EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION IN A PROFESSIONAL ENVIRONMENT: THE ROLE OF SOFT SKILLS FOR PHILOLOGISTS

Olga Ponomarenko

Ph.D., Associate Professor,
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine
e-mail: olga0508009510@gmail.com, orcid.org/0000-0003-0634-208X

Olena Kaptiurova

Ph.D., Associate Professor,
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine
e-mail: o.kaptyurova@knu.ua, orcid.org/0000-0002-1051-8415

Summary

In contemporary professional environments, the centrality of effective communication increasingly foregrounds the significance of soft skills alongside technical expertise. While philologists possess advanced linguistic and cultural knowledge, their success in academic, pedagogical, and applied contexts depends equally on interpersonal competence, adaptability, and reflective communicative practice. This article conceptualizes soft skills as multidimensional interpersonal, cognitive, and emotional capacities – encompassing communicative adaptability, empathy, conflict resolution, teamwork, and self-management – that extend beyond mere linguistic proficiency. Within communication theory, such skills are framed as dynamic strategies enabling discourse negotiation, contextual adaptation, and metacognitive regulation of communicative choices. Focusing on the philological domain, the study argues that soft skills are indispensable for roles requiring cultural mediation, translation, teaching, and editorial collaboration. Evidence suggests, however, a persistent skills gap: employers report that humanities graduates, despite assumptions of strong communicative competence, often underperform in negotiation, teamwork, and workplace adaptability. To address this discrepancy, the article proposes pedagogical interventions grounded in embedded integration, reflective metacognition, simulation-based practice, and interdisciplinary collaboration. Suggested curricular innovations include scenario-based role plays, conflict-resolution workshops, peer-assessed publication projects, and language labs emphasizing pragmatic variation. Ultimately, the article contends that philological training must transcend traditional textual analysis to cultivate the interpersonal and strategic dimensions of communication. By embedding soft skills development into higher education curricula, institutions can prepare philologists to navigate complex professional environments with rhetorical sensitivity, cultural awareness, and adaptive competence. Such integration not only enhances employability but also enriches the broader communicative impact of philologists within multilingual and multicultural contexts.

Key words: soft skills, communication, competence, communicative tactics, philologists, professional environment, higher education.

1. Introduction

In today's rapidly evolving environment, the ability to communicate effectively is one of the most essential competencies for professional success. While technical expertise and qualifications remain indispensable, employers increasingly emphasize a broader set of abilities known as soft skills. These include interpersonal, cognitive, and emotional capacities that shape collaboration, adaptability, and conflict resolution. For philologists – whose vocation is tied to language, discourse, and culture – communication skills are not only tools but an existential requirement. Their identity is inseparable from language as both medium and object of inquiry, making communicative competence central for academic and professional development.

The demands of twenty-first-century workplaces underscore the need to reconceptualize communicative competence. Traditional definitions highlight grammar, vocabulary, or literary analysis. While foundational, such expertise is insufficient in environments demanding dynamic collaboration across disciplines and cultures. Employers consistently identify a "skills gap": graduates demonstrate strong domain knowledge but limited interpersonal versatility for multicultural, fast-changing contexts *(Toronto Metropolitan University, 2015)*. This mismatch signals the need for explicit integration of soft skills into philological education.

Philologists hold a distinctive position in this discussion. Their training in linguistic structures, cultural interpretation, and critical reflection overlaps naturally with adaptability, empathy, and rhetorical sensitivity *(Yazlovytska, 2023)*. Yet education often privileges textual mastery while neglecting systematic cultivation of soft skills as teachable, assessable competencies. As a result, many graduates possess strong intellectual foundations but limited preparation for interpersonal and organizational demands *(Williams, 2015)*.

Addressing this imbalance requires embedding soft skills within communication theory. Communication is not mere information transfer but meaning-making shaped by roles, culture, and relationships. Effective professionals must move beyond technical proficiency toward holistic competence integrating reflection, adaptability, and interpersonal intelligence. Research in organizational behavior and applied linguistics emphasizes that successful professionals negotiate meaning, calibrate tone, and foster collaboration in diverse environments *(Touloumakos, 2023)*.

Globalization and digitalization reinforce this urgency. Globalization expands intercultural exchanges, while digital communication reshapes discourse. Email, videoconferencing, and collaborative platforms demand agility, clarity, and sensitivity to tone. For philologists – working as teachers, translators, editors, or mediators – linguistic expertise must combine with digital fluency and interpersonal awareness. Integration of soft skills into education thus becomes a structural necessity *(Cimatti, 2016)*.

The article pursues three objectives: (1) conceptualize soft skills within frameworks of communication and professional competence, clarifying boundaries with hard skills; (2) identify subdomains most critical for philologists – adaptability, empathy, conflict resolution, metacognitive reflection – and link them to translation, teaching, editing, and mediation; (3) propose strategies for embedding soft skills into curricula, including assessment models and interdisciplinary collaboration.

The rationale is both practical and scholarly. Practically, graduates must meet employer expectations: surveys rank communication, teamwork, adaptability, and problem-solving above technical knowledge *(Cukier, Hodson, & Omar, 2015)*. Humanities graduates are assumed to possess such skills, yet evidence shows otherwise *(Williams, 2015)*. Addressing this requires explicit pedagogy rather than implicit expectation. Scholarly, philology has emphasized textual analysis, but now can redefine its scope by engaging directly with applied communication.

Integrating soft skills into philological training also carries ethical and cultural weight. Communication is never neutral but infused with power, identity, and responsibility. Philologists, as specialists in language and culture, are positioned to foster inclusive and empathetic practices that bridge difference and promote understanding. Developing empathy, cultural sensitivity, and active listening is thus not only about employability but also about cultivating socially responsible citizenship *(Yazlovytska, 2023)*.

By identifying the skills gap, situating soft skills within communication theory, and specifying critical subdomains, this article argues for their intentional integration into philological education. Linguistic mastery, though necessary, is no longer sufficient for success in complex and evolving settings. A holistic approach is required, one that foregrounds interpersonal, cognitive, and emotional dimensions as central to professional competence.

Soft skills constitute a cluster of abilities enabling individuals to build relationships, adapt to challenges, and resolve conflicts constructively. Unlike hard skills, codified in qualifications, soft skills are enacted in professional interaction *(Cimatti, 2016)*. They encompass teamwork, empathy, adaptability, resilience, time management, and above all communication. Their defining feature lies in relational orientation: they are competencies performed dynamically with others.

In professional environments, the presence or absence of soft skills is decisive for cohesion, productivity, and satisfaction. Effective communication is not mere transmission of information but the foundation of trust and collaboration. Employers consistently rank communication and related soft skills as critical, often above technical proficiency *(Cukier, Hodson, & Omar, 2015)*. This emphasis resonates with philologists' realities: as teachers, translators, editors, and mediators, they must convey meaning, adjust register, negotiate understanding, and bridge cultural divides – tasks inseparable from professional success.

2. Communication and Soft skills

2.1. Defining Soft Skills

Despite their acknowledged importance, soft skills remain conceptually elusive. Terms such as interpersonal skills, people skills, generic competencies, and transversal skills circulate widely in research and practice, often interchangeably and without stable definitions *(Cukier et al., 2015)*. This inconsistency reflects the interdisciplinary nature of the field, spanning education, psychology, linguistics, and organizational studies. B. Cimatti (2016) provides a concise working definition, describing soft skills as "personal and social aptitudes—communication capacity, teamwork, adaptability, and emotional regulation—that complement technical skills and enhance organizational quality" (p. 98). This highlights two key features: their complementarity to hard skills and their contribution to organizational culture and effectiveness.

The lack of terminological consensus has clear pedagogical implications. Without clarity, educators struggle to design assessments or curricula that systematically develop these competencies. As W. Cukier et al. (2015) argue, this ambiguity sustains a persistent skills gap: employers expect soft skills, yet higher education often assumes they will emerge implicitly or relegates them to optional training. For philologists, whose professional practice depends on communication, empathy, and adaptability, this oversight is especially detrimental.

2.2. Soft Skills and Communicative Competence

The link between soft skills and communicative competence is particularly salient for philologists. Traditionally, communicative competence in linguistics encompassed

grammar, sociolinguistic awareness, discourse, and strategic competence. Yet in contemporary professional contexts, it must also include rhetorical sensitivity, interpersonal intelligence, and reflective practice.

A.K. Touloumakos (2023) critiques conventional communication training for reducing interaction to checklists – eye contact, body posture, or vocal variety. Such behavioral models risk oversimplifying communication as context-sensitive, strategic, and relational. Instead, A.K. Touloumakos advocates embedding communication within reflective practice, encouraging individuals to adapt strategies, evaluate effectiveness, and remain attentive to relational dynamics. This orientation aligns closely with soft skills, where adaptability, empathy, and metacognition are central.

Philologists' expertise in pragmatics and discourse positions them well for this integration. Pragmatic competence – understanding how meaning is negotiated in context, how speech acts shape relationships, and how language indexes social roles – translates directly into soft skills such as active listening, negotiation, and empathy. Embedding soft-skill development into philological training can thus yield a holistic communicative competence tailored to modern professional realities.

2.3. Soft Skills in Professional Settings

Professional environments where philologists work highlight the necessity of soft skills. In education, they must adapt communication to learners of varied ages, combining clarity with empathy and motivational strategies. In translation, cultural sensitivity and contextual awareness are as vital as linguistic accuracy. In editing and publishing, negotiation and teamwork are indispensable, since decisions often balance diverse perspectives. In cultural mediation, philologists bridge linguistic and cultural divides, requiring intercultural competence and relational tact.

In these contexts, soft skills amplify technical expertise. A precise translation that lacks cultural empathy may fail in communicative intent. A teacher proficient in grammar may still fail to engage learners without interpersonal sensitivity. A.-M. C. Williams (2015) showed that both employers and students perceive communication as the most critical yet most deficient soft skill among new professionals, underscoring the paradox: disciplines centered on language cannot assume communicative soft skills develop automatically.

2.4. Callenges in Teaching and Assessing Soft Skills

Teaching and assessing soft skills remains difficult. Unlike technical knowledge, which can be tested formally, soft skills are context-dependent and expressed differently across settings. B. Cimatti (2016) notes that assessment often relies on peer review, scenario-based tasks, or reflective self-evaluation rather than standardized tests. Similarly, W. Cukier et al. (2015) emphasize that pedagogical methods must be embedded in authentic contexts, not taught in isolation.

This challenge is acute in philological education, where curricula have long emphasized textual and theoretical analysis. To foster soft skills, institutions must redesign learning strategies. Approaches such as project-based learning, collaborative translation, role-playing, and simulations embed skills into real communicative practice. Group assignments can develop teamwork and negotiation, while reflective journals encourage students to examine and refine their communicative choices. Though less standardized, these approaches provide more authentic opportunities for growth.

2.5. Toward a Holistic Understanding

Taken together, these perspectives show that soft skills are not supplementary but integral to philological education. Effective professional communication requires more than grammatical mastery; it demands adaptability, empathy, reflective judgment, and cultural awareness.

Embedding these dimensions into philological curricula serves both employability and the discipline's intellectual mission: to analyze, mediate, and enhance human communication in all its complexity.

3. Communication as a Core Competence of Philologists

3.1. Communication as the Core of Philological Practice

Communication is both subject and medium of philological expertise. Philologists study texts, languages, and cultural practices, but they also communicate daily as teachers, translators, editors, or mediators. It is not an accessory but a defining element of professionalism. As O. Yazlovytska (2023) notes, linguistic mastery alone rarely ensures success; what distinguishes practitioners is the integration of interpersonal, cognitive, and emotional skills.

This centrality is heightened in today's globalized, digital world, where philologists engage across cultures and platforms. Calibrating register, negotiating meaning, and establishing rapport are indispensable. Yet employers often find that graduates, despite technical knowledge, lack communicative adaptability for dynamic contexts *(Cukier, Hodson, & Omar, 2015)*. For language professionals, such gaps threaten credibility.

3.2. Dimensions of Communicative Competence

Communicative competence traditionally covered grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic skills *(Hymes, 1972)*. Current views add interpersonal intelligence, teamwork, and reflexivity.

Adaptability. Philologists must shift discourse for students, peers, clients, or the public. Pragmatic awareness and sensitivity to expectations are essential. P. Bourdieu (1991) shows language is embedded in symbolic power.

Active listening and empathy. Teaching, translation, and mediation rely on perceiving tone and implied meanings. D. Goleman (1995) stresses empathy as central to trust.

Metacognition. Effective communicators monitor strategies and learn from interaction. A.K. Touloumakos (2023) highlights reflection as more durable than checklists.

Negotiation. Editorial and pedagogical contexts involve competing priorities. Tactful balance of assertiveness and cooperation is required; deficiencies remain common *(Williams, 2015)*.

Collaboration. Many philological roles demand teamwork. J. Lave and D. Wenger (1991) show competence emerges from communities of practice.

Resilience. Emotional regulation and perseverance sustain clarity in dialogue *(Cimatti, 2016)*.

3.3. Communicative Roles of Philologists

The centrality of communication is clear in diverse roles:

Education. Teachers must adapt to cognitive levels and cultural backgrounds, combining rigor with empathy *(Goleman, 1995)*.

Translation. Beyond accuracy, translators negotiate equivalence and resonance, requiring diplomacy *(Yazlovytska, 2023)*.

Editing. Editors manage texts and relationships, delivering feedback with sensitivity *(Williams, 2015)*.

Intercultural mediation. Work in diplomacy or cultural institutions demands pragmatic adaptability and awareness of symbolic power *(Bourdieu, 1991)*.

In each of the above mentioned cases, technical skills must pair with communicative ones to secure trust.

3.4. Evidence of Gaps and Challenges

Despite extensive training, philologists show communicative gaps. A.-M. C. Williams (2015) found communication both the most valued and the most lacking graduate skill. W. Cukier et al. (2015) documented mismatches in teamwork, negotiation, and adaptability. In this case, the key challenges are:

Cross-cultural complexity. Misreadings of politeness or nonverbal cues derail dialogue *(Bourdieu, 1991)*.

Digital barriers. Online collaboration requires etiquette and clarity *(Cimatti, 2016)*.

Stress. High pressures undermine correct regulation, which is vital for n effective dialogue *(Goleman, 1995)*.

These patterns confirm that communication must be cultivated intentionally, not assumed.

3.5. Toward an Integrated Model

A holistic model of communicative competence should unite linguistic expertise, reflection, emotional intelligence, and collaboration. A.K. Touloumakos (2023) emphasizes reflective pedagogy, treating communication as adaptive practice. Role-plays, collaborative translation, and reflective journals provide authentic training.

This aligns with J. Lave and D. Wenger (1991) view of learning through participation. Embedding communication in real tasks ensures graduates acquire not only knowledge but also adaptive competence for twenty-first-century success.

In short, communication is the cornerstone of philological practice – the point where hard skills meet soft skills and expertise becomes professional impact.

4. Challenges in Professional Communication

4.1. Challenges in Professional Communication

Although philologists are characterized by high levels of linguistic and cultural expertise, they frequently encounter barriers in professional communication. These challenges rarely stem from insufficient technical knowledge but rather from the complex interplay of interpersonal, emotional, and contextual factors that shape interaction in professional settings.

Overemphasis on academic knowledge. A recurrent concern is the disproportionate weight given to textual analysis, historical linguistics, or literary theory in philological training. While these domains are indispensable, they can overshadow the cultivation of interpersonal sensitivity. J. Heckman and T. Kautz (2012) emphasize that cognitive and technical proficiency alone are insufficient for long-term career success. Instead, so-called "soft skills" – empathy, teamwork, and adaptability – often determine whether theoretical knowledge can be effectively applied. For philologists, the ability to present ideas persuasively, negotiate meaning in dialogic interaction, and mediate between perspectives is just as vital as mastery of textual detail. Without such competencies, highly specialized expertise risks remaining inaccessible to diverse audiences.

Cultural differences. In multilingual and multicultural environments, communication may falter due to divergent expectations regarding politeness, directness, or authority. G. Hofstede's (2011) research on cultural dimensions demonstrates how differences in power distance, individualism, and uncertainty avoidance shape communicative behavior. Philologists who operate across borders (as translators, educators, or cultural mediators) must remain aware that pragmatic norms are not universal but culturally situated. Misalignment between communicative styles can result in misunderstanding, loss of trust, or even open conflict. For example, an academic accustomed to egalitarian debate may find their approach interpreted as disrespectful

in hierarchical cultures, while indirect politeness strategies may be misread as evasiveness in more explicit communicative traditions.

Digital communication barriers. The increasing reliance on digital platforms has profoundly transformed the landscape of professional interaction. Email, videoconferencing, and collaborative online tools demand conciseness, clarity, and sensitivity to evolving norms of digital etiquette. As D. Derks, A. Fischer, and A. E. Bos (2008) observe, the absence of embodied cues in digital communication heightens the risk of misinterpretation, especially regarding tone and intent. For philologists who often collaborate in geographically dispersed editorial projects, engage in online teaching, or mediate translations through digital tools, mastering these new communicative genres is essential. Failure to adapt not only hampers efficiency but can also jeopardize professional relationships that rely on trust, tact, and clarity.

Stress and emotional regulation. Professional communication is equally influenced by psychological strain. Teachers navigating diverse classrooms, translators working under tight deadlines, or editors mediating conflicting authorial voices often experience stress that compromises emotional self-regulation. P. Salovey and J. D. Mayer's (1990) foundational work on emotional intelligence demonstrates that the ability to perceive, understand, and manage emotions is integral to sustaining constructive interaction under pressure. For philologists, who are frequently expected to combine analytical rigor with sensitivity to interpersonal nuance, emotional resilience becomes a decisive factor. The ability to maintain composure, show empathy, and manage conflict without escalating tensions not only preserves collegiality but also ensures that intellectual contributions are heard and valued.

Generational expectations and professional identity. Another often overlooked dimension of communicative challenge involves intergenerational differences in professional settings. Younger philologists entering the workforce may prioritize collaborative dialogue, rapid feedback, and digital immediacy, whereas senior colleagues may value formal procedures, slower deliberation, and traditional authority structures. These differing orientations can produce friction if not addressed through conscious negotiation of expectations. At stake is not only efficiency but also the construction of professional identity: whether philologists see themselves primarily as solitary researchers, public intellectuals, or team-based cultural mediators influences their communicative style. Recognizing and accommodating such diversity is essential to preventing marginalization within academic and applied contexts.

Together, these challenges underline the necessity of deliberate soft-skills training in philological education. Without structured preparation, graduates risk being technically competent yet communicatively fragile, unable to thrive in dynamic and multicultural professional environments. Addressing these issues requires institutions to move beyond narrow technical training and recognize communication as central to the professional identity of philologists.

5. Discussion and Future Directions

Although the importance of soft skills in philological education is widely acknowledged, empirical research conducted specifically within philology remains limited. Recent studies published between 2022 and 2025 indicate a growing scholarly interest, yet significant gaps persist. This section synthesizes key findings and outlines promising directions for future research.

Thus, the key findings from recent philological literature show that:

Philology students and soft skills in local contexts. Evidence from Ukrainian higher education highlights the integration of communicative, collaborative, and critical-thinking competencies into philology curricula. L, Dovhan and O. Osaulchyk (2023) argue that professional

training must include systematic development of soft skills alongside linguistic and translation competence. Similarly, V. Kyrychenko (2023) demonstrates that courses such as *History of Ukrainian Literature*, when taught through interactive and collaborative methods, foster both communication and research capacities. These findings suggest that even discipline-specific subjects can become effective platforms for transferable skill development.

2. Technology-supported feedback and AI interventions. Digital feedback systems and AI-assisted tools are increasingly used to scaffold academic writing. A recent study on EFL postgraduate students showed that Grammarly Premium facilitated greater improvements in writing proficiency compared to traditional teacher comments, particularly for non-native speakers. Adaptive writing support systems likewise encourage self-regulated learning, with revision behaviour improving across multiple drafting cycles. Such findings align with broader trends in digitally mediated pedagogy, but more work is needed to determine the long-term effects of these tools in philological training.

3. Peer review and longitudinal designs. Mixed-methods studies confirm that peer review enhances sensitivity to rhetorical structures and improves feedback quality. Over an eleven-week intervention, low-proficiency English learners gained measurable confidence in critiquing peers' texts. Triangulated assessment models – combining teacher, peer, and self-evaluation – also show promise for translation tasks, producing a more holistic picture of both process and product. These insights underline the value of collaborative assessment and the need for research designs that extend beyond short-term interventions.

4. Systematic reviews highlight employability and curriculum gaps. C. Villegas (2024), in a review of literature on soft skills and employability, notes modest growth in publications yet identifies a persistent underrepresentation of humanities and philology. Other research in professional language education highlights a discrepancy: while employers consistently stress communication, adaptability, and teamwork, many curricula remain narrowly focused on technical mastery. The gap between institutional provision and workplace expectations continues to constrain graduates' career trajectories.

At the same time, there are still some gaps and challenges to be covered:

Lack of longitudinal data in philology careers. Few studies follow graduates into workplaces such as publishing, teaching, or translation agencies to determine which soft skills predict long-term success.

Fine-grained measures of quality. Research often reports global improvements in writing but rarely dissects which components – coherence, tone, accuracy, teamwork – are most sensitive to training.

Digital and hybrid communication. Virtual collaboration is now central to professional philology, yet little is known about how soft skills operate in online translation, editing, or academic conferencing.

Cultural and multilingual pragmatics. The role of politeness, code-switching, and intercultural negotiation in shaping communicative competence remains underexplored.

Technology integration and ethics. AI-assisted tools raise questions of bias, reliability, and student perceptions. Acceptance and trust appear as significant moderators of effectiveness.

Future Directions

Empirical intervention studies. Controlled trials should embed teamwork, negotiation, or feedback training directly into translation and writing courses, measuring impact on both product and process.

Longitudinal cohort tracking. Multi-year studies of philology graduates could identify which competencies most strongly influence employability and career satisfaction.

Digital and hybrid spaces. Research should analyze soft-skill deployment in remote translation projects, online editorial boards, and virtual teaching.

Technology-supported tools. Initiatives such as multimodal feedback systems *(Guerrero-Sosa et al., 2025)* could be adapted to evaluate tone, fidelity, and stylistic nuance in philological practice.

Cross-cultural pragmatics. Comparative studies across linguistic and cultural settings would clarify how soft skills are interpreted and valued differently.

Curriculum integration. Project-based learning, co-teaching, and internships offer avenues for embedding soft skills systematically alongside linguistic training.

Ethical and psychological dimensions. Research should consider student stress, equity, and attitudes toward AI or peer evaluation to ensure inclusivity.

In sum, recent scholarship indicates that soft skills are increasingly recognized as essential to philological education, with peer review and digital interventions showing particular promise. Anyway, to advance beyond descriptive accounts, future research must adopt longitudinal, cross-cultural, and technologically nuanced designs. Only through rigorous empirical work will curricula be able to prepare philologists who combine linguistic precision with the relational, collaborative, and digital competencies required in contemporary professional life.

6. Conclusions

The analysis undertaken here demonstrates that soft skills are not peripheral to philological education but central to its intellectual and professional mission. Philologists, by virtue of their linguistic and cultural expertise, occupy a privileged position in shaping communication across academic, pedagogical, and applied domains. Yet the evidence consistently reveals a paradox: although these professionals are assumed to excel at communication, their formal training often leaves them underprepared for the interpersonal, collaborative, and adaptive demands of contemporary workplaces. This discrepancy highlights an urgent need for systemic integration of soft skills into curricula, not as optional supplements but as structural components of professional formation.

At a theoretical level, soft skills can be understood as multidimensional capacities that blend interpersonal awareness, cognitive flexibility, and emotional regulation. They function as dynamic resources that enable professionals to calibrate tone, negotiate meaning, and sustain constructive interaction in diverse contexts. For philologists, these abilities are inseparable from their disciplinary identity, since communication is simultaneously their object of study and their primary tool of practice. Developing reflective and adaptive communicative competence therefore enriches not only employability but also the broader scholarly and cultural relevance of philology itself.

Practically, this requires reimagining the curriculum as an ecosystem where technical knowledge and interpersonal abilities reinforce each other. Translation workshops should include training in negotiation and collaborative editing; literature seminars should encourage dialogic exchange and peer critique; digital communication tasks should cultivate pragmatic sensitivity in online genres. Such embedded design ensures that students experience soft skills as integral to their field rather than external requirements imposed by employers.

Looking forward, the challenge lies not merely in acknowledging the importance of soft skills but in operationalizing their development and assessment within higher education. Research must expand to track how particular competencies – such as adaptability, conflict resolution, or intercultural empathy – shape long-term career trajectories in teaching, publishing,

and cultural mediation. Equally important is the exploration of digital and hybrid communication, where professional interaction increasingly unfolds. By addressing these dimensions through empirical study, cross-cultural comparison, and technological innovation, philology can move beyond the rhetoric of skills gaps toward substantive curricular transformation.

In conclusion, embedding soft skills within philological education is both a pedagogical imperative and a disciplinary opportunity. Doing so will prepare graduates to navigate complexity with intellectual precision, cultural awareness, and interpersonal sensitivity, thereby affirming the enduring relevance of philology in a rapidly changing world.

References

1. Bhatia, V.K. (2004) Worlds of Written Discourse: A Genre-Based View, London: Continuum.

2. Bourdieu, P. (1991). Language and symbolic power. Polity Press.

3. Cimatti, B. (2016). Definition, development, assessment of soft skills and their role for the quality of organizations and enterprises. International Journal for Quality Research, 10(1), 97–130. https://doi.org/10.18421/IJQR10.01-05

4. Cukier, W., Hodson, J., & Omar, A. (2015). "Soft" skills are hard: A review of the literature (Diversity Institute Report). Toronto Metropolitan University. https://www.torontomu.ca/content/dam/diversity/reports/KSG2015_SoftSkills_FullReport.pdf

5. Derks, D., Fischer, A. H., & Bos, A. E. (2008). The role of emotion in computer-mediated communication: A review. Computers in Human Behavior, 24(3), 766–785. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2007.04.004.

6. Dovhan, L., & Osaulchyk, O. (2023). Soft skill as a component of professional competency of philology students. Modern Engineering and Innovative Technologies, 3(27-03), 20–23. https://doi.org/10.30890/2567-5273.2023-27-03-012. [In Ukrainian]

7. Goleman, D. (1995). Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ. Bantam Books.

8. Guerrero-Sosa, J. D., Benítez-Guerrero, E., & Rodríguez-López, R. (2025). Towards multimodal frameworks for assessing soft skills: Combining voice, gesture, and textual interaction. arXiv Preprint. https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.01794

9. Heckman, J. J., & Kautz, T. (2012). Hard evidence on soft skills. Labour Economics, 19(4), 451–464. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.labeco.2012.05.014.

10. Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, 2(1). https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014.

11. Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), Sociolinguistics (pp. 269–293). Penguin.

12. Jackson, D. (2016). Re-conceptualising graduate employability: The importance of pre-professional identity. Studies in Higher Education, 41(8), 1237–1258. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2014.982352.

13. Kathpalia, S.S. (1997) Cross-cultural variation in professional genres: A comparative study of book blurbs. World Englishes 16/3, 417–26.

14. Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development. Prentice Hall.

15. Kyrychenko, V. (2020). Formation of soft skills of the future teachers-philologists of "History of Ukrainian Literature." [Formuvannia miakykh navychok maibutnikh uchyteliv-filolohiv pid chas vyvchennia "Istorii ukrainskoi literatury]. Modern Engineering and Innovative Technologies, 26(3). https://doi.org/10.30890/2567-5273.2023-26-03-015. [In Ukrainian]

16. Liu, M., Zhang, W., & Chen, J. (2023). *Revision behavior and self-regulated learning with adaptive writing support*. arXiv Preprint. https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.10304.

17. Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge University Press.

18. Mekheimer, M. (2025). Generative AI-assisted feedback and EFL writing: A study on proficiency, revision frequency and writing quality. *Discover Education, 4,* 170. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-025-00602-7.

19. Nicol, D., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education, 31(2),* 199–218. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572090.

20. Park, J., & Lee, S. (2022). Peer review and writing development: A longitudinal mixed-methods study with low-proficiency learners. *Asian EFL Journal, 24(3),* 125–150. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s40862-022-00154-5.

21. Robles, M. M. (2012). Executive perceptions of the top 10 soft skills needed in today's workplace. *Business Communication Quarterly, 75(4),* 453–465. https://doi.org/10.1177/1080569912460400.

22. Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality, 9(3),* 185–211. https://doi.org/10.2190/DUGG-P24E-52WK-6CDG.

23. Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action.* Basic Books.

24. Shuman, L. J., Besterfield-Sacre, M., & McGourty, J. (2005). The ABET "professional skills" – Can they be taught? Can they be assessed? *Journal of Engineering Education, 94(1),* 41–55. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2005.tb00828.x.

25. Sun, Y., & Wang, H. (2025). AI-assisted vs. teacher feedback in EFL postgraduate writing: A quasi-experimental study. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education, 27(2),* 341–359. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s44217-025-00602-7.

26. Touloumakos, A. K. (2023). Taking a step back to move forward: Understanding communication skills and their characteristics in the workplace. *Human Resource Development International, 26(2),* 125–143. https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2022.2030698.

27. Villegas, C. (2024). Mapping the research landscape on soft skills for employability: A systematic review. *Advanced Education, 22,* 67–84. https://ae.fl.kpi.ua/article/view/314064.

28. Villarreal-Durán, C., Rodríguez-Gómez, D., & Méndez-Aguilar, F. (2024). Soft skills in foreign language teaching for professional contexts: A curricular gap. *Revista Eduweb, 18(1),* 55–70. https://revistaeduweb.org/index.php/eduweb/article/view/442.

29. Wang, J., Li, Q., & Zhang, T. (2024). Stress, trust, and acceptance in AI-assisted language learning feedback. *Behavioral Sciences, 15(5),* 600. https://www.mdpi.com/2076-328X/15/5/600.

30. Williams, A.-M. C. (2015). *Soft skills perceived by students and employers as relevant employability skills* (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University). Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies. https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations/1427.

31. Yazlovytska, O. (2023). Soft skills development as an integral part of training specialists in the field of philology. [ROZVYTOK SOFT SKILLS YAK NEVIDIEMNA SKLADOVA PIDHOTOVKY FAKHIVTSIV U HALUZI FILOLOHII]. *Aktualni pytannia humanitarnykh nauk, 64(2),* 381–386. https://www.aphn-journal.in.ua/archive/64_2023/part_2/61.pdf. https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/64-2-61. [In Ukrainian]

32. Zhang, H., Li, M., & Chen, Z. (2024). *SWIF(T): A scientific writing feedback tool for non-native researchers.* arXiv Preprint. https://arxiv.org/html/2405.20477.