

МОВОЗНАВСТВО ТА ЛІТЕРАТУРА

УДК 373.5.091.3:[811.111'272:004]
DOI: 10.37026/2520-6427-2024-118-2-42-51

Oksana BOIKO,
Ph.D. student of the department
of English philology and linguodidactics,
Zaporizhzhia National University,
Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine
ORCID: 0000-0002-8850-1066
e-mail: super-ksenichik05@ukr.net

APPROACHES OF TEACHING COMPUTER-MEDIATED WRITTEN COMMUNICATION TO SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

Abstract. The necessity of teaching written online communication in secondary education institutions is proved. It is demonstrated that virtual communication can be a means of learning and a subject of learning. Three main approaches to teaching writing are considered. The works of scientists from around the world on the practical application of product, process and genre-based approaches to teaching writing are analysed. It is compared written tasks in text and picture-based formats. The product, genre-based and process approaches are compared in pairs. The advantages and disadvantages of product, process and genre-based approaches to teaching writing are described. The stages of teaching handwriting and virtual writing according to the product, process and genre-based approaches are shown. A multimodal approach to teaching any kind of writing is presented. A socio-cognitive approach to teaching traditional and virtual writing is presented. The prospects of using computer games of various genres in teaching offline and online writing are revealed. The development of video games as an analogy

of the writing process is considered. The features of virtual communication and college syllabi in digital writing are reviewed. The need to include online writing and speaking in the syllabi of higher education institutions is emphasised. The application of the product approach to teaching virtual English written communication is demonstrated on the example of the Go Getter learning line. It is indicated that the product approach is best suited for CEFR levels A1 and A2. The application of genre-based and mixed methods of teaching online written communication is demonstrated on the example of the Focus second edition learning line. The general conclusion is made that the best result in teaching online written communication will be shown in a combination of product, process and genre-based approaches at different stages of English language learning.

Key words: writing, internet written communication, process approach, product approach, genre-based approach, New Ukrainian school.

Оксана БОЙКО,
аспірантка кафедри англійської філології
та лінгводидактики
Запорізького національного університету,
м. Запоріжжя, Україна
ORCID: 0000-0002-8850-1066
e-mail: super-ksenichik05@ukr.net

МОДЕЛІ НАВЧАННЯ КОМП'ЮТЕРНО-ОПОСЕРЕДКОВАНОЇ АНГЛОМОВНОЇ ПИСЬМОВОЇ КОМУНІКАЦІЇ УЧНІВ 5-9 КЛАСІВ ЗАКЛАДІВ ЗАГАЛЬНОЇ СЕРЕДНЬОЇ ОСВІТИ

Анотація. У статті доведено необхідність навчання письмової онлайн-комунікації в закладах загальної середньої освіти. Продемонстровано, що віртуальна комунікація може бути як засобом навчання,

так і предметом навчання. Розглянуто три основні підходи до навчання письма – продуктивний, процесний та жанровий. Проаналізовано дослідження вчених із різних країн світу щодо практичного застосування

означених вище підходів до навчання письма та порівняно письмові завдання в текстовому форматі та на основі картинок. Попарно зіставлено продуктивний, процесний та жанровий підходи до навчання письма, а також описано їхні переваги і недоліки. Продемонстровано етапи навчання звичайного та віртуального письма за продуктивним, процесним та жанровим підходами. Презентовано мультимодальний підхід до навчання будь-якого письма та соціально-когнітивний підхід до навчання традиційного й віртуального письма.

Окреслено перспективи використання комп'ютерних ігор різних жанрів у навчанні офлайн-та онлайн-письма. Запропоновано розробку відеоігор як аналогію процесу написання. Схарактеризовано особливості віртуальної комунікації та навчальні програми коледжу з цифрового письма. Наголошено на необхідності включення навчання інтернет-письму та говорінню у навчальні програми закладів вищої освіти.

На прикладі навчальної лінійки Go Getter показано застосування продуктивного підходу до навчання віртуальної англомовної письмової комунікації. Зазначено, що продуктивний підхід якнайкраще підходить для рівнів A1 та A2 за шкалою CEFR. На прикладі навчальної лінійки Focus second edition продемонстровано застосування жанрового та змішаних методів навчання письмової онлайн-комунікації. Зроблено загальний висновок, що найкращий результат у навчанні письмової онлайн-комунікації буде досягнуто за умови поєднання продуктивного, процесного та жанрового підходів на різних етапах навчання англійської мови.

Ключові слова: *письмо, письмова інтернет-комунікація, процесний підхід, продуктивний підхід, жанровий підхід, Нова українська школа.*

Introduction. Writing is the most difficult skill to learn and teach because of its greater standardization and lack of practice outside the classroom. However, it is impossible to ignore writing because it demonstrates the results of previous learning and language use experience. According to the model foreign language curriculum of New Ukrainian School (NUS), writing is part of the general and specific expected results of students' learning and cognitive activities. With the development of modern ICTs, virtual communication has become a trend in everyday communication practices, including student-teacher feedback. In addition, online communication promotes the practical involvement of secondary education students in the dialogue of cultures, the use of foreign language knowledge and skills in the digital world. In the future, it is writing skills, including written online communication, that will determine students' success in higher education, as most of the students' grades are based on what they write in tests, exams, assignments, term papers, projects, graduate works, dissertations, etc. Inappropriate attention to written communication already at the stage of secondary education will lead to failure in secondary and higher education.

Literature review. Ken Hyland discusses the main approaches to teaching writing. He identifies three approaches: the text-as-product approach, the

author-focused approach and the processes required for writing, and the reader-centred approach. The scholar goes on to describe these approaches and concludes that all three approaches build on each other (Hyland, 2008). This paper is a theoretical study, but there are no practical examples in the article.

Norwegian researchers have investigated the relationship between picture- or text-based writing tasks and children's strategies in completing these tasks, as well as their final written products. The researchers found that the cognitive load on children would be greater if the task was presented in the form of a text. Personal and specific characteristics (time to write and pauses) were classified as process variables, while content, accuracy, formal aspects, spelling errors, and workload were classified as product variables. The researchers concluded that textual tasks had a significant effect on concentration, perseverance, writing time, and pausing time during the task – the process variables. Graphic tasks have a significant impact on accuracy and formal aspects of writing – product variables (Søvik and Flem, 1999). Modern authentic materials for teaching English in Ukraine under the NUS programme include writing tasks in both text and image form. The teacher should take into account the results of this study to choose effective methods and strategies for conducting a writing lesson.

The study of Yu, Jiang, and Zhou examined the relationship between product, process, and genre approaches to teaching writing and Chinese students' motivation and interest. Teaching writing as a product had a positive correlation with task management, planning, self-belief, and failure avoidance. However, a product approach can cause anxiety, self-sabotage, and withdrawal. Teaching writing as a process promotes student engagement in writing, but leaves the motivation to write unchanged. The genre-based approach to teaching writing compensates for the disadvantages of the product approach and increases motivation to write. However, for Ukrainian students, these results may differ significantly due to cultural differences and the role of the teacher in the classroom. In addition, no similar research has been conducted for secondary school students. Due to the age of the students, the specifics of the teaching materials and the teacher's work, very different conclusions can be drawn about these approaches (Yu, Jiang and Zhou, 2020).

The work of Kanto High School teachers explored the use of the genre approach to teach textual patterns and the relationship between written texts and the social context in which they are situated. Considering the difference between the product and genre approaches, scholars argue that both approaches focus on broader textual characteristics. However, the product approach helps to familiarise learners with text models only, and can help to simulate the structure of a text, while the genre approach develops a more flexible understanding of the general structures and ways in which genres interact. The genre approach focuses on ways of using rhetorical models and language to achieve social goals (Myskow and Gordon, 2009). That is, when teaching students to write using the product approach, it is important to discuss with students the interaction of the genre they are learning with the social context.

Chieko Onozawa examines the history, advantages and disadvantages, and practical value of the process approach to teaching writing. A process approach to writing is one in which the focus is on the process that leads to the production of the text. In the product approach, on the other hand, the focus is on the end result, i.e. the text. In the process approach, the learner is the central figure, and the teacher should act as a facilitator, encouraging students to express their thoughts and feelings without shame and giving them sufficient time and opportunity to rethink and revise their writing. A typical sequence of writing in the process approach consists of three stages: prewriting, drafting and revising. Additional stages may include thinking, planning, editing, and evaluating. The advantages of the process approach are the opportunity to think while writing, to explore a topic through writing, and to focus on more different classroom activities. The disadvantages of the process approach are less attention to grammar and structure and the final result, excessive focus on one's own experience, unrealistic due to repeated writing, and the threat of failing exams due to time constraints (Onozawa, 2010). However, many modern textbooks for learning English as a foreign language provide an opportunity to apply the process approach to teaching writing. This means that this approach is useful in teaching and the disadvantages can be levelled out by the creativity of modern teachers.

The work of a Palestinian scholar is devoted to the study of the effectiveness of the process approach in teaching writing at Birzeit University. The process approach helped students organise their ideas and edit their paragraphs (Abed, 2023). A similar study for students from Malaysia found similar results (Din, Swanto, Latip and Ismail, 2021). These studies confirm the usefulness of the process approach.

G. S. Mahdi, M. S. A. Al-Shlmani and A. a. J. Mohammed try to define the concepts of «product» and «process» and provide recommendations for teaching writing. They say that process writing emerged in response to the product approach. The researchers argue that the process approach to teaching writing is best used in both a full open model of teaching writing and a closed model of teaching writing (Mahdi, Al-Shlmani and Mohammed, 2022).

Blanka Klimova compares product and process approaches. The features of the process approach are: text as a resource for comparison, ideas as a starting point that requires more than one variant, focus on the purpose, theme, type of text, focus on the reader, collaboration with other colleagues, and focus on creativity. The features of the product approach are: imitation of a model text, the importance of organising ideas rather than the ideas themselves, one project, highlighting features, including controlled practice of these features, individual approach and emphasis on the final product (Klimova, 2014). In addition, a teacher can combine both approaches to teach writing. In this study, the combination of methods was not considered.

In contrasting product and process in English and Arabic classes in Oman, scholars say that the product approach to teaching writing is teacher-centred and requires students to write to only one person, the teacher.

In turn, the process approach to teaching writing is student-centred and pays special attention to different audiences (Al-Mahrooqi and Denman, 2015). The present study confirms the findings of Chieko Onozawa on the process approach.

Malaysian scholars review product, process, genre and multimodal approaches. The genre approach focuses on the linguistic features that are necessary to convey ideas to a particular audience, depending on the type of text. The advantages of the genre approach include familiarity with different types of texts and reduced anxiety due to the availability of relevant examples. However, this approach implies a low level of knowledge of syntax and rules for a specific audience, as well as an underestimation of creative and critical expression. Scholars believe that the genre approach is a continuation of the product approach. The paper provides various definitions of multimodality, for example: «The process of combining different semiotic resources to create and denote meaning». The authors believe that the advantages of the multimodal approach are different ways of communication. They conclude that a teacher should be able to use each approach separately and combine them with each other (Hussin and Aziz, 2022). A similar conclusion is drawn in the work of scientists from Saudi Arabia, which analyses approaches to teaching writing at King Khalid University (Siddiqui and others, 2023). From these studies, we can conclude that virtual communication as a special way of communication can serve as a means of teaching writing. However, the study of Hussin and Aziz omitted written Internet communication as a subject of study, and the study of Siddiqui and others did not consider virtual communication at all.

Chinese researchers investigate the impact of the process-genre approach to teaching argumentative writing on improving the writing skills of second language learners of English at university. The process-genre approach reveals the relationship between communicative goals and language forms of a particular genre as they go through a recursive process of prewriting, drafting, revision, editing and publishing. According to the results of the study, after the process-genre writing course, students in the main group scored higher in the final test. The process-genre approach contributed to improved knowledge of content, language and rhetoric (Yu Huang and Jun Zhang, 2019). That is, the combination of process and genre approaches can improve writing results in all aspects – content, organisation, vocabulary level, language use and mechanics.

Yin Ling Cheung describes writing competence, presents a historical overview of the process and genre approaches to teaching writing, and introduces the socio-cognitive approach to teaching writing. The socio-cognitive approach to teaching writing considers sociocultural processes, thought processes embedded in knowledge transformation and reader expectations. In the socio-cognitive approach, students need to understand the purpose of writing. In a writing class, knowledge should be transformed into writing. Coherence should be viewed in a broader sense, and the teacher should acknowledge that students will encounter writing problems and explain to students the complexity of writing and the reasons for them. This approach ensures that students understand the

macro-rhetorical purpose of writing a text of any genre (Cheung, 2016). That is, by understanding the readers' expectations, context and thought processes on the topic, students will be able to improve their work and understand the necessity of every linguistic detail in their writing.

In her article, Teresa Dovey reflects on her teaching of English for academic purposes to Master's students at the department of IT. The paper concludes that the genre approach does not allow transferring relevant learning from task to task. In addition, familiarising students with the works of scholars does not sufficiently facilitate writing their own text based on sources. At first, the teacher followed the traditional genre approach, where students already know what they are going to write. As a result, students wrote some unstructured and incoherent fragments. Then, the researcher redesigned the exercises to focus on the processes that enable source-based writing. This resulted in improved coherence, organisation and consistency of the students' final work and solved the problem of «patchwriting» (Dovey, 2010). Thus, the best results in academic writing will be achieved by applying product and process approaches at different stages of learning each specific genre.

The work of the Omani scholar is dedicated to combining product and process approaches to teaching writing. The scholar says that the approach to teaching writing should be mixed, because the goal of the process should be the product: «Process without product would be aimless and a product without a process would be hollow». Due to the peculiarities of the English language, learners of English as a foreign language need to learn how to achieve the end result through the process of achieving it. The main stages of product writing instruction are familiarization, controlled writing, guided writing and free writing. The advantages of this approach are the provision of linguistic knowledge about texts, ease of assessment, correction and commentary, and the facilitation of teaching new forms. The disadvantages of this approach are ignoring the development of students' own ideas, the gap between the student's previous knowledge and new knowledge, the reproduction of work, and the relegation of communication and creativity to the background. The process approach develops students' self-confidence. The main recursive procedures of process-based writing instruction are generating ideas, structuring, drafting, focusing, reviewing, and evaluation. These procedures form the 13 stages of writing: discussion, brainstorming, rapid writing, rough notes, preliminary self-assessment, structuring the text, first draft, peer assessment, conference, second draft, self-assessment / editing / proofreading, finished draft, final response to the draft. The advantages of this approach are: creating meaning, adding and deleting ideas, the possibility of checking and editing, and constant feedback. The disadvantages of this approach are the tendency to ignore content and form, the limited scope of writing in different genres, and the large amount of time involved (Khan and Bontha, 2015). That is, by giving students the task of writing a certain text, for example, at least 150 words, the teacher can combine the product and process approach at different stages of writing instruction by doing this task together with students.

The work of Ecuadorian scientists introduces a dual

method of teaching writing at school. The scientists say that a product approach should be used with students who have a low level of language proficiency. Their method is to first introduce children to vocabulary and grammar, then do controlled writing. After that, use pictures or flashcards on the topic to generate ideas and written notes, then use the notes to write sentences similar to the model text, organise the information, make a first draft, correct mistakes with the teacher's help, and present. As a result, students' writing improved (Abata, Cando and Toscano, 2019). This approach is time-consuming and the teacher should be well prepared to use the dual method. This approach ensures the comprehensive development of children, as required by the NUS, but it requires more hours of foreign language at school to offset the time problem.

Rebekah Shultz Colby's research explores the prospects of using games of different genres in teaching writing. The scientist says that commercial video games include visual, sound, writing, spatial and kinesthetic modes. One of the reasons for not using games in teaching writing is the lack of educational materials, including online communication, on how to teach writing through games. Most often, teachers use games to teach rhetorical analysis, new media theory, and technical communications. The researcher says that the least studied is the use of games to facilitate the transfer of aspects of the writing process (Shultz Colby, 2017). That is, despite the processes of gamification of education, the use of games in teaching English writing is unexplored, not to mention virtual English-language communication.

Alice J. Robison sees the video game development process as analogous to the writing process. The scientist says that writing instruction should create a space where you can practice the skills you have acquired and assess your potential for problem solving (Robinson, 2008). In other words, this paper reassesses the role of the writing instructional system used by the teacher. Words, paragraphs, and grammar are the theoretical framework that provide the purpose, and writing instruction is the design that needs to be extracted from the abstraction. Theory and design need to inform each other and, in combination, produce the final product – the learner's writing.

Paul Stapleton and Pavlina Radia emphasise that writing has acquired a new dimension due to the development of ICT. They provide examples of ICTs that can help in teaching writing, emphasising that instructions on how to use these resources should be systematically included in writing instruction (Stapleton and Radia, 2009). Thus, this paper focuses on teaching «ordinary» writing with the help of immersive technologies.

The work of American scholars focuses on the peculiarities of writing in virtual space, as well as the opportunities provided by virtual space for teaching and assessing writing. Virtual conversations are a source of dialogue creation. Ideas for writing are formed as a result of social interaction through complex dialogues or polylogues, and the quality of interaction depends on the preferences and learning style of the participants, the type of task, the role of the teacher, etc. Writing in this case is not a single statement of a person (Zheng and Warschauer, 2017). Thus, this paper focuses on computer-mediated

communication as a learning tool. Although, according to the NUS model foreign language curriculum, the teacher should not only use virtual communication as a teaching tool, but also teach students online communication.

Sam Hamilton analyses digital writing syllabi in colleges. The author considers virtual writing to be an integral part of digital literacy. The scientist says that most courses require students to create and analyze digital texts, as well as write a group project (Hamilton, 2019). In this paper, the author talks more about strategies for teaching the use of modern ICTs, and virtual communication is one of the components of such learning. However, the study does not consider online communication as a language skill that needs to be developed.

I. Elola and A. Oskoz emphasise the need to include the aspect of virtual communication in second language curricula. The researchers argue that with the rapid spread of ICTs, the approach to teaching writing needs to be more complex. That is, this study shows that virtual written communication, including in a foreign language, should be considered as a separate language skill that combines writing, speaking and digital literacy (Elola and Oskoz, 2017).

Thus, most of researches are devoted to product,

process and genre approaches to teaching writing, as well as to comparing these approaches. In some studies, virtual communication is presented as a diverse means of learning. However, work of I. Elola and A. Oskoz and the NUS model foreign language curriculum show that students of basic secondary education should learn to interact online.

Aim. The purpose of this study is to analyze writing lessons and online writing tasks in the Go Getter series of Students' Books for grades 5–7 of lower-secondary schools and Focus 2, Focus 3 second edition for grades 8–9 of upper-secondary schools, as well as to present practical cases of applying product, process and genre approaches to teaching virtual English written communication to secondary school students.

Results and discussion. Let's look at a virtual writing task on the MyEnglishLab platform from the Go Getter 1 textbook for Grade 5 (Bright, 2018). Similar tasks in the Pearson series of textbooks should be graded by the teacher. This will allow each student to receive feedback from the teacher in a convenient format.

The Unit, which the students are studying, is «Family and Friends». Let's analyze the lesson that precedes the task in *Figure 1*.

	Pierre	Pedro
Age	12	11
Country	France	Spain
Nationality	French	Spanish

Pierre and Pedro are best friends. Pierre is

Figure 1. Written task in online Workbook of Go Getter 1

Exercise 5 in *Figure 2* is a model text. Thus, a product approach to teaching writing is used in this case. Instead of explaining all the features of the text to students, the teacher can ask students the following questions: what is the text about – a girl named Jen; what information do they see here besides the name – Jen's nationality and about Jen's best friend. Next, the teacher can draw attention to the usage of Capital letters for names and nationalities in the text by asking what students see that is special about the Capital letters. The teacher can then ask where else they see the Capital letter – at the beginning of a sentence – and compare this with the Ukrainian language. By asking

students to circle all the capital letters in the text, the teacher will be doing activity 6 in *Figure 2*.

In this way, students will see that in English, unlike Ukrainian, nationalities are capitalised. Thus, the teacher will use the eliciting technique and reduce Teacher Talking Time. Using a product approach, the teacher will not be constantly in the centre of attention, as noted in Al-Mahrooqi and Denman's research. Exercise 7 can be used as a stage of controlled or guided writing. Here, the teacher will definitely pay attention to the forms of the verb to be. The task in *Figure 1* is free writing, the purpose of which is to introduce other people.

1.6 Listening and Writing I can understand and write short texts about best friends.

1 Look at the website. What is the radio show about?

2 Listen to the radio show. Match callers 1-3 to photos of their best friends A-C

1 Tom 2 Maria 3 Juan

3 **Exam Spot** Listen again. Write a number or a country.

- How old is Monica? 11
- Where is Monica now? Spain
- How old is Jack? 12
- Where are Georgia and Toni from? Italy

4 Who's your best friend? Tell the class.

5 Read Jen's blog and complete the table.

Me and my best friend

My name's Jen. I'm ten and I'm from the UK. I'm British. My best friend is my neighbour, Lucas. He's eleven. Lucas and his family are from Spain. They're Spanish.

Name	Age	Nationality	Country
Me	Jen		the UK
My best friend		Spanish	

Writing Capital letters

Use a capital letter for names of people, countries and nationalities. Use a capital letter for the pronoun I and at the beginning of every sentence too.

My best friend is Jack. I'm from France. Georgia and Toni are Italian.

6 Find and circle capital letters in Jen's blog in Exercise 5.

7 **Writing Time** Write about you and your best friend.

Find ideas
Find a photo of you and your best friend. Make notes.

Draft
Write about your name, age, country and nationality.
My name's ... I'm (ten/eleven/twelve ...)
I'm from ...
Write the same about your best friend.

Check and write
Check all the capital letters and write the final version of your text.

Figure 2. Page 18 in Go Getter 1 Student's book

It is worth noting that the entire series of Go Getter books has a similar structure of writing lessons. In addition, Go Getter 1, 2, 3 are designed to study and consolidate CEFR levels A1 and A2. This confirms the conclusion of Ecuadorian scientists about the priority of the product method for learners with lower language proficiency. Virtual written communication in this case becomes the subject of study. And students in this case will be able to write not only to the teacher, as Al-Mahrooqi and Denman

argued.

Consider a virtual writing task from the Focus 2 second edition textbook (Brayshaw, 2020).

Figure 3 shows that the purpose of this task is to write a complaint letter. Since a complaint is one of the genres of writing, it is better to use the genre approach to teaching writing in this case.

Consider the lesson that precedes the virtual writing task in Figure 3.

MyEnglishLab SECOND EDITION FOCUS 2

7.7 Writing: A formal written complaint Switch to Teacher view

SHOW WHAT YOU'VE LEARNT
Exercise 8

Look at the customer feedback form a gym and fitness centre. Use the information and write an email to make a polite complaint. Include and develop the points below.

- Give your reason for writing.
- Explain when you joined and how much you paid.
- Explain the problem and give appropriate details.
- Tell the reader what you expect the company to do.

Sunshine Gym & Fitness
Feedback and Suggestions
We are always keen to hear from our customers. Tell us about your experience at Sunshine Gym & Fitness.

I want to complain about your service. On 18/11, I paid 200 euros to join your gym for a year, but I am not happy. Half of the machines in the gym are broken or dangerous, the changing rooms are always smelly and dirty and the staff are rude. When I complained about the broken running machine last week, the man at the desk told me I should run home instead! I'm not going to come to your gym anymore and I want all my money back.

Figure 3. Written task in online Workbook of Focus 2 second edition

Activity 2 in Figure 4 shows a text that is not a formal complaint, and Activity 3 shows the features of the formal complaint genre.

7.7 WRITING
A formal written complaint
I can write a basic email of complaint requesting an action.

1 SPEAKING Tick any problems that you, your family or your friends have had when buying something. Tell your partner.

- It was past its sell-by date.
- It didn't work.
- It was broken or damaged.
- Some parts were missing.
- The service was bad.
- The delivery was late.
- It was different from the description.
- It was the wrong product.

2 Read Email 1 and answer the questions.

- Which problems in Exercise 1 did the customer have?
- Do you think this is a formal written complaint? Why? Why not?

3 Read the tips in the WRITING FOCUS. Which tips does Email 1 NOT follow?

WRITING FOCUS
A formal written complaint

- Open and close the email or letter formally.
- Give a reason for writing.
- Say what you bought and when.
- Explain the problem giving details.
- Tell the reader what you expect them to do.
- Use formal language with no contractions.

4 Read Email 2. For WRITING FOCUS tips 1-4, underline examples of formal language in the email.

Dear Sir or Madam,
I am writing to complain about the service provided by your company.
I bought a pair of headphones (Model: SA-DIV-RED) from your website on 3rd March and paid for them online. They arrived the next day, but when I tried them, they did not work, so I returned them to you on 5th March and you exchanged them for a new pair. Unfortunately, the second pair you sent were the wrong model, so I emailed you again and sent them back one more time. I received a pair of headphones from you today, but when I unpacked them, I found they were damaged, and they do not work.
I am very disappointed with your service. I do not want another pair of headphones. I would be grateful if you could send me a full refund for the headphones and the cost of sending them back to you three times.
Yours faithfully,
R. Barker

5 Read the LANGUAGE FOCUS. Complete the examples with words and phrases in Email 2.

LANGUAGE FOCUS
Formal language
You can make your language more formal by avoiding contractions and using more formal words and expressions.

Informal - Email 1	Formal - Email 2
they didn't work	they ¹ <u>did not</u> work
I got some headphones	I ² <u>received</u> some headphones
I sent them back	I ³ <u>returned</u> them to you
You swapped them	You ⁴ <u>exchanged</u> them
I got another pair	I ⁵ <u>received</u> another pair
I'm so angry	I ⁶ <u>am very disappointed</u>
I want all my money back	I ⁷ <u>would be grateful if you could send me a full refund</u>

Other common words and phrases

If you need more information	If you require further information
I want the chance to chat about this	I would like the opportunity to discuss this
Call us	Please contact us
We're sorry about the problem	We apologise for the problem

6 Rewrite the following exchange to make it more formal. Use the LANGUAGE FOCUS to help you.

CUSTOMER
I'm so angry. A couple of weeks ago, I got a suit from you to wear to a wedding but it was too small. You swapped it for a bigger size, but it's the wrong colour and the zip doesn't work on the trousers. I've sent them back because it's too late for the wedding. I want all my money back, including the price of postage.
I am very disappointed with ...

ONLINE CLOTHES STORE
We're sorry about the problem you've had with this order. We'll give you all your money back but we can't pay the postage. If you want the chance to chat about this, call us on 09000 999 999.
We apologise for ...

7 Do the writing task. Use the ideas in the WRITING FOCUS and LANGUAGE FOCUS to help you.
Look at the online music store website and read the customer's comment. Write a formal email of complaint. Include the following information:
• explain the reasons for your complaint
• describe what you bought and when
• explain the problem with the product in detail
• explain how you expect the company to solve the problem.

CONTACT US
Select a category: choose from the dropdown menu
Please tell us the type of problem you are experiencing:
• My download won't complete
• This is not the music I wanted
• My file won't play
• The quality of sound is low
• I deleted the file by mistake

Comment
I want to complain about your service. I have tried to download Adele's album 21 three times this month but every time the download has not completed. I've contacted you three times on 1st, 8th and 17th April. I've been a loyal customer for two years and I've enjoyed the music I've bought each month from your site. But now I want a refund of my last month's subscription. Please close my account.

SEND
Dear Sir or Madam,
I am writing to complain about ...

Figure 4. Pages 96-97 in Focus 2 second edition

To analyze the peculiarities of writing complaints, the teacher can first assign students the role of managers of a company, institution, etc. After that, teacher can discuss with the students the inevitability of complaints from customers and ask them what kind of complaint they would expect to see if a similar situation occurs. Most likely, students will mention the politeness and details of the problem. Teacher can then go through the text in Activity 2 with the learners and find out what is wrong with this complaint (progressively looking at the characteristics of complaints in Activity 3) and whether they would be pleased to read this from customers. This will give the students a chance to reflect on the topic, understand the importance of the introduction in writing complaints and the context of such situations. After that, teacher can tell the students that the correct complaint in Activity 4 is a model text in the complaint genre and, using the eliciting technique repeatedly, step by step analyze the linguistic features (they are written in Activity 5) of complaints

using the example of Activity 4. After that, consolidate these features with the help of Exercise 6 as a stage of controlled writing. Exercise 7, as in Go Getter, can be used as a guided writing activity. The online writing task in Figure 3 is a free writing task that the teacher can set as homework and then provide quality content and language feedback to each student in private comments and to all students in class.

Let's have a look at a virtual writing task from the Focus 3 second edition (Brayshaw, 2020). This textbook is designed for B1/B1+ level, which means that writing instruction should be increasingly student-centred.

The vocabulary topic that precedes the online writing task is «It's just a game». The topic of the writing lesson is writing stories with a simple linear sequence. That is, in the task in Figure 5, students have to write a story about how sport pushes human boundaries, using appropriate grammar.

MyEnglishLab
SECOND EDITION FOCUS 3
2.7 Writing: A story Switch to Student view

SHOW WHAT YOU'VE LEARNT
Exercise 9

You have decided to write a short story for your class magazine. The theme of the next edition is 'Pushing your limits.' Include and develop these points:

Figure 5. Online written task in Focus 3 second edition

In Figure 6, Exercise 2, there is a model text about snowboarding, but the task in Figure 5 does not hint that you need to write about sports. This lesson can be split into two. In the first lesson, the teacher can review the structure, vocabulary and grammatical features of the

text in Exercise 2. Then, they can reinforce the features with activities 7 and 9. This will be a product approach to teaching writing. The second lesson will be devoted to writing the story itself.

2.7 WRITING
A story
I can write a story with a simple linear sequence.

1 SPEAKING Look at photos A-F and match them with the extreme sports in the box. Then discuss the questions.

bungee jumping mountain biking rafting
rock climbing snowboarding water skiing

1 What extreme sports have you tried?
2 What extreme sports would you like to try?
3 What extreme sports would you recommend to try? Why?


2 Read the beginning of the story. What do you think went wrong?

There's a first time for everything!
I don't think many people have been in a situation like the one Lily and I experienced last winter. We were learning to snowboard for the first time in the spectacular mountains of Austria. Of course, many things can go wrong when you're new to an extreme sport, but what happened to us was very unusual. The old saying, 'there's a first time for everything' is definitely true based on our experience!

We'd booked lessons before we arrived, and were both feeling quite nervous as we took the lift up the mountain with Max, our enthusiastic instructor. 'Don't worry' he said, 'you might fall over a bit, but you'll love it!' The first lesson was really challenging and we fell over A LOT! By the end of the first day we were completely exhausted but, as promised, we'd had a brilliant time and fellas totally in love with snowboarding.

The following day, Max was demonstrating how to turn. As our eyes followed him down the slope, he suddenly disappeared. 'Where did he go?' I asked Lily, as we headed for where he'd disappeared. We discovered Max at the bottom of a big hole. 'I think it's broken!' he said holding his left leg. We called for help on his radio and twenty minutes later the three of us were in a helicopter heading for the medical centre.

I'm pretty sure we enjoyed the helicopter ride more than poor Max! The doctor confirmed that he had broken his leg. She said it was the first time she'd ever seen learners bring their instructor in for treatment.



3 Read the story and put the events a-g in chronological order (1-7).


a They arrived in Austria
b They rode in a helicopter
c They radioed for help
d They booked lessons
e Max fell down a hole
f They had their first lesson
g They met Max

4 SPEAKING Discuss your own experiences of trying out a sport for the first time.

5 Read the advice for writing a story and complete the examples in the WRITING FOCUS with the words in purple from the story.

WRITING FOCUS
A story
• Beginning your story
• Use an opening sentence and interesting title that makes the reader want to read on.
• Set the scene for the story so the reader can imagine what might happen next.
• Finish the beginning section with a problem, or at a point which is exciting or interesting.
• Telling your story
• Use a range of different narrative tenses to tell the story.
• Use the Past Continuous to set the scene.
We 1 were both feeling quite nervous.
Use the Past Simple to describe the main events.
We 2 she lift up the mountain.
Use the Past Perfect to make it clear that one past action happened before another past action.
We 3 lessons before we arrived.
• Use adverbs and strong adjectives to make the story exciting.
By the end of the first day, we were 4.
• Use sequencers so the reader can follow the story.
After 5 the three of us were in a helicopter...
• Use one or two short sentences for dramatic effect.
We discovered Max at the bottom of a big hole.
• Use some direct speech to make the story come alive.
6; I asked Lily.
• Ending your story
• Think of an exciting, funny or unexpected ending to the story to help the reader remember it.

6 Find and underline more examples of the narrative tenses from the WRITING FOCUS in the story.



7 Complete the story with the correct narrative form of the verbs in brackets.

'3-2-1 bungee!'
I wanted to jump, but my legs wouldn't move.
'1 _____ (visit) New Zealand when I _____ (decide) to try bungee jumping. I _____ (never do) it before, but felt quietly confident as I watched from the ground. An hour later though, as I stood on the edge of the bridge looking down, I _____ (realise) that all that confidence _____ disappear. 'Come on Dan! You can do it!' shouted the other jumpers. 'Three-two-one bungee!' ... Nothing. 'I ... I ... I'll have to get down!' I said. And so I did, though not quite as planned.
As I started to climb off the platform, I _____ (stand) on a rope and lost my balance. My cry of horror _____ (become) a scream of pure joy as I fell towards the ground. That _____ (be) the day I fell in love with bungee jumping.

8 Complete the LANGUAGE FOCUS with the underlined examples in the story in Exercise 2.

LANGUAGE FOCUS
Linkers to describe events in a sequence
• Beginning: '1 before we arrived/left/got there, (at) first, on the first morning/day
• Middle: then, later, the 2 _____ morning/evening, after that/three days, on the third/fourth day
• End: eventually (meaning after a long time), finally, in the end
• Other: 3 _____ the first day/lesson/journey/holiday

9 Choose the correct option.

The longest weekend of my life
Some weekends are special for the wrong reasons. Last weekend was one of them. 'After / Then very little training, my best friend and I attempted our first 100km walking race. 'Finally / On the first morning we fell out because he'd forgotten to pack the map. Luckily, we were able to borrow somebody's extra one. 'After six hours / At first we reached the first rest stop. We'd fought most of the way about which was the fastest way to go. 'Finally / By the end of the first day we'd walked forty-three kilometres and were not really speaking to each other anymore. 'The following morning / The day before, we started walking again at 5 a.m. and I can honestly say I've never heard so much complaining in all my life. 'Eventually / Before, we reached the finishing line after thirty-two hours of walking and an entire weekend of arguing. We haven't seen or spoken to each other since.

SHOW WHAT YOU'VE LEARNT
10 Do the writing task. Use the ideas in the WRITING FOCUS and the LANGUAGE FOCUS to help you.
Write a story about trying a new sport or activity for the first time and:
• use the first sentence and title to catch the reader's attention.
• set the scene and mention the characters involved in the story.
• use a range of narrative tenses to tell the story.
• finish the story with something exciting, funny or unexpected.

Figure 6. Writing lesson by unit «It's just a game» in Focus 3 second edition

The teacher can use the online writing task in Figure 5 to apply the process approach to teaching writing. The first step is to ask students the question: «How can you push your limits?» and use group discussion and brainstorming to generate and record (on a real or online whiteboard) a variety of ideas, including trying a new sport. Next, the teacher can draw attention to the points that need to be included in the story and give students time to quickly write an outline and sketch for each paragraph. The students then do a preliminary self-assessment of their plan and outline with the teacher. The teacher then gives the students a chance to write their first draft. At the end of the lesson, a conference can be held on the first draft, the teacher can remind students of what was covered in the first lesson, point out their mistakes or what is missing (words, phrases, grammatical structures), and the second project, which will be the final one for students, is the work of secondary school students on the MyEnglishLab platform in Figure 5. This lesson plan is similar to the one proposed in Khan & Bontha research, but slightly narrower. If there is enough time in the lesson, the teacher can expand the stages of the lesson. Another option is to write a second draft in Word and send it to the teacher, or to write and send a second draft in the messenger, and then the third attempt will be the final project in MEL.

Thus, the focus of the blended writing method is not on the teacher, but on the student. Secondary students

are constantly involved in writing. Communication and creativity are at the forefront. This can help students develop confidence in themselves and their writing abilities. Some students will simply model the text in Activity 2 in Figure 6 (it's a result of usage of the product approach), while others will go further and come up with their own unique story and reduce their mistakes (it's a result of usage of the process approach).

Conclusions. The main approaches to teaching «traditional» handwriting are product, process and genre, which can be combined with each other. The same approaches can be used to teach online written communication. This paper presents three examples of product, process and genre approaches to teaching virtual English written communication. The first example from Go Getter 1 is a possible variant of the product approach with the learner in the centre of attention. The second example from Focus 2 second edition is a genre-based approach with the learner as the central figure, and the example from Focus 3 second edition is a combination of product and process approaches to teaching virtual English writing, where Teacher Talking Time is limited as much as possible.

Research perspectives. This paper does not provide examples of applying only the process approach and mixing genre and process approaches, as well as the results of applied research, which is a prospect for

further researches. In addition, it is necessary to answer the question whether, for example, product-process and process-product methods differ from each other. If so, in what way and what are the features of each of these methods.

REFERENCES

- Hyland, K. (2008). Writing theories and writing pedagogies. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 4 (2), pp. 1–20. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.25170/ijelt.v4i2.145> (Accessed: 05.04.2024). [in English].
- Søvik, N. and Flem, A. (1999). The effects of different tasks on children's process and product variables in writing. *Learning and Instruction*, 9 (2), pp. 167–188. Available at: [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0959-4752\(98\)00043-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0959-4752(98)00043-7) (Accessed: 05.04.2024). [in English].
- Yu, S., Jiang, L. and Zhou, N. (2020). The impact of L2 writing instructional approaches on student writing motivation and engagement. *Language Teaching Research*, 27 (4), pp. 958–973. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820957024> (Accessed: 05.04.2024). [in English].
- Myskow, G. and Gordon, K. (2009). A focus on purpose: using a genre approach in an EFL writing class. *ELT Journal*, 64 (3), pp. 283–292. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccp057> (Accessed: 05.04.2024). [in English].
- Onozawa, C. (2010). A study of the Process Writing approach: A suggestion for an eclectic writing approach. *Research Note*, 10, pp. 153–163. (Accessed: 08.04.2024). [in English].
- Abed, T. B. B. (2023). Implementing the process writing approach to teach paragraph writing at Birzeit University. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 15 (1), pp. 24–34. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1501.04> (Accessed: 08.04.2024). [in English].
- Din, W. A., Swanto, S., Latip, N. a. A. and Ismail, I. H. (2021). The process approach to the teaching of writing: focus on process rather than product. *Journal of Information System and Technology Management*, 6 (23), pp. 63–71. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.35631/jistm.623005> (Accessed: 05.04.2024). [in English].
- Mahdi, G. S., Al-Shlmani, M. S. A. and Mohammed, A. a. J. (2022). Process approach to teaching writing applied in different teaching models. *IAR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3 (02), pp. 90–94. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.47310/iarjhss.2022.v03i02.013> (Accessed: 08.04.2024). [in English].
- Klimova, B. F. (2014). Approaches to the Teaching of Writing Skills. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 112, pp. 147–151. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.1149> (Accessed: 12.04.2024). [in English].
- Al-Mahrooqi, R. and Denman, C. (2015). Process vs. Product. In *Methodologies for Effective Writing Instruction in EFL and ESL Classrooms*, pp. 77–93. IGI Global. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-4666-6619-1.ch006> (Accessed: 12.04.2024). [in English].
- Hussin, S. N. L. and Aziz, A. A. (2022). Rethinking the Teaching Approaches of ESL/EFL Writing Skills. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 11 (1), pp. 1044–1054. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarped/v11-i1/12174> (Accessed: 12.04.2024). [in English].
- Siddiqui, S., et al. (2023). Teaching writing skills to EFL learners: Issues and concerns. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 14 (6), pp. 1541–1550. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1406.12> (Accessed: 12.04.2024). [in English].
- Yu Huang and Lawrence Jun Zhang. (2019). Does a Process-Genre Approach Help Improve Students' Argumentative Writing in English as a Foreign Language? Findings From an Intervention Study. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 36 (4), pp. 339–364. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2019.1649223> (Accessed: 12.04.2024). [in English].
- Cheung, Y. L. (2016). Teaching Writing. *English Language Education*, pp. 179–194. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-38834-2_13 (Accessed: 12.04.2024). [in English].
- Dovey, T. (2010). Facilitating writing from sources: A focus on both process and product. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 9 (1), pp. 45–60. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2009.11.005> (Accessed: 16.04.2024). [in English].
- Khan, K. and Bontha, U. R. (2015). How blending process and product approaches to teaching writing helps EFL learners. In *Advances in educational technologies and instructional design book series*, pp. 94–114. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-4666-6619-1.ch007> (Accessed: 16.04.2024). [in English].
- Abata, M., Cando, F. and Toscano, K. (2019). Teaching writing to children: product and process approach, a dual method. *Proceedings of EDULEARN19 Conference* [Preprint]. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.21125/edulearn.2019.1821> (Accessed: 16.04.2024). [in English].
- Shultz Colby, R. (2017). Game-based Pedagogy in the Writing Classroom. *Computers and Composition*, 43, pp. 55–72. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2016.11.002> (Accessed: 16.04.2024). [in English].
- Robison, A. J. (2008). The Design is the Game: Writing Games, Teaching Writing. *Computers and Composition*, 25 (3), pp. 359–370. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2016.11.002> (Accessed: 16.04.2024). [in English].
- Stapleton, P. and Radia, P. (2009). Tech-era L2 writing: towards a new kind of process. *ELT Journal*, 64 (2), pp. 175–183. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccp038> (Accessed: 19.04.2024). [in English].
- Zheng, B. and Warschauer, M. (2017). Epilogue: Second language writing in the age of computer-mediated communication. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 36, pp. 61–67. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2017.05.014> (Accessed: 19.04.2024). [in English].
- Hamilton, S. (2019). Reflection(s) In/On Digital Writing's Hybrid Pedagogy, 2010–2017. *Computers and Composition*, 52, pp. 158–174. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2019.02.006> (Accessed: 19.04.2024). [in English].
- Elola, I. and Oskoz, A. (2017). Writing with 21st century social tools in the L2 classroom: New literacies, genres, and writing practices. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 36, pp. 52–60. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2017.04.002> (Accessed: 19.04.2024). [in English].
- Bright, C. et al. (2018). *Go Getter 1 Student's book*. Pearson. 112 p. [in English].
- Brayshaw, D. et al. (2020). *Focus 2nd Edition 2 with*

Online Practice. Pearson. 159 p. [in English].
Brayshaw, D. et al. (2020). Focus 2nd Edition 3 with Online Practice. Pearson. 159 p. [in English].

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНОЇ ЛІТЕРАТУРИ

- Hyland, K. (2008). Writing theories and writing pedagogies. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 4 (2), pp. 1–20. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.25170/ijelt.v4i2.145> (Accessed: 05.04.2024).
- Søvik, N. and Flem, A. (1999). The effects of different tasks on children's process and product variables in writing. *Learning and Instruction*, 9 (2), pp. 167–188. Available at: [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0959-4752\(98\)00043-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0959-4752(98)00043-7) (Accessed: 05.04.2024).
- Yu, S., Jiang, L. and Zhou, N. (2020). The impact of L2 writing instructional approaches on student writing motivation and engagement. *Language Teaching Research*, 27 (4), pp. 958–973. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820957024> (Accessed: 05.04.2024).
- Myskow, G. and Gordon, K. (2009). A focus on purpose: using a genre approach in an EFL writing class. *ELT Journal*, 64 (3), pp. 283–292. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccp057>. (Accessed: 05.04.2024).
- Onozawa, C. (2010). A study of the Process Writing approach: A suggestion for an eclectic writing approach. *Research Note*, 10, pp. 153–163. (Accessed: 08.04.2024).
- Abed, T. B. B. (2023). Implementing the process writing approach to teach paragraph writing at Birzeit University. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 15 (1), pp. 24–34. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1501.04> (Accessed: 08.04.2024).
- Din, W. A., Swanto, S., Latip, N. a. A. and Ismail, I. H. (2021). The process approach to the teaching of writing: focus on process rather than product. *Journal of Information System and Technology Management*, 6 (23), pp. 63–71. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.35631/jistm.623005> (Accessed: 08.04.2024).
- Mahdi, G. S., Al-Shlmani, M. S. A. and Mohammed, A. a. J. (2022). Process approach to teaching writing applied in different teaching models. *IAR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3 (02), pp. 90–94. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.47310/iarjhss.2022.v03i02.013> (Accessed: 08.04.2024).
- Klimova, B. F. (2014). Approaches to the Teaching of Writing Skills. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 112, pp. 147–151. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.1149> (Accessed: 12.04.2024).
- Al-Mahrooqi, R. and Denman, C. (2015). Process vs. Product. In *Methodologies for Effective Writing Instruction in EFL and ESL Classrooms*, pp. 77–93. IGI Global. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-4666-6619-1.ch006> (Accessed: 12.04.2024).
- Hussin, S. N. L. and Aziz, A. A. (2022). Rethinking the Teaching Approaches of ESL/EFL Writing Skills. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 11 (1), pp. 1044–1054. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarped/v11-i1/12174> (Accessed: 12.04.2024).
- Siddiqui, S., et al. (2023). Teaching writing skills to EFL learners: Issues and concerns. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 14 (6), pp. 1541–1550. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1406.12> (Accessed: 12.04.2024).
- Yu Huang and Lawrence Jun Zhang. (2019). Does a Process-Genre Approach Help Improve Students' Argumentative Writing in English as a Foreign Language? Findings From an Intervention Study. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 36 (4), pp. 339–364. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2019.1649223> (Accessed: 12.04.2024).
- Cheung, Y. L. (2016). Teaching Writing. *English Language Education*, pp. 179–194. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-38834-2_13 (Accessed: 12.04.2024).
- Dovey, T. (2010). Facilitating writing from sources: A focus on both process and product. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 9 (1), pp. 45–60. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2009.11.005> (Accessed: 16.04.2024).
- Khan, K. and Bontha, U. R. (2015). How blending process and product approaches to teaching writing helps EFL learners. In *Advances in educational technologies and instructional design book series*, pp. 94–114. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-4666-6619-1.ch007> (Accessed: 16.04.2024).
- Abata, M., Cando, F. and Toscano, K. (2019). Teaching writing to children: product and process approach, a dual method. *Proceedings of EDULEARN19 Conference* [Preprint]. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.21125/edulearn.2019.1821> (Accessed: 16.04.2024).
- Shultz Colby, R. (2017). Game-based Pedagogy in the Writing Classroom. *Computers and Composition*, 43, pp. 55–72. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2016.11.002> (Accessed: 16.04.2024).
- Robison, A. J. (2008). The Design is the Game: Writing Games, Teaching Writing. *Computers and Composition*, 25 (3), pp. 359–370. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2016.11.002> (Accessed: 16.04.2024).
- Stapleton, P. and Radia, P. (2009). Tech-era L2 writing: towards a new kind of process. *ELT Journal*, 64 (2), pp. 175–183. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccp038> (Accessed: 19.04.2024).
- Zheng, B. and Warschauer, M. (2017). Epilogue: Second language writing in the age of computer-mediated communication. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 36, pp. 61–67. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2017.05.014> (Accessed: 19.04.2024).
- Hamilton, S. (2019). Reflection(s) In/On Digital Writing's Hybrid Pedagogy, 2010–2017. *Computers and Composition*, 52, pp. 158–174. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2019.02.006> (Accessed: 19.04.2024).
- Elola, I. and Oskoz, A. (2017). Writing with 21st century social tools in the L2 classroom: New literacies, genres, and writing practices. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 36, pp. 52–60. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2017.04.002> (Accessed: 19.04.2024).
- Bright, C. et al. (2018). Go Getter 1 Student's book. Pearson. 112 p.
- Brayshaw, D. et al. (2020). Focus 2nd Edition 2 with Online Practice. Pearson. 159 p.
- Brayshaw, D. et al. (2020). Focus 2nd Edition 3 with Online Practice. Pearson. 159 p.

Дата надходження до редакції: 30.04.2024