue for more systematic integration of writing instruction into university programmes, recognising

academic writing as a specialised discourse practice rather than a surface language skill.

Ukrainian research also highlights challenges in implementing collaborative writing approaches. These include limited exposure to authentic academic discourse, insufficient practice in writing research-based texts, and uneven levels of English proficiency among students. Additionally, there is an ongoing need for teacher training in collaborative and genre-based writing pedagogy, as many instructors are still transitioning from traditional grammar-oriented instruction. These challenges are not unique to Ukraine. They are widely documented in international EAP literature, but they take particular form in the Ukrainian context, where institutional resources and programme structures are simultaneously adapting to both international academic standards and wartime educational conditions.

Collaborative writing in higher education: Empirical evidence

Collaborative writing has become a widely discussed pedagogical approach in second language (L2) and academic writing instruction, particularly within communicative and socio-cognitive paradigms of language learning. It is understood as a socially mediated process in which learners construct knowledge through interaction, negotiation, and shared problem-solving (Storch, 2013). Writing, in this view, is not conceived solely as an individual cognitive act but as a socially distributed activity shaped by dialogue, peer feedback, and joint decision-making.

A key conceptual distinction between collaboration and cooperation underpins this body of research. Dillenbourg (1999) argues that cooperation typically involves the division of labour among group members, whereas collaboration requires sustained interaction, shared planning, and continuous negotiation of meaning, with learners jointly responsible for both the process and the final outcome. This distinction matters pedagogically: tasks designed as collaboration, rather than simple task division, are more likely to

generate the interactional processes that support language development.

In academic writing classrooms, collaborative practices typically include brainstorming, outlining, peer review, and joint text production. Researchers have long emphasised that such interaction fosters deeper engagement with language use and supports learners in developing disciplinary literacy, as students are required not only to produce linguistically accurate texts but also to negotiate meaning and construct knowledge within specific academic genres (Hyland, 2022; Lea & Street, 2006). Much empirical research supports this position. Studies such as Storch (2019) and Dobao and Blum (2013) demonstrate that collaborative writing enhances idea generation, vocabulary development, and learner engagement. Watanabe and Swain (2007) highlight the role of peer interaction in facilitating language learning through negotiation of meaning, while Özdemir (2024) reports a positive effect on L2 individual writing performance in terms of complexity, accuracy, fluency, and functional adequacy.

The effects of collaborative writing on writing fluency have historically been less convincing. Several studies report no significant advantage of collaborative writing over individual writing in terms of fluency. Zabihi and Rezazadeh (2013) found that collaboratively written texts did not significantly outperform individually written texts on fluency measures, which are often associated with total word count in a timed task. Elola & Oskoz (2010) similarly reported no significant differences in fluency between individual and collaborative writing conditions, despite improvements in accuracy.

More recent research has challenged this assumption. Pham (2021) investigated the effects of collaborative writing on writing fluency among 62 Vietnamese EFL students divided into experimental and control groups. The experimental group engaged in structured collaborative writing activities during the composing stage,

following a clear procedural framework: brainstorming collectively, co-constructing outlines, dividing writing responsibilities according to individual strengths, producing sections independently, and integrating and revising the complete text collaboratively. Writing fluency was measured through word counts in timed argumentative essays. The results revealed that collaborative writing significantly improved fluency not only in collaboratively produced texts but also in subsequent individual writing tasks, suggesting a transfer effect. Qualitative findings further indicate that students perceived collaborative writing positively, reporting increased motivation, richer idea development, and improved exposure to diverse linguistic forms, though challenges including disagreements and unequal participation were also noted.

Taken together, the literature indicates that while collaborative writing consistently enhances writing quality, vocabulary use, and learner engagement, its impact on fluency depends significantly on the degree of structural organisation. When collaborative writing is implemented through a clear procedural framework, it can positively influence both collaborative and individual fluency, positioning it as a scaffolding mechanism that strengthens internalised writing processes over time.

Conclusion

This review has examined collaborative academic writing in English-language university instruction, comparing international scholarship with Ukrainian pedagogical research, in order to answer the question of what similarities and differences characterise these two research traditions.

Both of them align in conceptualising academic writing as a socially situated, discipline-specific, and cognitively complex practice that cannot be reduced to surface linguistic accuracy. Both recognise collaborative writing as a pedagogically valuable means of developing not only writing proficiency and genre awareness but also critical thinking, learner autonomy, and

interactional competence. Ukrainian scholarship demonstrates a clear and accelerating alignment with international EAP frameworks, particularly through the adoption of competence-based and genre-oriented approaches and the integration of digital collaborative tools.

Differences lie primarily in emphasis and context. International research places greater attention on the interactional and cognitive mechanisms of collaboration (negotiation of meaning, scaffolding, identity construction) and has produced a more extensive empirical base for evaluating the effects of collaborative writing on specific writing outcomes. Ukrainian research, while increasingly empirical, continues to foreground methodological structuring, explicit instruction, and digital integration as the primary pedagogical practices, reflecting institutional traditions and the practical constraints of the Ukrainian higher education context.

The review also identified a debate in the international literature regarding the effects of collaborative writing on fluency, which recent research is beginning to resolve in favour of structured collaborative frameworks (Pham, 2021). This finding is directly relevant to Ukrainian practitioners designing collaborative writing tasks, as it underscores the importance of procedural organisation rather than open-ended groupwork.

In relation to the SDG framework introduced at the outset, the evidence reviewed here supports the conclusion that well-implemented collaborative writing pedagogy contributes to both SDG 4 (by creating inclusive learning environments that develop higher-order literacy competences) and SDG 17, by cultivating the collaborative, communicative, and intercultural competences essential for international academic partnership.

Further research might productively address two gaps identified by this review: first, empirical studies within the Ukrainian context that directly evaluate the effects of specific collaborative writing interventions

on writing quality and fluency, to build an evidence base comparable to that available internationally; second, investigation of how digital platforms and AI-assisted tools are reshaping collaborative writing practices across both contexts, given the rapid pace of technological change in academic environments.

References

- Bigunova, N., Tkachenko, H. & Neklesova, V. (2025). On the methodology of teaching academic writing in English. *Writings in Romance-Germanic Philology*, 1(54), 58-69. [https://doi.org/10.18524/2307-4604.2025.1\(54\).338543](https://doi.org/10.18524/2307-4604.2025.1(54).338543)
- Bruner, J. S. (1996). *The culture of education*. Harvard University Press.
- De Wit, H. (2011). Internationalization misconceptions. *International Higher Education*, (64), 6–7. <https://doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2011.64.8556>
- De Wit, H. (2011a). Globalisation and internationalisation of higher education. *RUSC. Universities and Knowledge Society Journal*, 8(2), 241–248. <https://doi.org/10.7238/rusc.v8i2.1247>
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. Macmillan. <https://bit.ly/4nHOH8Q>
- Dillenbourg, P. (1999). What do you mean by "collaborative learning"? In P. Dillenbourg (Ed.), *Collaborative-learning: Cognitive and computational approaches* (pp. 1–19). Elsevier.
- Dobao, A. F., & Blum, A. (2013). Collaborative writing in pairs and small groups: Learners' attitudes and perceptions. *System*, 41(2), 365–378. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.02.002>
- Elola, I., & Oskoz, A. (2010). Collaborative writing: Fostering foreign language and writing conventions development. *Language Learning & Technology*, 14(3), 51–71. <https://doi.org/10.64152/10125/44226>
- Hanušová, S., Dontcheva-Navratilova, O., Lahodová Vališová, M., & Matulová, M. (2020). Process genre approach to L2 academic writing: An intervention study. *XLinguae*, 13(4), 30–51. <https://doi.org/10.18355/XL.2020.13.04.03>
- Hyland, K. (2008). Genre and academic writing in the disciplines. *Language Teaching* 41(04). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444808005235>
- Hyland, K. & Hyland, F. (2019). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2022). *Teaching and researching writing*. Routledge
- Hyland, K. & Jiang, F. (2025). Scholarly discourse: The growth of English for research publication purposes. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 16(5), 2159–2182. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2023-025>
- Kavytska, T., & Drobotun, V. (2022). Online Teaching Writing to University Students: Negative Stereotypes Ruined. *Transferring Language Learning and Teaching From Face-to-Face to Online Settings*. (pp.67-87). <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-8717-1.ch004>
- Knight, J. (2008). *Higher education in turmoil: The changing world of internationalization*. Sense Publishers.
- Kozolup, M., Kokor, M., & Savchynskyi, R. (2020). Polish and Ukrainian university students' perspectives on academic writing: A comparative overview. *Central European Journal of Communication*, 3(27), 352-370. [https://doi.org/10.51480/1899-5101.13.3\(27\).3](https://doi.org/10.51480/1899-5101.13.3(27).3)
- Kvasova, O. (2024). Teaching summary writing as a transferable academic skill in Ukrainian university context. *Education Sciences*, 14(3), 288. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14030288>
- Lea, M. R., & Street, B. V. (2006). The "Academic literacies" model: Theory and applications. *Theory Into Practice*, 45(4). https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4504_11
- Lea, M. R., & Street, B. V. (1998). Student writing in higher education: An academic literacies approach. *Studies in Higher Education*, 23(2), 157–172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079812331380364>
- Lillis, T. & Curry, M. J. (2010). *Academic writing in a global context: The politics and practices of publishing in English*. Routledge.
- Özdemir, S. (2024). The effects of collaborative writing on L2 individual writing performance in terms of complexity, accuracy, fluency and functional adequacy. *Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction*, 14(4). <https://doi.org/10.47750/pegegog.14.04.20>
- Pham, V. P. H. (2021). The effects of collaborative writing on students' writing fluency: An efficient framework for collaborative writing. *SAGE Open*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244021998363>
- Schmied, J., Bondi, M., Dontcheva-Navratilova, O., & Pérez-Llantada, C. (2023). Language variation and change in academic writing: Recent trends through globalisation and digitalisation. *Token: A Journal of English Linguistics*, 16. <https://researchgate.net/publication/380663576>
- Storch, N. (2013). Collaborative writing in L2 classrooms. *New Perspectives on Language & Education*, 31. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847699954>
- Storch, N. (2019). Collaborative writing. In *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 124–137). Routledge.
- Sun, S. A., & Jiang, K. (2024). Analyzing metadiscourse in L2 writing for academic purposes: Models and approaches. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*, 3(3), 100149. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmal.2024.100149>
- Svyrydova, L. & Ameridze, O. (2016). Development of students' writing skills: focus on academic essay. *Bulletin of NTUU "KPI". Philology. Pedagogy: Collection of Scholarly Papers*, 7. <https://ela.kpi.ua/handle/123456789/60035>

Tarnopolsky, O., & Storozhuk, S. (2020). Experimental study of project-computer technique for teaching English academic writing to students of linguistic tertiary school. *Bulletin of Alfred Nobel University Series Pedagogy and Psychology*, 2(20), 267-277. <https://doi.org/10.32342/2522-4115-2020-2-20-31>

Thaksanan, P., & Chaturongakul, P. (2024). Enhancing EFL students' performance and genre awareness in academic writing through genre-based instruction. *Arab World English Journal*, 14(2), 295–311. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol14no2.21>

Watanabe, Y., & Swain, M. (2007). Effects of proficiency differences and patterns of pair interaction on second language learning: Collaborative dialogue between adult ESL learners. *Language Teaching Research*, 11(2), 121–142.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge University Press.

Wingate, U. (2016). Academic literacy across the curriculum: Towards a collaborative instructional approach. *Language Teaching*, 51(3), 349–364. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444816000264>

Zabihi, R., & Reza zadeh, M. (2013). Creativity and narrative writing in L2 classrooms: Comparing individual and paired task performance. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching and Learning Language and Literature*, 6(3). <https://raco.cat/index.php/Bellaterra/article/view/298190>.

United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development*. United Nations. <https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda>

Отримано редакцією журналу / Received: 25.03.26

Прорецензовано / Reviewed: 20.04.26

Схвалено до друку / Accepted: 22.04.26

Вікторія Дроботун (Україна)

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5628-6381

КОЛАБОРАТИВНЕ ПИСЬМО В АНГЛОМОВНОМУ НАВЧАННІ У ВИЩІЙ ШКОЛІ: ОГЛЯД ДОСЛІДЖЕНЬ І ПЕДАГОГІЧНОЇ ПРАКТИКИ

Актуальність. В умовах глобалізації та цифровізації вищої освіти англomовне академічне письмо набуває статусу ключової фахової компетентності студентів різних спеціальностей. Воно забезпечує ефективну участь у науковій комунікації, академічну успішність та інтеграцію в міжнародний науковий простір. Колаборативне навчання, що ґрунтується на засадах соціального конструктивізму, дедалі активніше впроваджується у практику викладання академічного письма як засіб розвитку не лише мовленнєвих умінь, а й критичного мислення, автономії учіння та міжкультурної компетентності.

Мета статті – проаналізувати міжнародні та українські дослідження в галузі навчання англomовного академічного письма у вищій школі з метою виявлення спільних рис і відмінностей між двома науковими традиціями щодо теоретичних засад та емпіричних результатів упровадження колаборативних підходів.

Методологія. Стаття є тематичним оглядом літератури. Джерела добиралися цілеспрямовано для представлення ключових теоретичних концепцій, значущих емпіричних досліджень і актуальних публікацій в міжнародному та українському науковому дискурсі. Огляд організовано тематично за трьома напрямками: теоретичні концептуалізації академічного письма, міжнародні емпіричні дослідження колаборативного письма та українська педагогічна наука і практика.

Результати та обговорення. Обидві наукові традиції (міжнародна та українська) розглядають академічне письмо як соціально зумовлену, дисциплінарно-специфічну та когнітивно складну практику. Обидві визнають колаборативне письмо педагогічно цінним засобом розвитку письмової компетентності, жанрової обізнаності, критичного мислення та автономії. Відмінності полягають переважно в тому, що міжнародні дослідження зосереджені на інтеракційних і когнітивних механізмах колаборації та мають ширшу емпіричну базу; українська наука, залишаючись дедалі більш емпіричною, традиційно акцентує методичну структурованість, експліцитне навчання та цифрову інтеграцію. Щодо впливу на швидкість письма, хоча результати досліджень тривалий час були суперечливими, нові дані свідчать про позитивний ефект структурованого колаборативного письма як на рівні спільно створених, так і індивідуальних текстів. Українська педагогічна практика демонструє стійку тенденцію до зближення з міжнародними компетентнісно-орієнтованими та жорсткими підходами.

Ключові слова: навички академічного письма, колаборативне письмо, навчання англійської мови, вища освіта, педагогічна практика.

BIO

Viktoriiia Drobotun, is an Assistant Professor at the Department of Teaching Methodology of Ukrainian and Foreign Languages and Literatures, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv. Her research interests include Cognitive Linguistics, COIL, Foreign Language Teaching, and Language Testing and Assessment.

E-mail: v.drobotun@knu.ua

Авторка заявляє про відсутність конфлікту інтересів. Спонсори не брали участі в дослідженні, в аналізі й інтерпретації даних, в описі результатів дослідження, у схваленні публікації до друку.

The author has declared no conflicts of interest. Sponsors were not involved in the research, data analysis, interpretation, writing, or publication approval process.