

A. AZIZOVA¹, G. YUSUPOVA^{2✉}, I. ORAZALI³, E. KHALMIRZAYEV⁴

¹International University of Tourism and Hospitality, (Kazakhstan, Turkistan)

²Khoja Akhmet Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University
(Kazakhstan, Turkistan), e-mail: guzal.yussupova@inbox.ru

³University of Florida, (United States of America, Gainesville)

⁴M. Auezov South Kazakhstan University, (Kazakhstan, Shymkent)

CREATIVE APPROACHES TO TEACHING PROFESSIONAL ENGLISH TO TOURISM STUDENTS THROUGH THE INTEGRATION OF DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES AND EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

Abstract. *Mastery of professional vocabulary and grammar does not always ensure that tourism students are prepared to handle service-related communicative tasks in English. This study aimed to evaluate the outcomes of an eight-week program integrating digital technologies, professional situations, and experiential learning in comparison with traditional instruction. A quasi-experimental pretest-posttest design was used with two intact classes: an experimental group and a control group, each comprising 30 students ($N = 60$). The program covered hotel check-in, complaint handling, tour selection, tour guiding, restaurant service, intercultural interaction, destination promotion, and integrated customer service. Outcomes were assessed using a professional English test, a situational speaking task, and a final engagement questionnaire. The mean test gain was 14.62 points in the experimental group and 3.68 points in the control group; the between-group difference in gains was 10.94 points ($p < 0.001$; $d = 2.50$). Final speaking scores were 22.70 and 19.10 points, respectively ($p < 0.001$; $d = 1.19$). Final engagement in the experimental group was described across behavioral, emotional, and cognitive dimensions. The findings indicate an advantage of the integrated program within the studied sample. Non-random group assignment and the simultaneous use of several pedagogical components limit causal interpretation and the generalizability of the findings to other educational settings.*

Keywords: *English for tourism; professional communication; experiential learning; digital technologies; role-play situations; professional speaking; student engagement.*

*Бізге дұрыс сілтеме жасаңыз: Azizova A., Yusupova G., Orazali I., Khalmirzayev E. Creative Approaches to Teaching Professional English to Tourism Students through the Integration of Digital Technologies and Experiential Learning // Bulletin of the International University of Tourism and Hospitality. – 2026. – No3(13). – Б. 141–152. <https://www.doi.org/10.62867/3007-0848.2026-3.10>

*Cite us correctly: Azizova A., Yusupova G., Orazali I., Khalmirzayev E. Creative Approaches to Teaching Professional English to Tourism Students through the Integration of Digital Technologies and Experiential Learning // Bulletin of the International University of Tourism and Hospitality. – 2026. – No3(13). – P. 141–152. <https://www.doi.org/10.62867/3007-0848.2026-3.10>

Introduction

For future tourism professionals, English is a tool for performing specific service functions: identifying travelers' needs, explaining booking conditions, conducting tours, and resolving unexpected problems. In such situations, reproducing a memorized dialogue is insufficient. Students need to listen to the interlocutor, select an appropriate formulation, maintain a professional role, and bring the interaction to a practical outcome.

A curriculum built primarily around translation, grammar exercises, and terminology checks may develop necessary knowledge while leaving little time to apply it under changing circumstances. The teacher's task is to create a safe environment in which students perform professional actions in English, receive feedback, reconsider their decisions, and try again. Digital maps, videos, interactive menus, and dialogue tools can vary case details and present materials resembling workplace situations. Their pedagogical value is determined by the task rather than by the mere presence of technology.

Research on experiential learning and digital dialogue systems supports the potential of professionally oriented language practice [3–5]. However, the pedagogical promise of individual tools does not mean that every combination will produce the same outcome. The research gap addressed in this study concerns the evaluation of an integrated program in which digital materials are embedded in a consistent cycle of performance, analysis, and repeated practice across eight tourism service situations. Comparing test performance with oral task performance makes it possible to examine both the acquisition of language content and its application in professional interaction.

The aim of the study is to evaluate the effect of integrating digital technologies and experiential learning on tourism students' professional English outcomes and to describe their final level of learning engagement.

Research questions: (1) Do test-score gains differ between the experimental and control groups? (2) Do final situational speaking scores differ between the groups? (3) What features characterize the final oral communication profile in each group? (4) How do participants in the experimental group evaluate their behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement after the program?

Research hypotheses: H1 — the mean gain in the professional English test is higher in the experimental group than in the control group; H2 — the final total score for situational speaking is higher in the experimental group. Analyses of individual speaking criteria and final engagement are descriptive. Because no baseline or control-group measures of engagement were collected, the study did not test a hypothesis that engagement increased as a result of the program.

Literature Review

Professional English and Tourism Practice

English for Specific Purposes involves selecting content according to occupational tasks, target audiences, and typical communicative actions. In tourism, this means teaching not only vocabulary related to accommodation and routes but also clarifying questions, paraphrasing, apologizing, explaining alternatives, and closing service interactions. Ellis et al. conceptualize tasks as organizing learning around a meaningful outcome while maintaining attention to language form [2]. Progress should therefore be assessed in terms of both linguistic accuracy and the successful provision of service to a simulated customer.

The classic approach of Hutchinson and Waters links ESP to an analysis of learners' needs and target situations of language use [7]. In tourism education, this principle allows tasks to be

selected according to the real functions of a specialist: clarifying a request, explaining service conditions, and negotiating a solution. Program content and assessment criteria should therefore refer to the same professional actions; general language achievement cannot substitute for assessment of their performance.

Experiential Learning

In D. Kolb's theory, learning is described as movement between concrete experience, observation and reflection, conceptualization, and a new attempt at action [1]. In English for tourism, a student may first role-play a guest check-in, then analyze an unsuccessful utterance and the feedback received, formulate more appropriate expressions, and repeat the situation with a modified request. This cycle distinguishes experiential practice from a one-off role-play activity without subsequent analysis.

Vasconcelos describes the use of a digital portfolio and simulated job interviews in professionally oriented learning for tourism and hospitality students [3]. The study is an experience report and supports the use of practical tasks, although its design differs from a two-group comparative assessment of outcomes. In the present study, experiential learning functions as a recurring way of organizing each lesson rather than as a separate final project.

Feedback is an independent component of the learning cycle. Hattie and Timperley view feedback as information that helps learners relate current performance to a goal and determine subsequent actions [13]. In a service-language task, this involves examining a specific utterance and its consequences for communication with a guest. A repeated attempt gives students an opportunity to apply the feedback; without it, reflection may remain discussion rather than lead to a change in action.

Digital Tools in Language Learning

Digital video can present a service situation and a guest's nonverbal reactions; maps and virtual tours provide material for explaining routes; and multimedia menus support the simulation of restaurant service. A dialogue system can vary a customer request and provide additional response attempts. Zhai and Wibowo reviewed dialogue systems and the interactional competence of university EFL learners [4]. At the same time, the accuracy of AI-generated responses, the realism of dialogue, and data protection require teacher oversight.

Aldamen et al. investigated AI-supported role-play dialogues in English instruction for tourism and hospitality [5]. Their quasi-experimental study involved 89 students, and the six-week program focused on complaint handling. The present study broadens the range of professional contexts to eight and compares overall test performance with situational speaking assessment. Its contribution therefore lies in the specific organization of the learning cycle and the set of assessed outcomes rather than in claiming the first use of AI in tourism language education.

Kohnke, Moorhouse, and Zou discuss the potential of ChatGPT for language teaching and emphasize the need for competent use of the tool [8]. Kasneci et al. examine the educational opportunities of large language models alongside issues of response reliability and pedagogical responsibility [9]. Lo systematizes early applications of ChatGPT in education and their limitations [10]. These studies support the controlled integration of AI into instruction but do not justify treating every automatically generated response as an accurate learning model.

The review by Crompton and Burke demonstrates the diversity of AI applications in higher education [11]. For a language course, what matters is the connection between a tool and a specific task rather than the mere fact that the tool is used. Huang, Hew, and Fryer identify the potential of

chatbots as conversational partners and simulation tools while also noting technical limitations, cognitive load, and novelty effects [12]. Digital practice therefore requires a clear purpose, manageable complexity, and combination with teacher feedback.

Engagement and the Research Gap

Behavioral engagement refers to participation in tasks, emotional engagement to interest and attitudes toward learning activities, and cognitive engagement to efforts to understand material and improve response strategies [6]. This structure distinguishes visible classroom activity from deeper work on language solutions. In the present study, engagement complements the assessment of learning outcomes but is not used as evidence of a causal mechanism. The research contribution lies in comparing knowledge and professional action after a single program organized around digital materials, feedback, and repeated practice.

Materials and Methods

Design and Participants

The study employed a quasi-experimental pretest–intervention–posttest design with two existing undergraduate Tourism classes. The sample included 60 students: 30 in the experimental group and 30 in the control group. Individual randomization between groups was not used. Baseline comparability was assessed using the professional English test and situational speaking task. The student was the unit of statistical analysis. Interpretation took into account that membership in an intact class may be associated with unmeasured educational characteristics.

Table 1- Study design

Group	Before instruction	During the eight weeks	After instruction
Experimental	Test and speaking task	Digital materials + professional situations + reflection	Posttest, final speaking task, engagement questionnaire
Control	The same measures	Comparable topics and hours; explanation, exercises, reading, and instructional dialogues	Posttest and final speaking task

Intervention Procedure

The program lasted eight weeks, with two lessons per week and 16 lessons in each group. In the experimental group, work followed a cycle of case introduction, performance of a professional role, feedback and self-reflection, analysis of language choices, and repeated performance under a modified condition. Digital materials provided the content and variability of the communicative situation. Each week focused on a separate professional context (Table 2). The key pedagogical principle was returning to the task after analyzing the initial attempt.

The general weekly cycle was: professional action → feedback analysis → reflection on the language solution → repeated attempt. Digital material supported this cycle, while the target competence defined the observable task outcome.

The repeated performance allowed students to apply feedback directly and adjust their language choices to changing professional situations. This process was intended to strengthen the connection between classroom language practice and the communicative demands of tourism-related

professional contexts.

Table 2- Experimental teaching program

Week	Context	Digital material	Practical action and product	Target communicative competence
1	Hotel front desk	Booking record and interactive guest card	Check-in and clarification of accommodation conditions	Clarifying information and confirming conditions
2	Room complaint	Variable dialogue scenario	Identifying the problem, apologizing, and proposing a solution	Apologizing and negotiating a solution
3	Travel agency	Catalogue of routes and prices	Identifying needs and justifying tour selection	Needs analysis and argumentation
4	Tour guiding	Map and virtual route	Delivering part of a tour and answering questions	Route description and question handling
5	Restaurant service	Multimedia menu	Explaining dish ingredients and accommodating guest restrictions	Explaining ingredients and restrictions
6	Intercultural interaction	Short video clip of an incident	Analyzing misunderstanding and adjusting communication	Appropriateness of utterances and resolving misunderstanding
7	Destination promotion	Short-video editing tool	Creating and orally presenting a tourism story	Persuasion and oral presentation
8	Integrated service	Several prepared materials	Sequence “greeting — consultation — problem — solution”	Managing a multi-stage interaction

The control group studied the same professional topics and target expressions within a comparable amount of instructional time. The main formats were teacher explanation, reading, lexical and grammatical exercises, question answering, and prepared dialogues. The conditions differed in the organization of practice: the experimental program systematically connected professional action with digital material, reflection, and a repeated attempt. However, the available results do not allow the effect of the digital tool to be separated from the possible effect of more intensive oral interaction.

Instruments and Assessment

The professional English test was scored on a 0–100 scale and included professional vocabulary (25 points), reading of a professional text (20), listening to a service dialogue (25), and selection and formulation of a situational response (30). This structure covers receptive skills and the application

of language in typical service tasks. Instrument checks and statistical processing were performed in IBM SPSS Statistics. Numerical reliability results are not reported in the present description. When reported, internal consistency and content validity should be distinguished: a reliability coefficient alone does not demonstrate that an instrument represents all target competencies [14].

The professional speaking task was assessed according to six criteria: fluency, professional vocabulary, grammatical accuracy, interaction management, professional appropriateness, and problem solving. Each criterion was scored from 1 to 5, giving a total range of 6–30 points. The service situation required the student to clarify a customer request, propose a solution, and agree on subsequent actions. The rubric distinguishes language form from achievement of the professional outcome. Assessment data were checked in IBM SPSS Statistics. For a reproducible description of inter-rater agreement, the applied index, its value, and confidence interval should be reported. If ICC was used, the model, rating type, and definition of agreement should be specified [15].

The final engagement questionnaire contained nine statements rated from 1 (“strongly disagree”) to 5 (“strongly agree”), with three items each for behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement [6]. The statements addressed participation in English dialogues, interest in service situations, and reflection on ways to improve responses after feedback. Mean post-course subscale scores are reported for the experimental group. Instrument reliability was checked in IBM SPSS Statistics, but subscale coefficients are not reported in the text. Because baseline and control-group engagement measures are unavailable, the questionnaire characterizes the experimental group’s final self-assessment rather than a change in engagement.

Statistical Analysis

Statistical analyses were performed in IBM SPSS Statistics, and calculations were cross-checked against the students’ source data. The primary analysis for H1 compared individual test gains between groups using an independent-samples t-test. Within-group changes were assessed using paired-samples t-tests. For H2, final total speaking scores were compared. Means (M), standard deviations (SD), t statistics, p values, and Cohen’s d based on the pooled standard deviation for independent groups are reported. The significance level was 0.05. With two measurement points, the difference in gains characterizes differences in group trajectories but does not eliminate the limitations of the non-randomized design. Analyses of individual speaking criteria and engagement were descriptive. Results of assumption checks and adjusted analyses accounting for baseline scores are not reported. The use of SPSS does not remove the limitations of a design based on two intact classes.

The study was conducted anonymously, and results are presented in aggregate form without revealing participants’ identities. Anonymity concerns data confidentiality. Information on the form of participant consent and institutional authorization is not provided in the manuscript materials and should reflect the procedures actually used.

Results

Results are presented in the following sequence: baseline group comparison, test-score dynamics, situational speaking dynamics, final oral communication profile, and self-reported engagement. Each group included $n = 30$ students. Mean gains are consistent with the differences between the corresponding pre- and post-program means. Statistical conclusions concern total scores; individual criteria and subscales are interpreted descriptively.

Table 3 - Baseline group results (M ± SD)

Measure	Experimental group, n = 30	Control group, n = 30	t(58)	p
Test, 0–100	57,60 ± 7,88	56,78 ± 7,42	0,42	0,679
Speaking, 6–30	16,66 ± 2,01	16,51 ± 2,55	0,26	0,798

Note. The absence of a statistically detected baseline difference does not demonstrate complete equivalence of the non-randomized groups.

Table 4 - Changes in the professional English test (M ± SD)

Group	Pretest	Posttest	Individual gain, M ± SD	Peer t (29)	p
Experimental	57,60 ± 7,88	72,22 ± 9,50	14,62 ± 4,54	17,62	< 0,001
Control	56,78 ± 7,42	60,46 ± 7,94	3,68 ± 4,22	4,79	< 0,001

After the program, the mean test score was 72.22 in the experimental group and 60.46 in the control group. The final between-group difference was 11.76 points: $t(58) = 5.20$, $p < 0.001$, $d = 1.34$. Mean gains were 14.62 and 3.68 points, respectively; the difference in gains was 10.94 points: $t(58) = 9.66$, $p < 0.001$, $d = 2.50$. Thus, H1 is supported by the reported results. The large effect size should be interpreted cautiously in view of the sample characteristics, organization of practice, and properties of the test.

The observed pattern indicates that the improvement in the experimental group was not limited to a higher final score but was also reflected in substantially greater learning gains over the intervention period. This suggests that the instructional approach implemented in the experimental group was associated with more pronounced development of the targeted skills than the conventional instruction received by the control group. At the same time, given the non-randomized design, these findings should be interpreted as evidence of a strong association with the intervention rather than as definitive proof of causality.

Table 5 - Changes in situational speaking (M ± SD)

Group	Before the program	After the program	Individual gain, M ± SD	Peer t (29)	p
Experimental	16,66 ± 2,01	22,70 ± 3,35	6,04 ± 2,35	14,11	< 0,001
Control	16,51 ± 2,55	19,10 ± 2,65	2,59 ± 1,78	7,96	< 0,001

The mean final speaking score was 22.70 in the experimental group and 19.10 in the control group; the difference was 3.60 points: $t(58) = 4.63$, $p < 0.001$, $d = 1.19$. Gains were 6.04 and 2.59 points, respectively. The results support H2 and indicate an advantage for the experimental group in the final total score on the professional situational speaking task.

The observed difference suggests that the experimental group demonstrated stronger development of professional speaking performance. In particular, the results indicate that repeated situational practice combined with digital support was associated with better performance in profession-oriented communicative tasks.

Table 6 - Final speaking profile by criterion (mean scores on a 1–5 scale)

Criterion	Experimental group	Control group	Difference
Fluency	3,70	3,20	0,50
Professional vocabulary	3,80	3,30	0,50
Grammatical accuracy	3,40	3,20	0,20
Interaction management	4,00	3,10	0,90
Professional appropriateness	3,90	3,20	0,70
Problem solving	3,90	3,10	0,80
Sum of means	22,70	19,10	3,60

Note. Differences between criterion means are presented descriptively. Without variances and individual scores, the statistical significance of individual differences or component-specific gains cannot be established.

Table 7 - Final engagement of the experimental group (mean scores on a 1–5 scale)

Subscale	Mean score
Behavioral	4,10
Emotional	4,24
Cognitive	3,92

Note. The table presents the final self-assessment of participants in the experimental group. No baseline measure or comparison with the control group is available; therefore, no conclusion is made about an increase in engagement.

Discussion

The main finding is a more pronounced positive change in the professional English test in the experimental group, whose baseline mean was comparable to that of the control group. An advantage was also observed in final situational speaking. The convergence of these two outcome types supports the proposition that the program was associated not only with the acquisition of language content but also with its application in service communication. At the same time, the absence of a significant baseline difference does not establish complete group equivalence or eliminate the influence of unmeasured factors.

A pedagogical explanation for the observed differences can be linked to Kolb's cycle: a professional situation provides experience, feedback supports reflection, analysis of language choices promotes conceptualization, and a repeated attempt allows students to test a modified strategy [1]. Within task-based learning, language practice is organized around achieving a meaningful outcome [2]. Vasconcelos supports the applicability of professionally oriented practical products in tourism education [3]. The review by Zhai and Wibowo and the study by Aldamen et al. support the use of dialogue systems for additional communicative practice [4, 5]. This comparison explains the pedagogical logic of the program but does not demonstrate that the digital component itself caused the observed advantage.

In the final speaking profile, the largest descriptive differences concerned interaction management (0.90 points) and problem solving (0.80), whereas the smallest concerned grammatical accuracy (0.20). This profile is consistent with the service-oriented focus of the tasks but does not demonstrate different rates of development for individual skills. For engagement, the emotional

dimension received the highest score (4.24), followed by behavioral (4.10) and cognitive engagement (3.92). These self-reports characterize students' perceptions after the program; they do not establish an increase in engagement or a relationship between engagement and learning gains. The practical significance of the findings lies in supporting an integrated learning cycle. A separate comparative study would be required to isolate the independent contributions of AI, virtual tours, and reflection.

The findings can also be interpreted through the role of feedback [13]: the program enabled students to return to a service task after reflecting on language choices. Research on digital language tools [8, 12] helps explain the availability of additional interaction attempts, while reviews of educational AI [9–11] emphasize the need for pedagogical oversight. However, neither similarity of mechanisms nor positive change in this sample allows the entire effect to be attributed to a single technological tool. Testing whether the advantage persists after course completion is especially important for distinguishing sustained learning from short-term interest in a novel format.

Teachers may begin by identifying the most frequent professional situations in the tourism receiving sector, developing a scenario with incomplete information for each one, and defining an observable outcome: the guest is checked in, an alternative is agreed upon, or a route is explained. After the first attempt, students need specific feedback on their utterances and an opportunity to try a different solution. Videos, maps, menus, and dialogue-based AI should be selected when they help vary the situation and support feedback. Final assessment can use a transparent rubric in which language accuracy is evaluated alongside communicative appropriateness and problem resolution.

The sample of 60 students and the eight-week duration limit the generalizability of the findings. The use of two intact groups without individual randomization retains the risk of baseline differences not captured by the pretest. Having only one class per condition does not reliably separate the program effect from class or teacher effects; the reported t-tests treat students as independent units. Instrument checks were conducted in IBM SPSS Statistics, but numerical reliability and agreement coefficients are not reported, which limits reproducibility of the measurement description. The final survey administered only to the experimental group does not allow changes in engagement to be assessed. The combined use of digital materials, professional tasks, and reflection prevents the contribution of each component from being isolated. The absence of a delayed posttest limits conclusions about skill retention and transfer to real service settings. Information about the educational institution, data-collection period, year of study, age, baseline English level, and documentation of participant consent should be added by the authors on the basis of the actual study records.

Conclusion

The eight-week program integrating digital materials, professional service situations, and experiential learning was associated with larger test-score gains and a higher final situational speaking score than the control instruction. The difference in mean test gains was 10.94 points, and the difference in final speaking scores was 3.60 points. The practical contribution of the study is the sequential organization of professional language practice through performance, feedback, reflection, and repeated attempts. Final engagement indicators complement the description of students' perceptions of the program but do not demonstrate a change in engagement. The conclusions apply to the studied sample and the integrated program; a more rigorous causal assessment requires reporting instrument reliability coefficients, accounting for the group structure, and including a delayed measurement.

BIBLIOGRAPHY/REFERENCES

1. Kolb D. A. *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1984. <https://www.informit.com/store/experiential-learning-experience-as-the-source-of-learning-9780132952613>
2. Ellis R., Skehan P., Li S., Shintani N., Lambert C. *Task-Based Language Teaching: Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108643689>
3. Vasconcelos S. Exploring the Potential of English for Specific Purposes and Experiential Learning in Fostering Tourism and Hospitality Students' Soft Skills: An Experience Report // *PUPIL: International Journal of Teaching, Education and Learning*. 2024. P. 75–76. <https://doi.org/10.20319/ictel.2024.7576>
4. Zhai C., Wibowo S. A systematic review on artificial intelligence dialogue systems for enhancing English as foreign language students' interactional competence in the university // *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*. 2023. Vol. 4. Article 100134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100134>
5. Aldamen H., Almashour M., Al-Deaibes M., Jarrah M. et al. Blended learning with AI role-play in English for tourism and hospitality // *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*. 2026. Vol. 14. Article 103067. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2026.103067>
6. Fredricks J. A., Blumenfeld P. C., Paris A. H. School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence // *Review of Educational Research*. 2004. Vol. 74, No. 1. P. 59–109. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059>
7. Hutchinson T., Waters A. *English for Specific Purposes: A Learning-Centred Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511733031>
8. Kohnke L., Moorhouse B. L., Zou D. ChatGPT for Language Teaching and Learning // *RELC Journal*. 2023. Vol. 54, No. 2. P. 537–550. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882231162868>
9. Kasneci E., Sessler K., Küchemann S., Bannert M. et al. ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education // *Learning and Individual Differences*. 2023. Vol. 103. Article 102274. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274>
10. Lo C. K. What Is the Impact of ChatGPT on Education? A Rapid Review of the Literature // *Education Sciences*. 2023. Vol. 13, No. 4. Article 410. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13040410>
11. Crompton H., Burke D. Artificial intelligence in higher education: the state of the field // *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*. 2023. Vol. 20. Article 22. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00392-8>
12. Huang W., Hew K. F., Fryer L. K. Chatbots for language learning—Are they really useful? A systematic review of chatbot-supported language learning // *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*. 2022. Vol. 38, No. 1. P. 237–257. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12610>
13. Hattie J., Timperley H. The Power of Feedback // *Review of Educational Research*. 2007. Vol. 77, No. 1. P. 81–112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
14. Tavakol M., Dennick R. Making sense of Cronbach's alpha // *International Journal of Medical Education*. 2011. Vol. 2. P. 53–55. <https://doi.org/10.5116/ijme.4dfb.8dfd>
15. Koo T. K., Li M. Y. A Guideline of Selecting and Reporting Intraclass Correlation Coefficients for Reliability Research // *Journal of Chiropractic Medicine*. 2016. Vol. 15, No. 2. P. 155–163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcm.2016.02.012>

A. AZIZOVA PhD, Acting Associate Professor, International University of Tourism and Hospitality, (Kazakhstan, Turkistan) e-mail: ainura_28_87@mail.ru https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1871-7398	G. YUSUPOVA Doctoral Student, Khoja Akhmet Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University, (Kazakhstan, Turkistan) e-mail: guzal.yussupova@inbox.ru https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7399-9407
I. ORAZALI Master Student, University of Florida (United States of America, Gainesville) e-mail: Indira.orazali@ufl.edu https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0501-7130	E. KHALMIRZAYEV German Language Teacher, M. Auezov South Kazakhstan University (Kazakhstan, Shymkent) e-mail: erbolhalmirzaev6@gmail.com https://orcid.org/0009-0005-5993-7273
<i>Received 22.01.2026</i> <i>Received in revised form 01.09.2026</i> <i>Accepted for publication 30.09.2026</i>	

А. АЗИЗОВА¹, Г. ЮСУПОВА^{2✉}, И. ОРАЗАЛИ³, Э. ХАЛМИРЗАЕВ⁴

¹Халықаралық туризм және меймандостық университеті, (Қазақстан, Түркістан)

²Қожа Ахмет Ясауи атындағы Халықаралық қазақ-түрік университеті
(Қазақстан, Түркістан), e-mail: guzal.yussupova@inbox.ru

³Флорида университеті, (Америка Құрама Штаттары, Гейнсвилл)

⁴М. Әуезов атындағы Оңтүстік Қазақстан университеті, (Қазақстан, Шымкент)

ЦИФРЛЫҚ ТЕХНОЛОГИЯЛАР МЕН ТӘЖІРИБЕЛІК ОҚЫТУДЫ ЫҚПАЛДАСТЫРУ АРҚЫЛЫ ТУРИЗМ СТУДЕНТТЕРІНЕ КӘСІБИ АҒЫЛШЫН ТІЛІН ОҚЫТУДЫҢ КРЕАТИВТІ ТӘСІЛДЕРІ

Аңдатпа. Кәсіби лексика мен грамматиканы меңгеру туризм мамандығы студентінің ағылшын тілінде қызмет көрсетуге байланысты коммуникативтік міндеттерді шешуге дайындығын әрдайым қамтамасыз ете бермейді. Зерттеудің мақсаты – цифрлық технологияларды, кәсіби жағдаяттарды және тәжірибе арқылы оқытуды біріктіретін сегіз апталық бағдарламаның нәтижелерін дәстүрлі оқытумен салыстыра бағалау. Алдын ала және қорытынды өлшемдері бар квазиэксперименттік дизайн қолданылды: эксперименттік және бақылау топтарының әрқайсысында 30 студенттен болды ($N = 60$). Бағдарлама қонақүйге тіркеу, шағымдармен жұмыс, тур таңдау, экскурсиялық сүйемелдеу, мейрамхана сервисі, мәдениетаралық өзара әрекет, дестинацияны ілгерілету және кешенді қызмет көрсету жағдаяттарын қамтыды. Нәтижелер кәсіби ағылшын тілі тесті, жағдаяттық ауызша тапсырма және қорытынды оқу белсенділігі сауалнамасы арқылы бағаланды. Тест нәтижесінің орташа өсімі эксперименттік топта 14,62 балл, бақылау тобында 3,68 балл болды; өсімдер арасындағы топаралық айырмашылық 10,94 баллды құрады ($p < 0,001$; $d = 2,50$). Қорытынды сөйлеу көрсеткіштері тиісінше 22,70 және 19,10 балл болды ($p < 0,001$; $d = 1,19$). Эксперименттік топтың қорытынды оқу белсенділігі мінез-құлықтық, эмоциялық және когнитивтік өлшемдер бойынша сипатталды. Нәтижелер зерттелген іріктеме шеңберінде кешенді бағдарламаның артықшылығын көрсетеді. Топтардың рандомизациясыз қалыптастырылуы және бірнеше педагогикалық компоненттің қатар қолданылуы себеп-

салдарлық түсіндіруді және нәтижелерді басқа білім беру жағдайларына жалпылауды шектейді.

Кілт сөздер: туризмге арналған ағылшын тілі; кәсіби коммуникация; тәжірибе арқылы оқыту; цифрлық технологиялар; рөлдік жағдаяттар; кәсіби сөйлеу; оқу белсенділігі.

А. АЗИЗОВА¹, Г. ЮСУПОВА^{2✉}, И. ОРАЗАЛЫ³, Э. ХАЛМИРЗАЕВ⁴

¹Международный университет туризма и гостеприимства, (Казахстан, Туркестан)

²Международный казахско-турецкий университет имени Ходжи Ахмеда Ясави (Казахстан, Туркестан), e-mail: guzal.yussupova@inbox.ru

³Университет Флориды, (Соединенные Штаты Америки, Гейнсвилл)

⁴Южно-Казахстанский университет имени М. Ауэзова, (Казахстан, Шымкент)

КРЕАТИВНЫЕ ПОДХОДЫ К ОБУЧЕНИЮ ПРОФЕССИОНАЛЬНОМУ АНГЛИЙСКОМУ ЯЗЫКУ СТУДЕНТОВ ТУРИСТСКИХ СПЕЦИАЛЬНОСТЕЙ ПОСРЕДСТВОМ ИНТЕГРАЦИИ ЦИФРОВЫХ ТЕХНОЛОГИЙ И ЭКСПЕРИЕНЦИАЛЬНОГО ОБУЧЕНИЯ

Аннотация. Владение профессиональной лексикой и грамматикой не всегда обеспечивает готовность студента туристской специальности решать коммуникативные задачи обслуживания на английском языке. Цель исследования — оценить результаты восьминедельной программы, объединяющей цифровые технологии, профессиональные ситуации и обучение через опыт, в сравнении с традиционным преподаванием. Применен квазиэкспериментальный дизайн с предварительным и итоговым измерением в двух учебных группах: экспериментальной и контрольной, по 30 студентов в каждой ($N = 60$). Программа включала регистрацию в гостинице, работу с жалобами, подбор тура, экскурсионное сопровождение, ресторанный сервис, межкультурное взаимодействие, продвижение дестинации и комплексное обслуживание. Результаты оценивались с помощью теста профессионального английского языка, ситуативного устного задания и итоговой анкеты вовлеченности. Средний прирост тестового результата составил 14,62 балла в экспериментальной группе и 3,68 балла в контрольной; межгрупповая разница приростов — 10,94 балла ($p < 0,001$; $d = 2,50$). Итоговые оценки говорения составили 22,70 и 19,10 балла соответственно ($p < 0,001$; $d = 1,19$). Итоговая вовлеченность экспериментальной группы описана по поведенческому, эмоциональному и когнитивному измерениям. Результаты указывают на преимущество комплексной программы в условиях исследованной выборки. Нерандомизированное формирование групп и совместное применение нескольких педагогических компонентов ограничивают причинную интерпретацию и перенос выводов на другие образовательные условия.

Ключевые слова: английский язык для туризма; профессиональная коммуникация; обучение через опыт; цифровые технологии; ролевые ситуации; профессиональное говорение; учебная вовлеченность.