

A MODEL FOR DEVELOPING FUTURE TOURISM SPECIALISTS' PROFESSIONAL COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE THROUGH SYNERGETIC DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES

Mexmonaliyeva Gullolaxon Juraboy qizi

Doctoral Researcher, Jizzakh Branch of the National University of Uzbekistan
named after Mirzo Ulugbek

E-mail: asal1901farxodbekova@gmail.com

Abstract

This study proposes a synergetic digital pedagogical model for developing the professional communicative competence of future tourism specialists. The model consists of five functional blocks and four implementation stages, supported by a proposed analytical assessment rubric. The model requires subsequent empirical validation.

Keywords

tourism education; professional communicative competence; synergetic approach; digital learning; professional communication; pedagogical methodology.

Introduction

Developing professional communicative competence systematically requires alignment between educational goals, learning content, digital tools, student activities, and assessment. A pedagogical model provides a coherent structure for organizing these elements and for making instructional decisions transparent. For future tourism specialists, the model must reflect authentic service communication, intercultural responsiveness, and the practical demands of digitally mediated tourism.

Within a synergetic approach, the elements of a learning model interact dynamically. Diagnostic evidence can influence the choice of subsequent activities; the difficulty of a communicative scenario can be adjusted to a student's preparation; and

reflection can reshape the next learning objective. This creates a feedback-oriented system rather than a rigid sequence of disconnected lessons.

This study aims to develop a conceptual pedagogical model for professional communicative competence in tourism education. It examines the model's functional components, implementation stages, assessment criteria, and conditions for future empirical validation.

Methods

Pedagogical modelling, structural-functional analysis, and competence-oriented instructional design were used. The proposed model was developed by aligning professional learning outcomes with authentic tourism situations, digital activities, and assessment indicators. Particular attention was paid to the relationship between formative diagnosis and subsequent task adaptation. The four-stage learning sequence and the proposed analytical rubric were specified as design instruments, not as empirical findings.

Results and discussion

The proposed model comprises five functional blocks. The goal-oriented block specifies learning outcomes such as identifying tourist needs, explaining services, conducting professional dialogue, and selecting interculturally appropriate strategies. The content block organizes tourism terminology, service ethics, cultural information, and representative communication scenarios. The process block coordinates interactive activities, role-play, digital simulations, and guided practice. The diagnostic block defines criteria and feedback mechanisms. The outcome block records the competence demonstrated in professional tasks.

Four instructional stages operationalize the model. The first stage diagnoses initial preparation and establishes motivation. The second develops conceptual and linguistic knowledge. The third uses virtual or role-play simulations to integrate knowledge with

professional performance. The fourth involves reflection, corrective feedback, and additional practice. These stages need not operate in a strictly linear order: a student who encounters a difficulty may return to an earlier activity before proceeding.

The diagnostic block includes four criteria: professional knowledge, communicative performance, intercultural adaptation, and reflective-digital skills. An illustrative analytical rubric can allocate 0–4 points to each criterion, producing a maximum possible score of 16 points. These values define a proposed measurement instrument; they are not experimental results. The rubric must be piloted and checked for reliability before being used to support strong comparative conclusions.

The instructor acts as a scenario designer, observer, facilitator, and assessor rather than only as a transmitter of information. The student takes an active role in decision-making and reflection. Clear responsibilities and accessible learning materials are necessary for the model to operate consistently.

Future testing should use comparable pre- and post-assessment scenarios, a shared scoring rubric, and procedures for examining agreement among assessors. Only then can claims about the model's contribution to learning outcomes be supported by evidence.

The model should be understood as a design hypothesis, not an experimentally validated mechanism. Its five blocks describe responsibilities within a coordinated instructional system: intended outcomes determine tasks, tasks determine digital supports, and performance evidence informs subsequent teaching decisions.

A concrete implementation may use a three-session cycle. In the first session students analyse visitor profiles and practise key expressions. In the second they complete a simulated itinerary consultation with unexpected constraints. In the third they review recordings, justify their communication choices and repeat the task with a modified visitor profile.

Analytic scoring can distinguish task completion, factual reliability, interaction management and intercultural appropriateness. Each indicator requires descriptors illustrated by examples. To strengthen reliability, two assessors can score selected recordings independently and discuss disagreements before using the rubric for consequential decisions.

Methodological implication. The model should be understood as a design hypothesis, not an experimentally validated mechanism. Its five blocks describe responsibilities within a coordinated instructional system: intended outcomes determine tasks, tasks determine digital supports, and performance evidence informs subsequent teaching decisions.

Practical application. A concrete implementation may use a three-session cycle. In the first session students analyse visitor profiles and practise key expressions. In the second they complete a simulated itinerary consultation with unexpected constraints. In the third they review recordings, justify their communication choices and repeat the task with a modified visitor profile.

Assessment consideration. Analytic scoring can distinguish task completion, factual reliability, interaction management and intercultural appropriateness. Each indicator requires descriptors illustrated by examples. To strengthen reliability, two assessors can score selected recordings independently and discuss disagreements before using the rubric for consequential decisions.

Conclusion

The five-block synergetic digital model integrates learning goals, content, activity, diagnosis, and outcomes within a coherent instructional design. Four implementation stages and four diagnostic criteria provide a basis for planning and evaluating professional communication tasks. Further research should pilot the model in authentic classes, refine the rubric, and examine the reliability of assessment results.

References

1. Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment—Companion Volume. Council of Europe Publishing.
2. OECD. (2023). OECD Digital Education Outlook 2023: Towards an Effective Digital Education Ecosystem. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/c74f03de-en>
3. European Commission, Joint Research Centre. (2022). DigComp 2.2: The Digital Competence Framework for Citizens. Publications Office of the European Union. <https://doi.org/10.2760/115376>
4. UNESCO. (2023). Global Education Monitoring Report 2023: Technology in Education—A Tool on Whose Terms? UNESCO.
5. UNESCO. (2020). Education for Sustainable Development: A Roadmap. UNESCO. <https://doi.org/10.54675/YFRE1448>
6. European Commission. (2020). Digital Education Action Plan 2021–2027: Resetting Education and Training for the Digital Age. European Commission.