

TORUBARA Oksana

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5375-4696>

Scopus ID 60094511600

PhD in Education, Associate Professor,

Associate Professor in the Foreign Languages Department,
T.H. Shevchenko National University «Chernihiv Colehium»
(Chernihiv, Ukraine) E-mail: oksana.torubara@gmail.com

Visiting Researcher in the

Linguistics and English Language Department,
Lancaster University

(Lancaster, UK) E-mail: o.torubara@lancaster.ac.uk

ORIENTATING EMERGING SCHOLARS IN THE LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE: TOWARDS EARLY RESEARCH IDENTITY FORMATION

The aim of the this article is to examine a workshop model designed to broaden postgraduate students' understanding of the contemporary linguistic landscape and to support the early stages of research identity formation. The session introduced students to major linguistic subfields, guided them through analytical work with authentic publication titles, and encouraged them to articulate their own preliminary research interests.

Methodology. *The workshop followed a six-stage, task-based design combining conceptual input, collaborative problem-solving, and reflective individual output. Activities included acronym decoding, clustering of disciplinary terminology, guided exploration of linguistic subfields, analysis of genuine research titles, examination of publication venues via QR codes, and drafting initial research questions. Interaction patterns moved from individual to pair and whole-class modes. Observations of student engagement and responses served as the basis for reflective analysis.*

Scientific novelty. *The study proposes an introductory pedagogical model that integrates disciplinary mapping, authentic research examples, academic literacies development, and early publication literacy to foster research identity formation in MA students. The approach highlights how personal and academic experience can be used to model a coherent research trajectory and demonstrates the value of guided exposure to real publication contexts in TEFL-oriented programmes.*

Conclusions. *The intervention expanded students' awareness of linguistic subfields, improved their ability to relate research titles to disciplinary domains, and familiarised them with a journal scope, publication expectations, and elements of academic literacies. Students formulated tentative research questions, indicating the workshop's potential to initiate research engagement. Limitations include the one-off format and lack of formal data collection. Future work may involve longitudinal tracking, adaptation to diverse contexts, and integration into academic literacy curricula.*

Keywords: *linguistics; research identity; academic literacy; publication practices; postgraduate students.*

Formulation of the problem in general terms and its connection with theoretical and practical tasks. Postgraduate students entering Master's level foreign philology programmes (MA TEFL students) often approach their studies with a limited conception of the discipline, focusing mainly on teaching English rather than the wider linguistic field [7; 1]. This limited picture makes it difficult to form an early research identity, to recognise viable subfields, and to articulate publishable questions. Recent higher-education research shows that early-career scholars' identities are shaped and sometimes constrained by institutional expectations and incomplete maps of their disciplines, which can impede confident research planning [6]. Since research identity today is closely tied to patterns of

academic publishing [2], early awareness of disciplinary subfields and publication practices becomes particularly important for MA students preparing to enter scholarly environments.

At the same time contemporary linguistics is expanding rapidly bridging applied linguistics, academic literacies, language policy, corpus and computational methods, and AI-mediated research. Helping novices see the breadth and interconnections of the field is therefore not ornamental but foundational to researcher agency and informed topic selection [5]. In practical terms, universities increasingly require graduates who are able to navigate publication processes and, when appropriate, work across subfields, for instance, by combining discourse analysis with policy analysis, or by integrating English for Academic Purposes (EAP) / English for Research Publication Purposes (ERPP) with computational methods.

Thus, the problem this article addresses is twofold. First, novice researchers often lack a clear, operational map of the linguistic field that would allow them to situate their interests and scaffold a sustainable research trajectory. Second, the wider academic environment is rapidly evolving, with AI-mediated scholarship and increasing interdisciplinarity, which raises the bar for navigating the field independently. Addressing this gap is essential both for core scholarly development, such as the formation of a coherent research identity, the ability to formulate stronger questions, and improved methodological alignment, and for practical preparedness including publication literacy, realistic journal selection, and the ethical and effective use of emerging technologies in study and research.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Recent studies emphasise that postgraduate language-programme students and early-career scholars often face two interrelated challenges: insufficient disciplinary orientation and increasing demands for interdisciplinarity and publication readiness. Studies of international doctoral students in English as Additional Language (EAL) highlight persistent institutional and writing-support gaps, suggesting that academic writing and publication literacy are not yet fully integrated into graduate training [3].

Meanwhile, investigations within applied linguistics demonstrate that the discipline is expanding its boundaries moving from traditional descriptive and pedagogical focuses towards intersections with corpus/ computational linguistics, policy analysis, academic literacies and digital research practices [4; 5]. This dual trend of increasing the field complexity and limited student orientation makes it urgent for MA students to acquire not only understanding of the linguistic landscape but also a capacity to situate themselves within it, negotiate publication venues and integrate cross-subfield methods.

Purpose of the article. **Aim of the article** is to describe and reflect on a pedagogical intervention designed to introduce MA TEFL students to the contemporary linguistic landscape and to support the formation of an early research identity. Building on the assumption that many novice researchers enter postgraduate studies with limited awareness of the scope and internal structure of linguistics, the intervention sought to familiarise students with major disciplinary subfields; demonstrate their overlaps and points of synergy; and model ways of identifying potential research directions that align with personal interests, methodological preferences, and prospective publication pathways. **The article's objective** is to offer a practical, adaptable model of early disciplinary orientation that can be integrated into postgraduate curricula or delivered as a standalone workshop.

A second, **related aim** is to demonstrate how such orientation may foster students' academic agency, particularly by helping them understand how different subfields of linguistics connect to current research problems, how to articulate researchable questions, and how to consider appropriate publication venues. In this sense, the intervention does not prescribe directions, but rather equips novice researchers with conceptual tools to navigate and position themselves within the field.

Presentation of the theoretical and methodological research procedure. This article is presented as a pedagogical reflection grounded in a single teaching intervention delivered to MA TEFL postgraduates. The intervention took the form of an 80-minute introductory workshop titled «Sailing the Linguistic Ocean: Choose Your Adventure». The workshop combined elements of interactive lecture, guided exploration, and collaborative reflection. The methodological approach can be characterised as qualitative and descriptive, based on reflective analysis of teaching design and implementation rather than controlled experimentation. While no formal data collection (e.g., surveys, recordings) was conducted, informal observations and student responses during the session informed the reflections presented here.

The intervention is theoretically informed by current discussions around early research identity development, interdisciplinarity, and academic literacy in linguistics. Its goal is formative rather than evaluative: to propose a feasible workshop model for departments seeking to provide clearer disciplinary orientation at the start of postgraduate study.

The session consisted of six main stages, which drew on an interactive, student-centred methodology characteristic of task-based and exploratory pedagogies. The workshop design followed a gradual progression from activation of prior knowledge to conceptual input, guided practice, and reflective application. Tasks were structured using varied interaction patterns (individual – pair – whole-class), encouraging collaborative meaning-making and lowering participation barriers. Although the format resonates with CELTA task staging (Lead-in – Clarification – Practice – Follow-up), it was adapted to the postgraduate context to stimulate awareness of linguistics subfields and research identity formation. Approximate timings are indicated to illustrate pacing across the 80-minute session.

Stage 1. Lead-In and Warm-Up: «Crack the Acronym» (15 minutes)

Interaction pattern: individual – whole-class – pairs – whole-class.

Aim: to activate prior knowledge, build group rapport, and foreground the disciplinary breadth of applied linguistics.

Students were first invited to review a list of commonly used acronyms in TEFL and applied linguistics and identify as many as they could. This was intentionally low-stakes, with guessing encouraged. A brief whole-class check-in followed, during which the lecturer confirmed meanings and clarified less familiar items.

Learners then worked in pairs to group acronyms according to perceived thematic similarity (e.g., teaching-oriented, research-oriented, technology-related). The stage concluded with an open-class discussion, consolidating students' suggestions into several umbrella clusters. This acted as a discovery-based bridge to the next stage, focused on the structure of the discipline.

Stage 2. Conceptual and Focused Input: Overview of Linguistics Branches (20 minutes)

Interaction pattern: individual – pairs – whole-class

Aim: to familiarise students with major branches and subfields of linguistics and to encourage initial self-positioning within the field.

The lecturer provided a structured overview of eight major branches of linguistics, using short definitions and accessible examples. To introduce interconnections across subfields and emphasise the dynamic, interdisciplinary nature of contemporary linguistic research, a visual schematic (linguistics as an interconnected continuum linking theoretical, applied, and technological domains) was then presented. Short examples were used to illustrate how theoretical insights can feed practice, practice can raise new theoretical questions, and technological tools now enable research and pedagogy. This conceptual consolidation prepared students for subsequent analytical tasks involving authentic research materials (Stage 3).

As they listened, students were asked to select one or more areas they felt curious about and briefly justify their choice. Pair discussion followed to compare emerging interests. The stage concluded with a whole-class exchange, highlighting the diversity of interests and demonstrating that linguistics offers multiple entry points, even for students who self-identify primarily as language-teaching specialists.

Stage 3. Guided Application: Analysing Research Titles (15 minutes)

Interaction pattern: pairs – whole-class

Aim: to practise interpreting real research topics and relating them to specific linguistics subfields.

Students worked in pairs with three sample publication titles drawn from the real peer-reviewed work. They were asked to identify: approximate subfields represented; recurring themes; likely research questions. Pairs shared ideas in plenary. The lecturer offered brief commentary, highlighting common threads (e.g., academic English, publication challenges, language policy) and demonstrating how personal experience of the author may generate coherent research programmes over time.

The sample publication titles analysed during the workshop were drawn from the lecturer recent work on academic English and displaced Ukrainian scholars [8; 9; 10]. This choice served a dual purpose: to provide authentic, contextually relevant material, and to model how a coherent research trajectory may grow out of one's personal and academic experience. Using examples grounded in own scholarly path also created space for students to ask direct questions and receive insights «first-hand,» which many reported as motivating and practically valuable.

Stage 4. Publication Awareness: Exploring Journals (10 minutes)**Interaction pattern:** pairs – whole-class**Aim:** to increase students' exposure to real publication venues and encourage early development of publication literacy.

Students scanned QR codes linking to the articles discussed and were asked to identify each journal's scope, thematic focus, and publication context (e.g., national/international, disciplinary orientation, indexing). The following whole-group discussion emphasised realistic first-step venues for early-career researchers and the importance of strategic alignment between topic, target audience, and journal scope. The students were offered to consider which journal explored might be a realistic choice for them and why. This helped demystify the journal choice and publication practices.

Stage 5. Individual Output: Drafting a Research Idea (10 minutes)**Interaction pattern:** individual – plenary**Aim:** to prompt personal reflection and support early research identity formation.

Students were invited to propose a preliminary research topic, question, or problem to explore in the chat (e.g., «I'm interested in...», «I'm curious why...», «I'd like to explore further ...»). This final task foregrounded personal relevance, demonstrating that research often begins from curiosity, experience, or unanswered questions. Selected responses were briefly commented on in plenary, reinforcing that exploratory thinking, not polished output, was the goal.

Stage 6. Whole-Class Wrap-Up and Reflection (10 min)**Interaction:** whole class**Aim:** consolidate learning; encourage forward-looking reflection.

The session concluded with an open discussion in which students summarised their take-aways from the workshop: one new insight gained and one area they wished to explore further. The lecturer briefly highlighted pathways for deepening engagement (e.g., reading, course choices, conference participation) and encouraged students to view research development as an ongoing process.

This six-stage sequence blended awareness-raising, conceptual introduction, analytical practice, and reflective personalisation. The structure enabled students to develop an initial understanding of linguistic subfields, connect them to authentic research, and begin articulating their own scholarly interests.

Presentation of the main research material. The workshop led to several observable outcomes that reflect its effectiveness in broadening postgraduate students' disciplinary awareness and supporting the early stages of research identity formation. These outcomes emerged through a combination of collaborative meaning-making, guided conceptual and focused input, and structured reflection.

First, the level of student engagement during pair and whole-group tasks was consistently high. During the acronym-based warm-up and subsequent clustering activity, most students participated actively, offering hypotheses, negotiating meanings, and comparing prior experiences. This suggests that beginning with accessible, problem-solving tasks helped lower the affective filter and positioned learners as meaning-makers rather than passive recipients of knowledge.

Second, students demonstrated an ability to recognise and differentiate between multiple linguistic subfields. After the conceptual overview, participants were generally able to identify at least two areas of interest and explain their relevance. Their choices spanned both familiar domains (e.g., TEFL/TESOL, English for Academic Purposes) and less familiar areas (e.g., sociolinguistics, computational linguistics), indicating that even brief, structured input can expand students' conceptual maps of the discipline.

A further outcome was students' emerging capacity to link research titles to specific thematic areas within linguistics. In the guided application stage, pairs effectively connected the three sample publication titles to broader areas such as ERPP, language policy, sociolinguistics, and academic literacies. Several pairs also inferred plausible research questions, demonstrating a developing ability to read research titles not only descriptively but analytically. This skill is central to navigating academic texts and understanding how research is positioned within the field.

Students likewise showed increased awareness of academic publication contexts. When exploring journals via QR codes, they identified key dimensions such as journal scope, audience, and disciplinary positioning. This helped demystify publication practices and foregrounded the principle of venue - topic alignment, an important aspect of academic literacy for novice researchers. Such awareness aligns with recent scholarship emphasising that developing early familiarity with publication conventions is critical for successful participation in academic communities [2].

Finally, the closing task, in which students drafted preliminary research ideas, demonstrated the emergence of individually meaningful research interests. Although these ideas varied in clarity and specificity, nearly all students were able to articulate a starting point, often grounded in personal experience or prior study. This supports the view that even minimal scaffolding can lead to the articulation of early research questions in postgraduate learners [6; 7].

Taken together, these observations suggest that the workshop structure of progressing from activation to conceptual mapping, authentic analysis, and personal reflection effectively supported early research identity formation. Students moved from perceiving linguistics primarily through the lens of language teaching to recognising a wider, interconnected field with multiple entry points. This development reflects existing research highlighting the importance of disciplinary orientation and identity work at the early stages of postgraduate education [3].

The findings also align with the view that research identity emerges through guided participation in authentic scholarly practices rather than through abstract description alone. By interacting with real titles and journal venues, students gained insight into how research is communicated, situated, and valued within specific academic communities. This authentic exposure is especially significant in contexts such as Ukrainian higher education and forced academic mobility, where pathways into international publication may be opaque and require additional support.

In summary, the workshop helped students: engage actively with disciplinary concepts; recognise and differentiate among linguistic subfields, analyse research topics in relation to disciplinary categories, understand publication venues as socially and academically situated, articulate early research questions rooted in personal interest. These outcomes justify the pedagogical model employed and demonstrate its potential value for MA-level students preparing to enter academic discourse communities.

Conclusion and prospects for further research. The workshop demonstrated that even a short, structured intervention can meaningfully broaden postgraduate students' awareness of the linguistic field and support the early stages of research identity formation. Throughout the session, students engaged actively with conceptual input, collaborative classification tasks, and guided interpretation of authentic research titles. As a result, participants demonstrated an expanded understanding of linguistic subfields, the ability to link research topics to disciplinary domains, and an emerging capacity to articulate research interests in preliminary form. The targeted exploration of academic journals further familiarised students with the logic of publication practices, including journal scope and audience, which is essential for their future academic integration.

From a pedagogical perspective, the workshop model shows potential as an introductory component within MA programmes in linguistics, applied linguistics, and foreign philology. Because it combines conceptual orientation with exploratory, reflective tasks, the model may help students position themselves within the discipline at an early stage and engage with academic discourse communities more confidently. Importantly, it requires minimal institutional resources, making it adaptable for various teaching contexts, including those with limited access to structured research training.

At the same time, several limitations require consideration. First, the session constituted a one-off intervention, which limits the strength of inferences about its long-term impact on students' research development. The effects observed were immediate and exploratory; the degree to which these initial shifts translate into sustained academic engagement remains unknown. Second, no formal data collection was undertaken. The analysis presented here is based on informal observation and student responses during the session, rather than systematic assessment. Third, the workshop took place in a specific institutional and sociolinguistic context: Ukrainian MA students trained primarily within TEFL-oriented programmes. Their needs and experiences, particularly in relation to academic English and publishing, may differ from those of students in other contexts. These factors place limits on the generalisability of the observations presented.

Despite these limitations, the workshop highlights promising directions for further development. Future iterations could incorporate follow-up tasks or longitudinal tracking to examine how students' research questions evolve and whether initial ideas lead to concrete projects or publications. A structured feedback instrument could also provide a more systematic account of students' learning gains and perceived challenges. Finally, integrating the model into a short academic literacy module or accompanying it with mentoring could provide a more sustained pathway for building research capacity.

In sum, this small-scale intervention underscores the value of intentional early support for research identity formation. While more systematic investigation is needed, initial observations suggest that providing students with conceptual navigational tools, authentic research examples, and guided opportunities for self-positioning can play an important role in their transition from coursework to independent inquiry.

References

1. Akimbek A. *TEFL master students' perceptions of their research training: Evidence from a selective university in Kazakhstan*. OSF Preprints, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.35542/osf.io/emqy5>.
Akimbek, A. (2024). *TEFL master students' perceptions of their research training: Evidence from a selective university in Kazakhstan*. OSF Preprints. <https://doi.org/10.35542/osf.io/emqy5>. [in English].
2. Frandsen T. F., Nicolaisen J. *Defining the early career researcher: A study of publication-based definitions*. Learned Publishing, 2024. №37. <https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1621>
Frandsen, T. F., & Nicolaisen, J. (2024). *Defining the early career researcher: A study of publication-based definitions*. Learned Publishing, 37, e1621. <https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1621>. [in English].
3. Gupta S., Jaiswal A., Paramasivam A., Kotecha J. *Academic writing challenges and supports: Perspectives of international doctoral students and their supervisors*. *Frontiers in Education*. 2022. №7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2022.891534>.
Gupta, S., Jaiswal, A., Paramasivam, A., & Kotecha, J. (2022). *Academic writing challenges and supports: Perspectives of international doctoral students and their supervisors*. *Frontiers in Education*, 7, 891534. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2022.891534>. [in English].
4. Habibie P., Flowerdew J. *Critical language awareness and English for research publication purposes*. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 2023. №60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2023.100990>.
Habibie, P., & Flowerdew, J. (2023). *Critical language awareness and English for research publication purposes*. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 60, 100990. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2023.100990>. [in English].
5. Ma X. X., Hui L. H., Chen Y. H. *The interdisciplinary nature of linguistics*. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*. 2023. №11. P. 132-137. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2023.113009>
Ma, X. X., Hui, L. H., & Chen, Y. H. (2023). *The interdisciplinary nature of linguistics*. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 11, 132-137. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2023.113009> [in English].
6. Mula J. *Early career researchers' identity: A qualitative review*. *Higher Education Quarterly*. 2022. №76(2). P. 786-799. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12348>
Mula, J. (2022). *Early career researchers' identity: A qualitative review*. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 76(2), 786-799. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12348>. [in English].
7. Obeidat M. M., Shehadeh M. M. *Graduate students' perspective about the MA TEFL program at Hashemite University in Jordan*. *International Journal of Higher Education*. 2020. № 9(3). P. 28-38. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v9n3p28>.
Obeidat, M. M., & Shehadeh, M. M. (2020). *Graduate students' perspective about the MA TEFL program at Hashemite University in Jordan*. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 9(3), 28-38. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v9n3p28>. [in English].
8. Torubara O. *Academic English in Exile: Mapping the Research Publication Challenges of Displaced Ukrainian Scholars in the UK*. *East European Journal of Psycholinguistics*. 2025. №12(1). <https://doi.org/10.29038/>
Torubara, O. (2025). *Academic English in Exile: Mapping the Research Publication Challenges of Displaced Ukrainian Scholars in the UK*. *East European Journal of Psycholinguistics*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.29038/> [in English].
9. Torubara O. *Academic Writing Retreats: Unlocking New Opportunities for Ukrainian Scholars*. *Вісник Національного університету «Чернігівський колегіум» імені Т. Г. Шевченка*. 2025. Вип. 32 (188). С. 190-200.
Torubara O. (2025) *Academic Writing Retreats: Unlocking New Opportunities for Ukrainian Scholars*. *Visnyk Natsionalnoho universytetu «Chernihivskyi kolehium» imeni T.H. Shevchenka [Bulletin of T.H. Shevchenko National University «Chernihiv Colehium»]*. 32 (188). 190-200. [in English].
10. Torubara O. *National Language Policies and English Proficiency in Ukrainian Academia: Challenges and Implications for Research Publishing*. *European Journal of Language Policies*. 2025. №17(2). P. 255-282 <https://doi.org/10.3828/ejlp.2025.14>.
Torubara, O. (2025). *National Language Policies and English Proficiency in Ukrainian Academia: Challenges and Implications for Research Publishing*. *European Journal of Language Policies*, 17(2), 255-282. <https://doi.org/10.3828/ejlp.2025.14>. [in English].

ТОРУБАРА Оксана

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5375-4696>

Scopus ID 60094511600

Кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент,
доцент кафедри іноземних мов,
Національний університет
«Чернігівський колегіум» імені Т.Г. Шевченка
(Чернігів, Україна) E-mail: oksana.torubara@gmail.com

Гостьовий дослідник
кафедри лінгвістики та англійської мови,
Ланкастерський університет
(Ланкастер, Великобританія)
E-mail: o.torubara@lancaster.ac.uk

ОЗНАЙОМЛЕННЯ МОЛОДИХ НАУКОВЦІВ ІЗ ОСНОВНИМИ НАПРЯМАМИ ТА ПІДХОДАМИ СУЧАСНОЇ ЛІНГВІСТИКИ ЯК ШЛЯХ ДО ФОРМУВАННЯ ДОСЛІДНИЦЬКОЇ ІДЕНТИЧНОСТІ

Мета статті – представити модель заняття, спрямованого на розширення та поглиблення уявлення магістрантів про стан розвитку сучасної лінгвістики та формування їхньої дослідницької ідентичності. Під час сесії студенти ознайомилися з основними напрямками лінгвістики, працювали з автентичними науковими публікаціями та пробували окреслити власні дослідницькі інтереси.

Методологія. Заняття складалося з шести етапів і поєднувало стислий виклад матеріалу, роботу з публікаціями, виконання аналітичних завдань, а також індивідуальну рефлексію. Викладачка окреслила основні напрями лінгвістики, продемонструвала їх реальними прикладами та прокоментувала сучасні тенденції в кожній. Студенти з'ясували значення акронімів, групували терміни, аналізували назви статей, знайомилися з профілями наукових журналів за QR-кодами та формулювали власні попередні дослідницькі запитання. Робота відбувалася в індивідуальному, парному та груповому форматах. Спостерігаючи за тим, як студенти працювали із завданнями та обговорювали результати, авторка змогла проаналізувати ефективність запропонованої моделі й визначити, як її можна вдосконалити в подальших дослідженнях.

Наукова новизна. Дослідниця запропонувала педагогічну модель, що поєднує ознайомлення з основними напрямками сучасної лінгвістики, роботу з автентичними матеріалами, розвиток академічної грамотності та базових умінь орієнтуватися в просторі міжнародних наукових публікацій. Такий підхід демонструє, як особистий і професійний досвід викладача може стати підґрунтям для формування власної дослідницької траєкторії, а також сприяти становленню дослідницької ідентичності магістрантів, зокрема в програмах, орієнтованих на вивчення та викладання англійської мови як іноземної.

Висновки. Заняття допомогло студентам розширити уявлення про основні напрями досліджень в царині сучасної лінгвістики, навчило співвідносити теми досліджень із відповідними сферами наукових розвідок та краще визначати змістову спрямованість та цільову аудиторію наукових видань. Студенти сформулювали попередні дослідницькі питання, що свідчить про здатність запропонованої моделі навчання стимулювати процес дослідницького пошуку. Одноразовий формат заняття та відсутність формалізованого збору даних обмежують узагальнення отриманих спостережень. Подальша робота може бути зосереджена на відстеженні динаміки формування заявлених дослідницьких інтересів магістрантів, адаптацію моделі до інших навчальних контекстів і залучення її до курсів з академічної грамотності.

Ключові слова: лінгвістика, дослідницька ідентичність, академічна грамотність, публікаційна діяльність, магістранти.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 16.04.2026

Рецензент – доктор педагогічних наук, професор О.О. Лілік