



**DIAGNOSIS OF SCHOOL STUDENTS' READINESS
TO DEVELOP ACADEMIC WRITING IN
KAZAKHSTAN**

**ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ БІЛІМ АЛУШЫЛАРДЫҢ
АКАДЕМИЯЛЫҚ ЖАЗУДЫ ДАМУҒА
ДАЙЫНДЫҒЫН ДИАГНОСТИКАЛАУ**

**ДИАГНОСТИКА ГОТОВНОСТИ
ОБУЧАЮЩИХСЯ К РАЗВИТИЮ
АКАДЕМИЧЕСКОГО ПИСЬМА В КАЗАХСТАНЕ**

FAN TARMOG'I
13.00.00 – Pedagogika

QABUL QILINDI
01.08.2026

CHOP ETILDI
04.08.2026

M.A.Zhanzakova

PhD Doctoral Student of Akhmet
Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish
University

G.K.Zhylykbay

Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor, Akhmet Yassawi
International Kazakh-Turkish University

ABSTRACT

This article examines the issue of diagnosing the readiness of students in Kazakhstan to develop academic writing skills. The relevance of the research work is explained by the importance of academic literacy in the modern system of higher and secondary education, including the culture of writing. Academic writing is one of the main tools for shaping students' scientific thinking and improving the culture of professional communication. The purpose of the article is to determine the level of psychological, linguistic and methodological readiness of students to master the skills of academic writing. In the course of the research, the methods of questioning, control and analysis of written work were used. The diagnostic results showed that the majority of students did not fully master the structure of the academic text, the peculiarities of the scientific style and methods of working with sources. The study also determines the need for the development of units of critical thinking, argumentation and construction of text logic in the process of teaching academic writing along with language competence. The authors note the importance of methodological support, improvement of special courses and curricula for the systematic formation of a culture of academic writing. This can become a methodological aid to future linguists in developing practical writing skills by diagnosing the readiness of students in the country to develop academic writing.

Keywords: literacy, academic writing, school students, readiness assessment for academic writing development.

АНДАТПА

Бұл мақалада Қазақстандағы білім алушылардың академиялық жазу дағдысын дамыту дайындығын диагностикалау мәселесі қарастырылған. Зерттеу жұмысының өзектілігі қазіргі жоғары және орта білім беру жүйесіндегі академиялық сауаттылықтың, оның ішінде жазбаша тіл мәдениетінің маңыздылығымен түсіндіріледі. Академиялық жазу – білім алушылардың ғылыми ойлауын қалыптастырып, кәсіби қарым-қатынас мәдениетін жетілдіретін негізгі құралдардың бірі. Мақаланың мақсаты – білім алушылардың академиялық жазу дағдысын меңгеруге психологиялық, тілдік және әдістемелік тұрғыдан дайындық деңгейін анықтау. Зерттеу барысында сауалнама, бақылау және жазба жұмысын талдау әдістері қолданылды. Диагностикалық нәтижелер білім алушылардың көпшілігі академиялық мәтін құрылымын, ғылыми стиль ерекшеліктерін және дереккөздермен жұмыс істеу әдістерін толық меңгермегенін көрсетті. Сонымен қатар зерттеу академиялық жазуға үйрету үдерісінде тілдік құзыреттілікпен қатар сыни ойлау, аргумент келтіру және мәтін логикасын құру бірліктерін дамыту қажеттігін айқындайды. Авторлар академиялық жазу мәдениетін жүйелі қалыптастыру үшін әдістемелік қолдау, арнайы курстар мен оқу бағдарламаларын жетілдірудің маңызын атап өтеді. Мұның өзі еліміздегі білім алушылардың академиялық жазуды дамытуға дайындығын диагностикалау арқылы болашақ тіл мамандарына жазба жұмыстарын жүргізуде практикалық дағдыларды қалыптастыруға әдістемелік көмек бола алады.

Кілт сөздер: сауаттылық, академиялық жазу, білім алушылар, академиялық жазуды дамытуға дайындығын бағалау.

АННОТАЦИЯ

В данной статье рассматривается вопрос диагностики готовности обучающихся в Казахстане к развитию навыков академического письма. Актуальность исследовательской работы объясняется важностью академической грамотности в современной системе высшего и среднего образования, в том числе культуры письменной речи. Академическое письмо – один из основных инструментов формирования научного мышления обучающихся и совершенствования культуры профессионального общения. Цель статьи – определить уровень психологической, языковой и методической готовности обучающихся к овладению навыками академического письма. В ходе исследования были использованы методы анкетирования, контроля и анализа письменной работы. Диагностические результаты показали, что большинство обучающихся не полностью овладели структурой академического текста, особенностями научного стиля и методами работы с источниками. Исследование также определяет необходимость развития в процессе обучения

академическому письму наряду с языковой компетентностью единиц критического мышления, аргументации и построения логики текста. Авторы отмечают важность методической поддержки, совершенствования специальных курсов и учебных программ для системного формирования культуры академического письма. Это может стать методической помощью будущим языковедам в формировании практических навыков ведения письменной работы путем диагностики готовности обучающихся страны к развитию академической письменности.

Ключевые слова: грамотность, академическое письмо, обучающиеся, оценка готовности к развитию академического письма.

INTRODUCTION

The modernization of education in the Republic of Kazakhstan in recent years has required individuals to be ready to work effectively and productively in diverse spheres of activity. Free access to information resources, self-directed learning, and research engagement have become top priorities. The implementation of key strategic documents - such as the Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan “On Science”, the “Kazakhstan-2050 Strategy”, the “Strategic Development Plan of the Republic of Kazakhstan 2025”, the “Plan of the Nation: 100 Concrete Steps”, and the programs “Third Modernization of Kazakhstan” and “Modernization of Public Consciousness” - along with the nation’s aim to join the ranks of the 30 most developed countries, has intensified the need to mobilize the country’s research potential (Syzdykbayeva, 2022).

Accordingly, the objectives of general secondary education now include creating an educational environment that prepares students academically for higher education and professional self-determination. This preparation is grounded in developing a wide range of essential skills, particularly in research and academic communication (State Program, 2016). Therefore, this study aims to assess the readiness of school students in Kazakhstan to develop academic writing skills and to identify the main challenges impeding this process.

MAIN PART

The development of research activities requires that students acquire academic writing skills (Lillis, 2010; Oshima, 2007). Academic writing involves producing written texts within academic discourse and expressing newly gained knowledge according to the research conventions of a specific discipline and the subject of cognitive activity in an appropriate academic genre (Irvin, 2010; Paltridge, 2004).

An academic text represents the articulation and justification of one’s ideas in a clear, logically structured, and comprehensible scholarly form (Bailey, 2014). The

text should be accessible, coherent, and written in a formal academic style. To create such a text, the author must possess both linguistic competence - the ability to paraphrase expressions, verbalize ideas, and use linguistic resources effectively at the sentence, paragraph, and text levels and metalinguistic competence, which encompasses logical reasoning, analytical thinking, and critical reflection (Savage, 2007; Lillis, 2010).

Academic writing is essential for students' success in both professional and social contexts. Schools play a crucial role in laying the foundation for literacy by developing competencies that enable graduates to work effectively and continue their studies (Hamp-Lyons, 2006). According to UNESCO's *Global Conception of Literacy*, literacy encompasses three fundamental skills: reading, writing, and numeracy. Consequently, schools as institutions of general education should focus on nurturing general literacy reading (the ability to find, understand, and critically evaluate information), writing (the ability to generate and organize one's thoughts), and mathematical reasoning (the ability to think logically and operate with symbols) (Burnett, 2006).

Among these, writing is the most visible indicator of literacy. However, in the Kazakhstani education system, there is a widespread misunderstanding of what writing competence or, in international terminology, academic writing entails. Writing is often reduced merely to spelling accuracy and punctuation (Shestak, 2011).

The absence of academic writing instruction in schools forces specialists to construct their own approaches to writing during their professional careers, often intuitively and inconsistently. As a result, works that may appear acceptable within local contexts are frequently perceived by international peers as "empty" compilations lacking original thought. Conversely, research papers that are substantively strong may receive low evaluations due to poor structure, weak academic literacy, and limited attention to reader engagement (Hamp-Lyons, 2006). This raises an important question: Is the Kazakhstani school system truly incapable of providing students with even basic academic writing skills?

Systemic Issues in Academic Literacy Development

The concept of academic writing that has evolved and functions successfully in Western education includes two interrelated components:

1. The ability to generate and justify original ideas through logical reasoning and argumentation;
2. The ability to structure written work coherently, systematically organizing both theoretical and empirical material (Kress, 2003).

The roots of academic illiteracy among Kazakhstani students and even among higher-education graduates-lie in the foundations of the general education system

itself, regardless of the school's specialization or the teacher's competence. The inability or even fear of expressing one's own opinions stems from the traditional focus of schools on authoritarian teaching methods, rote memorization, and the lack of interdisciplinary connections. Furthermore, the assessment of knowledge in most subjects often disregards literacy in both oral and written forms.

A second significant issue concerns narrow vocational specialization, or "profiling," within schools. Profiling limits systematic thinking, logical reasoning, and modeling abilities, particularly in the humanities, resulting in excessive subjectivity, emotionality, and a weak evidence base in research. Students in technical fields often struggle to communicate ideas clearly, focusing excessively on details or raw information that has not been critically processed. Conversely, humanities students frequently lack mathematical and technical literacy. Such specialization deprives students of the opportunity to acquire a comprehensive and balanced set of essential skills, violating one of the fundamental principles of the international literacy concept: those overloaded with technical content lose language skills, while those overloaded with humanities content lose quantitative reasoning (Korotkina, 2013).

Historically, higher education in Kazakhstan has followed a subject-centered model that reinforces the differentiation of scientific disciplines. As a result, by the end of postgraduate education, a PhD candidate may specialize in an extremely narrow field and remain largely uninformed about related disciplines. This creates an educational system that is fragmented, overloaded, and lacking a unified core and internal logic.

Contemporary Challenges and International Comparisons.

These issues have become particularly critical as Kazakhstan integrates into the global education system through participation in the Bologna Process. The results of the international PISA project reveal that Kazakhstani students struggle with tasks assessing academic literacy skills. According to the analytical report of the *Center for Education Quality Assessment* (2019), major shortcomings include "a lack of rigor in thinking, insufficient analytical and evaluative skills, poor formation of cognitive operations such as analysis and generalization, and limited independence and initiative in developing one's life position."

The comparatively weak performance of Kazakhstani students highlights deep-rooted deficiencies not only in educational methods but also in content. Innovative reforms often fail to resolve these issues because new subjects and programs are introduced without removing outdated or redundant elements, thus increasing students' workload. Teaching remains predominantly oral and memory-based, with little emphasis on developing independent, critical, and analytical thinking.

Consequently, students fail to acquire the necessary skills for research-oriented, discipline-specific writing.

The lack of interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary connections further fragments students' understanding and leads to incoherence in knowledge acquisition. This fragmentation is compounded by the increasing separation of students into narrow educational profiles, which restricts the development of holistic and integrative thinking.

M.A. Lytaeva and E.V. Talalakina (2015) distinguish three groups of skills that should be developed in the English for Academic Purposes (EAP) course. The first group includes skills aimed at recognizing the key components or semantic milestones of a text (e.g., identifying the main idea, key arguments, and supporting details). The second group focuses on understanding the logical connections between textual components and recognizing the structure of a text. At this stage, learners engage in deeper text analysis: they study the principles of paragraph organization, explore genre characteristics of essays, abstracts, and articles, and identify linguistic elements that ensure textual coherence. The third group of skills involves interpreting graphic information and transforming it into verbal form (Nasibullina, 2015).

At the initial stage of academic writing development, students must acquire the ability to express and justify their own ideas in written form. This process requires mastering several interrelated skills: information retrieval and reading comprehension, transformation and interpretation of information, evaluation of content, and direct writing proficiency. Table 1 below outlines the criteria and indicators used to diagnose these skills.

Table 1: Criteria for assessing the formation of meaningful reading and writing skills

The meta-disciplinary outcome groups	Criteria	Indicator	Score
Searching for information and reading comprehension	Know how to identify the theme and main idea of a text	Identified and wrote down the theme and main idea of the text	2
		Identified and wrote only the topic of the text, could not find a sentence in the text that conveys the main idea	1
		Didn't write down the theme and main idea of the text	0
	Know how to plan a text	Made a simple outline showing all the meaningful parts, the sequence of the parts is not broken	2
		Has drawn up a plan, missing 1 semantic part of the text; not all parts of the text are reflected, the sequence of parts is broken	1
		Didn't make a plan	0
	The ability to reconstruct the sequence of events	The sequence of events is unbroken	2
		Made a mistake in the sequence of two events	1
		The sequence of events is broken	0
	Can answer questions about the content of the	The answer is framed as a complete speech statement, supported by information from the text	2
		Formulated answer is correct, but one-syllable, not supported by	1



	text	information from the text	
		The answer does not correspond to the content of the text	0
	Know how to identify the type, style of text	Correctly identified the type and/or style of text and recorded the characteristic features	2
		Indicates the type and/or style of text, but does not record the characteristic features	1
Converting and interpreting information	Explain new (unfamiliar) words (combinations of words) with reference to context	Misidentified the type and/or style of text	0
		Explained the meaning of a new word (combination of words) based on the content of the text	2
		Explained the meaning of a new word (combination of words) using existing knowledge rather than information from the text	1
		Could not explain the meaning of a new word (combination of words)	0

The text for the diagnostic task was selected from a children's encyclopedia or a moral story (no more than 95 words). The total sample included 48 students.

The table presents the meta-disciplinary outcome groups aimed at developing reading and writing comprehension skills, as well as the criteria, indicators, and scoring system used for their assessment. The evaluation framework is divided into two main areas:

1. Searching for information and reading comprehension
2. Converting and interpreting information.

The first area - *Searching for information and reading comprehension* - encompasses students' skills in analyzing, understanding, and structurally comprehending a text. The following criteria are identified within this category:

- Identifying the theme and main idea of the text;
- Planning the structure of the text;
- Reconstructing the sequence of events;
- Answering questions about the content of the text;
- Identifying the type and style of the text.

Each criterion is assessed using a three-level scoring system:

- 2 points - when the requirement is fully and accurately met,
- 1 point - when the task is partially or inaccurately completed,
- 0 points - when the task is not completed or incorrectly performed.

For example, if a student correctly identifies both the theme and the main idea of the text, they receive 2 points; if only the theme is identified but the main idea is missing - 1 point; if neither is identified - 0 points. Similarly, when the student's text plan includes all meaningful parts in proper sequence, it is awarded 2 points; if one semantic part is missing or the order is disrupted - 1 point; if no plan is made - 0 points.

The second area - *Converting and interpreting information* - assesses students' ability to explain new or unfamiliar words based on the context of the text. These skills are also evaluated using a three-point scale: if a student explains the meaning of

a new word by referring to the context -2 points; if they rely on prior knowledge rather than textual information - 1 point; and if they fail to explain the meaning - 0 points.

Overall, this table provides a comprehensive assessment framework for evaluating students' text comprehension and writing-related competencies. It helps to determine the level of their metacognitive skills, such as text understanding, structural analysis, information processing, and reformulation of meaning.

Descriptive statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Standard deviations
Test subject number	48	1	48	24,50	14,000
Know how to identify the theme and main idea of a text	48	0	2	,90	,660
Know how to plan a text	48	0	2	,85	,652
The ability to reconstruct the sequence of events	48	0	2	,92	,679
Can answer questions about the content of the text	48	0	2	,90	,692
Know how to identify the type, style of text	48	0	2	1,02	,729
Explain new (unfamiliar) words (combinations of words) with reference to context	48	0	2	,96	,683
N valid (per list)	48				

The table presents the results of the descriptive statistical analysis conducted to evaluate the development of reading and writing comprehension skills. A total of 48 participants ($n = 48$) took part in the assessment. Each criterion was scored on a three-point scale (0–2), where 0 indicates the task was not completed, 1 represents a partial or incomplete response, and 2 denotes a complete and accurate performance.

The analysis shows that the mean scores for all criteria range between 0.85 and 1.02, suggesting that the participants' overall reading and writing skills are slightly above the average level.

Specifically:

- *Identifying the theme and main idea of a text* - Mean = 0.90
- *Planning a text* - Mean = 0.85
- *Reconstructing the sequence of events* - Mean = 0.92
- *Answering questions about the text content* - Mean = 0.90
- *Identifying the type and style of the text* - Mean = 1.02
- *Explaining new (unfamiliar) words based on context* - Mean = 0.96

The standard deviations range from 0.65 to 0.73, indicating relatively small variations among participants' results. This consistency suggests that the students' performance levels are fairly homogeneous, with no significant differences across the group.

Overall, the descriptive statistics indicate that while learners demonstrate a generally sufficient level of reading comprehension and text interpretation skills, there remains room for further improvement and development of higher-level text analysis competencies.



1. Searching for information and reading comprehension

1.1 Know how to identify the theme and main idea of a text					
		Frequency	Percentages	Valid percentage	Accumulated interest
Valid	Didn't write down the theme and main idea of the text	13	27,1	27,1	27,1
	Identified and wrote only the topic of the text, could not find a sentence in the text that conveys the main idea	27	56,3	56,3	83,3
	Identified and wrote down the theme and main idea of the text	8	16,7	16,7	100,0
	Total	48	100,0	100,0	

The results demonstrate that the majority of participants experienced difficulties in identifying both the theme and the main idea of a text. Specifically, 56.3% of respondents were able to recognize only the topic of the text but failed to determine a sentence expressing its main idea. Meanwhile, 27.1% of participants did not identify either the theme or the main idea, and only 16.7% successfully identified and recorded both elements. These findings indicate that most students show partial understanding of the text's core meaning, suggesting a need for further development of analytical reading skills.

1.2 Know how to plan a text					
		Frequency	Percentages	Valid percentage	Accumulated interest
Valid	Didn't make a plan	14	29,2	29,2	29,2
	Has drawn up a plan, missing 1 semantic part of the text; not all parts of the text are reflected, the sequence of parts is broken	27	56,3	56,3	85,4
	Made a simple outline showing all the meaningful parts, the sequence of the parts is not broken	7	14,6	14,6	100,0
	Total	48	100,0	100,0	

The data show that 56.3% of participants were able to produce a partial text plan, missing one semantic part or disrupting the logical sequence. A considerable proportion (**29.2%**) did not make any plan at all, while only 14.6% demonstrated the ability to create a coherent outline that included all meaningful parts in proper order. This distribution suggests that the majority of students have not yet fully mastered the skill of text structuring, which plays a crucial role in the process of coherent writing and comprehension.

1.3 The ability to reconstruct the sequence of events

		Frequency	Percentages	Valid percentage	Accumulated interest
Valid	The sequence of events is broken	13	27,1	27,1	27,1
	Made a mistake in the sequence of two events	26	54,2	54,2	81,3
	The sequence of events is unbroken	9	18,8	18,8	100,0
	Total	48	100,0	100,0	

When assessing students' ability to reconstruct the logical order of events, it was found that **54.2%** of participants made minor sequencing errors involving two events, and **27.1%** displayed a completely broken sequence. Only **18.8%** of respondents successfully maintained an unbroken sequence of events. These results reveal that many students face challenges in understanding and reproducing the logical flow of a text, which reflects insufficient comprehension and narrative organization skills.

2. Converting and interpreting information

2.1 Explain new (unfamiliar) words (combinations of words) with reference to context

		Frequency	Percentages	Valid percentage	Accumulated interest
Valid	Could not explain the meaning of a new word (combination of words)	12	25,0	25,0	25,0
	Explained the meaning of a new word (combination of words) using existing knowledge rather than information from the text	26	54,2	54,2	79,2
	Explained the meaning of a new word (combination of words) based on the content of the text	10	20,8	20,8	100,0
	Total	48	100,0	100,0	

The analysis shows that more than half of the participants (54.2%) attempted to explain new or unfamiliar words by relying on their existing knowledge rather than using contextual clues from the text. Meanwhile, 25.0% of respondents were unable to explain the meaning of the words at all, and only 20.8% successfully provided explanations based on the context of the text. These findings indicate that most students have limited contextual inference skills and tend to depend on memorized vocabulary rather than meaning derived from textual evidence.

3. Evaluating the information

3.1 Can verbally express their attitudes towards the text or events described on the basis of their own knowledge

		Frequency	Percentages	Valid percentage	Accumulated interest
Valid	Without interest in the information received, made no judgments	14	29,2	29,2	29,2
	I expressed my attitude on	21	43,8	43,8	72,9

	the level of liking - disliking, not being able to assess the usefulness of the information for myself				
	Expressed his personal view of the text, explaining his opinion	13	27,1	27,1	100,0
	Total	48	100,0	100,0	

In evaluating students' capacity to express their attitudes and opinions about the text, it was found that 43.8% of participants expressed their views only at the level of personal preference (liking/disliking), without assessing the usefulness or relevance of the information. Additionally, 29.2% of respondents showed no engagement or judgment regarding the content, while only 27.1% articulated a personal and reasoned opinion, providing justification for their stance. These results demonstrate that while a small portion of students can engage critically with textual information, the majority exhibit surface-level evaluative responses, lacking reflective reasoning and interpretation.

4. Writing skills

4.1 The ability to take dictation					
		Frequency	Percentages	Valid percentage	Accumulated interest
Valid	Up to 5 spelling or punctuation errors, missing words or up to 2 dysgraphic errors	13	27,1	27,1	27,1
	2-3 non-dysgraphic (spelling, punctuation) errors	26	54,2	54,2	81,3
	no more than 1 spelling or punctuation error	9	18,8	18,8	100,0
	Total	48	100,0	100,0	

The test results revealed an average-low level of readiness of school students to develop academic writing. The most vulnerable group of meta-skills were: information assessment and writing skills. The findings confirm that pupils need to develop a basic set of academic writing skills.

Regarding writing proficiency, particularly dictation accuracy, more than half of the participants (54.2%) made 2–3 spelling or punctuation errors, which indicates a moderate level of writing competency. Another 27.1% produced texts with up to five errors or omissions, including minor dysgraphic mistakes. Only 18.8% of respondents completed the dictation with no more than one error, demonstrating a high level of accuracy. Overall, these results suggest that while the majority of students possess basic writing skills, attention to orthographic and punctuation accuracy still requires further improvement.

Taken together, the results across all sections (*Reading comprehension, Information interpretation, Evaluation, and Writing skills*) reveal a generally average level of language proficiency among the participants. The data suggest that while students can comprehend and reproduce textual information to some extent, they face

challenges in deep interpretation, critical evaluation, and precise written expression. Continuous practice in analytical reading, contextual vocabulary use, and error-free writing is recommended to enhance overall literacy competence.

CONCLUSION

The primary goal of modern education is to prepare specialists capable of navigating the ever-changing and diverse world of the 21st century, becoming worthy members of the information society. To achieve this, schools must be oriented towards real-life contexts so that graduates leave truly literate – able to manage and critically engage with information flows. At the core of this new educational space lies independent research activity, which serves as the foundation of academic writing. Essential educational technologies and competencies should therefore focus on developing academic literacy.

Language literacy comprising both reading and writing is fundamental, as it supports other forms of literacy, including mathematical, scientific, and socio-cultural literacies. The Kazakh (and Russian) language should be approached as a written and functional discipline, emphasizing the active and communicative dimensions of writing. Moreover, the assessment of linguistic and written literacy should be distinguished from literary reading and integrated into all school subjects. Structured, logically organized written work should be produced across disciplines, as it represents genuine preparation for professional and academic success.

Every teacher faces the challenge of enabling students to use information sources independently and to formulate their own ideas based on critical reading. Language, therefore, is not merely a body of knowledge it is a tool of cognition. No genuine understanding or production of knowledge is possible without linguistic competence, which forms a kind of “metacompetence” essential for learning.

Mathematical literacy represents another metacompetence, inherently connected to linguistic reasoning. Mathematics fosters logical and analytical thinking through its symbolic system, which parallels linguistic logic. Thus, language and mathematics together form the foundation of academic literacy. Drawing on international educational practice, it is evident that Western universities emphasize two compulsory subjects for admission to any field: academic writing (mastery of linguistic logic) and mathematics (mastery of logical argumentation).

The unity of these literacy-based metacompetences language, logic, and reasoning constitutes the cornerstone of education. If, at certain stages of development, their balance was disrupted, leading to a fragmentation of literacy, then restoring education to its full integrity requires reinstating this foundational triad.

REFERENCES



1. Короткин И.В. Академическое письмо: на пути к концептуальному единству // Высшее образование В России. – 2013. – №. 3. – С. 136-142.
2. Сыздыкбаева А.Д., Абдигапбарова У.М. Академическое мошенничество субъектов постдипломного образования: сущность, текущее состояние // Вестник Национальной академии наук Республика Казахстан Казахский национальный педагогический университет имени Абая. ISSN 1991-3494 Volume 3, Number 397 (2022), S.161-178. <https://doi.org/10.32014/2022.2518-1467.309>
3. Kazakhstan S.P.P.R. GOSUDARSTVENNAIA PROGRAMA razvitia obrazovaniia i nauki Respubliki Kazakhstan na 2020-2025 gody Razdel 1. Pasport Programy. – 2016.
4. Lillis T. M., Curry M. J. Academic writing in global context. – London: Routledge, 2010.
5. Oshima A. et al. Introduction to academic writing. – Pearson/Longman, 2007. – С. 3.
6. Irvin L. L. What Is «Academic Writing»? // Writing spaces: Readings on writing. – 2010. – Т. 1. – С. 3-17.
7. Paltridge B. Academic writing // Language teaching. – 2004. – Т. 37. – №. 2. – С. 87-105.
8. Bailey S. Academic writing: A handbook for international students. – Routledge, 2014.
9. Savage A. et al. Effective academic writing. – Oxford University Press, 2007.
10. Hamp-Lyons L., Heasley B. Study writing: A course in written English for academic purposes. – Cambridge University Press, 2006.
11. Bernett N., Parker S., Bella N. Obrazovanie dlä vsekh. Gramotnost': jiznennaia neobhodimost' // Vsemirnyi doklad po monitoriñu ODV. – 2006.
12. Şestak V. P., Şestak N. V. Formirovanie nauchno-issledovatel'skoi kompetentnosti i «akademicheskoe pismo» // Vysşee obrazovanie v Rosii. – 2011. – №. 12. – С. 115-119.
13. Kress G. Learning to write. – Routledge, 2003.
14. Osenka obrazovatel'nykh dostijeni obuchaiuşıhsä PISA https://forbes.kz/process/education/pochemu_kazahstanskije_shkolniki_provalili_mej_dunarodnyiy_ekzamen_pisa
15. Nasibullina F. F., Bezrukov A. N. Akademicheskoe pismo v istoriko-lingvisticheskom kontekste (na primere nemeskogo iazyka) // Vysşee obrazovanie v Rosii. – 2015. – №. 8-9. – С. 148-153.