**UDC 811.111'27:378.147:620.9**
**DOI: 10.15587/2519-4984.2026.359563**

# A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PROFESSIONALLY ORIENTED OPINION-SHARING DIALOGUE AND DISCUSSION IN TEACHING ENGLISH TO FUTURE POWER ENGINEERS

**Mariana Shevchenko**

*The article presents the results of a thorough theoretical and methodological study devoted to the functional and structural differentiation between two key types of professional spoken interaction: professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue and professionally oriented discussion. The methodological need to implement professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue training in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) lessons for third-year undergraduate students in power engineering specialities is substantiated by the transition to the study of highly specialised disciplines and the need to prepare future professionals for international engineering cooperation in the energy sector. The work proposes a systematic comparison between professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue and professionally oriented discussion based on 20 parameters that cover functional, structural, psychological, and ethical aspects of professional oral communication. Attention is also paid to the features of implementing these types of dialogue in distance and blended learning formats, which have become popular in modern higher education institutions worldwide. It has been identified that professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue is a fundamental cognitive tool for the collaborative development of innovative technologies and engineering projects, modernisation of power systems, and coordination of technical work within a globalised professional environment. A comparative analysis of the parameters proposed in the present article reveals that professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue is a flexible, cooperative interaction characterised by spontaneous exchange, indirect disagreement, and the pursuit of shared consensus without requiring a facilitator. Conversely, professionally oriented discussion is a strictly regulated, competitive debate necessitating a facilitator, prepared argumentation, and rigid turn-taking to establish the superiority of a single perspective. The results of the study enable ESP lecturers to more accurately differentiate methodological tools and create exercises that meet the real demands of the modern energy industry. It has been proven that incorporating such approaches contributes to the holistic development of professional foreign-language (English) communicative competence in students at technical faculties. The paper's practical value lies in the possibility of using the developed criteria to create innovative educational materials (potentially) based on authentic videos in English, i.e. thematically relevant movies and programmes, to develop the professional English spoken interaction skills of the mentioned students. This will enable the educational process to closely mirror the real conditions of international professional communication, thereby enhancing the readiness of future power engineers to solve professional tasks*

***Keywords:*** *teaching, English for Specific Purposes, professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue, professionally oriented discussion, power engineers, technical specialities, communicative competence, oral communication, English, teaching methodology*

**How to cite:**
Shevchenko, M. (2026). A comparative analysis of professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue and discussion in teaching English to future power engineers. ScienceRise: Pedagogical Education, 2 (67), 40–46. http://doi.org/10.15587/2519-4984.2026.359563



## 1. Introduction

The transformation of the global energy sector requires its specialists to function effectively in multilingual professional environments. For third-year undergraduate students, developing oral professional dialogic communication skills becomes a priority as they prepare to participate in international innovative projects. Furthermore, acquiring these skills in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) classes provides comprehensive benefits that extend well beyond foreign-language proficiency. The collaborative strategies inherent in professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue are universally applicable. Consequently, the skills mastered during ESP training will prove highly valuable for future power engineers not only in international cooperation but also in their daily professional interactions with domestic colleagues in their native language. However, an analysis of real-world engineering communication situations indicates that most processes – such as discussing technical issues or power supply schemes, modernising power

systems, or agreeing on project documentation – occur in the form of a professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue rather than a rigid and long professionally oriented discussion. A thorough examination of this issue necessitates an understanding of what exactly is being studied and why it is relevant to contemporary technical education, especially in the context of the widespread implementation of distance learning technologies. Furthermore, highly developed communication skills and "soft skills" are gaining increased popularity among employers in the engineering sphere worldwide, as they are considered essential for professional success and competitiveness in the international labour market [1].

**2. Literature review**

An analysis of scientific periodicals over the past ten years reveals a significant interest among researchers in dialogic teaching. In the study by Moreira Mejía and Alcívar Loor [2], group discussion is considered a key strategy for improving speaking fluency. Similar conclusions are drawn by Crisianita and Mandasari [3], who investigated the use of small-group discussions to improve students' speaking skills. At the same time, Jiang and Paulino [4] emphasise the importance of communicative language teaching (CLT) for the professional success of technical institution graduates. The effectiveness of using the CLT approach specifically for developing speaking skills is also convincingly confirmed in the work of Haliwanda [5].

Meanwhile, the study by Echiverri et al. [6] points to a complex relationship between the format of classroom discussion and the overall level of students' active participation. This thesis is complemented by the findings of Ahmad [7], which demonstrate that traditional discussion formats often lead to students' reluctance to participate due to psychological barriers and the fear of making mistakes. This highlights the need to find and implement less stressful, cooperative forms of interaction. It has also been noted that engineering students often face challenges due to a limited professional vocabulary and a lack of exposure to real-life communication examples, which can be effectively addressed through the integration of authentic audiovisual materials into the educational process [1].

Research concerning "peer-to-peer" interaction and collaborative learning acquires special significance: Al-Buraiki [8] substantiates a positive attitude towards the "collaborative dialogue of equals", while Ramasamy and Zainal [9], as well as Zhang and Zhang [10], thoroughly analyse the processes of collective knowledge construction by specialists specifically through dialogic discourse. Despite these studies, alongside the research by Romios et al. [11], Jocuns [12], and Heron et al. [13] regarding the creation of a "dialogic space" in an online environment, the specific features of professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue as an autonomous type of professional interaction remain unaddressed.

Traditionally, the English for Specific Purposes methodology for technical students prioritises the development of oral dialogic speech primarily through formal discussions [2, 3]. However, this approach overlooks a crucial pedagogical reality: the foundational step in developing professionally oriented dialogic communication skills should be the professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue. Previous studies predominantly equate any professional conversation with a professionally oriented discussion, failing to clearly differentiate between a cooperative exchange of opinions and a competitive dispute.

Before mastering the rigid argumentation and competitive strategies required for discussions, future power engineers must first acquire the collaborative skills inherent in opinion-sharing. This process can be effectively initiated through specific pedagogical interventions, such as the 'Think-Pair-Share' technique, which creates a structured environment for individual reflection followed by low-stakes peer interaction [14]. Because professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue is intrinsically cooperative and less psychologically demanding (which helps to overcome the reluctance to participate noted by Ahmad [7]), it creates a safe environment for students to build their communicative confidence. As demonstrated in recent studies [14], implementing collaborative techniques allows power engineering students to gradually transition from simple information exchange to more complex dialogic speech production by reducing cognitive load and social anxiety. Moreover, it accurately mirrors the daily collaborative practices of modern power engineering – such as joint brainstorming, negotiating engineering solutions, and horizontal problem-solving – where the primary goal is reaching a consensus and synthesising knowledge rather than refuting an interlocutor's argument. A lack of understanding of the structural and functional differences between these two types of interaction leads to the use of aggressive communicative strategies where flexibility is needed, which ultimately hinders cooperation. This article addresses this gap by offering a detailed comparative analysis of these phenomena.

**3. The aim and objectives of the research**

The study aims to identify the specific characteristics of professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue and professionally oriented discussion through a systematic comparison across 20 parameters encompassing the functional, structural, psychological, and ethical aspects of professional oral communication, thereby substantiating their significance in the training system for future power engineers.

The objectives of the study are:

1. To highlight the key parameters for comparing professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue and professionally oriented discussion.

2. To conduct a detailed comparison of these types of interaction according to functional, linguistic, and psychological criteria.

3. To analyse the features of implementing these dialogues in traditional, distance and blended learning formats.

**4. Materials and methods**

To achieve the stated aim, this research employs a systematic comparative analysis as its primary methodological framework. The study focuses on a detailed differentiation between professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue and professionally oriented discussion

across 20 parameters that encompass the functional, structural, psychological, and ethical aspects of professional oral communication.

The empirical data analysed in this study consist of authentic verbal communication situations. The research materials comprise a curated selection of authentic audiovisual materials in English within the power engineering domain. These include feature films that realistically represent technical discourse among specialists in this field, professional video repositories featuring native speakers, and documented real-world communication cases from the energy sector.

This corpus was selected to examine how professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue and professionally oriented discussion function in energy-focused contexts. To process these data and differentiate between the two types of interaction based on the 20 parameters, methods of system analysis, functional and semantic comparison, and the deductive modelling of speech strategies were utilised. This criteria-based approach ensures a thorough theoretical and practical differentiation, providing a clear and reproducible framework for similar pedagogical research.

**5. Research results and discussion**

To develop an effective methodology for teaching foreign-language professional oral communication, it is necessary to clearly distinguish the concepts of professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue and professionally oriented discussion, as they require employing different speech strategies. The functional and structural differentiation between professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue and discussion is illustrated by the twenty key parameters detailed below:

1. ***Function.*** An analysis of the functional aspect indicates that professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue is characterised by the interconnected expression of specialists' own reasoned points of view regarding a specific field-related situation, event, subject, or phenomenon. This process is often accompanied by the expression of a subjective assessment during the exchange of impressions, opinions, or ideas, and the participants' positions may partially coincide or differ (completely or marginally). In turn, professionally oriented discussion functions as an extended discussion of a problematic issue in a dialogic form, where different, and often diametrically opposed, viewpoints of the interlocutors may exist.

2. ***Purpose.*** Considering the target orientation of both types of spoken interaction, the purpose of professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue is to present one's own vision of a situation, and to agree with or refute the point of view of a partner (or partners) in order to reach a consensus on a certain professional issue or to solve a current problem. Conversely, professionally oriented discussion aims to resolve a problematic issue through rigorously systematic argumentation and counter-argumentation, primarily seeking to persuade opponents and highlight a single 'winning' position regarding the issue under discussion, thereby triggering the so-called 'persuasion effect'.

3. ***Nature of the interaction.*** Professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue can be cooperative, coordinating, or contradictory, ensuring flexible communication depending on the convergence or divergence of opinions. In contrast, professionally oriented discussion is characterised exclusively by its contradictory nature, arising from the initial presence of conflicting positions and the necessity of their clash in the search for truth.

4. ***Interlocutors' points of view.*** When comparing the participants' positions, it was identified that during professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue, points of view can be similar (with only minor differences) or opposite, allowing a wide range of verbal responses. In contrast, it is characteristic of professionally oriented discussion that the interlocutors' positions are always oppositional, as the very nature of this requires a clear confrontation of views on the issue.

5. ***Communication paradigm.*** Characterising the interaction model, it should be noted that professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue is based on the paradigm of a joint dialogue, in which parties, whether in a pair or a larger group, work together to achieve a mutual understanding and find a solution. During such an exchange, personal experience plays a key role: presenting their own opinions and knowledge, interlocutors understand that the thoughts of other participants are aimed at improving the results of the interaction, rather than diminishing the significance of others' judgements. In professionally oriented discussions, however, personal experience and factual content are often viewed as separate concepts; the individual contributions of participants focus on 'correctness' and are valued specifically according to this criterion. Professionally oriented discussion essentially consists of a series of monologues, and listening to the points of view of other participants often occurs solely to insert one's own remark in a timely and accurate manner. As a rule, such a format encourages individual opinion-sharing, which is sometimes accompanied by insufficiently attentive listening and a low level of interest in opponents' arguments.

6. ***Subject matter.*** Differences in thematic organisation are reflected in the degree of interaction flexibility. In the process of professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue, a subtopic or several subtopics can be changed or added directly during the conversation, depending on the course of the communication (in particular, agreement or disagreement with other viewpoints and the speed of reaching a compromise) and the speech behaviour of the partners. Professionally oriented discussion, however, has a strict thematic focus and is aimed exclusively at discussing and solving the main problem without any deviations from the primary topic.

7. ***Object.*** Analysis of the object component revealed that for professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue, the object is a problematic professional issue and other related aspects, the solutions to which the participants must find jointly through opinion-sharing and potential future actions. In contrast, the object of professionally oriented discussion is a specific problematic issue that is critically important in a certain professional situation and provokes ambiguous, often contradictory opinions and proposals. Unlike in professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue, taking specific actions after the completion of professionally oriented discussion is not mandatory.

8. ***Number of interlocutors.*** The numerical composition of participants also varies according to each type of interaction. Professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue demonstrates high interaction effectiveness even with only two interlocutors. Usually, such an exchange of opinions takes the form of a classic dialogue ("interlocutor A – interlocutor B") or a trilogue ("interlocutor A – interlocutor B – interlocutor C"). On the other hand, although theoretically two or more people can participate in a professionally oriented discussion, it is recommended to involve at least 3–6 participants to organise a successful professional discussion. During professionally oriented discussions, more complex communicative models are often observed, such as "interlocutor–group" or "group–group".

9. ***Initiative.*** An analysis of the communication dynamics reveals that in professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue, the initiative to conduct a conversation involving the sharing of impressions or opinions is always bilateral, which emphasises the equality of the participants. Conversely, in professionally oriented discussion, the communicative initiative can be either unilateral or bilateral, depending on the proponent's strategic goals and the opponent's activity during the discussion.

10. ***Inherent types of dialogic unities.*** The analysis of structural organisation revealed both common and distinct types of dialogic unities. For professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue, the following combinations are most typical: "message – message", "question – answer + message", "message – question", "message – response message + additional message", as well as the classic "question – answer". Conversely, professionally oriented discussion is characterised by a slightly different dialogic unity structure, which includes: "message – message", "question – answer", "message – answer", and an extended unity "message – response message + additional message". This indicates a higher proportion of reactive messages in professionally oriented discussions compared to initiating questions, which are more commonly encountered during professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue.

11. ***Characteristic features.*** When comparing specific features, it is established that professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue is characterised by a concise, straightforward, logical, and simple presentation of opinions, where elliptical sentences are predominantly used. The speech content is characterised by the active use of professional clichés, phraseologisms, idioms, abbreviations, acronyms, and professional jargon. A mandatory condition is a clear indication of the topic, concept, or technology with a justification of one's own opinions, which often serves to persuade the interlocutor. Conversely, professionally oriented discussion is characterised by a longer duration, where remarks often acquire features of monologic speech, although the overall style of presentation remains straightforward and logical. Unlike in professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue, both elliptical and full sentences can be used in professionally oriented discussion. The speech is also rich in clichés, phraseologisms, and jargon; however, the key difference lies in the mandatory presence of extended argumentation and counter-argumentation, as well as the dominant function of persuading the opponent.

12. ***The need for a facilitator (*leader*).*** An important difference between the two types of dialogue is the role of the leader. In professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue, the presence of a facilitator is not mandatory. Professionally oriented exchange of impressions or opinions can occur effectively without external regulation in a "one-on-one" format. At the same time, an option involving a leader is also permitted in "individual – group of individuals" or "small group – small group" arrangements. Conversely, for professionally oriented discussion, the presence of a facilitator is compulsory. The facilitator acts as a discussion regulator: such a person indicates the topic and direction of the conversation, resolves issues regarding the volume and methods of introducing new information, and balances opposing viewpoints, artificially strengthening the less represented point of view to maintain the dynamics of the dispute. In addition, the facilitator monitors the regulations and gives the floor to opponents, ensuring the constructive nature of the exchange.

13. ***Stages of conversation***. A comparison of the progression of both interaction types reveals distinct levels of formal structure. The process of professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue typically encompasses three main stages: defining the topic (a professional issue or problem); a direct exchange of remarks (opinions) with possible argumentation to present one's vision of solving the issue, as well as expressing agreement or disagreement with the interlocutors' positions; and the final achievement of a certain discussion result (consensus). On the other hand, professionally oriented discussion has a more complex and strictly regulated sequence of stages, which includes: defining the topic; outlining the main rules for conducting the discussion by the facilitator; exchanging remarks to present each point of view with mandatory argumentation; a stage of counter-argumentation against the opponents' opinions; responding to these counter-arguments; and, finally, summarising the results by the leader, which involves announcing the conclusions and/or the adopted decision.

14. ***Spontaneity and reasoning***. An analysis of the degree of preliminary preparation indicates significant differences between the studied types of dialogue. The need for an exchange of opinions during professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue often arises suddenly; consequently, interlocutors do not always have prepared arguments in advance. In such a format, one's own point of view is not necessarily supported by proven facts; it can be based on personal experience, guesses, subjective judgements, or previously acquired knowledge, since the priority goal is to express one's position, rather than to persuade the interlocutor. In contrast, participants in professionally oriented discussion must be prepared in advance for the exchange and to prove the validity or significance of their position. This requires interlocutors to carefully consider the course of presenting their perspective, prepare arguments and counter-arguments, and collect verified facts and additional information to strengthen their own line of defence in the dispute.

15. ***Consideration of interlocutors' opinions***. The nature of interpersonal interaction differs significantly depending on the type of dialogue. In the course of professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue, actively asking for the interlocutors' opinions to clarify their standpoint is permissible. At the same time, interrupting other participants directly during their utterance is considered acceptable if it is justifiable, for example, when a speaker continues the thought of the interrupted interlocutor to demonstrate a full understanding of their idea or standpoint. Alternatively, during professionally oriented discussion, opinions are presented separately, and participants often do not show direct interest in the opponents' opinions beyond searching for weak points for counter-argumentation. Any interruption of opponents during their speech or the expression of a position within professionally oriented discussion is considered unacceptable and violates the interaction regulations.

16. ***Emotionality.*** The two types of interaction differ significantly in terms of their emotional intensity. In professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue, emotions play a positive role, as they help to deepen the understanding of the negotiated issue by strengthening interpersonal or intergroup relations. On the contrary, in professionally oriented discussion, emotional responses, although they may be present, are undesirable. This is explained by the fact that the discussion focuses on the direct content of persuasion, not on the content resulting from the speaker's or group of speakers' emotionality.

17. ***Intensity of the linguistic expression of objection and disagreement***. When analysing the ways of expressing disagreement, significant strategic discrepancies were revealed. In professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue, objections and disagreement often have an indirect ('veiled') or euphemistic ('soft') character. In particular, a phrase expressing disagreement may not be addressed directly to the interlocutor, thereby maintaining a cooperative tone of communication. In contrast, in professionally oriented discussion, objections and disagreements are always expressed clearly and unambiguously. A characteristic feature of this type of dialogue is the regular use of clichés of strong disagreement with opponents' viewpoints to emphasise the antagonism of positions.

18***. Frequency of changing interlocutors' remarks***. The study of temporal and structural speech characteristics indicates varying intensities in the exchange of utterances. Professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue is characterised by a possible rapid change (alternation) of the interlocutors' opinions during a single communication act. In this format, interrupting the interlocutor without waiting for the complete conclusion of their thought is frequently encountered, as well as the parallel (simultaneous) speaking of two interlocutors, which is caused by the high emotionality of the conversation. On the contrary, in professionally oriented discussion, opposite points of view are discussed sequentially, without frequent changes of opponents. The discussion regulations stipulate that only one person speaks at a specific moment in time: first, the complete opinion of a supporter of one position is heard, and only after that is the floor given to a representative of the opponents.

19. ***Duration of the conversation.*** The time limits of both types of dialogue are determined by their functional tasks. Professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue can be both lengthy (with in-depth consideration of the main problem and its derivatives) and short-term – for example, in the format of expressing an opinion by one of the interlocutors, accompanied by a clarifying question, an appropriate explanation, and a final agreement remark. Professionally oriented discussion, on the other hand, is most often a long-term process. Such duration is conditioned by the necessity to present the standpoints of each opponent (or a group representative), to engage in a mandatory counter-argumentation stage, to provide answers to these counter-arguments, and to bring the discussion to a specific result.

20. ***Consensus***. The final stage and the nature of communication effectiveness differ significantly in their philosophy. The result of professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue is not necessarily a 100% 'victory' for one party's point of view; a solution to a professional issue or problem is often achieved at the intersection of several opinions formed precisely during the conversation. In this type of dialogue, it is critically important to listen, 'hear', and take into account the interlocutors' arguments, rather than proving their invalidity. Moreover, professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue typically remains open, thereby enabling participants to return to it (if necessary) in the future. Conversely, in professionally oriented discussion, the key aspect is determining a clear 'winner', i.e., recognising the superiority (correctness) of one of the positions. This type of interaction is characterised by intense, sometimes emphatic assertions of the rightness of one's opinion and direct refutation of opponents' views by means of a prepared evidence base: facts, statistics, and citations. Most often, the result of professionally oriented discussion is its closure after a decision is made, but cases of an 'open' discussion also occur if a leader cannot be clearly identified (a 'zero effect'), which necessitates its continuation later.

***Practical relevance***. An evaluation of the results indicates that while the professional identity of power engineers is often formed through discussions, professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue provides the necessary psychological comfort in traditional, blended, and distance learning in ESP lessons at universities. By mitigating reluctance to participate and reducing speaking anxiety – barriers thoroughly described by Ahmad [7] – this cooperative format ensures a higher level of student engagement [14].

***Research limitations***. It is worth mentioning that the distance learning format may impose certain limitations due to the lack of complete non-verbal contact in the online environment (Zoom, Google Meet, etc.) and present some challenges for future power engineers regarding the implementation of the 'soft' strategies of professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue. Furthermore, the present research is primarily situated within the pedagogical context of a university setting, specifically addressing the communicative requirements of senior undergraduate students. While power engineering serves as the primary illustrative field, the study focuses specifically on oral

professional interaction. Consequently, the findings may not fully account for the complexities of written professional discourse or communication involving significantly diverse cultural norms and expectations. However, putting modern teaching methodology into practice helps lecturers make ESP study effective despite these constraints.

***Prospects for further research***. The results of the present research can be applied to the development of syllabi and manuals on English for Specific Purposes. The scope of application covers the preparation of future power engineers for real professional communication, including within the framework of international cooperation. Beyond the current engineering focus, the proposed functional and structural differentiation between professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue and professionally oriented discussion holds broader relevance and can be adapted across various other professional disciplines. Future studies could profitably explore the application of these findings to written professional discourse or investigate their effectiveness in communicative environments with diverse cultural expectations. Another promising direction for future research involves evaluating the efficacy of teaching professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue by incorporating authentic audiovisual materials tailored to the students' specific engineering field. This pedagogical approach can be effectively integrated into traditional, blended, or distance learning environments, particularly through the utilisation of screencasting technology to enhance the delivery of field-related content. Furthermore, another vital area for further investigation involves the integration of Artificial Intelligence functions to ensure continuous, on-demand access for students to professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue practice. The use of AI-driven tools could support students both during English for Specific Purposes lessons and in their autonomous study, providing a flexible platform for refining their interactional strategies and perfecting their professional communication skills outside the classroom.

## 6. Conclusions

1. The findings of this research lead to the conclusion that professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue and professionally oriented discussion are independent, functionally distinct objects of future power engineers' study within the context of learning English as a foreign language.

Thus, a systematic comparison was conducted across 20 established parameters:

1) function,
2) purpose,
3) nature of the interaction,
4) interlocutors' points of view,
5) communication paradigm,
6) subject matter,
7) object,
8) number of interlocutors,
9) initiative,
10) inherent types of dialogic unities,
11) characteristic features,
12) the need for a facilitator (leader),
13) stages of conversation,
14) spontaneity and reasoning,
15) consideration of interlocutors' opinions,
16) emotionality,
17) intensity of the linguistic expression of objection and disagreement,
18) frequency of changing interlocutors' remarks,
19) duration of the conversation,
20) consensus.

2. This analysis demonstrated that professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue is based on the principles of a cooperative strategy aimed at knowledge synthesis, whereas professionally oriented discussion is oriented towards competitiveness and persuasion. This differentiation is of fundamental importance for ESP teaching methodology, as it allows the lecturer to select specific communicative tasks for each type of interaction.

3. For future power engineers, mastering the skills of professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue is critically important at the undergraduate level, as the modern energy industry is transforming into integrated intelligent systems ('smart grids'), which require collective intellectual work rather than individual leadership through dispute. The ability to engage in professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue ensures the effectiveness of project activities, where the priority is coordinating the actions of specialists from different departments. The implementation of the methodology for teaching professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue into the English for Specific Purposes course allows power engineering students not only to master terminology but also to develop professional communicative competence and a set of professionally important qualities: empathy, active listening, and flexibility in decision-making.

The results of the comparative analysis indicate that professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue creates a favourable psychological environment, reducing the level of speaking anxiety in ESP lessons, which is particularly relevant for students of technical specialities. At the same time, it is determined that distance and blended learning formats require specific approaches to organising professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue to compensate for the deficit of non-verbal communication.

Thus, professionally oriented opinion-sharing dialogue emerges not simply as a form of conversation, but as a powerful cognitive tool for professional growth and the joint search for engineering solutions in the globalised energy sector.

**Conflict of interest**

The author declares that she has no conflict of interest in relation to this research, whether financial, personal, authorship or otherwise, that could affect the research and its results presented in this paper.

**Funding**

The study was performed without financial support.

**Data availability**

Manuscript has no associated data.

**Use of artificial intelligence**

The authors confirm that they did not use artificial intelligence technologies in creating the submitted work.

**Author's contributions**

**Mariana Shevchenko**: Conceptualisation, Methodology, Investigation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing.

**References**

1. Saienko, N., Shevchenko, M. (2020). Authentic Videos in Teaching English to Engineering Students at Universities. International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 19 (8), 350–370. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.19.8.19

2. Moreira Mejía, L. L., Alcívar Loor, T. F. (2024). Using Group Discussion as a Strategy to Promote Speaking Fluency in the Ecuadorian University EFL Classroom: Students' Benefits and Teachers' Challenges. Ciencia Latina Revista Científica Multidisciplinar, 7 (6), 7777–7800. https://doi.org/10.37811/cl_rcm.v7i6.9310

3. Crisianita, S., Mandasari, B. (2022). The use of small-group discussion to imrpove students' speaking skill. Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning, 3 (1), 61–66. https://doi.org/10.33365/jeltl.v3i1.1680

4. Jiang, L., Paulino, F. B. (2024). Rethinking Communicative Language Teaching in College English Teaching: Strategies and Lesson Plan. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 15 (2), 607–616. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1502.29

5. Haliwanda, U. (2021). The effect of using the communicative language teaching (CLT) approach in teaching speaking. Elite Journal, 8 (2), 40–53. Available at: https://journal.uin-alauddin.ac.id/index.php/elite/article/view/24347

6. Xu, K., Echiverri, L. L., Shang, H. (2020). Class Discussion and Class Participation: Determination of Their Relationship. 6th International Conference on Higher Education Advances (HEAd'20). Valencia, 651–658. https://doi.org/10.4995/head20.2020.11121

7. Ahmad, C. V. (2021). Causes of Students' Reluctance to Participate in Classroom Discussions. ASEAN Journal of Science and Engineering Education, 1 (1), 47–62. https://doi.org/10.17509/ajsee.v1i1.32407

8. Al-Buraiki, S. A. (2025). Peer Collaborative Dialogues: Perceptions and Attitudes of EFL Students and Teachers. World Journal of English Language, 16 (2), 180–190. https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v16n2p180

9. Ramasamy, S. A., Zainal, A. Z. (2023). Facilitating the construction of knowledge collectively through dialogic discourse: teachers' perspectives and practices in english language teaching. TEFLIN Journal-A Publication on the Teaching and Learning of English, 34 (1), 79–96. https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v34i1/79-96

10. Zhang, L. J., Zhang, D. (2020). Dialogic discussion as a platform for constructing knowledge: student-teachers' interaction patterns and strategies in learning to teach English. Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education, 5 (1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-020-00101-2

11. Romios, L., Musthafa, B., Lengkanawati, N. S. (2024). Students' perceptions of the implementation of dialogic teaching for improving speaking skills at a university in West Java. English Review: Journal of English Education, 12 (2), 449–462. https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v12i2.9531

12. Jocuns, K. (2021). Dialogic Teaching as a Way to Promote Students' English Language Use in EFL classroom. Pasaa, 62 (1), 173–203. https://doi.org/10.58837/chula.pasaa.62.1.7

13. Heron, M., Dippold, D., Husain, A. (2021). How dialogic is the online space? A focus on English speaking skills. TESL-EJ, 25 (3), 1–11. Available at: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1331741.pdf

14. Shevchenko, M. (2024). The 'Think-Pair-Share' technique in teaching engineering students English dialogic speech production. Proceedings of the 4th International Online Conference 'Corpora and Discourse'. Kyiv, 140–143. Available at: https://corpora.kamts1.kpi.ua/cad/paper/view/32065/18840

*Received 02.04.2026*
*Received in revised form 05.05.2026*
*Accepted 19.05.2026*
*Published 29.05.2026*

**Mariana Shevchenko**, Lecturer, Department of English for Engineering No. 1, National Technical University of Ukraine "Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute", Beresteiskyi ave., 37, Kyiv, Ukraine, 03056
**E-mail:** marianashevchenko@ukr.net
**ORCID:** https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5881-0263