

UDC 159.9:316.47]:378.035:316.772.4

DOI: 10.33989/2226-4078.2024.2.22

## Peculiarities of dialogic interaction of technical profile students with different types of communicative response

Yurii Kuksa\*

Postgraduate Student

Poltava V.G. Korolenko National Pedagogical University

36003, 2 Ostrohradskoho Str., Poltava, Ukraine

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7346-9529>

**Abstract.** Dialogic interaction is crucial in human communication, but there is a lack of research on the development of these skills of technical profile students, especially taking into account their personal characteristics. In this regard, the purpose of the research was to study the peculiarities of dialogic interaction of technical profile students with different types of communicative response. The empirical study covered 300 students of technical higher education institutions. The empirical research programme included the “Dialogicity of Interpersonal Relationships” methodics and “Test of Communication Skills”. It was found that technical profile students had an average level in terms of the self-worth of relationships, the constructiveness of relationships, and the dialogicity of relationships. At the same time, it was determined that almost a third of respondents tend to demonstrate an unpreparedness to interact with other people effectively, and the smallest proportion of respondents demonstrates a high ability to adapt in interaction situations, self-confidence in communication and the ability to construct open relationships. Furthermore, the biggest part of the respondents is inclined to a competent response in communication, but a third part of them tends to act aggressively in interaction, and the rest are inclined to addiction in communication. The study demonstrates that all indicators of dialogicity of relationships strongly correlate with the competent type of communicative response, while no significant correlation was found with other types. Therefore, the study made it possible to state that the construction of dialogic interaction among technical profile students correlates positively with the tendency to partnership in communication

**Keywords:** interaction; dialogic interaction; self-worth of relationships; constructiveness of relationships; dialogicity of relationships; response in communication; technical profile students

### Introduction

The concepts of dialogue and dialogic interaction have been used in various fields and have expanded their conceptual framework. Dialogue is seen as the primary and most fundamental form in the development of interpersonal communication. During a dialogue, a person comes into direct contact with others, has the opportunity to express his or her opinions on a number of issues, and to know the opinions of opponents on the same issues. The involvement of participants into complicity, interaction, and the joint search for common solutions is the main element of dialogue. During a dialogue, controversial and ambiguous issues may be discussed, and opinions may be exchanged on a problem that requires immediate resolution. As a result of this process, a single semantic field is formed, which

allows not only to understand the problem itself but also to comprehend your interlocutor better.

In modern society, the interpretation of dialogue goes from understanding it only as the speech mode. O. Slobodianiuk (2019) tend to accentuate on the dialogic nature of the whole human existence and to show dialogue as a creative interaction that allows new insights and unexpected ideas to emerge from the encounter. K. Sanders & E. Gutierrez-Garcia (2020) emphasise that the “dialogue” is the interaction between parties with the intention of generation a shared understanding, something deeper than knowledge transmission. According to studies of M. Pickering & S. Garrod (2021), dialogic interaction is something more than a mode of speech, as it is the main channel in the range

### Suggested Citation:

Kuksa, Yu. (2024). Peculiarities of dialogic interaction of technical profile students with different types of communicative response. *Psychology and Personality*, 14(2), 22-29. doi: 10.33989/2226-4078.2024.2.22.

\*Corresponding author



Copyright © The Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

of human communication channels. O. Liubashenko & Z. Kornieva (2019) came to the conclusion, that mostly, when it comes to students' dialogic interaction, it means work in the classroom under the guidance of a lecturer to acquire professional knowledge or develop skills necessary to perform professional functions. K. Šedová *et al.* (2020) identified various interactive teaching methods used by lecturers to improve students' professional skills.

In the works of W.S. Ng & G. Yu (2023) the influence of the lecturer on the process of professional competences formation of students of higher education institutions is analysed and how modern dialogical technologies can be integrated into the classroom learning process for the effective acquisition of professional knowledge and skills. A relatively smaller number of studies are devoted to the problems of developing students' dialogical skills as a feature of an effective specialist of the twenty-first century. Thus, N. Mercer *et al.* (2019a) considers methods and approaches to the development of students' dialogue skills necessary for successful professional activity, while J. Hill & H. West (2020) emphasise on the use of interactive teaching methods to develop students' dialogical skills.

N. Holota & A. Karnaukhova (2022) found specific methods and approaches to the development of dialogical skills of students studying on certain specialties. A similar study was conducted by N. Mercer *et al.* (2019b), who discovered the importance of dialogic interaction in the professional training of students and methods of its development. In the context of the formation of dialogic interaction skills of technical profile students, fewer studies are presented. Thus, R. Alexander (2020) studied methodological aspects of students' professional training, in particular, his attention was paid to classroom work under the guidance of a lecturer, as well as specific approaches and methods, including dialogue methods, used by lecturers to develop students' professional communicative skills.

The impact of dialogic interaction on the formation of students' professional competences, as well as the importance of dialogical skills in the professional activities of modern technical specialists and ways to develop them were the main result of studies by D. Alt & N. Raichel (2020). In studies of S. Semerikov *et al.* (2020) the specific methods of communicative skills formation of technical profile students are revealed, as well as the use of interactive methods for the development of communicative skills of technical profile students.

However, despite the fact that researchers have developed a fairly wide range of issues related to the problems and prospects of the development of communication skills of technical profile students, the points of taking into account the personal characteristics of technical profile students in the formation of their dialogic interaction skills remains studied insufficiently. In this regard, the aim of the study was to an-

alyse the features of dialogic interaction of technical profile students with different types of response in communication.

## Materials and Methods

Studying the specifics of dialogic interaction of technical profile students with different types of communicative response is of particular interest in practical terms. Considering this, an empirical study was conducted.

**Participants.** The research was held in 2023-2024 academic year. It comprised 300 students of the institutions of higher technical education from Poltava and Kharkiv regions, Ukraine (Poltava State Agrarian University, Khorol Agro-Industrial College of Poltava State Agrarian University and State Biotechnology University). The age of participants was 18-22 years. The study included students obtaining professional junior bachelor's, bachelor's and master's degrees (100 respondents per each degree). The sample included 270 male participants (90%) and 30 female participants (10%), which represents the distribution of technical profile students by gender according to the Higher and professional higher education in 2023 (2023). Thus, a systematic selection of subjects from the general population was made. Consequently, the preliminary characterisation of the sample allows to assert that the empirical study was conducted on an appropriate sample that represents the general population by the required characteristics and is evidence of the reliability and validity of the subsequent results.

**Procedure.** The survey was conducted in a mixed format, both in the classroom and offline using Google Forms survey administration software. The study was conducted in accordance with the ethical principles set forth by the American Psychological Association (2017) and National Psychological Association of Ukraine (2021). All participants were informed of the purpose of the study prior to data collection, and their written consent was obtained. Also, the participants were informed that the research was voluntary and that any given information was strictly confidential. Furthermore, the survey was anonymous to ensure the confidentiality and reliability of data.

**Study Tools.** The programme of empirical research included:

- 1) "Dialogicity of Interpersonal Relationships" methodics (Dukhnovskiy, 2005), which diagnoses the desire to see and take into account the uniqueness of one's partner, the value and significance that the relationship has for the interacting subjects. The dialogical orientation is an unrestricted exchange of ideas and opinions between the subjects of relations, which is based on their mutual recognition and understanding. The diagnostic parameters of dialogicity that are included into the methodics are the self-worth and constructiveness of interpersonal relationships, with self-worth being the emotional side of dialogicity and constructiveness

being its cognitive side. The index of dialogicity of relationships is the total score of these two scales. Dialogicity of relationships imply their value and significance for the interacting subjects. The research procedure consisted of the following. Subjects responded on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = absolutely wrong to 7 = absolutely right) (Altuna & Arslan, 2016). The raw scores were converted to standard ones using a special table, and then a conclusion about the level of expression of the indicators on the diagnostic scales (low, medium, or high) was made.

2) "Test of Communication Skills" methodics (Michelson's communicative..., n.d.), which is aimed at the identification of the level of communicative competence and the quality of formation of the basic communicative skills of the individual. Communicative response is the actions performed in response to communicative influences of interlocutors and denoting the feedback that exists between the communicator and the communicant.

The test contains a description of 27 communication situations. For each situation, 5 possible behavioral options are offered. The respondent has to choose one way of behavior that is inherent in this situation. As a result of the study, the number of correct and incorrect answers is calculated as a percentage of the total

number of selected answers. The key is used to determine which type of response is inherent to the respondent: competent, dependent, or aggressive.

**Statistical Tools.** Data obtained from the study tools were compiled using the point-biserial correlation coefficient  $r_{pb}$ , which is applied for empirical data whose significance are obtained on different measurement scales (Bosniuk, 2020). The calculation was made using the Microsoft Excel 2016. The statistical computer programme IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 23.0. was used to analyse the data. The significance level was determined at  $p < 0.01$ .

### Results and Discussion

According to the overall aim of the study, the purpose of the empirical research was to compare the indicators of dialogicity of relationships of technical profile students with the types of response in communication, which are inherent to them. The general hypothesis was that technical profile students' dialogical orientation in interpersonal relations is connected with the construction of more efficient partnership in communication.

At the first stage of the empirical study, the features of dialogicity of relationships of students using the "Dialogicity of Interpersonal Relationships" methodics (Dukhnovskyi, 2005) were identified (Table 1).

**Table 1.** Indicators of dialogicity of relationships among technical profile students (n = 300, %)

| No. | Scales                            | Levels of expression |        |      | TOTAL |
|-----|-----------------------------------|----------------------|--------|------|-------|
|     |                                   | Low                  | Medium | High |       |
| 1.  | Self-worth of relationships       | 30                   | 52     | 18   | 100   |
| 2.  | Constructiveness of relationships | 29                   | 54     | 17   | 100   |
| 3.  | Dialogicity of relationships      | 29                   | 53     | 18   | 100   |

Source: author's elaboration

The self-worth of relationships is their importance, significance for a person through positive content. As usual, rapprochement and interactive feelings, self-confidence, and self-reliance dominate in these relationships. Such relationships are the characteristic of emotionally mature, optimistic people who are ready to overcome obstacles. According to the scale of self-worth of relationships, the majority of technical profile students (52%) demonstrate a medium level of manifestation. These subjects are usually well aware of the requirements of reality, do not hide their shortcomings, and are extroverted. About a third of the surveyed students (30%) have low indicators of the self-worth of relationships. This indicates a serious approach to life, rigidity, and suspicion. It may also indicate a reduced emotional stability and a predominance of negative emotional tone among these students. The smallest part of technical profile students' sample (18%) has high indicators of the self-worth of relationships scale. They denote the subjects' cheerfulness, optimistic attitude to the life situation, and readiness to overcome obstacles. In addition, this may be the evidence of

students' confidence in their strengths, capabilities, emotional maturity and resilience, and a good ability to adapt to interactions with different people.

Constructiveness of relations is a desire to achieve common goals, which implies free expression of thoughts and positions by the subjects of relations, as well as a style of relations that satisfies the subjects and corresponds to the situation of interpersonal interaction, taking into account the status and role characteristics of each other. Constructiveness is a kind of commonality in interpersonal relationships. On the scale of constructiveness of relationships, more than half of the surveyed students (54%) have a medium level. This indicates their orientation toward the group's opinion, their need for support, approval, and advice from others, as well as about their organisation, ability to plan their lives effectively, and a concern for their social reputation. A low level of constructiveness of relationships was reported for 29% of the surveyed technical profile students. This indicates that they are independent, self-sufficient people who do not seek contact with others on their own initiative. It can be difficult for them

to adapt to corporate or managerial hierarchies. Sometimes this can be an indication of disappointment with life, a falling into doubt, which allows them to avoid the need to make their own life choices. High rates of constructiveness of relationships are demonstrated by 17% of respondents. These technical profile students show readiness to overcome difficulties throughout realizing their abilities. They are characterised with practicality in matters, kindness, gentleness, and indulgence towards themselves and other people. In addition, they may be described with satisfaction with life, its course, and the process of realisation. Usually, they have a high level of personal success, and are able to take responsibility and make their own choices.

According to the index of dialogicity of relations, more than half of the surveyed students (53%) have a medium level of its manifestation. This indicates the ability of the respondents to plan their lives and activities effectively. They are characterised with a prudent approach to life and relationships, and care about their own social reputation. This can be an indicator that these students are well aware of the requirements of reality, they prefer not to destroy established ways of things going, and they do not have a strong willingness to confront the common habits and views. Their interpersonal relationships are also quite harmonious, but they are less flexible. 29% of the surveyed technical profile students demonstrate a low level of dialogicity of relationships, i.e., they show intolerance to criticism, isolation from the group's position, a possible sense of complacency and a sense of superiority over others. As a rule, their relationships are unstable

and disharmonious. They are also distinguished with rivalry, a desire to take a dominant position, regardless of the situation of interpersonal interaction and the intentions of their partners. 18% of respondents have a high level of dialogicity of relationships. This indicates an optimal distance in interpersonal relationships. The participants of the relationship are in a state of well-being, feel satisfied with the way their relationships develop. Rapprochement feelings dominates for them. Their relationships can be described with high self-worth and constructiveness. They are characterised with a friendliness, a desire to cooperate and to help, and to empathise with other people. Their relationships are open and natural. They have a desire to take into account each other's individual features. These subjects change their point of view easily, accept unstable views and ideas calmly, and are tolerant to contradictions.

Thus, basing on the results of this stage of the study, it is possible to conclude that technical profile students have medium scores on all scales that characterise dialogic interaction with others, namely, they have a medium level of both the self-worth of relationships and the constructiveness of relationships, and, accordingly, dialogicity of relationships. At the same time, almost a third of respondents have low scores on all indexes, which may indicate their unpreparedness for effective interaction with others. At the next stage of the study, the predominant type of communicative response of students using the "Test of Communication Skills" methodics (Michelson's communicative..., n.d.) was identified (Table 2).

**Table 2.** Indicators of the type of communicative response of technical profile students (n = 300, %)

| No.   | Type of communicative response | Respondents |
|-------|--------------------------------|-------------|
| 1.    | Dependent                      | 30          |
| 2.    | Competent                      | 40          |
| 3.    | Aggressive                     | 30          |
| TOTAL |                                | 100         |

Source: author's elaboration

Among the respondents, the majority of students tend to show a competent type of communicative response (40%). In communication they are more inclined to partnerships. It is not difficult for them to predict events basing on the understanding of thoughts, feelings, and intentions of communication partners, as well as to predict further actions of people basing on the analysis of real communicative situations. These subjects also have a well-developed sensitivity to the shades and nature of human relationships, which contribute to quick and correct understanding what people say to each other in the context of a particular relationship or a situation. It is easy for them to choose a topic for conversation or to support the topic previously chosen by the interlocutor.

The respondents demonstrate dependent and aggressive types of communicative response equally (30%). Students with a predominance of the dependent type in communication prefer to let their partner take the initiative, because they do not seek to take the initiative themselves. These students are inclined to choose easy paths that can not lead them to a conflict or to any misunderstandings with their partners, perhaps because they have a poorly developed ability to predict events basing on an understanding of the feelings, thoughts, intentions of the participants in communication, as well as to predict further actions of people basing on the analysis of real situations of communication (family, business, friendship). Most often, these students tend to adapt to their interlocutors in

communication, give in to them, agree with the topics of conversation chosen by their communication partners, even if they would prefer to talk about another issues.

Students, who are dominated by aggressive reactions in communication (30%), in contrast to those who adhere to dependent reactions, possibly due to incompetence in communication, tend to achieve what they want through aggressive behavior and manipulation, which in turn has a detrimental effect on communication with others and contributes to the isolation of

these people. Thus, the overall picture shows that most of the surveyed technical profile students are prone to a competent response in communicative situation, but one third of the respondents tend to behave aggressively in communicative situations, and another third of the respondents are prone to addiction in communication. Comparison of the specifics of dialogic interaction construction by technical profile students with different types of communicative response using the point-biserial correlation coefficient  $r_{pb}$  is given in Table 3.

**Table 3.** Correlation between the peculiarities of dialogic interaction construction and the type of communicative response of technical profile students according to the point biserial correlation coefficient  $r_{pb}$

| No. | Type of communicative response             | Dependent | Competent | Aggressive |
|-----|--|-----------|-----------|------------|
|     | Indicators of dialogicity of relationships |           |           |            |
| 1.  | Self-worth of relationships                | 0.184     | 0.512**   | 0.104      |
| 2.  | Constructiveness of relationships          | 0.142     | 0.429**   | 0.186      |
| 3.  | Dialogicity of relationships               | 0.012     | 0.616**   | -0.214     |

**Note:** \* – correlation is significant at the 0.05 level; \*\* – correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

**Source:** author's elaboration

The obtained data give an opportunity to conclude that self-worth of relationships is in statistically significant strong correlation ( $p \leq 0.01$ ) with the competent type of communicative response (0.512), while correlation with the dependent type is weak (0.184), as well as with the aggressive type (0.104). It means that the more students are inclined to partnerships in communication, the more they show optimistic attitude to the life, cheerfulness and readiness to overcome different life obstacles. And vice versa, the more the technical profile students show a good ability to adapt to interactions with different people, the more they have a well-developed sensitivity to the nature and shades of human relationships.

Constructiveness of relationships is in statistically significant strong correlation ( $p \leq 0.01$ ) with the competent type of communicative response (0.429), while correlation with the dependent type is weak (0.142), as well as with the aggressive type (0.186). It means that the more students are inclined to partnerships in communication, the more they show readiness to overcome difficulties in realizing their abilities, and vice versa, the more the technical profile students are able to take responsibility and make their own choices, the more they can predict further actions of people basing on the analysis of real communicative situations.

Dialogicity of relationships is in statistically significant strong correlation ( $p \leq 0.01$ ) with the competent type of communicative response (0.616), while correlation with the dependent type is weak (0.012), and the correlation with the aggressive type is negative (-0.214). It means that the more students are inclined to partnerships in communication, the more they are characterised with a friendliness and desire to help and

to empathise with other people, with a willingness to cooperate with others. And vice versa, the more the technical profile students' relationships are open and natural, the more they understand quickly and correctly what people say in the context of a particular situation or a particular relationship.

Hence, the main focus of the present study was to determine the existence or absence of a dialogic orientation in interaction among technical profile students and their tendency to respond in one or another way to the influences of partners in communication or interaction. The results of this study were supported by previous studies that revealed the problems faced by technical profile students in the formation of dialogical skills and ways to solve them (Vukadinova *et al.*, 2021). The data collected in this previous research offer a tool for developing professional communicative skills regarding the competence in communication, which is to some extent related to the current study.

Another previous study found the influence of learning technologies on the development of dialogical skills of technical profile students and due to this distinguished the approaches to the development of communicative competence through project work and interaction in pairs (Meshko *et al.*, 2021), as well as it was found in the similar study of T. Kramarenko (2021).

I. Ljunggren *et al.* (2022) conducted the research of communicational and interactional skills of psychology students. The focus of this study was on communicational microskills of psychology students and dialogue as psychological method in training interviewing and communication skills, so the peculiarities of students' communicative response were not considered.

The results obtained in the current study are confirmed by the data of H. Kuznetsova *et al.* (2023), which ascertained that the main elements of the communicative competence of higher education students are speech and communication skills that ensure communication, namely, the competent communicative response. Also results of the current study are in line with earlier research of L. Sushchenko *et al.* (2020), who substantiated that involvement of students into various forms of dialogic interaction in educational process creates opportunities for the formation of a communicative personality of future specialist. Thus, the common feature that unites this study and those analysed above is the idea that it is essential to explore more deeply the specifics of dialogic interaction of students, in particular, technical profile students, in order to develop and improve the dialogic interaction skills of students and to form the qualified specialists who are able to work effectively in their field and to meet modern challenges. However, the differences in approaches to dialogic interaction between students of different specialties are yet to be studied.

### Conclusions

Thus, the results of the current study are consistent with the overall pattern of expectation, which stated that the dialogicity in interpersonal relations of technical profile students help them to construct the most efficient partnership in communication. The research showed that the technical profile students have a medium level of the self-worth, the constructiveness and the dialogicity of relationships. At the same time, almost a third of respondents show the unpreparedness for effective interaction with others. Furthermore, the

biggest part of the respondents is inclined to a competent response in communication, but a third part of them tends to act aggressively in interaction.

All the indicators of dialogicity of relationships are in strong correlation with the competent type of communicative response ( $p \leq 0.01$ ) and has no correlation with the other types. This indicates that the more students are ready to construct partnership in communication, the more they are optimistic towards different life obstacles and ready to overcome interaction issues, are able to predict the further actions of others on the base of real communicative situations analysis. The more the students' interpersonal relations are natural and open, the more they understand what people say in particular situation or relations quickly and correctly. Therefore, it was proved that the dialogic interaction construction of technical profile students correlates positively with the tendency to partnerships in communication.

The practical significance of the study lies in the fact that the conclusions developed and proposed in the article can be used in the work of psychological services of higher education institutions to develop students' communication skills and their abilities to construct the effective communication and interaction in professional field. Prospects for further research within the framework of the outlined issues are to study the peculiarities of dialogic interaction of technical profile students of different types of educational institutions.

### Acknowledgements

None.

### Conflict of Interest

None.

### References

- [1] Alexander, R. (2020). *A dialogic teaching companion* (1<sup>st</sup> ed.). London: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9781351040143.
- [2] Alt, D., & Raichel, N. (2020). Higher education students' perceptions of and attitudes towards peer assessment in multicultural classrooms. *Asian-Pacific Education Researcher*, 29(4), 567-580. doi: 10.1007/s40299-020-00507-z.
- [3] Altuna, O.K., & Arslan, F. (2016). Impact of the number of scale points on data characteristics and respondents' evaluations: An experimental design approach using 5-point and 7-point Likert-type scales. *Istanbul University Journal of Political Science*, 55(55), 1-20. doi: 10.17124/iusiyaasal.320009.
- [4] American Psychological Association. (2017). *Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct*. Retrieved from <https://www.apa.org/ethics/code>.
- [5] Bosniuk, V. (2020). *Mathematical methods in psychology: Lecture course. Multimedia educational edition*. Kharkiv: NUCPU.
- [6] Dukhnovskiy, S. (2005). *Dialogicity of interpersonal relations*. Retrieved from <https://psytests.org/family/dialduh.html>.
- [7] Higher and professional higher education in 2023. (2023). Retrieved from [https://ukrstat.gov.ua/operativ/operativ2021/m\\_w/vofp\\_23.xls](https://ukrstat.gov.ua/operativ/operativ2021/m_w/vofp_23.xls).
- [8] Hill, J., & West, H. (2019). Improving the student learning experience through dialogic feed-forward assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 45(1), 82-97. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2019.1608908.
- [9] Holota, N., & Karnaukhova, A. (2022). Dialogical interaction as an integral component professional and personal growth of the future educator. In *Conference proceedings of the international scientific conference "The role of psychology and pedagogy in the spiritual development of modern society"* (pp. 220-224). Riga: Baltija Publishing. doi: 10.30525/978-9934-26-228-9-60.

- [10] Kramarenko, T. (2021). Peculiarities of the professional dialogue mediated by modern means of telecommunication in the process of training future specialists in economics. *Bulletin of Alfred Nobel University*, 2(22), 212-219. doi: [10.32342/2522-4115-2021-2-22-24](https://doi.org/10.32342/2522-4115-2021-2-22-24).
- [11] Kuznetsova, H., Panasenko, A., Luchkina, L., Zenchenko, T., & Danylchenko, I. (2023). Dialogic learning as means of forming the communication skills of higher education students. *Eduweb*, 17(2), 101-115. doi: [10.46502/issn.1856-7576/2023.17.02.9](https://doi.org/10.46502/issn.1856-7576/2023.17.02.9).
- [12] Liubashenko, O., & Kornieva, Z. (2019). Dialogic interactive speaking skills assessment in the experiential teaching of technical English to tertiary school students. *Advanced Education*, 6(13), 18-25. doi: [10.20535/2410-8286.156228](https://doi.org/10.20535/2410-8286.156228).
- [13] Ljunggren, I., Najström, M., Levitt, D.H., & Ramnerö, J. (2022). Dialogue as psychological method – a study of training interviewing and communication skills in psychology students. *Nordic Psychology*, 75(4), 386-396. doi: [10.1080/19012276.2022.2112744](https://doi.org/10.1080/19012276.2022.2112744).
- [14] Mercer, N., Hennessy, S., & Warwick, P. (2019a). Dialogue, thinking together and digital technology in the classroom: Some educational implications of a continuing line of inquiry. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 97, 187-199. doi: [10.1016/j.ijer.2017.08.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2017.08.007).
- [15] Mercer, N., Wegerif, R., & Major, L. (Eds.). (2019b). *The Routledge international handbook of research on dialogic education* (1<sup>st</sup> ed.). London: Routledge. doi: [10.4324/9780429441677](https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429441677).
- [16] Meshko, H., Habrusieva, N., & Kryskov, A. (2021). Research of professional responsibility of students of technical specialities by means of information and communication technologies. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1840(1), article number 012058. doi: [10.1088/1742-6596/1840/1/012058](https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1840/1/012058).
- [17] Michelson's communicative skills test. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://um.co.ua/6/6-9/6-97710.html>.
- [18] National Psychological Association of Ukraine. (2021). *Code of ethics for psychologists*. Retrieved from <https://npa-ua.org/en/ethics/>.
- [19] Ng, W.S., & Yu, G. (2023). The impacts of dialogic interaction to engage students in peer assessment. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 32, 53-64. doi: [10.1007/s40299-021-00633-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-021-00633-2).
- [20] Pickering, M., & Garrod, S. (2021). *Understanding dialogue: Language use and social interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi: [10.1017/9781108610728](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108610728).
- [21] Sanders, K.B., & Gutiérrez-García, E. (2020). Understanding the role of dialogue in public sector communication. In V. Luoma-aho & M.J. Canel (Eds.), *The handbook of public sector communication* (pp. 289-302). Hoboken: Wiley. doi: [10.1002/9781119263203.ch19](https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119263203.ch19).
- [22] Šedřová, K., Šalamounová, Z., Švaříček, R., & Sedláček, M. (2020). Elements of dialogic teaching and how to get them into classrooms. In *Getting dialogic teaching into classrooms. Understanding teaching-learning practice* (pp. 17-36). Singapore: Springer. doi: [10.1007/978-981-15-9243-0\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-9243-0_2).
- [23] Semerikov, S., Striuk, A., Striuk, L., Striuk, M., & Shalatska H. (2020). Sustainability in software engineering education: A case of general professional competencies. *E3S Web of Conferences*, 166(2), article number 10036. doi: [10.1051/e3sconf/202016610036](https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202016610036).
- [24] Slobodianiuk, O. (2019). Dialogization of the educational environment: Origins and prospects. *Humanitarium*, 43(1), 142-150. doi: [10.31470/2308-5126-2019-43-1-142-150](https://doi.org/10.31470/2308-5126-2019-43-1-142-150).
- [25] Sushchenko, L., Hrybanova, O., & Khodakovska, A. (2020). Educational dialogue as a factor of efficient humanistically-oriented teacher-student interaction. *Pedagogy of the Formation of a Creative Person in Higher and Secondary Schools*, 73(2), 214-217. doi: [10.32840/1992-5786.2020.73-2.40](https://doi.org/10.32840/1992-5786.2020.73-2.40).
- [26] Vukadinova, T., Terzieva, S., & Popov, M. (2021). Developing professional and communication skills of students in engineering disciplines. *Foreign Language Teaching*, 48, 255-266. doi: [10.53656/for21.33razy](https://doi.org/10.53656/for21.33razy).

## Особливості діалогічної взаємодії студентів технічного профілю з різним типом комунікативного реагування

Юрій Кукса

Аспірант

Полтавський національний педагогічний університет імені В. Г. Короленка  
36003, вул. Остроградського, 2, м. Полтава, Україна  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7346-9529>

**Анотація.** Діалогічна взаємодія є ключовою в людській комунікації, але досліджень щодо формування цих навичок у студентів технічних спеціальностей недостатньо, особливо з урахуванням їхніх особистісних особливостей. У зв'язку з цим метою дослідження був аналіз особливостей діалогічної взаємодії студентів технічного профілю з різними типами комунікативного реагування. Емпіричним дослідженням було охоплено 300 студентів закладів вищої освіти технічного спрямування. Програма емпіричного дослідження включала методику «Діалогічність міжособистісних стосунків» та методику «Тест комунікативних здібностей». Встановлено, що студенти технічного профілю мають середній рівень за показниками самоцінності відносин, конструктивності відносин та діалогічності відносин. Водночас визначено, що майже третина респондентів схильні демонструвати неготовність до ефективної взаємодії з іншими людьми, а високу здатність до адаптації у ситуації взаємодії, впевненість у собі під час комунікації та здатність до побудови відкритих відносин виявляє найменша частина досліджуваних. Крім того, більшість респондентів схильні до компетентного реагування у спілкуванні, однак третина здатні до агресивної поведінки у взаємодії, а решта мають тенденцію до залежності у спілкуванні. Доведено, що усі показники діалогічних стосунків перебувають у сильному кореляційному зв'язку з компетентним типом комунікативного реагування і не мають кореляційного зв'язку з іншими типами. Отже, дослідження дало змогу констатувати, що у студентів технічного профілю побудова діалогічної взаємодії позитивно корелює зі схильністю до партнерства у спілкуванні

**Ключові слова:** взаємодія; діалогічна інтеракція; самоцінність відносин; конструктивність відносин; діалогічність відносин; реагування у спілкуванні; студенти технічного профілю