The Implementation of the Action-Oriented Approach in Language Textbooks

Dil Öğretimi Ders Kitaplarında Eylem Odaklı Yaklaşımın Uygulanması

Ahmet Acar[1]

ÖZ: İlk kez ADOÇP (Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeve Programı) tarafından tanıtılan ve daha sonra Puren (2004, 2009, 2014a, 2014b, 2014c, 2017, 2018, 2019) tarafından geliştirilen eylem odaklı yaklaşım dil öğretimi için yeni bir hedef belirlemiştir: bir sosyal aktörün eğitimi. Dil öğretimi ders kitaplarında bu amacın nasıl başarılacağı yabancı dil öğretimi alanında derinlemesine ele alınması gereken bir konudur. Bu çalışma, iki dil öğretimi ders kitabının, Türkiye'de kullanılan 'Count Me In' ve Fransa'da kullanılan 'Version Originale 4', içindeki iki nihai görevin (5. ve 7. ünitelerdeki) iletişimsel görevlerin özelliklerini mi yoksa küçük projelerin özelliklerini mi yansıttığını ortaya çıkarmayı hedeflemektedir. 'Count Me In' ders kitabındaki nihai görevlerin küçük projelerin özelliklerini yansıtmadığı, 'Version Originale 4' ders kitabındaki nihai görevlerin ise bu özellikleri yansıttığı ve dolayısı ile eylem odaklı yaklaşımın ilkeleriyle uyumlu olduğu tespit edilmiştir.

Anahtar sözcükler: ADOÇP, eylem odaklı yaklaşım, küçük projeler, dil öğretim ders kitapları

ABSTRACT: The action-oriented approach, first introduced by the CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages) and developed later by Puren (2004, 2009, 2014a, 2014b, 2014c, 2017, 2018, 2019), set a new goal for language teaching: training of a social actor. How to achieve this goal in language textbooks is yet to be dealt with in dept in the foreign language teaching field. This study aims to find out whether two final tasks (those of Unit 5 and Unit 7) in two language textbooks, 'Count Me In' (B2 level) used in Turkey and 'Version Originale 4' (B2 level) used in France, reflect the characteristics of communicative tasks or mini-projects. It is found that the final tasks in 'Count Me In' do not reflect the characteristics of the mini-projects while the final tasks in 'Version Originale 4' reflect these characteristics and hence are more in line with the principles of the action-oriented approach.

Keywords: CEFR, the action-oriented approach, mini-projects, language textbooks.

UZUN ÖZET

Giriş

Van Ek (1975) tarafından Avrupa Konseyi için hazırlanan Eşik Düzeyi Belgesi dil öğrencilerini hedef dili kullanıcıları ile turistik seyahat ortamlarında kısa süreli konuşmaya hazırlamayı hedeflemiştir. Eşik Düzeyi Belgesi, öğrencilerin bu tür etkileşimlerde etkili bir şekilde iletişim kurmalarını sağlayan asgari yeterlilik seviyesini göstermiştir. Bu nedenle, bu belgedeki hedef referans durumu turistik seyehat, hedef referans eylemi, konuşma eylemleri olarak tanımlanan dil etkileşimidir ve başarı kriteri, başarılı bilgi alışverişidir.

Eşik Düzeyi Belgesi sonrası gelişmeler Avrupa Dilleri Ortak Çerçeve Programı (ADOÇP) 'nın (2001) ve Ek Belgesinin (2018) yayınlanmasıyla gelmiş, burada Eşik Düzeyi Belgesinden farklı bir hedef belirlenmiştir: bir sosyal aktörün eğitimi. Avrupa vatandaşları için dil öğrenme hedeflerindeki değişim "2000'li yıllara kadar olan Avrupa entegrasyon sürecindeki siyasi, sosyal ve ekonomik alanlardaki son değişikliklerle, Avrupalı dil öğrenenlerin ihtiyaçları, yalnızca birbirleri ile iletişim kurmaktan kendi veya hedef kültürdeki yabancılarla birlikte yaşama ve çalışmaya doğru bir değişim gösterdiğinden" (Acar, 2019, p. 122-123) dolayı doğal bir değişim olarak görülebilir. Öğrencileri sosyal

---
[1] Dr. Lecturer, Dokuz Eylül University, Buca Faculty of Education, Turkey. Email: ahmet.acar@deu.edu.tr ORCID: 0000-0001-8940-4359

aktörler olarak eğitirken, referans durumu artık turist gezi değil, Avrupa'nın çok dilli ve çok kültürlü bir toplumu, referans eylemi artık dil etkileşimi (konuşma eylemleri) değil, sosyal eylem (diğerleriyle hareket etmek veya onlarla çalışmak) ve başarı kriteri yalnızca başarılı bilgi alışverişi değil aynı zamanda bir sosyal aktörün kişisel özerklik, toplu sorumluluk, bilgi yönetimi ve karmaşık eylemlerin tasarımı, yönetimi ve uygulaması gibi donanımlarla donatıldığı temel becerilerdir. Kısacası, sosyal aktörlerin eğitiminde uygulanacak yaklaşım artık iletişimsel yaklaşım değil eylem odaklı yaklaşımdır.

Dil öğretimi ders kitaplarında sosyal aktörün eğitimi amacının nasıl başarılacağı yabancı dil öğretim alanında derinlemesine ele alınması gereken bir konudur. Bu çalışma, iki dil öğretimi ders kitabının, Türkiye'de kullanılan *'Count Me In'* ve Fransa'da kullanılan *'Version Originale 4'*, içindeki iki nihai görevin (5. ve 7. ünitelerdeki) iletişimsel görevlerin özelliklerini mi yoksa küçük projelerin özelliklerini mi yansıttığını ortaya çıkarmayı hedeflemektedir. *'Count Me In'* ders kitabındaki nihai görevlerin küçük projelerin özelliklerini yansıtmadığı, *'Version Originale 4'* ders kitabındaki nihai görevlerin ise bu özellikleri yansıttığı ve dolayısı ile eylem odaklı yaklaşımın ilkeleriyle uyumlu olduğu tespit edilmiştir.

Yöntem

Bu çalışma nitel araştırmayı benimsemiştir ve yabancı dil öğretmek amacıyla hazırlanmış iki ders kitabındaki (Türkiye'de kullanılan 'Count Me In' ve Fransa'da kullanılan 'Version Originale 4') nihai görevlerin, küçük projelerin özelliklerini yansıtıp yansıtmadığını tespit etmek için araştırma yöntemi olarak belge analizi kullanılmıştır. Tüm ünitelerdeki tüm nihai görevlerin derinlemesine bir analizi sayfa sınırlamasını aşacağından, derinlemesine bir analiz için iki ders kitabındaki tüm nihai görevler arasından rastgele iki nihai görev seçilmiştir (5. Ünite ve 7. Ünitedekiler). Bowen (2009), doküman analizini "hem basılı hem de elektronik (bilgisayar tabanlı ve internete aktarılan) materyalleri incelemek veya değerlendirmek için sistematik bir prosedür" (p. 27) olarak tanımlamaktadır. Bu araştırmanın ana sorusu şudur:

1. Türkiye'de kullanılan *'Count Me In'* ve Fransa'da kullanılan *'Version Originale 4'* ders kitaplarından rastgele seçilen iki nihai görev, sosyal aktörleri eğitecek küçük projelerin özelliklerini yansıtmakta mıdır?

Bu amaçla, *'Count Me In'* ve *'Version Originale 4'* ders kitaplarındaki iki nihai görevin küçük projeler biçiminde uygulanan eylem odaklı yaklaşımın özelliklerini yansıtıp yansıtmadığının analizi ve karşılaştırması yapılmıştır.

Tartışma ve sonuç

Dil öğretiminde, hedefin başarılı iletişimcileri eğitmek olan iletişim paradigmasından, hedefin demokratik toplumlarında uyumlu bir şekilde yaşayabilen ve birlikte çalışabilen sosyal aktörleri eğitmek olan sosyal eylem paradigmasına doğru geçiş, eylem odaklı yaklaşımın eğitim projeleri ve dil öğretimi ders kitaplarında kullanabilecek küçük projeler olarak uygulaması ile yansıtılabilir. Dil öğretimi ders kitaplarındaki küçük projeler, projelerin özelliklerini ve uygulamalarını mümkün olduğunca yansıtmaktadır ve bu küçük projelerin uygulaması eğitim projelerinin uygulanmasına mümkün olduğunca yakın olmalıdır. Bu nedenle, küçük projeler belirli bir öğrenci özerkliğine ve belli bir karmaşıklık düzeyine sahip bir tasarım aşaması ve kendisinin kollektif bir boyuta sahip olduğu nihai ürünün sonunda kollektif bir öz değerlendirme aşamasını içermelidir. Bu nedenle, dil öğretiminde iletişim paradigmasından sosyal eylem paradigmasına doğru gerçek bir geçişin gerçekleştirilmesi için dil öğretim ders kitaplarında eylem odaklı yaklaşımın uygulaması küçük projeleri içermelidir.

Bu çalışma, yabancı dil öğretmek amacıyla hazırlanmış iki ders kitabının (Türkiye'de kullanılan *'Count Me In'* ve Fransa'da kullanılan *'Version Originale 4'*) içindeki iki nihai görevin (5. ve 7. ünitelerdeki) iletişimsel görevlerin özelliklerini mi yoksa küçük projelerin özelliklerini mi yansıttığını ortaya çıkarmayı hedeflemektedir. Fransızca ders kitabı *'Versiyon Originale 4'*, her bir ünite sonunda aynı nihai görevin iki çeşidini önermekte ve sosyal aktörleri eğitmek için ünitenin sosyal eylem hedeflerine hizmet etmektedir, bir başka deyişle, her ünite öğrencileri bu sosyal eylemleri başarmaya hazırlamaktadır. İngilizce ders kitabı 'Count Me In'in ünitesi hedefleri işlevler açısından belirtmekte ve önerilen nihai görevler, başarılı iletişimcileri eğitmeyi hedefleyen her ünitenin işlevsel hedeflerine

hizmet etmektedir. Karmaşıklık düzeyi küçük projelerin ayırt edici özelliğidir. Bu da katılımcı sayısının (bireysel ya da kolektif gerçekleştirme), nihai görev sayısının (öğrenciler tarafından tek bir görev mi yoksa ilgili alt görevler olup olmadığının), nihai görevin tasarım aşamasının varlığının, ki bunun içinde kolektif bir karar veya eyleme sahip nihai üretimlerin bulunması (sadece iletişimden ziyade) ve nihai üretimin kolektif bir öz değerlendirmenin bulunması gerekir, dikkate alınmasını gerektirir. 'Version Originale 4' ders kitabının 5. ve 7. ünitelerinde bulunan nihai görevler karmaşıklık kriterini sağlamaktadır ve her nihai görevden sonra küçük projelerin bir diğer önemli özelliği olan nihai üretimin toplu bir öz değerlendirmesi vardır. Öte yandan, 'Count Me In' ders kitabının 5. ve 7. ünitelerinin nihai görevleri, hem alt görevlerin hem de nihai üretimin tasarımında ve uygulamasında toplu bir çalışma ve belli bir düzeyde öğrenci özerkliği içermemektedir. Ayrıca bu nihai görevler nihai üretimin kollektif öz değerlendirmesini içermemektedir. Bu nedenle, 'Count Me In' ders kitabındaki nihai görevlerin küçük projelerin özelliklerini yansıtmadığı ve daha fazla iletişim odaklı oldukları, 'Version Originale 4' ders kitabındaki nihai görevlerin bu özellikleri yansıttığı ve bu nedenle eylem odaklı yaklaşımın ilkeleri ile uyumlu olduğu sonucuna varılabilir.

'Count Me In' ders kitabı, ünitelerinin sonunda, bu makalede ana hatlarıyla belirtildiği şekilde küçük projelerin özelliklerine sahip en az iki küçük proje önerecek şekilde geliştirilmelidir: Küçük projeler, nihai bir üretime veya toplu karara götüren çeşitli görevleri içeren bir tasarım aşaması içermelidir. Ayrıca küçük projelerde, belirli bir öğrenci özerkliği ve nihai ürünün sonunda kolektif bir boyutu olan kolektif bir öz değerlendirme aşaması bulunmalıdır. Gerçek anlamda sosyal eylem odaklı bir ders kitabı olmak için 'Count Me In' ders kitabı, unite hedeflerini işlevsel ve kavramsal terimlerle değil, sosyal eylemler cinsinden belirtmelidir. Örneğin, 'Version Originale 4' ders kitabının 7. ünitesinde, ünitenin hedefi 'Bu ünitenin sonunda öğrenciler açık bir mektup yazacak ve/veya bir dilekçe vereceklerdir.' biçiminde belirtilmiştir. Ünite, daha sonra, öğrencileri bu sosyal eylemleri gerçekleştirmeye hazırlar. Nihai amacı başarılı iletişimci yetiştirmek olan iletişimsel görevler sosyal aktörleri eğitemediğinden, ders kitabı ünitelerinin sonundaki nihai görevler iletişimsel görevler değil küçük projeler olmalıdır.

1. INTRODUCTION

The publication of the first Threshold Level document 'The Threshold Level in a European-Unit/Credit System for Modern Language Learning by Adults', which was developed by Van Ek (1975) for the Council of Europe, aimed to prepare the language learners for a short term contact with the users of the target language in the situation of a touristic visit. The 'Threshold Level' indicated the minimum level of proficiency that allows students to communicative effectively in such interactions. Thus, the target reference situation in this document is the trip, the target reference action is the language interaction described in terms of speech acts, and the criterion of success is the successful exchange of information.

Developments in the Threshold Level Document came with the publication of the CEFR (2001) and its companion volume (2018), where a new goal as different from that of the Threshold Level Document was introduced: Training of a social actor. The change in language learning goals for the European citizens can be considered as a natural transition since "with the recent changes in political, social and economic domains in European integration process up to 2000s, the needs of European language learners also changed from merely communicating with each other to live and work together with foreigners in their home or target culture" (Acar, 2019, p. 122-123). In training learners as social actors, the reference situation is no longer the tourist trip but the multilingual and multicultural society of Europe, the reference action is no longer the language interaction (speech acts) but social action (acting with the others or working with the others), and the criterion of success is not only the successful exchange of information but also the main skills that a social actor is equipped with such as personal autonomy, collective responsibility, information management and the design, management and implementation of complex actions. In short, the approach to be implemented in training social actors is no longer the communicative approach but the action-oriented approach (the social action perspective or social-action-based learning). "Language teaching from this perspective has, thus, a more general educational goal, that of training democratic citizens as promoted by its three great historical

representatives: John Dewey in the USA, Ovide Decroly in Belgium and Célestin Freinet in France" (Acar, 2019, p. 123).

Unlike the communicative approach, the classrooms in the action-oriented approach (social-action-based learning) are viewed as mini-societies where learners are not only involved in a simple exchange of information (talking with each other) but also in acting with each other in projects to give a final product. Puren (2004) indicates the necessity of this paradigm shift in language teaching and learning as follows:

> The European didactics that will emerge in the 2000s will have to move away from the communicative approach - as well as the task-based language learning-, moving in particular from the concept of interaction (which is a talking with and acting on the other) to the concept of co-action (which is an act with others), and the concept of interculturality (mainly referring to the phenomenon of contact between different cultures and individuals) to that of co-culturality (developing a common culture by and for collective action) (p.20).

1.1. From communicative tasks to mini-projects in language textbooks

While tasks are defined in various ways by its proponents (Prabhu, 1987; Nunan, 1989; Willis 1996; Skehan, 1998; Ellis, 2003), "generally accepted principles are that the primary focus is on meaning (communication of meaning or exchange of information), task accomplishment is important, a task has a communicative result and outcome, and assessment is made through this outcome" (Acar, 2019, p. 134). Since social actors will not only communicative with each other but also act with each other, task-based language teaching, whose aim is to train successful communicators, cannot be sufficient to train social actors. Thus, in the implementation of the action-oriented approach (social-action-based learning), Puren (2008) takes a different stance and argues that

> if the principle of action-task homology continues to work, what is to be expected from this perspective, which I propose to call more precisely "co-actional", is a very strong reactivation of the so-called "project pedagogy", the basic principle of which is precisely to give meaning and coherence to learners' learning by making them mobilize themselves on collective actions with a collective dimension (p. 6).

The transition from training successful communicators to training of social actors can only be realized through real social actions since with the action-oriented approach (social-action-based learning), "it is now a question of training citizens of multilingual and multicultural societies capable of living together harmoniously (and foreign and second language classes in France are mini-societies of this type), as well as students and professionals capable of working with others over the long term in foreign languages and cultures" (Puren, 2009, p. 125). Thus, for Puren (2008, 2009), the goal of training social actors cannot be realized by communicative tasks but by educational projects and mini-projects. Puren (2004) distinguishes between task and action, "by defining as 'task' what the learner does in his/her learning process and as 'action' what the user does in society" (p. 18). To Puren (2008), 'action' refers to social action (real social activity) to develop social actors and 'task' refers to school action (simulated school activity) to develop successful communicators.

Implementing the action-oriented approach in the language textbooks, thus, necessitates a move from the use of communicative tasks to mini-projects. Educational projects, in which the students are responsible for the design, implementation and evaluation phases of a project (with the help and under the guidance of the teacher), cannot be limited and directed by the time frame of a textbook. Mini-projects at the end of the textbook units, however, are those that approximate as much as possible to projects in design, implementation and evaluation. According to Puren (2019), a mini-project is the one which has a design stage with a certain level of complexity, a certain level of student autonomy and a collective self-evaluation phase at the end of the final product, which also has a collective dimension.

The level of complexity is the distinctive characteristic of mini-projects. It requires a consideration of the number of participants (individual or collective realization); the number of final tasks; the presence of the design stage of the final task, in which there are collectivity and a certain degree of student autonomy; final productions with a collective decision or action and a collective self-

evaluation of the final production. Besides, mini-projects, which aim to train social actors, should serve the action objectives of the units in language textbooks rather than functional and/or notional objectives as in the case of the communication paradigm. Accordingly, the implementation of the action-oriented approach in language textbooks must include mini-projects if a real shift will be realized from the communication paradigm to the social action paradigm in language teaching.

Table 1 shows the direction of a move from communicative tasks to projects in the implementation of the action-oriented approach (social-action-based learning) (Puren, 2014b).

Table 1
Analysis grid of the different current types of implementation of the action in foreign language textbooks

	ACTION PERSPECTIVE	
Task-based language teaching (**communicative tasks**)	Weak version Strong version (**action tasks**) (**mini-projects**)	The strongest version (**project pedagogy**)

In this grid, Puren (2014b) presents a clear distinction between the different characteristics of communicative tasks and mini-projects. In the implementation of the action-oriented approach (social-action-based learning) in language textbooks, student activities are organized around real mini-projects carried out by language learners as social actors. In cases where real mini-projects cannot be carried out, simulated mini-projects are preferred but even in this case, the mini-projects must be as realistic as possible rather than artificial. Puren (2009) argues

> Even if the simulated projects will still be necessary, the perspective of social action leads to a focus on real projects, possibly in combination with the first ones. The interest of simulated projects for the authors of a textbook is of course that they can control them from start to finish, from design and preparation to implementation and exploitation, the real projects necessarily involving a greater autonomy among learners (p. 133).

Table 2 illustrates the differences between the characteristics of communicative tasks and mini-projects (Puren, 2014b).

Table 2
Communicative tasks and mini-projects

Task-based language teaching (communicative tasks)	The action-oriented approach (mini-projects)
1. The reference action is the communicative task: it involves managing communication situations through language interactions, the main issue being the exchange of information. The characteristics of this action are those of the tourist trip: the inchoative, the punctual, the perfective and the individual.	1.The reference action is social action. The characteristics of this action are, contrary to those of the tourist trip, the repetitive, the durative, the imperfective and the collective. The action is of the order of complex: relevant to the process, requiring metacognition and feedback ('project management').
2. Tasks are predetermined by the teacher/textbook.	2. Learners can introduce personalized variants of action.
3. Competencies are defined and worked in terms of language activities (listening, reading, spoken interaction, spoken production, writing), speech acts (acting on the other by language) and language action (pragmatic competence)	3. Competence is defined and worked on primarily as a complex ability to act, requiring, in particular, the articulation and combination of different language activities. The other competence models (those of the communicative approach) are also taken into account.

4. The reference society is the external foreign society (e.g. France for French as a foreign language learners)	4. Learners are considered as full-fledged social actors, engaged with teaching in a collective project (teaching-learning). The class-society is considered as a society in its own right: there is homology between action/learning situation and action/use situation.
5. The tasks are done in simulation.	5. We first consider the possible real actions, then the realistic simulations, and the recourse to the other uses of the language (playful, aesthetic, imaginative,...). With regard to the use of the L2 in the classroom, priority is given to the convention (L2 as a working language in the space and time of teaching-learning of this language) over simulation.
6. We only target a language objective: communicative competence.	6. We also aim to achieve an educational goal: the training of a real citizen as a social actor autonomous and supportive, critical and responsible, in a democratic society. This citizen must now be able to live harmoniously and act effectively in a multilingual and multicultural society.
7. The linguistic objectives of each unit/ didactic sequence are defined first in terms of communication situations and/or in terms of notional-functional content.	7. The objectives are defined from the beginning in terms of the social action(s) to be carried out, and/or the results expected from these actions: the unity of the didactic unit or sequence is the unity of action. The actions are proposed to the students in a framework that encourages the reuse of the lexical and grammatical objectives of the unit or sequence (e. g. cultural theme determined for the lexicon, type of text for the grammar).
8. The cultural objectives are the meta cultural (knowledge), and intercultural (usually in the narrow sense of intercultural comparison) components of cultural competence.	8. The privileged cultural component is the co-cultural component: the ability to adopt/adapt a culture of collective action in the classroom/in external societies/in professional circles. All components of cultural competence are likely to be mobilized.
9. Language and cultural contents are entirely predetermined by the teacher/textbook. The task(s) is (are) designed as opportunities to reuse these contents. Variations in the language and cultural content worked on are made within the chosen theme.	9. The variations in the language and cultural content worked on are introduced by the variants of action and/or field of action (personal, public, educational, professional), and therefore partly chosen by the learners.
10. Communication is both the goal and the means: model dialogues are used; information management stops when the communication is successful.	10. Communication is a means at the service of action: no dialogue or another document model of production. The communicative objective is integrated into the objective of informational competence (i.e. the ability of a social actor to act on and through information), the management of the information integrating post- and pre-communicative activities.
11. Priority is given to interindividual interactions: the reference group is the group of two.	11. The reference group is the major group. There is involvement of the large group in the design of the final joint task.
12. The tasks remain fully managed and exploited within each group. The large group may serve as an	12. The action(s) has (have) a permanent collective dimension (cooperation and / or collaboration).

audience during the performance of the simulated scene.

13. The documents are all provided to learners.	13. Learners can search and add their own documents.
14. The documents are treated as a priority according to the language activity concerned ('support logic').	14. Documents are treated primarily as resources for action ('documentation logic'). All 'documentary logics' are likely to be implemented.
15. The use of L1 is avoided.	15. The L1 is introduced when it helps to carry out the action (e. g. part of the documentation in L1) or to project it in the learners' society(ies) (e.g. L1 translation of the final production and dissemination in the learners' country). Activities related to language mediation are planned.
16. The evaluation is mainly done on the individual productions of the learners.	16. The evaluation takes into account not only the work done ('product' dimension), but also the realization of the work (the 'process' dimension).
17. The evaluation criteria are communicative (e. g. in the CEFR: linguistic, sociolinguistic, pragmatic).	17. The evaluation criteria specific to social action are added as priorities: the success of the action and the 'professional' quality of the production.

As seen in table 2, the characteristics of communicative tasks and mini-projects are different. Thus, the implementation of the action-oriented approach (social-action-based learning) in language textbooks in terms of mini-projects differs from both the communicative approach and task-based language teaching. To realize the transition from training successful communicators (task-based language teaching) to training social actors (the action-oriented approach or social-action-based learning) in language textbooks, it is not appropriate to give place to communicative tasks at the end of the textbook units. Since the mini-projects reflect the characteristics of social action, they must be employed at the end of the textbook units.

2. METHOD

This study adopts qualitative research and as a research method, document analysis is used to find out whether the final tasks in two language textbooks, '*Count Me In*' (B2 level) used in Turkey and '*Version Originale 4*' (B2 level) used in France reflect the characteristics of mini-projects. Since an in-depth analysis of all the final tasks in all the units of these two textbooks will exceed the page limitation, two final tasks are chosen for an in-depth analysis, those of Unit 5 and Unit 7, selected randomly among all the final tasks in the two textbooks. Bowen (2009) defines document analysis as "a systematic procedure for reviewing or evaluating documents—both printed and electronic (computer-based and Internet-transmitted) material" (p. 27). The central question of this research is:

1. Do the two chosen final tasks in two language textbooks, *'Count Me In'* (B2 level) used in Turkey and *'Version Originale 4'* (B2 level) used in France reflect the characteristics of mini-projects to train social actors?

For this purpose, the two final tasks in two language textbooks, *'Count Me In'* and *'Version Originale 4'* were analyzed and compared to find out whether they reflect the characteristics of the action-oriented approach in the form of mini-projects.

3. FINDINGS

The comparison in this section begins first by providing general information about the two textbooks including the objectives of each unit, and then two final tasks in Unit 5 and Unit 7 are analyzed to find whether these tasks reflect the characteristics of mini-projects.

3.1. The analysis of two final tasks in '*Version Originale 4*'.

In the foreword section of the French textbook *Version Originale 4 - B2 (Paris: Éditions Maison des Langues)*, such arguments about the textbook are put forward as follows:

> The Original Version method has been designed according to the latest developments in language and culture didactics. It resolutely implements the action perspective promoted by the 2001 Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, which "considers first and foremost the user and learner of a language as social actors who have to perform tasks (which are not only linguistic) in given circumstances and environment, within a particular field of action". The actions proposed for level B2 in Original Version 4 are precisely those that every citizen is called upon to carry out in society, either collectively or personally towards the community: it is a question of being informed but also of informing oneself, managing one's image, creating social cohesion, living together, engaging oneself, creating....Original Version 4 continues to draw inspiration from the didactic reflections and proposals of recent years concerning the practical implications of the transition from the perspective of communicative action to the new perspective of social action, while making full use of the experience accumulated in the three previous levels.

From the foreword of the textbook, it is clearly understood that *Version Originale 4* adopts the action-oriented approach (social-action-based learning). The units and two finals tasks presented in each unit, as well as one professional task presented after every two units, are presented in table 3 below.

Table 3
Units and final tasks in Version Originale 4.

Unit title	Final tasks
Unit 1. Inform: all journalists	Prepare a press review and/or create the front page of an April 1st newspaper.
Unit 2. Manage your image	Create a digital profile of the class and/or write a science fiction short story.
Professional task	Write a blog CV.
Unit 3. Live better	Design a Health-café project and/or write an article promoting the virtues of a dish.
Unit 4. Make the link	Reorganize a survey and write a report and/or write a utopian essay.
Professional task	Animate a company round table discussion on intergenerational relationships.
Unit 5. Live together	Make a presentation on the theme of discrimination and/or stage and perform a humorous sketch on this same theme.
Unit 6. Have your chances	Prepare a plea on the theme of the second chance in education and/or give a chance to a historical character.
Professional task	Prepare a job interview.
Unit 7. Be able to say it	Write an open letter and/or make a petition.

Unit 8. Make a commitment	Write a collection of committed poems and/or create a wacky association and write its founding text.
Professional task	Manage conflicts at work (labor courts).
Unit 9. Create	Design the cultural aspect of a stay in a French-speaking country and/or stage two cultural characters who defend their works to appear in a museum.
Unit 10. Circulate	Write a story of our French language learning experiences and/or write a metaphorical travel story.
Professional task	Write a call for tenders for a cultural event.

In each unit, two final tasks in the form of mini-projects, which are the variants of the same social action, are offered and learners are required to choose one or both (one realistic, the other fictional). The proposal of two mini-projects in each unit is logical in terms of the action-oriented approach (social-action-based learning) since it gives learners freedom of choice (learner autonomy). After every two units, one professional task, which deals with the professional domain, is proposed. In the action-oriented approach, first the possible real actions are considered, then the realistic simulations, and finally the other uses of the language (playful, aesthetic, imaginative,...). This characteristic of mini-projects is reflected in the finals tasks of *Verison Originale 4* as stated in its foreword as follows:

> One of these tasks is "realistic" in the sense that it corresponds to real societal issues -whether in the classroom society and/or in the outside society- and can therefore lead to a real project if conditions allow; otherwise, it can be done in simulation, which is designed as a training for a possible future action, as is the case for an apprentice pilot in a flight simulator. The other task is "fictional" in the sense that it involves artistic expression, poetry, affectivity, emotion, playfulness, creativity or even fantasy. Learners will choose with their teacher to do one or the other, or both, according to their motivations, their capacities of expression or their environment; or to share them in groups, which will naturally provide opportunities for pedagogical differentiation.

In Unit 5 entitled 'Live together', for example, the proposed actions in the form of final tasks are 'make a presentation on the theme of discrimination and/or stage and perform a humorous sketch on this same theme'. In this unit, objectives are stated in terms of social actions rather than functions and notions (which is also logical in terms of the action-oriented approach, which views language as a means of social action): At the end of this unit, the students will make a presentation on the theme of discrimination and/or stage and perform a humorous sketch on this same theme. The unit, then, prepares the learners for achieving these actions. One of the proposed actions is 'real': The students will make a presentation on the theme of discrimination, the other action is 'fictional' (it involves affectivity, emotion, creativity and imagination): The students will stage and perform a humorous sketch on the theme of discrimination. The action is chosen in a way that citizens in any democratic society would be required to perform since 'living together' by managing differences is considered as an element of any democratic society and the learners, in the process of language learning, also learn how to live together both despite and with the differences among themselves (again logical in terms of the action-oriented approach, whose social situation of reference is a multilingual and multicultural society unlike the communicative approach, whose social situation of reference is the touristic visit).

In Unit 7 entitled 'Be able to say it', the proposed actions in the form of final tasks are 'write an open letter and/or make a petition'. In this unit, objectives are also stated in terms of social actions rather than functions and notions: At the end of this unit, the students will write an open letter and/or make a petition. The unit, then, prepares the learners for achieving these social actions. One of the proposed actions is 'real': The students make an online petition. The other action is 'fictional' (it involves affectivity, emotion, creativity and imagination): The students will write an open letter to the mayor of Paris to protest against the announcement of the demolition of the Eiffel Tower. The actions

are chosen in a way that any democratic society would allow its citizens to carry out in itself for them to be able to live together in a democratic manner since the right to protest through making a petition is considered as an element of any democratic society and the learners, in the process of language learning, also learn how to express their personal reactions in a democratic manner. Final tasks in Units 5 and 7, thus, embody the goal of training social actors in a society, who will live and work together in a democratic manner, a goal adopted by the action-oriented approach, that of educating democratic citizens.

The level of complexity is the distinctive characteristic of mini-projects. It requires a consideration of the number of participants (individual or collective realization), the number of final tasks, the presence of the design stage of the final task, in which there are collectivity and a certain degree of student autonomy, final productions with a collective decision or action and a collective self-evaluation of the final production. Special emphasis on collectivity in the complexity criteria is important in the action-oriented approach since the social actions in society have a collective dimension (cooperation and/or collaboration) and if learners are prepared as autonomous social actors for the external society, they should be given this autonomy in their mini-society: the classroom. "The action-oriented approach aims to train learners for both individual autonomy and collective autonomy in both as groups and as whole class and this autonomy is given to the individuals and the whole class in the initial stage of a class by allowing them to choose their projects that they will work on and learners can search and add their own documents (informational competence)" (Acar, 2019, p.132). The whole class is involved in the design of the final tasks and the whole class does a collective self-evaluation of the final task (what went well and what could have done to make it better and how, what did we gain from this final task for the next final task).

The collectivity of action is also given much attention in *Version Originale 4*. In Unit 5 'Live together', for example, the students will make a presentation on the theme of discrimination and the whole class first decides on the criteria for evaluating an oral presentation and at the end of the presentations, again the whole class evaluates and comments on the quality of oral communication in the presentations. In Unit 7 'Be able to say it', the students will write an open letter to the mayor of Paris to protest against the announcement of the demolition of the Eiffel Tower and each group writes the text of the open letter to the mayor and presents it to the class, who decides which one will finally be sent after collectively negotiating and making changes.

In these final tasks, collectivity is reflected in the design of the mini-projects. The collectivity is emphasized in the foreword section of *Version Originale 4* as follows:

> The "we" is not used by chance in the presentation of tasks on the first page of each didactic unit of Version Originale 4 (for example, for unit 1: "At the end of this unit, we will prepare a press review and/or create the front page of an April 1st newspaper."). To the focus on the individual that the communicative approach favored (the reference group is the group of two, that of interindividual communication), the action perspective adds the focus on the class group because its main objective is the training of social actors. This is why in Version Originale 4, in addition to individual or interindividual activities, sub-group activities and large group activities are organized, with the whole class also having to make decisions about the tasks to be carried out.

Among these criteria in the complexity of the final task, the presence of the design stage of the final task is a special characteristic that makes the final task a mini-project. The proposed final tasks in *Version Originale 4* have a design stage with a certain degree of student autonomy and with a series of subtasks, which reflects the complexity of the final tasks. In Unit 7 'Be able to say it', in the design phase of the final task, the students read the April 1 brief published in a French newspaper, discuss the reasons for the decision of the mayor of Paris regarding the abolishment of the Eiffel Tower, and they make a list of people who would be affected by the disappearance of the Eiffel Tower. The students, then, choose from this list some examples and look for the arguments that people could advance. Thus, the students are not imposed a pre-programmed list of people from which they must choose but they autonomously discuss the reasons, make a list, choose from this list, look for the arguments and then in the implementation of the final task, each group writes the text of the open letter to the Mayor and presents it to the class that decides which one will finally be sent. In the final task of Unit 7 'Write an

open letter to the mayor of Paris', the steps A, B, C, D correspond to the design stage, which has a certain degree of student autonomy and a level of complexity:

We will write an open letter to express our outrage.
A. Read the April 1 brief published in a French newspaper. What is the reason for the decision of the mayor of Paris?
B. Make a list of people who would be affected by the disappearance of the Eiffel Tower.
C. In groups, choose a few examples from this list and look for the arguments that could be put forward by the people concerned.
The souvenir seller will no longer be able to settle down under the Eiffel Tower. He will be forced to move elsewhere or else he will find himself unemployed.
D. Each group writes the text of the open letter to the Mayor and presents it to the class that decides which one will finally be sent.

The variant of this final task, 'Make a petition' also has a design phase (A, B, C, D, E) with a certain degree of student autonomy and a level of complexity:

We will make an online petition to make our views known.
A. In groups, choose a cause that you feel currently deserves your collective commitment.
B. Share your ideas and decide together on the theme of the petition and the size of its text (it should not exceed 150 words).
C. Each group writes their text according to the tone they want to give it (humor, anger...).
D. The whole class chooses one of the texts, making some changes if necessary.
E. You can present your collective petition in your school or city. You can also upload it on a specialized website.

In Unit 5 'Live together', for example, the proposed action in the form of a final task is 'Make a presentation on the theme of discrimination', which also has a design phase (A, B, C, D) with a certain degree of student autonomy and a level of complexity:

You are going to make an oral presentation on the subject of discrimination.
A. Before you begin, you will decide on the criteria for evaluating an oral presentation. Complete the grid below by defining and describing the sub-criteria.
B. Choose the subject of your presentation and collect the necessary information (through surveys, the internet, etc.)
C. Prepare a detailed plan and give your presentation orally to the class.
D. Your classmates will take notes, ask you questions and then evaluate and comment on the quality of the oral communication of your presentation.

The variant of this final task, 'Stage and perform a humorous sketch on the theme of discrimination' also has a design phase (A, B, C, D, E) with a certain degree of student autonomy and a level of complexity:

You will write, direct and perform a humorous sketch on the theme of discrimination.
A. Read the definition of parody and comment on it among yourselves.
B. Look at these two photos and explain why the second one is a parody.
C. In groups, choose the discrimination you want to report. Write the sketch. You can paradoy a work if you wish.
D. Work on the staging by adding stage directions to your text: indications about the places, costumes, intonations, gestures and mimics, etc.
E. Do a dress rehearsal and then play in front of the whole class. Which sketch was the most successful? Why?

When the final tasks in *Version Originale 4* are analyzed in terms of whether they serve the communicative objectives or action objectives of the units, in terms of their status (real, simulated, fictional, artificial), in terms of the presence of a design phase with a certain degree of student autonomy and a level of complexity, and in terms of whether there is(are) final production(s) with a collective decision or action and a collective self-evaluation of the final production(s), it is found that they carry out the characteristics of mini-projects. Thus, these final tasks in *Version Originale 4* reflect the application of the action-oriented approach in language textbooks in the form of mini-projects.

3.2. The analysis of two final tasks in '*Count Me In'.*

The English textbook *'Count Me In'-B2 (Publication of the Ministry of National Education)* is used in the public high schools of Turkey (12th grade). Since there is not a foreword in either the teacher's book or the student's book, it is not understood whether the textbook is based on the action-oriented approach. Thus, to understand the approach adopted in the textbook, it is necessary to investigate the high school English curriculum of Turkey since in Turkey the textbook writers must follow the approach and syllabus proposed by the English curriculum prepared by the Ministry of National Education of Turkey. From the foreword of the curriculum, it is understood that the approach adopted is the action-oriented approach:

> This curriculum has been designed in accordance with the descriptive and pedagogical principals of The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). Therefore, the language proficiency levels are reflected as A1, A2 (Basic Users) and B1, B2 (Independent Users). The approach adapted is an action-oriented approach since in this curriculum, the target language (English) is seen as a vehicle for communication rather than a lesson to study (p.4).

The action-oriented approach, however, is misleadingly presented as having a goal of enabling the learners to use English as a means of communication and not as a means of social action. Thus, the approach that the textbook writers must follow in writing *'Count Me In'* textbook is presented in the curriculum as the action-oriented approach. In the contents section of the textbook, there is no final task, in other words, the final task(s) are not given any place in the content (unlike *Version Originale 4*). When the units are analyzed, some finals tasks can be seen at the end of each unit (e.g. Unit 1. Music. Final task: Create your dream concert poster) and some final tasks take place towards the end of the unit and hence they are not final. In Unit 3. Human rights, for example, the final task is 'Read and determine the stress patterns of the words. Then, listen and check', which is not even a task, and in this unit, the final task is the one that comes towards the end of the unit 'Write a variation of the essay in Part 5 A using the template below. Take one or more disadvantaged group/s. Think about their problems and offer solutions. You can refer to Part 5 A'. The units and finals task(s) presented in each unit are presented below.

Table 4

Units and final tasks in Count Me In.

Unit title	Final tasks
Unit 1. Music	Create your dream concert poster.
Unit 2. Friendship	Use the following template to write an opinion essay. Choose at least 2 or 3 qualities and state reasons.
Unit 3. Human rights	Write a variation of the essay in Part 5A using the template below. Take one or more disadvantaged group/s. Think about their problems and offer solutions. You can refer to Part 5 A.

Unit 4. Coming soon	Imagine that you have designed a cyber game and are trying to sell it to a company. Use the slide frames with headings on and prepare a slide show to introduce the game. For the scenario part, include the characters, setting, purpose, main actions, etc.
Unit 5. Psychology	Work in pairs. Look at the role cards below and role-play a school counselor and a student after creating your dialogue.
Unit 6. Favors	Think about your dream and write an application letter addressing to the scholarship announcements below. Remember to place the date and addresses as in the sample letter.
Unit 7. News stories	Write a news story or a past experience using the template below. Try to include answers to the questions in Part 2 C in your writing. Alternatively, you can write an imaginary story.
Unit 8. Alternative energy	Work in pairs. Pick one of the prompt boxes below and debate with your partner over alternative energy in the future as someone in favor or against.
Unit 9.Technology	Write a 'for and against essay' on any aspect of technology as in the sample in Part 6 A.
Unit 10. Manners	Write a personal letter about a bad manner you have witnessed or experienced before. Describe the event, your experience and how you felt in detail.

When the final tasks in '*Count Me In'* are analyzed in terms of whether they serve the communicative objectives or action objectives of the units, it is seen that they serve the communicative objectives of the unit. In the textbook, the objectives of each unit are stated in terms of communicative functions. Unit 5. 'Psychology', for example, states the objectives of the unit as 'describing mood', 'making suggestions to change negative mood', 'following and giving instructions'. Unit 7. 'News stories' states the objectives of the unit as 'narrating a past event/experience', 'talking about sequential actions'. Thus the units are not action units but communicative units, and the final tasks are used to serve the communicative objectives, which is a characteristic of the communicative approach rather than the action-oriented approach.

Since the level of complexity of final tasks is a distinctive characteristic of mini-projects, it is necessary to analyse the complexity of the finals tasks in '*Count Me In'* from the perspective of whether they require a consideration of the number of participants (individual or collective realization), the number of final tasks, the presence of the design stage of the final task, in which there are collectivity and a certain degree of student autonomy, final productions with a collective decision or action and a collective self-evaluation of the final production.

In Unit 5. 'Psychology', the final task is 'Work in pairs. Look at the role cards below and role-play a school counselor and a student after creating your dialogue.' This is a typical communicative role-play activity (in the form of simulation but not real action) and the collectivity is restricted to pair work. There is neither a group nor a whole class involvement in the realization of this final task. In Unit 7. 'News stories', the proposed final tasks are 'Write a news story or a past experience using the template below. Try to include answers to the questions in Part 2C in your writing. Alternatively, you can write an imaginary story.' This is an individual writing task in which collectivity is also absent. Unlike the proposal of a single simulated role-play activity in Unit 5, in this activity, the students are given three variants of the same task, one of which (write a past experience) could be real and the others fictional.

Among the complexity criteria, the presence of the design stage of the final task, in which there are collectivity and a certain degree of student autonomy, is a special characteristic that makes the final task a mini-project. The proposed final tasks in *Version Originale 4* has a design stage with a certain

degree of student autonomy and collectivity and embody a series of subtasks. In *'Count Me In',* the design stage for the role-play activity (in Unit 5) 'Work in pairs. Look at the role cards below and role-play a school counselor and a student after creating your dialogue.' is presented as:

A. Below are expressions with negative moods and suggestions for each of them. Match the situations with negative moods to suggestions.
'I feel nervous these days'; 'I'm in despair. I don't know what to do'; 'I can't help feeling excited. My lips are dried out'.
1. Why don't you seek professional help? There is always a way out. 2. Chill out! Let's go and get a drink. 3. I suggest you socialize with cheerful people.
B. Now, listen to Mrs. Calmer, talking to different clients and make a list of the suggestions she makes to change the negative moods of her clients. Tapescript 5.1
C. Work in pairs. Look at the role cards below and role-play a school counselor and a student after creating your dialogue.

In this design, the student autonomy is very much restricted since the students can only be involved in matching one item with another and listen to someone and make a list of suggestions they hear and finally they look at the role cards predetermined by the textbook and obey the stated commands given in these cards. The collectivity in the design is absent and role-play is restricted to two students. The sub-tasks prepare the students for the final simulated role-play activity, which is a typical characteristic of the communicative approach. The design stage also lacks both final production(s) with a collective decision or action, and a collective self-evaluation of the final production(s).

In Unit 7, the design stage of the final task 'Write a news story or a past experience using the template below. Try to include answers to the questions in Part 2 C in your writing. Alternatively, you can write an imaginary story.' is presented as:

A. Below are some statements with their paraphrased forms. Work in groups and study the pairs to find out how paraphrasing was achieved. Write the change/s in brackets, as in the examples.
B. Imagine that you are a reporter and you have interviewed Oumar Houdini, an earthquake survivor, for a story in your newspaper and below is what he told you about his experience. Paraphrase the story before submitting it to your editor.
C. Work in pairs. Find the answers to the questions in Oumar Houdini's story.
D. Write a news story or a past experience using the template below. Try to include answers to the questions in Part 2 C in your writing. Alternatively, you can write an imaginary story.

The sub-tasks A, B, C do not allow any student autonomy since they are very directive, do not allow choices to the students and are predetermined by the textbook. The last task, D, is itself directive since it offers the students a template according to which they have to write a news story or a past experience or an imaginary story. Student autonomy in step D, however, is still achieved to a certain extent since the students are presented with options to choose the task they would like to be involved in. A certain level of collectivity is achieved by group work in step A. The other steps (B, C and D) lack collectivity (involvement of the large groups and the whole class). Step D can be criticized even from the communicative perspective since there is no recipient: The students do not know for whom they are writing a news story or an imaginary story and also it seems they are writing a past experience for themselves. Both final tasks in Unit 5 and 7 lack a collective self-evaluation of the final product, which is an important element of mini-projects. For these reasons, it is difficult to consider these final tasks as mini-projects.

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

From the 2000s to the present day, the extended integration process in the European Union led to major changes in political, social and economic domains in Europe and accordingly the Council of Europe made changes in language teaching policy by introducing CEFR (2001) and its companion volume (2018). Thus, the goal of language teaching had a more ambitious goal, that of training social actors as democratic citizens, who can live and work together harmoniously in the multilingual and multicultural societies of Europe. Puren (2004, 2009, 2014a, 2014b, 2014c, 2017, 2018, 2019) puts forward two applications of the action-oriented approach (social-action-based learning), which will reflect this social action paradigm in methodology: educational projects, in which the students are involved in projects which they choose and design themselves autonomously (with the help and under the guidance of the teacher) and the implementation of the action-oriented approach in language textbooks through mini-projects, which are designed by the textbook writers beforehand. There are distinctive characteristics of projects and mini-projects which reflect the real nature of social action and which differ them from the communicative activities and tasks.

In language teaching, the real shift from the communication paradigm, in which the goal is to train successful communicators, to the social action paradigm, in which the goal is to train social actors who can live and work together harmoniously in their democratic society, can coherently be reflected by the implementation of the action-oriented approach in terms of educational projects and mini-projects that can be employed by language textbooks. Mini-projects in language textbooks reflect as much as possible the characteristics of projects and their implementation should approximate the implementation of projects as much as possible. For this reason, mini-projects should include a design phase with a certain level of student autonomy, a level of complexity and a collective self-evaluation phase at the end of the final product, which itself has a collective dimension. Thus, the implementation of the action-oriented approach in language textbooks must include mini-projects if a real shift will be realized from the communication paradigm to the social action paradigm in language teaching.

This study aims to find out whether two final tasks (those of Unit 5 and Unit 7) in two language textbooks, '*Count Me In'* (B2 level) used in Turkey and '*Version Originale 4'* (B2 level) used in France reflect the characteristics of communicative tasks or mini-projects. The French textbook '*Version Originale 4'* proposes two variants of the same social action at the end of each unit and they serve the action objectives of the unit to train social actors; in other words, each unit prepares the learners for achieving these actions, which reflects an action orientation. The units of English textbook *'Count Me In'* state objectives in terms of functions and the proposed final tasks serve the functional objectives of each unit to train successful communicators, which reflects a communicative orientation. The level of complexity is the distinctive characteristic of mini-projects. It requires a consideration of the number of participants (individual or collective realization), the number of final tasks, the presence of the design stage of the final task, in which there are collectivity and a certain degree of student autonomy, final productions with a collective decision or action and a collective self-evaluation of the final production. The analyzed final tasks of Unit 5 and 7 of '*Version Originale 4'* meet the criteria of complexity and after each final task, there is a collective self-evaluation of the final production, which is another important characteristic of mini-projects. The final tasks of Unit 5 and 7 of the textbook *'Count Me In'*, on the other hand, lack a collective realization, and student autonomy is restricted. They also lack a collective self-evaluation of the final production. Thus it can be concluded that the final tasks in *'Count Me In'* do not reflect the characteristics of the mini-projects and they are more communication-oriented while the final tasks in *'Version Originale 4'* reflect these characteristics and are in line with the principles of the action-oriented approach.

The textbook *'Count Me In'* should be improved in such a way that it should propose at least two mini-projects at the end of its units, which will have the characteristics of the mini-projects as outlined in this article: The mini-projects should include a design phase which should include several tasks leading to a final production or collective decision. The mini-projects should also have a certain level of student autonomy, and a collective self-evaluation phase at the end of the final product, which itself has a collective dimension. To be a truly action-oriented textbook, the textbook *'Count Me In'* should state the unit objectives not in terms of functional and/or notional terms but in terms of social actions. In Unit 7 of '*Version Originale 4*', for example, the objective of the unit is stated as 'At the end of this unit, the students will write an open letter and/or make a petition.' The unit, then, prepares the

learners for achieving these social actions. Since communicative tasks with their ultimate objective of training successful communicators cannot train social actors, the final tasks at the end of the textbook units should not be communicative tasks but mini-projects.

5. REFERENCES

Acar, A. (2019). The Action-Oriented Approach: Integrating Democratic Citizenship Education into Language Teaching. *English Scholarship Beyond Borders, 5* (1), 122-141.

Barthélémy, F., Kleszewski, C., Perrichon, E., Wuattier, S. (2003). Version Originale 4 – Livre de l'élève. Paris: Editions Maison des langues.

Bowen, G.A. (2009). Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method. *Qualitative Research Journal*. 9 (2), 27-40.

Council of Europe (CoE). (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Council of Europe (CoE). (2018). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume with New Descriptors*. Retrieved from https://rm.coe.int/cefr-companion-volume-with-new-descriptors-2018/1680787989.

Çimen, F., Tigin, B.T., Demir, E., Çokçalışkan, A, Fındıkçı, G. (2018). Count Me In-Student's Book. Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları.

Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı¸ (MEB) [Turkish Ministry of National Education]. (2018). İngilizce Dersi Öğretim Programı (Ortaöğretim 9,10,11, ve 12. Sınıflar) [English Language Teaching Program (Secondary Schools Grades 9,10,11, and 12)]. Ankara: T.C. Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı.

Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second Language Pedagogy.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Puren, C. (2004). De l'approche par les tâches à la perspective co-actionnelle. Retrieved from https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2004a/

Puren, C. (2008). De l'approche communicative à la perspective actionnelle, et de l'interculturel au co-culturel. Retrieved from https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2008e/

Puren, C. (2009). La nouvelle perspective actionnelle et ses implications sur la conception des manuels de langue. In "L'approche actionnelle dans l'enseignement des langues. Onze articles pour mieux comprendre et faire le point" Retrieved from https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2009g/.

Puren, C. (2014a). Approche communicative et perspective actionnelle, deux organismes méthodologiques génétiquement opposés… et complémentaires. Retrieved from https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2014a/.

Puren, C. (2014b). La pédagogie de projet dans la mise en œuvre de la perspective actionnelle. Retrieved from file:///C:/Users/User/Downloads/PUREN_2014b_Dossier_Travail_P%C3%A9dagogie_projet%20(7).pdf.

Puren, C. (2014c). Différents niveaux de l' « agir » en classe de langue-culture: corrigé du tp sur la notion de « compétence » Retrieved from file:///C:/Users/user/Downloads/054-2_Niveaux_agir_notion_comp%C3%A9tence_corrig%C3%A9_TP.pdf

Puren, C. (2017). "Opérations cognitives (proaction, métacognition, régulation) et activités fonda-mentales (rétroactions, évaluations) de la démarche de projet". Retrieved from https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2017a/

Puren, C. (2018). différents niveaux de l' « agir » en classe de langue-culture: tp sur la notion de « compétence ». Retrieved from file:///C:/Users/user/Downloads/054-1_Niveaux_agir_notion_comp%C3%A9tence_TP_v4%20(2).pdf

Puren, C. (2019). De la tâche finale au mini-projet : un exemple concret d'analyse et de manipulation didactiques. Retrieved from file:///C:/Users/User/Downloads/PUREN_2019f_Tache_finale_a_mini-projet%20(1).pdf

Skehan, P. (1998). *A Cognitive Approach to Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Van, Ek J.A. (1975). *The threshold level*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Willis, J. (1996). *A Framework for Task-Based Learning*. Harlow: Longman.