Third, technical disciplines present both vulnerabilities—high cognitive demands susceptible to trauma impacts—and opportunities, channeling distress into constructive problem-solving.

Fourth, with 45% of teachers reporting high emotional exhaustion, targeted interventions for teacher well-being constitute a national educational priority.

Conclusion Teachers occupy a pivotal position: simultaneously frontline support providers and a population at significant burnout risk. The path forward requires multi-level action—individual resilience training, institutional safe environments and reduced administrative burdens, and policy-level investment in mental health infrastructure. The dedication of Ukrainian teachers deserves recognition, but dedication cannot substitute for systematic support. As the war continues, the international community must learn from Ukraine's experience and contribute to sustainable support systems for education in crisis contexts.

References

1. Afuzova, H. V., Krotenko, V. I., & Naidonova, H. O. (2024). Training as a means of developing resilience. Scientific Journal of USU, Series 19, 46, 5-11.

2. Sytniakivska, S. M. (2025). Impact of martial law on professional burnout of university teachers. Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University Journal, 1(120).

3. Vaintraub, M. (2024). Professional competence development of teaching staff under martial law. Educational Challenges, 9(1), 204-213.

4. Supporting Adaptive and Flexible Education for War-Affected Students in Ukraine (SAFE LEARN). (2025). Pryazovskyi State Technical University.

DEVELOPING COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE OF FUTURE ENGINEERS VIA PROJECT-BASED TECHNOLOGY

Voronova Ye. M., Associate Professor,

Gerasymchuk T. V.,PhD, Associate Professor,

Gubareva O. S., PhD, Associate Professor,

Kharkiv National Automobile and Highway University

The contemporary engineering profession demands far more than technical expertise. Employers consistently rank communication skills among the most critical attributes for engineering graduates, often placing them above specialized technical knowledge. Engineers must explain complex technical concepts to diverse audiences, collaborate within multidisciplinary teams, negotiate with stakeholders, write clear technical documentation, and present proposals persuasively. The Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) explicitly requires engineering programs to develop students' "ability to communicate effectively with a range of audiences."

Yet traditional engineering curricula, with their emphasis on individual problem-solving and lecture-based instruction, provide limited structured opportunities for developing these competencies. This disjuncture between educational practice and professional requirements creates a pedagogical challenge: how can technical higher education institutions systematically cultivate communicative competence without displacing essential technical content?

Project-based technology offers a promising response. By engaging students in extended, collaborative projects that mirror authentic engineering practice, this approach creates natural contexts for communication skill development. This article examines the theoretical underpinnings, practical implementation, and evidence base for using project-based technology to develop communicative competence in future engineers.

Theoretical Foundations

Defining Communicative Competence for Engineers Communicative competence extends beyond linguistic accuracy to encompass the ability to deploy communication strategies appropriately across varied professional contexts. For engineers, this includes technical writing (reports, specifications, documentation), oral communication (presentations, client meetings, team discussions), visual communication (diagrams, schematics, data visualization), and interpersonal communication (teamwork, negotiation, feedback).

Drawing on Hymes's foundational sociolinguistic framework and subsequent adaptations for professional contexts, engineering communicative competence can be understood as comprising four dimensions:

- Linguistic competence: mastery of technical vocabulary, genre conventions, and professional register

- Sociolinguistic competence: awareness of audience, context, and communication purpose

- Discourse competence: ability to structure coherent technical arguments and explanations

- Strategic competence: capacity to repair communication breakdowns and adapt strategies

Project-Based Technology as a Pedagogical Framework Project-based technology is rooted in constructivist learning theory, which posits that knowledge is actively constructed through engagement with meaningful problems. Key characteristics include authentic problems driving investigation, sustained inquiry over extended periods, collaborative teamwork, production of concrete artifacts, and reflection and revision.

This approach aligns with situated learning theory, which emphasizes that learning occurs most effectively within authentic contexts resembling those in which knowledge will be applied. By simulating professional engineering environments, project-based technology creates communicative demands that mirror workplace requirements: students must negotiate roles, explain technical decisions, document processes, and present outcomes to stakeholders.

The Intersection: Learning by Communicating The theoretical synergy between communicative competence development and project-based learning operates through several mechanisms. Projects generate authentic communication needs—students communicate because the project demands it, not because the assignment requires it. They provide opportunities for iterative practice across multiple communication modes. They situate communication within meaningful professional contexts, enhancing motivation and transfer. And they expose students to diverse perspectives through team interaction, developing sociolinguistic awareness.

Methodological Framework

Project Design Principles Effective project-based interventions for communicative competence development should incorporate structured communication milestones alongside technical deliverables. Projects should require varied communication formats—written reports, oral presentations, visual documentation—and include stakeholder engagement beyond the classroom. Peer and instructor feedback on communication effectiveness should be integrated, and collaborative structures fostering genuine interdependence are essential.

A successful framework implemented across several European technical universities structures engineering projects around five phases, each with associated communicative tasks:

Phase 1: Problem Definition. Students analyze the project brief, conduct stakeholder analysis, and produce a problem statement and requirements document. Communication focus: analytical writing, information synthesis.

Phase 2: Research and Ideation. Teams investigate existing solutions, brainstorm alternatives, and prepare a literature review and concept presentation. Communication focus: information literacy, oral presentation of technical options.

Phase 3: Design Development. Students develop detailed designs, create specifications and calculations, and produce progress reports and design documentation. Communication focus: technical writing, visual representation of design.

Phase 4: Implementation and Testing. Teams build prototypes or models, conduct testing and data analysis, and maintain laboratory notebooks and test reports. Communication focus: data reporting, collaborative problem-solving.

Phase 5: Evaluation and Dissemination. Students evaluate outcomes against criteria and present final results, preparing final reports, formal presentations, and project portfolios. Communication focus: persuasive presentation, comprehensive technical documentation.

Assessment of Communicative Competence Assessing communication within project-based contexts requires holistic criteria evaluating both process and product. Rubrics should address technical content accuracy, organizational clarity and coherence, audience adaptation and rhetorical effectiveness, visual communication and data representation, and collaborative contribution and team communication.

Assessment can incorporate instructor evaluation of formal deliverables, peer evaluation of team communication contributions, self-reflection on communication development, and, where feasible, external stakeholder feedback on professional communication quality.

Scaffolding Strategies Students do not automatically develop communicative competence through project participation alone. Deliberate scaffolding includes communication workshops integrated into project timelines, model exemplars of high-quality technical communication, structured peer review protocols for draft documents and presentations, and incremental complexity progression across successive projects.

Implementation and Evidence

Case Examples Integrated Design Projects (Capstone). Many engineering programs employ capstone design experiences where teams tackle industry-sponsored projects. When communication development is explicitly integrated—through required proposals, interim reviews, final presentations, and comprehensive reports—students demonstrate significant gains in technical writing quality and presentation confidence.

Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL) Projects. Virtual collaboration between engineering students from different countries creates rich contexts for developing intercultural communication competencies. Students must navigate language differences, varying communication norms, and distributed teamwork tools while completing technical tasks.

Community-Engaged Engineering Projects. Projects addressing local community needs—designing accessible infrastructure, improving water systems—require students to communicate with non-specialist stakeholders, translating technical concepts for diverse audiences and developing crucial public communication skills.

Research Findings Empirical studies support project-based technology's effectiveness for communication development. Meta-analyses of engineering education interventions demonstrate that active learning approaches, including project-based learning, produce superior communication outcomes compared to traditional instruction. Effect sizes are particularly pronounced for oral communication and teamwork skills.

Research identifies critical success factors: explicit communication learning objectives integrated alongside technical objectives, formative feedback on communication throughout the project lifecycle, multiple communication opportunities across varied genres and audiences, and collaborative structures designed for genuine interdependence rather than task division.

Longitudinal studies indicate that gains from project-based communication experiences persist and transfer to professional contexts, particularly when students engage in multiple project experiences across their program of study.

Challenges and Limitations Implementation faces several challenges. Faculty in technical disciplines may lack training in communication pedagogy and assessment. Curricular constraints create tension between technical content coverage and project-based approaches requiring substantial time investment. Assessment of individual contributions within team contexts poses difficulties, and successful implementation demands institutional support and faculty development.

These challenges, while significant, are addressable through systematic faculty development programs, communication-across-the-curriculum initiatives embedding communication instruction within technical courses, and administrative recognition of the resource implications of project-based pedagogy.

Recommendations for Practice For curriculum designers: Integrate communication learning objectives explicitly into project-based courses; ensure progressive development across the curriculum through multiple project experiences; and create opportunities for varied communication genres and audiences.

For instructors: Provide explicit communication instruction and models; incorporate formative feedback on communication alongside technical content; design assessment rubrics that value communication quality equally with technical accuracy; and model effective communication practices in teaching and interaction with students.

For institutions: Invest in faculty development programs addressing communication pedagogy; establish writing and communication centers with engineering-specific expertise; and recognize project-based teaching's additional demands in workload allocation.

Conclusion Project-based technology represents a pedagogically coherent and empirically supported approach to developing communicative competence in future engineers. By creating authentic contexts in which communication matters—where students explain, document, negotiate, and present because the project demands it—project-based learning bridges the persistent gap between technical education and professional communication requirements.

The effectiveness of this approach depends on intentional design: communication must be treated as a core project outcome rather than an incidental byproduct. When projects are structured to include explicit communication objectives, varied communication tasks, formative feedback, and genuine collaborative interdependence, they provide rich environments for developing the communicative competencies that define successful engineering careers.

As engineering practice grows increasingly interdisciplinary and globally distributed, the ability to communicate effectively across boundaries—disciplinary, cultural, linguistic—becomes ever more critical. Project-based technology offers engineering education a proven pathway for cultivating these essential capabilities while maintaining and even enhancing technical learning outcomes.

References

1. ABET. (2023). Criteria for Accrediting Engineering Programs. ABET Engineering Accreditation Commission.

2. Dym, C. L., Agogino, A. M., Eris, O., Frey, D. D., & Leifer, L. J. (2005). Engineering design thinking, teaching, and learning. Journal of Engineering Education, 94(1), 103-120.

3. Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), Sociolinguistics. Penguin.

4. Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation. Cambridge University Press.

5. Mills, J. E., & Treagust, D. F. (2003). Engineering education: Is problem-based or project-based learning the answer? Australasian Journal of Engineering Education, 3(2), 2-16.

6. Prince, M. J., & Felder, R. M. (2006). Inductive teaching and learning methods: Definitions, comparisons, and research bases. Journal of Engineering Education, 95(2), 123-138.