

UDC 378.147:811.111:621.31

DOI <https://doi.org/10.52726/as.pedagogy/2026.2.11>**M. V. SHEVCHENKO**

*Lecturer at the Department of English for Engineering No. 1,  
National Technical University of Ukraine “Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute”,  
Kyiv, Ukraine*

*E-mail: [marianashevchenko@ukr.net](mailto:marianashevchenko@ukr.net)*

*<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5881-0263>*

## **LINGUISTIC FEATURES AND STRUCTURE OF PROFESSIONALLY ORIENTED OPINION-SHARING DIALOGUE IN TEACHING ENGLISH TO FUTURE POWER ENGINEERS**

The article presents a comprehensive analysis of the structure and linguistic features of professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue as a core component of English for Specific Purposes training for future power engineers. The relevance of the study is driven by the demands of the globalised engineering and energy sector, where power engineers must effectively interact in international teams. The article argues that students in power engineering specialities often experience heightened communicative anxiety in foreign-language interactions due to the significant implications of technical errors. Therefore, professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue is identified as the most psychologically comfortable and professionally relevant mode of interaction for third-year students aiming to achieve the B2 proficiency level according to the CEFR requirements. The study details the characteristics of the dialogue in question, explaining its implementation in both dialogue and trilogue formats, and outlines the essential and additional knowledge, skills, and abilities required for successful interaction in the form of professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue. Based on the cascade of communication model in a professional environment and the principles of dialogic teaching, psychological tasks, structural components, and typical situations for engaging in a professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue in the power engineering field are systematised. The communicative intentions of power engineers are categorised into three main dialogue types: cooperative, coordinating, and contradictory. Furthermore, the article highlights the specific linguistic features necessary to fulfil these intentions, including the use of ellipsis, conversational markers, 19 categories of professional clichés, and various mitigation strategies. The article concludes that mastering these structural and linguistic elements is crucial for effective professional communication and serves as a foundation for further training using authentic video materials in English.

**Key words:** teaching, English for Specific Purposes, future power engineers, professionally oriented dialogic speech, professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue, linguistic features, mitigation strategies.

**Introduction.** The worldwide integration of energy markets, the transition to green energy, and the introduction of modern energy-efficient technologies make it essential for power engineering specialists to possess not only deep technical expertise but also the ability to collaborate effectively on an international scale. Today, English is the indisputable means of international professional communication (*lingua franca*) in the engineering environment. Given this global scientific and technological trend, training highly professional power engineers is becoming a matter of paramount importance.

At the same time, an analysis of practical training in higher education institutions shows that power engineering students often face significant barriers when producing spontaneous foreign language speech. The specific nature of their future profession, where every inaccuracy can have serious consequences, creates an elevated level of communicative anxiety and a fear

of making mistakes during foreign-language communication, as well.

According to the requirements of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), the target level of training for third-year students is the production of professionally oriented dialogic speech at the B2 English proficiency level [Bolaito & Vest : 122–124; Council of Europe], which implies the ability to initiate freely, maintain, and conclude a conversation. However, practical analysis indicates that the English proficiency of these students – specifically their ability to engage in reasoned, professionally oriented dialogic speech – frequently falls short of the B2 level required in the third year of study at non-linguistic faculties. Furthermore, rigid interaction formats, such as formal debates or structured arguments, often serve only to reinforce existing psychological barriers. Therefore,

there is an urgent need to update the methodology of teaching English for Specific Purposes (ESP), based on the most natural, psychologically comfortable, and professionally appropriate interaction format – professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue, creating an environment as close as possible to the real professional circumstances of power engineering specialists. Thus, compliance with all characteristics and principles of the communicative approach and of ESP teaching in general is ensured [Chow et al.; Shevchenko 2015].

As modern research proves, in senior years of university, interest in foreign language activities is maintained not only by the presence of a cognitive component but also by the systematic nature of its presentation and the interactive format – primarily through the active involvement of the students in a professionally oriented interaction with the exchange of impressions/opinions or ideas. Satisfying these communicative and cognitive needs is a fundamental condition for the effective organisation of professionally oriented dialogic speech teaching.

**Analysis of recent research and publications.** The conceptual foundations of the hierarchy of professional communication are reflected in the ‘cascade of communication’ model by Clutterbuck and Hirst [Clutterbuck & Hirst], which proves the highest value of dialogic exchange of experience. The general principles of dialogic teaching and its impact on student development were fundamentally explored by R. Alexander [Alexander]. The linguistic aspects and communication strategies have been studied by Faerch and Kasper [Faerch & Kasper]. Current trends in the use of dialogic interaction for problem-solving in the learning environment are analysed in detail in a recent study by Hu, Chen and Wu [Hu, Chen & Wu].

**Unresolved parts of the general problem.** Despite a significant number of scientific works dedicated to teaching dialogic speech [Hu & Chen; Hu, Chen & Wu; Shi et al.], the linguistic potential of the professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue remains insufficiently investigated in the methodology of teaching ESP to future power engineers. Most researchers focus on analysing student interaction in written academic discourse or discussions of controversial general social topics [Shi et al.]. There is still a lack

of comprehensive research that logically combines the structural organisation, communicative intentions, types, and specific linguistic inventory of professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue, which is critically necessary for teaching power engineering students at the B2 level.

**The aim of the article.** The paper focuses on determining the linguistic features, structural organisation, essential knowledge, skills, and abilities, as well as the types of professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue in teaching English to future power engineers.

**Results and Discussion.** Successful activity in the power engineering industry is impossible without close cooperation. Professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue is a process of social and speech interaction among communication participants to exchange thoughts, judgments, and impressions regarding a specific object, professional issue, or problem of mutual interest, to reach a consensus or make an appropriate decision [Kalmykova et al. : 25; Oxford Dictionary of English : 480].

Among the four functional types of dialogue – questioning, agreement, opinion-sharing, and discussion [Bihych, Borysko, et al. : 316–317] – choosing professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue for teaching English professionally oriented dialogic speech to future power engineers in the third year of their Bachelor’s degree is considered appropriate. Its specific professional context determines the characteristics of such a dialogue. During interaction in the form of professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue, the initiative of exchange is always two-sided. In the professional situations of power engineers, this process can take the form of a classic dialogue (communication according to the “Speaker A – Speaker B” scheme), as well as a more complex form – a trilogy, reflecting the interaction of three people with a mutual exchange of remarks (“Speaker A – Speaker B – Speaker C”) (see Pic. 1).

To communicate fluently at the B2 level during professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue, power engineering students need to develop the following knowledge, skills, and abilities [Bihych, Bondar, et al. : 287–288]:

1. Initiating a dialogue, taking into account the cultural and professional features of the energy sector;



**Pic. 1. Dialogue and trilogue**

2. Listening to interlocutors, reacting to their points of view, and presenting one’s own opposing opinion;

3. Pursuing one’s own strategic line to influence the participants of the interaction;

4. Seeking clarification or further explanation from interlocutors;

5. Prompting another interlocutor to continue the interaction;

6. Expressing key speech functions (agreeing, refuting, suggesting, etc.).

To transition to the level of an actual speech skill, it must acquire such characteristics as purposefulness, productivity, independence, dynamism, and integration. In addition, supplementary knowledge, skills, and abilities play a critical role. Power engineering students must learn to consider non-standard elements of the dialogue (a sudden change in mood or deviation from the topic), master expressive and productive speaking, and learn how to correctly conclude professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue by choosing words for a clear summary.

Effective teaching of professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue can be achieved by considering the principles of dialogic foreign language teaching [Alexander 2018]:

- *Collectivity*: students solve educational tasks together;
- *Reciprocity*: students listen to each other, share opinions, and consider alternative viewpoints;
- *Support*: students articulate their thoughts and ideas freely without fear of giving an “incorrect answer” and help one another in reaching a shared understanding and resolving the issue;
- *Cumulation*: students build upon other perspectives during the oral opinion-sharing, linking them into coherent lines of thinking, understanding, and problem-solving;
- *Purposefulness*: while remaining open and dialogic, the opinion-sharing exchange in

the ESP classroom is structured according to specific educational goals.

By participating in dialogic interaction in class, students feel that they are part of a learning community rather than remaining passive listeners [Kuznetsova et al.].

The importance of mastering professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue is confirmed by the ‘cascade of communication’ in a professional environment (see Pic. 2) [Clutterbuck & Hirst].

According to this model, the transmission of dry “Data” and “Information” (informing) has the lowest impact index – level 1. “Knowledge” and “Skills” involve discussion – level 2. And only when interlocutors add personal experience (opinions) – that is, share “Wisdom” – does a true dialogue emerge, which has the highest index of positive changes in a professional environment (8–10) – level 3.

While engaging in professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue, each communication participant must solve many psychological tasks: remember previous discussions, keep in mind their own and others’ remarks, be able to express an opinion at the right time without inappropriate interruption, maintain a relevant emotional tone, and monitor the correctness of the language form.

Professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue must meet such criteria as integrity and cohesion. Such dialogic speech has external and inter-



**Pic. 2. The cascade of communication**

nal features. External features include the presence of interlocutors and simultaneity, while internal features include the use of professional jargon, clichés, and elliptical constructions. Furthermore, the structural components of a professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue are:

- 1) circumstances;
- 2) relationships between the subjects of communication;
- 3) speech motivation;
- 4) the process of interaction itself.

Professional communication among power engineers most often revolves around the modernisation of power grids, the implementation of renewable energy sources, troubleshooting emergency system failures, energy audits, or project development. In such situations, the main communicative intentions of power engineers during professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue will be: discussion, clarification, analysis, exchange of experience, evaluation, justification of a point of view, persuasion, agreement, and a call to action.

A properly organised opinion-sharing (with student engagement and aimed at resolving a specific issue) will lead to the maximum mobilisation of knowledge and experience of future power engineers in English lessons, the formation of thoughts in professionally oriented English, and, as a result, will contribute to the development of knowledge, skills, and abilities of engagement in unprepared professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue in English with other students, since knowledge does not exist exclusively in the individual consciousness, but is constructed by engaging participants in critical interaction [Hu & Chen]. At the same time, students should be involved not only in discussing a problematic topic as a whole but also in searching for contradictory positions on a specific issue, since the ability to analyse a problem in the context of its multifaceted nature develops scientific communication skills [Yatsenko : 85–86].

By analysing the process of dialogic interaction through a communicative approach [Shevchenko 2015], the following types of professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue can be distinguished:

- **Cooperative** – power engineers have a common goal, complement each other, and search

for the truth together (the level of conflict is minimal).

- **Coordinating** – involves directing the interaction by one of the specialists, who gathers the impressions of subordinates and moderates the process.

- **Contradictory** – arises in the presence of disagreements. Unlike an argument, mitigation strategies are applied here; thus, disagreement is expressed as diplomatically as possible.

In the power engineering sector, all three types are used with equal frequency. However, they are applied in distinct professional communicative situations depending on the participants engaged in a professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue. The combination of these types of dialogue constitutes a cohesive system of substantiated professional dialogic communication, which enables the differentiation of the objectives, content, and instructional methodologies for teaching these dialogue types.

However, successfully operating within this system and realising the corresponding communicative intentions is impossible without power engineering students mastering specific linguistic features. This requirement is underpinned by the fundamental rule: while very little can be conveyed without grammar, nothing can be conveyed without vocabulary [Wilkins]. This is also confirmed by applied linguodidactic research [Faerch & Kasper : 145], the results of which indicate that communication breakdowns and low efficiency are most often caused by the speaker's lexical limitations rather than incorrect pronunciation or grammatical errors. Given the key role of vocabulary in the professional communication of future power engineers, there is a need for a detailed study of the linguistic features of professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue.

The first linguistic feature is **ellipticity** (omission of certain sentence members), which adds dynamism to the speech (“*Yes, of course*”; “*Not very often*”). At the same time, elliptical constructions have a specific intonation design that distinguishes them from full constructions. Frequent changes of intonation in professionally oriented dialogue increase the emotionality and impact of speech without using additional descriptive words.

The second key feature is the use of **professional clichés**. The following typical categories

of clichés are identified for future power engineering specialists:

1. Initiating a dialogue / Attracting attention (*I'd like to point out that...; Let me begin by telling...*);

2. Expressing one's opinion: absolute certainty (*I'm absolutely convinced that...*), neutrality (*In my opinion...; As I see it...*), uncertainty (*To be honest, I'm not sure; I have no idea*);

3. Asking the interlocutor's or interlocutors' opinion (*Do you agree?; What do you think (about...)?*);

4. Agreeing: full agreement (*Absolutely; Exactly; I totally agree*), neutral (*I agree; That's true*), partial (*I suppose so; Sure, that's one way of looking at it*);

5. Expressing polite disagreement and counter-argumentation (*Even so...; I'm afraid, I disagree; I see your point, but...; With all due respect...*);

6. Clichés for continuing the dialogue (*As I was saying...; That's a good question; What I mean is...*);

7. Emphasising (*I want to point out that...; I would like to stress...*);

8. Clichés for persuasion in being right (*Let me reassure you on that point*);

9. Clarifying and checking: requesting repetition (*Pardon?; Sorry?; Um?/Uh?*), clarifying what was heard (*Are you telling me that...; Did you say...?*), obtaining an explanation (*Can/Could you tell me (exactly)...?; What do you mean?*), checking one's own or the interlocutor's understanding (*Do you see what I'm getting at?; Right?*);

10. Confirmation (*That's right; Of course*);

11. Denial (*No chance; No, that's not quite right*);

12. Suggestion / Assumption (*Perhaps we can...; What if I/we...?; Wouldn't it be good idea to...?*);

13. Expressing surprise (*No way!; Oh!; Whoa!; You've got to be kidding!*);

14. Linking words (*Besides; Consequently; Moreover; Hence*);

15. Avoiding a direct answer (*I'd like to answer that question later, if I may; That would depend on various factors*);

16. Interrupting (*Sorry to interrupt, but...; May I say something here?*);

17. Thanking (*Thank you*);

18. Responding to thanks (*It's a pleasure*);

19. Fillers / Expressing hesitation (*Um; Well; You know; Like; So; Hm*).

It is worth noting that clichés can be 'closed' (unchangeable in form and word order) and 'open' (with the possibility of changing elements in a phrase or sentence). Examples of the former are "*It's not rocket science*", "*Last but not least*", and the latter – "*Taking into account...*" = "*Judging from...*".

Another essential feature is that power engineers' professionally oriented dialogic speech in English is saturated with **professional idioms**, ensuring conciseness and efficiency. The defining feature of these phraseological units is the restricted combinability of their components. Alongside clichés and ellipses, such idioms (e.g., *to come up with new ideas* instead of "to think of", or *to run into a few problems* instead of "to have") significantly enhance the expressiveness and stylistic colouring of the message while enriching oral speech with synonymous lexical series.

The fourth important component is the pragmatic aspect – **mitigation strategies (hedging)**. When teaching professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue in English, it is also important to improve the pragmatic competence of power engineering students, i.e. awareness and appropriate implementation of communicative actions [Kuznetsova et al.]. Among the most common techniques in professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue in English are the following:

1. Using modal verbs *would, could, might* ("*That would be unacceptable*" instead of "*That is unacceptable*"; "*That could be an issue*" instead of "*That can be an issue*");

2. Presenting a point of view as a question (*Wouldn't it be a good idea to...?*);

3. Using the negative form of verbs to show openness to discussion (*Isn't that too complicated?*);

4. Using introductory words for emotional preparation (*Actually...; To be honest...; Well,...; Frankly,...*);

5. Adding "*I'm afraid...*" before negative news (*I'm afraid, our project may not receive funding at this stage*);

6. Applying restrictive markers (*a slight problem; a little more time; a bit difficult; a short delay; a slight misunderstanding*);

7. Using the negative particle *not* with a positively coloured word (“*not very convenient*” instead of “*I don’t agree*”);

8. Using the comparative degree of an adjective (*better; more appropriate*);

9. Using the continuous form of a verb (*I was wondering...*);

10. Semantic emphasis through intonation and emphatic constructions (*It **is** important...; I was **quite interested** in your suggestion; I **do** need to hear your thought”; I **have** sent you the details already; I **am** waiting for your decision*).

In addition, the spontaneity of thinking and choosing language material is recognised as a main attribute of real-life oral communication, and the development of listening comprehension skills is the key to achieving competence in producing foreign-language oral speech. **Communication strategies** deal with the connection between the formation and production of a thought and the means used for this. **Strategies for expanding resources** – generalisation of concepts and paraphrasing – are also necessary to overcome barriers.

The practical implementation of these strategies, along with the use of professional clichés and other linguistic features, is best observed through authentic video recordings. Such materials reflect a country’s national specifics, its inhabitants, their behaviour, and the most common communicative situations, including professionally oriented ones, in terms of visual clarity [Shevchenko 2018]. The word ‘authentic’ implies the non-educational nature of any resource. The cinematic discourse featured in authentic videos of the cinematic type in the form of fragments of professionally oriented communication is very close to real language; therefore, it gives students the opportunity to hear ‘real’ oral speech of a general and professionally oriented nature and the elements accompanying it [Chow et al.; Shevchenko 2018]. The authenticity of video recordings in English is reflected in: 1) the script/narration text, 2) the speech features of the actors or narrator(s), and 3) the non-verbal and paralinguistic components.

Whether vintage or contemporary, movie excerpts provide valuable speech models due to their inherent linguistic authenticity. Under such circumstances, participants in the educational process master ESP actively rather than passively, specifically focusing on the production of professionally oriented dialogic speech along with its distinctive linguistic features, such as professional idioms, clichés, and mitigation strategies. This approach ensures interaction is as close as possible to real communication conditions, serving as a basis for further discussion and the memorisation of necessary vocabulary and grammar through strong and diverse associative links [Shevchenko 2018].

**Conclusion.** Professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue is the most important instrument of foreign language professional activity for a modern power engineer. Considering the psychological profile of power engineering students, it is precisely this format, based on the principles of cooperation and cumulation, that removes communicative tension. The defined structural organisation of professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue and systematised communicative intentions require robust linguistic support. Teaching power engineering students elliptical constructions, 19 categories of professional clichés, and pragmatic mitigation strategies is the key to their successful engagement in global professional cooperation. Therefore, future research could be directed toward a functional and structural comparative analysis of professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue and professionally oriented discussion. Furthermore, it may focus on the development of a new methodology for teaching professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue using authentic video recordings in English delivered via screencasting technology to enhance the presentation of all linguistic, non-verbal, and paralinguistic elements of professionally oriented dialogic communication among native English speakers.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Бігич О. Б., Бондар Л. В., Волошинова М. М., Максименко Л. О., Огуй О. М., Окопна Я. В., Сімкова І. О. Теорія і практика формування іншомовної професійно орієнтованої компетентності в говорінні у студентів нелінгвістичних спеціальностей : Колективна монографія. Київ : Вид. центр КНЛУ, 2013. 383.

2. Бігич О. Б., Бориско Н. Ф., Борецька Г. Е. та ін. Методика навчання іноземних мов і культур: теорія і практика : підручник для студ. класичних, педагогічних і лінгвістичних університетів / за загальн. ред. С. Ю. Ніколаєвої. Київ : Ленвіт, 2013. 590.
3. Болайто Р., Вест, Р. Інтернаціоналізація українських університетів у розрізі англійської мови: Проект «Англійська для університетів». Київ : Видавництво «Сталь», 2017. 154.
4. Калмикова Л. О., Калмиков Г. В., Лапшина І. М., Харченко Н. В. Психологія мовлення і психолінгвістика: Навчальний посібник для студентів вищих навчальних закладів. Київ : Переяслав-Хмельницький педагогічний інститут, в-во «Фенікс», 2008. 245.
5. Яценко С. Навчальний діалог у професійній підготовці майбутнього вчителя початкової школи. *Освітні обрії*. 2019. Vol. 2, No. 49. С. 83–87. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15330/obrii.49.2.83-87>
6. Alexander R. Developing dialogic teaching: genesis, process, trial. *Research Papers in Education*. 2018. Vol. 33, No. 5. P. 561–598. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2018.1481140>
7. Chow B. W.-Y., Hui A. N.-N., Li Z., Dong, Y. Dialogic teaching in English-as-a-second-language classroom: Its effects on first graders with different levels of vocabulary knowledge. *Language Teaching Research*. 2023. Vol. 27, No. 6. P. 1408–1430. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820981399>
8. Clutterbuck D., Hirst S. Talking business: Making communication work. Butterworth-Heinemann, 2002. 210.
9. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment – Companion volume / Council of Europe. Council of Europe Publishing, 2020. URL: <https://rm.coe.int/common-european-framework-of-reference-for-languages-learning-teaching/16809ea0d4> (дата звернення: 27.04.2026).
10. Hu L., Chen G. Dialogic collaborative problem solving: a theoretical framework for analyzing students' dialogic interaction in collaborative problem solving. *Research Papers in Education*. 2025. P. 1–22. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2025.2610216>
11. Hu L., Chen G., Wu J. Improving participation equity in dialogic collaborative problem solving: A participatory visual learning analytical approach. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*. 2024. Vol. 40, No. 4. P. 1632–1657. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12975>
12. Kuznetsova H., Panasenko A., Luchkina L., Zenchenko T., Danylchenko I. Dialogic learning as means of forming the communication skills of higher education students. *Revista Eduweb*. 2023. Vol. 17, No. 2. P. 101–115. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.46502/issn.1856-7576/2023.17.02.9>
13. Oxford Dictionary of English. 2nd ed. Oxford, UK : Oxford University Press, 2003. 2088.
14. Shevchenko M. Analysis of the influence of authentic English videos on technical students' memorization and subsequent recall of the English lexis. *Science and Education a New Dimension. Pedagogy and Psychology*. 2018. Vol. VI(155), No. 65. P. 49–53. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31174/send-pp2018-155vi65-11>
15. Shevchenko M. V. Communicative approach to teaching English at technical universities. *Advanced Education*. 2015. No. 3. P. 101–107. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.20535/2410-8286.44302>
16. Shi Y., Zhang Z., Cao S., Liu Q. Dialogic teaching of controversial issues: discursive moves to enact two-sided discussions. *Language and Education*. 2024. Vol. 38, No. 2. P. 303–319. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2023.2240292>
17. Strategies in interlanguage communication / ed.: C. Faerch, G. Kasper. Longman Group Limited, 1983. 253.
18. Wilkins D. A. Linguistics in language teaching. London : Edward Arnold, 1972. 252.

## REFERENCES

1. Bihych, O. B., Bondar, L. V., Voloshynova, M. M., Maksymenko, L. O., Ohui, O. M., Okopna, Ya. V., & Simkova, I. O. (2013). *Teoriia i praktyka formuvannia inshomovnoi profesiino oriientovanoi kompetentnosti v hovorinni u studentiv nelinhvistychnykh spetsialnostei: Kolektyvna monohrafiia* [Theory and practice of forming foreign language professionally oriented speaking competence in students of non-linguistic specialities: A collective monograph]. Vyd. tsentr KNLU.
2. Bihych O. B., Borysko N. F., Boretska H. E., et. al. (2013). *Metodyka navchannia inozemnykh mov i kultur: teoriia i praktyka: pidruchnyk dlia stud. klasychnykh, pedahohichnykh i linhvistychnykh universytetiv* [Methodology of foreign language and culture teaching: theory and practice: textbook for students of classical, pedagogical and linguistic universities] (S. Yu. Nikolaieva, Ed.). Lenvit.
3. Bolaito, R., & Vest, R. (2017). *Internatsionalizatsiia ukrainskykh universytetiv u rozrizi anhliiskoi movy: Proekt "Anhliiska dlia universytetiv"* [Internationalisation of Ukrainian universities in the context of the English language: The "English for Universities" project]. Vydavnytstvo Stal.
4. Kalmykova, L. O., Kalmykov, H. V., Lapshyna, I. M., & Kharchenko, N. V. (2008). *Psykhohohiia movlennia i psykhohinhvistyka: Navchalnyi posibnyk dlia studentiv vyshchykh navchalnykh zakladiv* [Psychology of speech and psycholinguistics: A study guide for university students]. V-vo "Feniks".
5. Yatsenko, S. (2019). Navchalnyi dialoh u profesiinii pidhotovtsi maibutnoho vchytelia pochatkovoii shkoly [Educational dialogue in the professional training of a future primary school teacher]. *Osvitni obrii*, 2(49), 83–87. <https://doi.org/10.15330/obrii.49.2.83-87>

6. Alexander, R. (2018). Developing dialogic teaching: genesis, process, trial. *Research Papers in Education*, 33(5), 561–598. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2018.1481140>
7. Chow, B. W.-Y., Hui, A. N.-N., Li, Z., & Dong, Y. (2023). Dialogic teaching in English-as-a-second-language classroom: Its effects on first graders with different levels of vocabulary knowledge. *Language Teaching Research*, 27(6), 1408–1430. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820981399>
8. Clutterbuck, D., & Hirst, S. (2002). *Talking business: Making communication work*. Butterworth-Heinemann.
9. Council of Europe. (2020). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment – Companion volume*. Council of Europe Publishing. Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/common-european-framework-of-reference-for-languages-learning-teaching/16809ea0d4>
10. Hu, L., & Chen, G. (2025). Dialogic collaborative problem solving: a theoretical framework for analyzing students' dialogic interaction in collaborative problem solving. *Research Papers in Education*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2025.2610216>
11. Hu, L., Chen, G., & Wu, J. (2024). Improving participation equity in dialogic collaborative problem solving: A participatory visual learning analytical approach. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 40(4), 1632–1657. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12975>
12. Kuznetsova, H., Panasenko, A., Luchkina, L., Zenchenko, T., & Danylchenko, I. (2023). Dialogic learning as means of forming the communication skills of higher education students. *Revista Eduweb*, 17(2), 101–115. <https://doi.org/10.46502/issn.1856-7576/2023.17.02.9>
13. Oxford Dictionary of English (2nd ed.). (2003). Oxford University Press.
14. Shevchenko, M. (2018). Analysis of the influence of authentic English videos on technical students' memorization and subsequent recall of the English lexis. *Science and Education a New Dimension. Pedagogy and Psychology*, VI(155) (65), 49–53. <https://doi.org/10.31174/send-pp2018-155vi65-11>
15. Shevchenko, M. V. (2015). Communicative approach to teaching English at technical universities. *Advanced Education*, (3), 101–107. <https://doi.org/10.20535/2410-8286.44302>
16. Shi, Y., Zhang, Z., Cao, S., & Liu, Q. (2024). Dialogic teaching of controversial issues: discursive moves to enact two-sided discussions. *Language and Education*, 38(2), 303–319. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2023.2240292>
17. Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (1983). *Strategies in interlanguage communication*. Longman Group Limited.
18. Wilkins, D. A. (1972). *Linguistics in language teaching*. Edward Arnold.

## М. В. ШЕВЧЕНКО

викладач кафедри англійської мови технічного спрямування № 1,  
Національний технічний університет України «Київський політехнічний інститут  
імені Ігоря Сікорського», м. Київ, Україна  
Електронна пошта: [marianashevchenko@ukr.net](mailto:marianashevchenko@ukr.net)  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5881-0263>

## ЛІНГВІСТИЧНІ ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ТА СТРУКТУРА ПРОФЕСІЙНО ОРІЄНТОВАНОГО ДІАЛОГУ-ОБМІНУ ВРАЖЕННЯМИ/ДУМКАМИ В НАВЧАННІ АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВИ МАЙБУТНІХ ІНЖЕНЕРІВ-ЕНЕРГЕТИКІВ

У статті подано комплексний аналіз структури та лінгвістичних особливостей професійно орієнтованого діалогу-обміну враженнями/думками (ПОДОВД) як ключового компонента навчання англійської мови професійного спрямування майбутніх інженерів-енергетиків. Актуальність дослідження зумовлена вимогами глобалізованого інженерно-енергетичного сектору, де фахівці мають ефективно взаємодіяти у рамках міжнародної співпраці. Обґрунтовано, що студенти інженерно-енергетичних спеціальностей часто відчують підвищений рівень комунікативної тривожності під час іншомовного спілкування через усвідомлення високої ціни технічної помилки. У зв'язку з цим ПОДОВД визначається як найбільш психологічно комфортний і фахово релевантний формат англійськомовної взаємодії для студентів 3-го курсу, цільовим рівнем підготовки яких, згідно з вимогами CEFR, є B2. В роботі деталізовано характеристики ПОДОВД у форматах діалогу та трилогу, а також визначено основні й додаткові знання, навички й вміння, необхідні для його успішної реалізації. Спираючись на модель «каскаду комунікації» у професійному середовищі та принципи діалогічного навчання, систематизовано психологічні завдання, структурні компоненти й типові ситуації реалізації ПОДОВД у інженерно-енергетичній галузі. Комунікативні наміри інженерів-енергетиків згруповано у три основні види діалогу: кооперативний, координуючий і контрадикторний. Окрім цього, висвітлено специфічні лінгвістичні риси, необхідні для реалізації цих намірів на рівні B2, зокрема використання еліптичних конструкцій, маркерів розмовного дискурсу, 19 категорій фахових кліше та стратегій пом'якшення висловлювань. Зроблено висновок,

що оволодіння цими структурними й лінгвістичними елементами є критично важливим для ефективної професійної комунікації та слугує базою для подальшого навчання з використанням автентичних англомовних відео телекінематографічного типу.

**Ключові слова:** навчання, англійська мова професійного спрямування, майбутні інженери-енергетики, професійно орієнтоване діалогічне мовлення, професійно орієнтований діалог-обмін враженнями/думками, лінгвістичні особливості, стратегії пом'якшення.

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 13.03.2026

Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 17.04.2026

Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 30.05.2026

Стаття поширюється на умовах ліцензії відкритого доступу CC BY 4.0

