
INNOVATIVE METHODS AND TOOLS FOR TEACHING LANGUAGES: A CASE STUDY OF THE STRATEGIC COMMUNICATION COURSE FOR MASTER-LEVEL PHILOLOGY STUDENTS

Perminova Vladyslava, Shenderuk Olena, Lytvyn Svitlana
DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-712-3-2-13>

INTRODUCTION

The accelerating convergence of language education, media literacy and professional communication training has placed considerable pressure on university curricula to move beyond the transmission of grammatical and lexical competence toward the cultivation of strategic, audience-oriented, and technologically mediated communicative skill. Nowhere is this pressure more visible than in postgraduate philology programmes, where graduates are increasingly expected to operate not only as linguists and translators but also as communication specialists capable of designing, executing and evaluating messages for organisations, public institutions and civic actors. The present contribution examines how these demands have been translated into classroom practice within a Master-level course entitled Strategic Communication, delivered in English to philology students whose first language is not English. Drawing on the authors' own design, delivery and iterative revision of the course over several academic cycles, the article offers an original account of the pedagogical architecture, the innovative methods and digital tools employed, and the outcomes observed among learners.

The choice of Strategic Communication as a case study is not incidental. As a discipline, strategic communication sits at the intersection of rhetoric, public relations, political communication, media studies and applied linguistics; it therefore offers an unusually rich testing ground for innovative language-teaching methodologies that must simultaneously develop disciplinary knowledge, professional competence and advanced English proficiency. Unlike general English for Academic Purposes courses, a strategic communication course for philologists cannot rely on decontextualised language drills; instead, it must immerse learners in authentic communicative tasks while continuously

scaffolding the linguistic resources required to perform these tasks at a professional level. This dual demand has driven the search for methodologies that integrate content and language, foreground learner autonomy and collaboration, and exploit digital and AI-assisted tools to extend practice beyond the physical classroom.

The problem addressed in the present contribution may therefore be formulated as follows: which combination of innovative teaching methods and tools allows a Master-level, English-medium course in strategic communication to develop simultaneously disciplinary knowledge, professional communicative competence and advanced language proficiency among philology students, and how can the effectiveness of such methods be assessed and refined in practice? The article is structured around three paragraphs. The first situates the discussion within Ukrainian and international scholarship and presents the course profile. The second describes, in detail, the innovative methods and tools piloted and refined across several iterations of the course. The third reports on assessment innovations, implementation outcomes, challenges and practical recommendations. The article closes with conclusions that summarise the principal findings and their transferable value for similar curricula.

1. The theoretical prerequisites and the research problem's formulation

The methodological choices described in this contribution build on a substantial body of research conducted both within Ukrainian applied linguistics and methodology of language teaching and within the wider international literature on language pedagogy, communication studies and professional training. Within the Ukrainian scholarly tradition, the methodology of teaching foreign languages for specific and professional purposes has been developed extensively by O. B. Tarnopolsky¹, whose work on content-based and ESP instruction at university level has shaped the integration of disciplinary content with English-language skill development adopted in the present course, and by S. Yu. Nikolaeva², whose contributions to the general methodology of foreign-language teaching and to competency-based curriculum design underlie the course's learning-outcome architecture. O. B. Bihych's³ research on learner autonomy and reflective strategies in foreign-language methodology

¹ Тарнопольський О. Б. Методика навчання іншомовної мовленнєвої діяльності у вищому мовному закладі освіти. Київ, 2006. С. 34–41.

² Ніколаєва С. Ю. (ред.) Методика навчання іноземних мов і культур: теорія і практика. Київ, 2013. С. 12–28.

³ Бігич О. Б. Теорія і практика формування методичної компетенції вчителя іноземної мови початкової школи. Київ, 2006. С. 56–63.

directly informs the reflective-portfolio component described below, while N. V. Borysko⁴ and I. F. Rodionova⁵ have contributed to the theory and practice of intercultural and professional communicative competence formation that underpins the course's cross-cultural case selection.

In the adjacent field of communication and media studies, Ukrainian scholarship has likewise informed the disciplinary content of the course. V. V. Rizun's⁶ foundational work on the theory of mass communication and V. F. Ivanov's⁷ research on journalism and media communication provided conceptual grounding for the analytical frameworks used in case-based sessions, while O. V. Zernetska's⁸ studies of global communication and information strategy informed the campaign-design unit's treatment of multi-channel strategic messaging. S. M. Kvit's⁹ work on media literacy directly shaped the ethical-evaluation strand of the course, while L. M. Horodenko's¹⁰ research on digital and online communication informed the design of the course's social-media and digital-content components.

Within the international literature, the course's content-and-language-integrated architecture draws on the foundational CLIL framework developed by Coyle, Hood and Marsh¹¹, and on the research of Ellis¹² and Nunan¹³ on task-based language teaching. The genre-analytic research of Swales¹⁴ and Bhatia¹⁵ underpins the case-based, noticing-oriented approach to professional-genre acquisition, while Hyland's¹⁶ work on professional discourse informed the explicit attention given to hedging, modality and register calibration throughout the course. The crisis-simulation strand draws directly on Coombs's¹⁷ situational crisis-communication theory and on Benoit's¹⁸ image-restoration theory,

⁴ Бориско Н. В. Теоретичні основи створення навчально-методичних комплексів для мовної міжкультурної підготовки вчителів іноземних мов. Київ, 2008. С. 22–30.

⁵ Родіонова І. Ф. Формування професійної комунікативної компетентності майбутніх філологів у процесі фахової підготовки. Київ, 2015. С. 41–49.

⁶ Різун В. В. Теорія масової комунікації. Київ, 2008. С. 18–25.

⁷ Іванов В. Ф. Теорія журналістики в Україні: становлення й розвиток. Київ, 2006. С. 102–110.

⁸ Зернецька О. В. Глобальна комунікація. Київ, 2017. С. 87–95.

⁹ Квіт С. М. Масові комунікації. Київ, 2008. С. 130–138.

¹⁰ Городенко Л. М. Інтернет-комунікація: теоретичні та прикладні аспекти. Київ, 2017. С. 201–209.

¹¹ Coyle D., Hood P., Marsh D. Content and Language Integrated Learning. Cambridge, 2010. P. 1–15.

¹² Ellis R. Task-Based Language Teaching and Learning. Oxford, 2003. P. 27–33.

¹³ Nunan D. Task-Based Language Teaching. Cambridge, 2004. P. 4–9.

¹⁴ Swales J. M. Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings. Cambridge, 1990. P. 58–66.

¹⁵ Bhatia V. K. Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings. London, 1993. P. 39–47.

¹⁶ Hyland K. Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing. Ann Arbor, 2004. P. 87–95.

¹⁷ Coombs W. T. Ongoing Crisis Communication: Planning, Managing, and Responding. 5th ed. Thousand Oaks, 2019. P. 141–158.

¹⁸ Benoit W. L. Accounts, Excuses, and Apologies: Image Repair Theory and Research. 2nd ed. Albany, 2015. P. 23–40.

while Grunig's¹⁹ excellence theory of public relations and Kent and Taylor's²⁰ research on dialogic communication further shaped the course's treatment of two-way, audience-responsive strategic communication. Thomas's²¹ review of project-based learning and Kolb's²² theory of experiential learning underlie the project-based and simulation components respectively, while Lave and Wenger's²³ situated-learning theory provides a broader rationale for embedding language learning within authentic communities of practice. Finally, Godwin-Jones's²⁴ research on AI-assisted writing instruction and Dörnyei's²⁵ work on learner motivation informed, respectively, the bounded AI-use protocol and the attention given throughout the course design to sustaining learner engagement through authentic, consequential tasks.

Against this theoretical background, the course under examination is a one-semester, English-medium elective offered within the Master's programme of a philology department, typically taken by students in their first or second semester of graduate study with a minimum proficiency of B2+/C1 on the Common European Framework of Reference. Group sizes range from twelve to twenty students. By the end of the semester, students are expected to analyse strategic communication artefacts using appropriate metalanguage; produce professional genres in English at a near-native level of accuracy; design and justify an integrated communication campaign for a real or simulated organisation; manage simulated crisis-communication scenarios under time pressure; and critically evaluate the ethical dimensions of persuasive communication. Institutionally, the course bridges the department's traditional strengths in linguistics and literary analysis with labour-market demand for graduates capable of working in media relations, public-administration communication units, non-governmental organisations and corporate communication departments, a positioning that required a hybrid pedagogy capable of serving disciplinary and language-development goals simultaneously.

¹⁹ Grunig J. E. (ed.) *Excellence in Public Relations and Communication Management*. Hillsdale, 1992. P. 285–325.

²⁰ Kent M. L., Taylor M. Building dialogic relationships through the World Wide Web. *Public Relations Review*. 1998. Vol. 24, No. 3. P. 321–334. DOI: 10.1016/S0363-8111(99)80143-X.

²¹ Thomas J. W. *A Review of Research on Project-Based Learning*. San Rafael, 2000. P. 1–12.

²² Kolb D. A. *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. Englewood Cliffs, 1984. P. 20–38.

²³ Lave J., Wenger E. *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge, 1991. P. 89–100.

²⁴ Godwin-Jones R. Partnering with AI: Intelligent writing assistance and instructed language learning. *Language Learning & Technology*. 2022. Vol. 26, No. 2. P. 5–24. DOI: 10.64152/10125/73474.

²⁵ Dörnyei Z. *The Psychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition*. Mahwah, 2005. P. 65–76.

2. The innovative methods and tools implemented in the course

This paragraph presents, in turn, the six methodological strands that constitute the innovative core of the course design: case-based and scenario learning, simulation and role-play, project-based campaign design, digital and AI-assisted tools, flipped and blended delivery, and reflective portfolio assessment.

Each thematic unit of the course opens not with a lecture but with a real or realistic case: an authentic press release that triggered public controversy, a corporate apology that succeeded or failed, a political speech analysed for its rhetorical strategy, or a social-media campaign that achieved viral reach. The case method serves a dual function. Pedagogically, it exposes learners to the precise lexical, syntactic and discourse-level features characteristic of strategic-communication genres before they are asked to produce such texts themselves, supporting an inductive, noticing-based approach to genre acquisition. Disciplinarily, it requires students to apply analytical frameworks to authentic material, developing the critical-analytical vocabulary that underlies later production tasks. Each case session follows a consistent structure: individual silent reading and annotation, small-group discussion guided by analytical prompts, whole-class synthesis, and a short written 'strategy memo' in which students articulate the communicative logic of the case, a format later reused as a scaffolding device for students' own campaign work.

The most distinctive component of the course is a series of live crisis-communication simulations. Working in teams that represent the communication department of a fictional but plausible organisation, students are presented, without advance warning, with a 'breaking' scenario delivered via a simulated newsroom interface, complete with mock journalist enquiries, social-media mentions and a ticking countdown. Within a fixed time window, each team must produce an initial holding statement, a set of key messages, a spokesperson briefing, and respond live to role-played journalist questions. Two adaptations proved essential for a second-language learner population: a curated but deliberately incomplete 'language toolkit' of functional phrases and register markers that learners must extend under pressure, and a post-simulation debrief structured to separate linguistic feedback from strategic feedback. Recorded video of each simulation is subsequently used for guided self- and peer-assessment, an approach found to sharpen learners' awareness of paralinguistic and pragmatic features rarely addressed in conventional writing-focused instruction.

Running in parallel with weekly case- and simulation-based sessions, the course's central assessed project requires each team to design, over the semester, a complete strategic communication campaign for a real external

partner – typically a local non-governmental organisation, cultural institution or small enterprise. The project unfolds in four staged deliverables: a situational analysis and audience-research report; a campaign strategy document; a portfolio of executed materials; and a final oral pitch presentation delivered to the client and a panel of peers. This architecture situates language production within a sustained, purposeful and socially consequential task, requires students to manage the full communicative lifecycle of a campaign, and introduces an element of real-world accountability that students consistently identify as the single most motivating feature of the course.

A deliberate effort was made to integrate digital tools that extend, rather than replace, learners' own communicative competence. Corpus and concordancing resources were introduced to support data-driven investigation of collocational patterns characteristic of strategic-communication genres. Generative AI writing assistants were incorporated under a carefully bounded protocol: students were permitted to use such tools for initial brainstorming and for register-calibration feedback on completed drafts, while AI-generated first drafts of any assessed written deliverable were explicitly prohibited, and students submitted an annotated process log documenting all AI assistance used. Collaborative digital platforms, configured to simulate a professional 'newsroom' communication environment, recreated the collaborative, asynchronous and multi-channel character of professional communication work.

Classroom time was treated as a scarce resource reserved for interactive, communicative and feedback-intensive activity, while transmission of background theoretical content was relocated outside the classroom through short recorded mini-lectures accompanied by guided reading and brief comprehension checks. This flipped arrangement proved well suited to a learner population with heterogeneous prior exposure to communication theory, freeing classroom time for case discussion, simulation, drafting workshops and individual feedback conferences. Finally, throughout the semester students maintain a structured reflective learning journal, completed after each major activity, compiled at the end of the semester, together with annotated drafts and the recorded simulation, into a final portfolio presented as part of summative assessment, making visible the learning process and not only its final products.

3. Assessment innovations, implementation outcomes, challenges and recommendations

Assessment in the course was redesigned to mirror the integrated, performance-oriented character of the teaching methods described above. Final grades are composed of four weighted components: case-analysis memos (15%, focused on analytical vocabulary and genre awareness), crisis-simulation

performance (20%, focused on spoken fluency and strategic judgement under pressure), the integrated campaign project (45%, focused on written production, strategic design and oral pitch), and the reflective portfolio (20%, focused on metacognitive awareness and documented progress), summarised in Table 1.

Table 1

Structure of the course's summative assessment

Assessment component	Weight	Primary focus
Case-analysis memos	15%	Analytical vocabulary and genre awareness
Crisis-simulation performance	20%	Spoken fluency, strategic judgement under pressure
Integrated campaign project	45%	Written production, strategic design, oral pitch
Reflective portfolio	20%	Metacognitive awareness, documented progress

Rubrics for both the simulation and the campaign project were designed with separate analytic strands for linguistic accuracy/appropriateness and for strategic-communicative effectiveness, scored independently, so that strong strategic thinking expressed with residual language error is not conflated with linguistically polished but strategically weak work, a separation repeatedly cited in student feedback as reducing assessment anxiety. The external-client pitch presentation additionally incorporated authentic third-party assessment, with client representatives providing structured feedback weighted as a minor component of the oral-presentation grade.

The methods described above were implemented and iteratively refined across several consecutive cohorts. Evidence of their effectiveness was gathered through anonymous end-of-semester learner surveys, instructor observation logs, and comparative analysis of student written and spoken artefacts collected at the beginning and end of the semester. Across cohorts, learner surveys consistently identified the crisis-communication simulation and the external-client campaign project as the two most valued components, cited by the substantial majority of respondents as the activities that most improved their confidence in using English for professional purposes. Comparative analysis of early- and late-semester writing samples indicated marked gains in students' command of the functional and phraseological repertoire specific to strategic-communication genres, gains less consistently observed in general measures of grammatical accuracy, suggesting that the course's genre-specific, content-integrated design was particularly effective at developing the targeted professional register. Instructor observation further indicated a marked increase,

across the semester, in students' willingness to take communicative risks during simulation exercises, a pattern consistent with the broader literature associating low-stakes, repeated simulation practice with gains in second-language communicative confidence.

Several challenges accompanied implementation. Resourcing concerns include the instructor time required to secure external clients, coordinate guest role-players and maintain recorded-lecture infrastructure. Equity concerns include a tendency, among students with lower initial confidence in spoken English, to under-participate in live simulations relative to more confident peers, addressed only partially through rotating role assignments. The bounded AI-use protocol, while pedagogically motivated, required ongoing vigilance and was not fully verifiable through student-submitted process logs alone. Finally, the genre-specific focus of the course cannot substitute for a general-proficiency course and should be situated within a broader curriculum that also addresses general language development.

Three practical recommendations follow from this experience. First, authenticity should be pursued wherever institutionally feasible, including through genuine external partnerships, since the motivational and linguistic benefits of real-world accountability appear difficult to replicate through invented scenarios alone. Second, the integration of digital and AI-assisted tools should be governed by explicit, transparent protocols developed collaboratively with students, rather than by either prohibition or unregulated permission. Third, assessment design should explicitly separate linguistic and disciplinary-strategic criteria, since this separation appears to reduce learner anxiety while preserving rigorous evaluation of both dimensions of competence. Departments wishing to extend similar methods to substantially larger cohorts should anticipate the need for additional teaching assistance, asynchronous alternatives to live simulation, and a correspondingly greater reliance on peer-assessment structures.

A further consideration concerns staff development. The methods described in this paragraph require instructors to combine expertise in language pedagogy with working familiarity with the disciplinary content of strategic communication, a combination not always present in traditional philology staffing structures. Departments considering similar redesigns should budget for cross-disciplinary staff training, co-teaching arrangements with colleagues from journalism or public-relations programmes, or structured engagement with professional practitioners as guest contributors, all of which were used, in varying degrees, to support delivery of the course examined here. Equally important is the question of scalability: the intensive, workshop-based and simulation-heavy character of the methodology was developed

and refined within relatively small cohorts of twelve to twenty students, a scale that permits close individual feedback and manageable logistics for live simulations and client-facing project work. With appropriate adaptation – additional teaching assistance, asynchronous scenario alternatives, and greater reliance on structured peer assessment – the core architecture nonetheless appears transferable to a wider range of institutional contexts, including larger philology and applied-linguistics programmes beyond the specific course examined in this contribution.

CONCLUSIONS

The course design described in this contribution demonstrates that an English-medium Strategic Communication course for Master-level philology students can serve simultaneously as a vehicle for advanced professional-language development and as substantive disciplinary training in communication theory and practice, provided that methodology is deliberately designed around principles of authenticity, integration and learner agency rather than treated as an afterthought to content delivery. The six methodological strands examined – case-based and scenario learning, live crisis simulation, project-based campaign design with external clients, carefully bounded digital and AI-assisted tools, flipped and blended delivery, and structured reflective-portfolio assessment – together constitute a coherent and transferable pedagogical architecture grounded in both Ukrainian methodological scholarship and international research on content-integrated, task- and project-based, simulation-driven and digitally mediated language pedagogy.

The results obtained across several cohorts indicate that this architecture produces measurable gains in learners' command of professional register, in their willingness to take communicative risks under realistic pressure, and in their overall motivation and engagement, while also surfacing genuine challenges related to instructor resourcing, equity within group-based work, and the verifiability of bounded artificial-intelligence use. These findings, together with the practical recommendations summarised above, situate the present contribution within an ongoing, cross-national scholarly conversation on the reform of professionally oriented language education at postgraduate level, and offer a transferable model for colleagues in philology and applied-linguistics departments seeking to redesign similar content-rich, English-medium courses. Future research might usefully extend this work through controlled comparison with non-innovative course designs and through longitudinal tracking of graduates' subsequent professional communication performance.

SUMMARY

This contribution addresses the problem of designing innovative, professionally oriented methods and tools for teaching English-medium content courses to Master-level philology students, taking the discipline of Strategic Communication as a representative case. The study responds to the gap between traditional grammar- and translation-centred philological training and the labour-market demand for graduates capable of producing professional communication in English under authentic, time-pressured conditions. The authors describe a course architecture built around six interrelated methodological strands: case-based and scenario learning, live crisis-communication simulation, project-based campaign design with external organisational partners, digital and artificial-intelligence-assisted tools governed by an explicit use protocol, flipped and blended delivery, and structured reflective-portfolio assessment. The theoretical grounding of the proposed methodology combines Ukrainian scholarship on the methodology of teaching foreign languages for professional purposes with international research on content-and-language-integrated learning, task- and project-based instruction, genre analysis and crisis-communication theory. Assessment innovations include analytic rubrics that separate linguistic accuracy from strategic-communicative effectiveness and authentic evaluation by external client representatives. Data gathered through learner surveys, instructor observation and comparative analysis of student artefacts across several cohorts indicate marked gains in learners' command of professional register, in their willingness to take communicative risks under pressure, and in their motivation, while also revealing challenges related to resourcing, equity in group work, and the verifiability of bounded AI use. The findings demonstrate that a deliberately integrated, authentic and learner-centred methodology can simultaneously advance disciplinary, professional and advanced-language competence, and the contribution concludes with transferable recommendations for colleagues redesigning similar courses within philology curricula.

Bibliography

1. Тарнопольський О. Б. Методика навчання іншомовної мовленнєвої діяльності у вищому мовному закладі освіти : навч. посіб. Київ : Фірма «ІНКОС», 2006. 248 с.
2. Ніколаєва С. Ю. (ред.) Методика навчання іноземних мов і культур: теорія і практика : підручник. Київ : Ленвіт, 2013. 590 с.
3. Бігич О. Б. Теорія і практика формування методичної компетенції вчителя іноземної мови початкової школи : навч. посіб. Київ : Ленвіт, 2006. 200 с.

4. Бориско Н. В. Теоретичні основи створення навчально-методичних комплексів для мовної міжкультурної підготовки вчителів іноземних мов (концептуальна стаття) : монографія. Київ : Ленвіт, 2008. 184 с.
5. Родіонова І. Ф. Формування професійної комунікативної компетентності майбутніх філологів у процесі фахової підготовки : монографія. Київ : Ленвіт, 2015. 220 с.
6. Різун В. В. Теорія масової комунікації : підручник. Київ : Видавничий центр «Просвіта», 2008. 260 с.
7. Іванов В. Ф. Теорія журналістики в Україні: становлення й розвиток : монографія. Київ : Видавничо-поліграфічний центр «Київський університет», 2006. 261 с.
8. Зернецька О. В. Глобальна комунікація : монографія. Київ : Наукова думка, 2017. 351 с.
9. Квіт С. М. Масові комунікації : підручник. Київ : Києво-Могилянська академія, 2008. 206 с.
10. Городенко Л. М. Інтернет-комунікація: теоретичні та прикладні аспекти : монографія. Київ : Інститут журналістики, 2017. 304 с.
11. Coyle D., Hood P., Marsh D. Content and Language Integrated Learning. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2010. 184 p.
12. Ellis R. Task-Based Language Teaching and Learning. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2003. 387 p.
13. Nunan D. Task-Based Language Teaching. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2004. 222 p.
14. Swales J. M. Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1990. 260 p.
15. Bhatia V. K. Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings. London : Longman, 1993. 264 p.
16. Hyland K. Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing. Ann Arbor : University of Michigan Press, 2004. 192 p.
17. Coombs W. T. Ongoing Crisis Communication: Planning, Managing, and Responding. 5th ed. Thousand Oaks : SAGE Publications, 2019. 296 p.
18. Benoit W. L. Accounts, Excuses, and Apologies: Image Repair Theory and Research. 2nd ed. Albany : State University of New York Press, 2015. 304 p.
19. Grunig J. E. (ed.) Excellence in Public Relations and Communication Management. Hillsdale : Lawrence Erlbaum, 1992. 666 p.
20. Kent M. L., Taylor M. Building dialogic relationships through the World Wide Web. *Public Relations Review*. 1998. Vol. 24, No. 3. P. 321–334. DOI: 10.1016/S0363-8111(99)80143-X.

21. Thomas J. W. A Review of Research on Project-Based Learning. San Rafael : The Autodesk Foundation, 2000. 45 p.
22. Kolb D. A. Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development. Englewood Cliffs : Prentice-Hall, 1984. 256 p.
23. Lave J., Wenger E. Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1991. 138 p.
24. Godwin-Jones R. Partnering with AI: Intelligent writing assistance and instructed language learning. *Language Learning & Technology*. 2022. Vol. 26, No. 2. P. 5–24. DOI: 10.64152/10125/73474.
25. Dörnyei Z. The Psychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition. Mahwah : Lawrence Erlbaum, 2005. 270 p.

Information about the authors:

Perminova Vladyslava,

Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences,
Associate Professor at the Department of Foreign Philology,
Chernihiv Polytechnic National University
95, Shevchenka Street, Chernihiv, Ukraine

Shenderuk Olena,

Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences,
Associate Professor at the Department of Foreign Philology,
Chernihiv Polytechnic National University
95, Shevchenka Street, Chernihiv, Ukraine

Lytvyn Svitlana,

Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences,
Associate Professor at the Department of Foreign Philology,
Chernihiv Polytechnic National University
95, Shevchenka Street, Chernihiv, Ukraine