The Action-Oriented Approach: Integrating Democratic Citizenship Education into Language Teaching

Ahmet Acar

Dokuz Eylül University Department of English Language Teaching

Dr. Ahmet Acar is working as a Dr. Lecturer at Dokuz Eylül University, Department of English Language Teaching, in İzmir, Turkey. His research interests are English as an international language pedagogy, the action-oriented approach, curriculum development, distance learning and virtual reality in English teaching.

The action-oriented approach in language teaching as adopted by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) and developed in detail by Puren (2004a, 2009b, 2011d, 2013, 2014a, 2014b, 2016, 2017g), has a dual aim, unlike the communicative approach, of both proposing a framework for teaching languages and educating democratic citizens for a democratic society. The first aim, that of teaching languages, is at the service of the second aim. This paper aims to outline the basic principles and methodological processes of the action-oriented approach within the framework of Puren (2004a, 2009b, 2011d, 2013, 2014a, 2014b, 2016, 2017g). It also aims to explain how the action-oriented approach detaches itself from the recent development of the communicative approach, namely task based language teaching. It is argued that while the communicative approach and task based language teaching aim to train learners to communicative with each other, which is mainly an exchange of information, the action-oriented approach moves further and aims to prepare learners to live and work together in a democratic society. Such an aim requires learners to develop the main skills expected from a social actor such as personal autonomy, collective responsibility, group work, information management, negotiation, design and implementation of complex actions since these skills are important for language learners to live and work successfully in their democratic society.

Introduction

The Threshold Level (Van Ek, 1976), when first published by the Council of Europe for adult language learning in Europe, was innovative since it didn't consider the aim of language learning as learning of grammar but rather as a means of communication. In other words, it turned the direction of ELT from a focus on the usage of language to its authentic communicative use, and language teaching profession witnessed the rise of the functional and notional categories in language syllabi. The main aim of the Threshold Level was to prepare the adult learners in Europe to communicative effectively in everyday life as a visitor in a foreign country. Thus successful exchange of information became the criteria of success for the teachers, curriculum and test developers. 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. This paradigm of change was reflected in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) by the adoption of the action-oriented approach explained in its chapter 2 as "the approach adopted here, generally speaking, is an action-oriented one in for as it views users and learners of a language primarily as social agents, i.e. members of society who have tasks (not exclusively language- related) to accomplish in a given set of circumstances, in a specific environment and within a particular field of action" (CEFR, p.9). While CEFR began to view learners as social actors rather than merely communicators, its emphasis on tasks even devoting a chapter (7) to them and their role in language teaching led many researchers, teachers, syllabus designers and curriculum developers to equate the action-oriented approach with what Puren (2004a) called Anglo-Saxon task based language teaching and learning. This might perhaps be natural since CEFR does not make any explanation regarding the relationship or difference between communicative approach and task based language teaching, on the one hand, and the action-oriented approach on the other. The same CEFR, however, indicates a clear paradigm change by viewing language learners as social agents in a multilingual and multicultural society. This issue, however, has been successfully dealt with over the years by Puren (2004a, 2009b, 2011d, 2013, 2014a, 2014b, 2016, 2017g), the issue of how to train social actors rather than mere communicators in the classroom in line with a coherent action-oriented approach. In such a view, language classrooms in the action-oriented approach, should be turned into mini-societies in which language users should be social actors who can live and work together harmoniously, which should be encouraged by mini-projects (which can be real) and real projects of project pedagogy or realistic simulations. Learners' involvement in such projects as social actors will develop their main skills of taking collective responsibility, involving in joint action, developing personal autonomy, information management (what Puren 2008b, 2009c, 2014a calls informational competence), making negotiations, decision taking, critical reasoning (Nunn, Brandt, and Deveci, 2016), respect for others, understanding and tolerance since these skills are important for language learners to live and work successfully in their democratic society. 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.

The theoretical basis of the action-oriented approach

John Dewey is one of the most influential proponents of pragmatism, also known as experimentalism. The word pragmatism comes from the Greek word 'pragma', which means action or work which is related to practicability. "According to pragmatism, the theory and practice of education is based on two main principles,: (i) Education should have a social function, and (ii) Education should provide real-life experience to the child." (Sharma, Devi, Kumari, 2018, p. 1549). The action-oriented approach draws much on Dewey's notion of education conceived as learning by experience or learning by doing. Dewey (1916) argues that

When we experience something we act upon it, we do something with it; then we suffer or undergo the consequences…To 'learn from experience' is to make a backward and forward connection between what we do to things and what we enjoy or suffer from things in consequence. Under such conditions, doing becomes a trying; an experiment with the world to find out what it is like; the undergoing becomes instruction-discovery of the connection of things. (pp. 139-140).

This notion of learning characterized by acting on things or doing something with them (learning from experience) goes beyond a mere transmission of knowledge as in traditional school thinking. Thus Dewey's orientation to learning at school focuses on the need to establish a link between school and society and on learners as social actors who act on things or do something with them in school, which is viewed as a mini-society. One way of achieving this is through projects at schools. Ulrich (2016) argues that "John Dewey and his group advocated projects as a means of "learning by doing" based on student self-interest and a constructivist approach" (p. 55).

In Dewey's thinking, school is also considered as a mini-society for educating democratic citizens. In this perspective, democracy is not viewed just as a form of government but a way of life. Dewey (1916) points out that

a democracy is more than a form of government; it is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience. The extension in space of the number of individuals who participate in an interest so that each has to refer his own action to that of others to give point and direction to his own, is equivalent to the breaking down of those barriers of class, race, and national territory which kept men from perceiving the full import of their activity.(p.87)

In schools as mini-societies, students are involved in such conjoint communicated experience or in cooperative learning experience by acting on things or doing something with them to produce a product and in doing so they also learn how to make cooperation with peers to take and share responsibility, design actions, collect information, share information, work together, make a production, which means developing such a personality which will break all the barriers of class, race and other negative prejudices. Since democracy requires freedom and voluntary choice, Dewey is also against the imposition of problems to learners by the textbooks or methods. He states that

It is indispensable to discriminate between genuine and simulated or mock problems. The following questions may aid in making such discrimination. A) Is there anything but a problem? Does the question naturally suggest itself within some situation or personal experience? Or is it an aloof thing, a problem only for the purpose of conveying instruction in some school topic? B) Is it the pupil's own problem, or is it the teacher's or textbook's problem, made a problem for the pupil only because he cannot get the required work. (Dewey, 1916, p. 155).

The action-oriented approach, basing its theoretical background on this type of learning by doing or learning from experience, thus, goes beyond a single goal of teaching languages but embraces a more ambitious educational goal, that of educating democratic citizens in schools

viewed as mini-societies. This means a contribution to personality development while learning languages. The students freely and voluntarily choose projects they will be involved in and make the necessary search for information and design and implement them cooperatively to give a product. Deveci and Nunn (2018), for example, in their project-based course, state that the students are encouraged "to choose technical topics of general interest such as recycling, solar energy, or mobile technologies. In this way, they gain exposure to a more technical and scientific language. The intrinsic motivation created by their own choice of topics likely provides them with greater engagement in the target language" (p. 31). The endeavor of today's textbooks to impose projects on students must also be approached with caution given the restrictive nature of the textbooks and their directive characters, which hinder freedom and voluntary choice on the parts of the students. In this regard, Puren (2009b, 2011d, 2013), mostly, draws attention to the restrictive nature of textbooks in the implementation of the action-oriented approach in the form of project pedagogy.

It is important to note that the Council of Europe has recently broadened the goals of language learning and teaching to include not only developing successful communicators as aimed by the communicative approach but also developing autonomous learners who know how to learn and thus have the ability to take charge of their own learning, developing social actors who can do things in society and developing personality (identity) in terms of both cognitive and affective dimensions in such a way as to develop persons who can effectively carry out responsibilities towards other individuals and society in general. The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) thus goes beyond developing communicative competence in students and includes general competences as a goal which includes declarative knowledge, skills and know-how, existential competence and ability to learn. The Council for Cultural Cooperation of the Council of Europe (1992) also developed a project: Language learning for European citizenship. This is reflected in CEFR as it puts it in this way: "The Council also supports methods of learning and teaching which help young people and indeed older learners to build up the attitudes, knowledge and skills they need to become more independent in thought and action, and also more responsible and co-operative in relation to other people. In this way, the work contributes to the promotion of democratic citizenship" (in notes for the user, CEFR, 2001).

The other theoretical basis of the action-oriented approach draws on the works of a Belgian physician, psychologist and educator Ovide Decroly. Decroly's thinking is not radically different from that of Dewey's. Decroly indicates the necessity of establishing a link between school and society. For him, there is "an obligation on the schools' part to prepare each child effectively for life as a person, a worker and a citizen" (Dubreucq, 1993, p.2). Decroly's educational view is often associated with the slogan of 'for life through life'. He puts experimentation at the center of education. The learners observe facts not only in the classroom but also outside the classroom by, for example, visiting factories or public institutions, then they make associations between what they observe and what they already know and finally they express their view in the form of a product. Decroly classrooms resemble workshops or laboratories rather than traditional classrooms. Learners are encouraged to work in groups cooperatively and record and keep their studies during their study. Decroly, like Dewey, favors

the project pedagogy and opposes the restrictive nature of textbooks and curriculum and argues for liberating the learners from these elements and gives the learners freedom of choice in terms of the selection of topics they would study. "Curriculum planning was thus transferred to the children themselves. Each one of them suggested the subjects he wanted to deal with and all the proposals were negotiated by the whole group, which then put together as a group project (work plan), for a shorter or longer term (from a few days for the youngest children to one year for the oldest ones) (Dubreucq, 1993, p.13).

Like Dewey, Decroly has a deep commitment to educating democratic citizens and to the personality development of learners. Dubreucq (1993) argues in this respect:

School so conceived is a political microcosm, undergoing problems, crises and conflicts that are overcome, as successfully as possible, through the active co-operation of all the partners. The attribution of individual and collective responsibilities is a matter of practical ethics for which a substantial place should be reserved in the timetable. It should be based on the election of different delegates, the rotation of responsibilities, the rendering of accounts, etc. Real powers for the management of the school should be devolved to students. The political option that this education of the citizen implies is clear: 'Democratic government must be considered as the most appropriate form of state for encouraging evolution and adaptation to progress.' This, therefore, is what governs the life of a Decrolian community. (p. 12)

In Decroly's view, like Dewey's, traditional schooling is much concerned with the transmission of knowledge in classes, where the learners are passive recipients. Tests, accordingly, only measure to what extent the learners get the knowledge transferred to them. Decroly, with his experimental pedagogy which is also based on 'learning by doing', opposes both this methodology and the assessment through tests. One of his major contributions is a 'life journal' in which students gather their works. It is the basis of the most popular form of assessment, namely, a portfolio, which is also adopted by the CEFR as an assessment tool.

The third most influential pedagogue underpinning the theoretical basis of the action-oriented approach is the French educator Celestin Freinet. Like Dewey and Decroly, Freinet also emphasizes the importance of project pedagogy and he was the most influential promoter of project pedagogy in France. Freinet also embarks on establishing a link between school and society. Students are viewed as social actors carrying out projects collectively. For this purpose, he introduced different techniques like inter-school correspondence, the class newspaper, free text, the class library and printing house. Inter-school correspondence with classes abroad is a means of exchange of students' works. "The sending of varied documents (written documents, sound recordings, videos, illustrations, etc.) is done from class to class by all possible means of transmission: by post, fax, etc." Schlemminger (2001, p. 6). Preparing a class newspaper is a technique also adopted by the CEFR (p. 10). "The class newspaper is the place where the cooperative work is published: a selection of corresponding documents, surveys, evaluated questionnaires, etc. will be published there, to be read, the newspaper must be imperatively bilingual." Schlemminger (2001, p. 7). It is then sold to the parents or schoolmates. The free text provides a tool for communication for the students. "The students are encouraged to write when he or she can draw on the richness of class life and its exchanges (correspondence, journal, exit-investigation, etc.)" Schlemminger (2001, p. 8). The class library is formed from useful

documents for the class and also the students' works: "various manuals, dictionaries, leaflets, books, maps, magazines, photos, advertisements, etc." Schlemminger (2001, p. 8). Lastly, students print their works, for example, a magazine prepared by the students, in the printing house. All these techniques allow the students to work cooperatively, to take responsibility, to think and express their views freely, to choose their topics of study voluntarily, to design and implement their own works, to respect one another, to share their products collectively, all of which contribute to their personal development and educate them as democratic citizens.

Communicative Approach and The Action-Oriented Approach

Hymes's (1972) development of the theory of communicative competence as a reaction to Chomsky's (1965) linguistic competence in the field of linguistics turned the attention of the language teaching profession from an emphasis on structural aspects of language to its communicative use. The Council of Europe aimed to develop in students communicative competence, which will enable the learners to move internationally across Europe mainly as a tourist and to communicative with foreigners. For this purpose, The Threshold Level (Van Ek, 1975) was published, which aimed to specify objectives in terms of communicative use, in other words, what the learners should be able to do with the language. It basically aimed to prepare a learner to use English as a visitor or a short term resident in the foreign language environment. The rise of the functional-notional syllabi has been witnessed during this period. The theory of communicative competence along with functional notional syllabi of various types and various ways of defining objectives in terms of communicative language use like the Threshold Level (Van Ek, 1975) led to the development of the communicative approach. Thus, the criterion of success in the communicative approach has been a successful exchange of information (talking with the others), realized through simulations, role plays and other communicative activities.

Because of the political changes and expansion in the European integration process, from 1990s to 2000s, the Council of Europe decided to broaden the aims and objectives making them more complex than the first Threshold Level document and the Threshold Level was republished in 1990 "taking into account the development of the individual as a communicator, learner, social subject and person." (Van Ek, 1990, p.2). The Threshold Level was used as the basis for developing two lower levels, Breakthrough (1990, unpublished) and Waystage (van Ek, Alexander & Fitzpatrick 1980) and one higher level, Vantage (van Ek & Trim, 1996). These developments contributed to the formation of CEFR by the Council of Europe. This time, the Council of Europe attempted to view learners as social actors, who can live and work together in a long term in a multilingual and multicultural society as outlined by CEFR rather than as communicators as a short term visitor in a foreign language society. However, its adoption of tasks to develop these social actors led many curriculum developers to equate the action-oriented approach with what Puren (2004a) called Anglo-Saxon task based language teaching and learning. This is mainly because CEFR does not make any explanation regarding the relationship or difference between the communicative approach and task based language teaching, on the one hand, and the action-oriented approach on the other. As a result, the application of CEFR to various contexts like Turkey resulted in ELT curriculum development processes, which emphasize the communicative approach rather than the action-oriented approach, which is clearly observed in 2013 and 2018 ELT curricula of Turkey. The authors of

the 2013 ELT curriculum of Turkey, for example, while claiming to create a curriculum truly consistent with the CEFR, interpret CEFR's action-oriented approach as the communicative approach:

> The communicative approach to language teaching, which is grounded in this view and has strongly influenced the Turkish approach to English instruction, highlights the forms and lexis of English in real-life contexts in order to create relevance in learners' daily lives. Furthermore, the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), a set of guidelines for language teaching and learning that is widely observed in the European context and beyond, emphasizes the development of communicative competence in foreign languages (CoE, 2001). (Kırkgöz, Çelik, Arıkan, 2016, p. 1202-1203)... (and) The newly developed curriculum, in accordance with the principles of Communicative Language Teaching and the CEFR, gives primacy to spoken language in grades two through four, with the main emphasis on the development of oral-aural skills." (Kırkgöz, Çelik, Arıkan, 2016, p.1207)

As seen in the quote, the 2013 Turkish ELT curriculum, though it claims to be consistent with the CEFR, cannot go beyond the communicative approach, let alone outline the action-oriented approach. Similarly, Zorba and Arıkan (2016), in their "a study of Anatolian high schools' 9th grade English language curriculum in relation to the CEFR" devote one paragraph to the action-oriented approach and characterize its key elements as "communicative language competences, language activities (production, reception, interaction and mediation), domains (public, occupational, educational and vocational), tasks and strategies since these key aspects play a vital role in the development of skills which are essential in language learning" (p.14). This characterization of the action-oriented approach here is also ill-defined since it makes reference to both the communicative approach (with the mention of communicative competence) and task based learning (with the mention of tasks) in defining the action-oriented approach and does not make any distinction among the three approaches or methods. By doing so, it ignores the transition from developing communicators who will use English as visitors in a foreign language to developing social actors who will live and work together, defined by Puren (2002b, 2008e 2014a) as co-action, in a multilingual and multicultural society, a transition indicated by CEFR but reflected coherently at the approach level by Puren (2002b, 2004a, 2008b, 2008e 2009c, 2014a) as the action-oriented approach. Zorba and Arıkan (2016) go on to argue that "Communicative language teaching is one of the key principles of the CEFR" (p. 17) and that "Task-based learning has a significant place in the CEFR. In fact, the action-oriented approach that the CEFR adopted is based on tasks" (p. 18). This time, the authors clearly indicate that the action-oriented approach is task based language learning, which is again a wrong equation as emphasized by Puren (2004).

In the published version of the 2013 Turkish ELT curriculum, however, the statement regarding the approach is "eclectic": "As no single language teaching methodology was seen as flexible enough to meet the needs of learners at various stages and to address a wide range of learning styles, an eclectic means of instructional techniques has been adopted, drawing on an action-oriented approach in order to allow learners to experience English as a means of

communication, rather than focusing on the language as a topic of study." (2013 Turkish ELT curriculum, p. II), a statement aiming to train learners to use English as a means of communication rather than training them as social actors and thus it reflects a view that the action-oriented approach is the communicative approach. A constant flow of ideas going from the communicative approach to task based language teaching and learning, on the one hand, and equation of task based language teaching and learning with the action-oriented approach and also equation of communicative approach and the action-oriented approach on the other hand, leads the English teachers in Turkey to a methodology in the ELT curriculum in which it is very difficult to understand these concepts clearly. It is, therefore, necessary to indicate the differences among the three approaches or methodologies and in fact this is what Puren (2004a, 2009b, 2011d, 2013, 2014a, 2014b, 2016, 2017g) has been doing successfully for many years, which was completely ignored by the authors of the 2013 ELT curriculum of Turkey (Kırkgöz, Çelik, Arıkan, 2016), who do not make a single reference to Puren.

Puren (2014a) states that, "The CEFR announces a new social reference situation - the multilingual and multicultural society - and two new reference actions namely not only communicating with visiting foreigners, but (1) living and (2) working over the long term with people partly or entirely of different languages and cultures, which form the basis of two new didactic orientations." (p.3). Thus the main characteristics of the communicative approach are its adoption of the tourist trip as the social reference situation and of exchange of information as a social reference action. The action-oriented approach, on the other hand, takes as a social reference situation the multilingual and multicultural society as in CEFR and it takes as social reference action living and working with people from different cultures in the long term. In other words, while the communicative approach aims to prepare learners to communicate with foreigners in the short term as a tourist, the action-oriented approach aims the prepare social actors to live and work together in the long term in the multilingual and multicultural society. The communicative approach emphasizes interaction through communication (realized through various communicative activities with a focus on functions and notions) but the action-oriented approach emphasizes what Puren (2002b, 2008e 2014a) calls co-action, which is acting with the other (realized through mini-projects and project pedagogy of Dewey, Decroly and Freinet), defined also by Nunn (2014) as "a holistic and constructivist philosophy of learning" (p.19). Puren (2002e) argues that "This dual co-action-co-cultural perspective is best suited to all collective mechanisms - they have multiplied in recent years and are likely to become more widespread in the coming years - where language is taught/learned for and by action with a social dimension" (p. 10). Thus training social actors who will not only communicate with others but also co-act will necessarily require a different competence along with communicative competence and Puren indicates that informational competence is required for these social actors. The concept of competence is more holistic in this respect as is also indicated by Nunn and Langille (2016). To Puren (2014a, p.10), informational competence refers to the fact that learners are asked to perform operations:

- pre-communicative: define their information needs, search for it, select it, evaluate it and prioritize it; decide to whom, when it will be transmitted and for what purpose,... .;

- and post-communicative: assess the relevance of the information transmitted, the time and the recipient chosen; decide whether to delete the information, or whether to keep it because it could later be useful to oneself or others, and then decide whether to keep it as it is or whether to update it periodically,... This is called "knowledge management", of which a social actor must, in our current societies, have good command."

Thus the classroom in the action-oriented approach is viewed as a mini-society where the students are social actors who not only exchange information as required by the communicative approach in an intercultural environment but also act with each other, which Puren (2002b, 2008e, 2014a) defines as co-action in a co-cultural environment. The social actors, on the other hand, need to rely on their informational competence (Puren, 2008b, 2009c, 2014a), which is the ability to act on and through information as a social actor, while the communicative approach only aims to develop communicative competence in learners. Such a co-actional and co-cultural perspective to language teaching will develop social actors who can live and work together harmoniously in their democratic society. The communicative approach, in so far as it does not go beyond viewing students as language learners whose main aim is to achieve successful communication in the classroom, is also far from adopting the goal of educating democratic citizens.

Puren (2008e) contrasts the action-oriented approach with the communicative approach in the following way:

In the communicative approach, the aim is to train learners to communicate in a foreign language with the native speakers they will certainly have the opportunity to meet, to have them communicate with each other in the classroom as if they were native speakers, each didactic unit being designed in such a way as to ultimately enable the learners to succeed in this simulation.

-If we extend the functioning of this principle of fine-medium homology to the actional perspective (and we do not see for the moment how this principle could be abandoned), we will now train students to act socially in foreign language culture first by making them act socially in foreign language culture in the classroom: as I have already mentioned above, this already has a name in general pedagogy, and it is the "pedagogy of the project". (Puren, 2008e, p.7)

In the communicative approach, it is the unity of place ("In the street", "At the post office", "At the café"), but also behind the unity of characters, time and theme of conversion: in a dialogue of a communicative textbook, they are the same people speaking for a limited time in the same place about the same thing (uniqueness of the theme of conversation).

- In the co-action perspective, it is the unity of action: "Making a poster of your favourite heroes", "Recording a radio show on animals", "Preparing a Christmas show", "Celebrating a birthday at school", "Organizing mini Olympiads at school", to use some titles from a teaching

material for early English teaching, whose different didactic units are also significantly called "projects". (Puren, 2008e, p.13)

While Puren (2014a) contrasts in this way the action-oriented approach and the communicative approach, he states that co-action, working together, will necessarily include communication. Thus the action-oriented approach and the communicative approach are two genetically opposed and complementary methodological organisms (Puren, 2014a).

Puren's (2002b, 2008b, 2008e, 2009c 2014a) contrast of the action-oriented approach and communicative approach can be summarized as in Table 1.

Table 1. The Action-Oriented Approach and The Communicative Approach

The action-oriented approach is based on Dewey's educational notion of pragmatism with reference to socio-cognitive dimension in line with Piaget (constructivist psychology) and Vygotsky (social, collective constructivism), whose implementation is reflected in project pedagogy of Dewey, Freinet, and Decroly.	The communicative approach is based on no sound theory of learning.
The action-oriented approach goes beyond the view of language as a means of communication. It doesn't view communication as an end in itself but as a means of doing something, in other words, communication is at the service of action.	The communicative approach views language as a means of communication.
The goal of language teaching is to train social actors who will live and work together in a multilingual and multicultural society	The goal of language teaching is to train learners to meet the natives of foreign languages on a tourist trip and enable them to be involved in successful interaction.
The goal of language teaching also adopts a more general educational goal, that of educating democratic citizens as promoted by Dewey, Decroly, and Freinet.	The goal of language teaching does not have a broader educational goal beyond communication.
The social situation of reference is a multilingual and multicultural society.	The social situation of reference is the target language society where the learners would take a tourist trip.

The reference activity is action (common action or co-action as in a real project).	The reference activities are simulations, role plays and various communicative activities with an emphasis on speech acts
While the action-oriented approach favors real projects and in cases in which it is not possible to carry out real projects then realistic simulations.	The communicative approach does not give any priority to realistic simulations but it consists of full of artificial simulations as well.
In the co-action perspective, it is the unity of action: "Making a poster of your favourite heroes", "Recording a radio show on animals", "Preparing a Christmas show", "Celebrating a birthday at school", "Organizing mini Olympiads at school", to use some titles from a teaching material for early English teaching, whose different didactic units are also significantly called "projects" (Puren, 2008e, p.13).	In the communicative approach, it is the unity of place ("In the street", "At the post office", "At the café"), but also behind the unity of characters, time and theme of conversion: a dialogue of a communicative textbook, they are the same people speaking for a limited time in the same place about the same thing (uniqueness of the theme of conversation) (Puren, 2008e, p.13).
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).	The communicative approach focuses on individual autonomy by allowing the students to carry out communicative activities themselves but the activities and documents are provided to students by the teacher, in which case the students' autonomy is more restricted.
The action-oriented approach requires a co-cultural component (a culture shared by and for collective action), which is necessary for co-action, in which the focus is on common cultures of action in the multicultural environment (building a common cultural competence in cultural diversity in the sense that getting along with someone requires understanding him/her since just listening to him in communication is not enough) so the matter is not knowing who we are but what we are going to do with who we are, and what to do together both despite and with our differences.	The communicative approach requires intercultural component (the discovery of otherness and the awareness of one's own identity), which is necessary for cross-cultural communication (in a tourist trip).

Competence is both communicative competence and informational competence.	Competence is communicative competence.
In the action-oriented approach, the evaluation criterion is social action: both the process (collective action and individual participation in that collective action) of work (project) and the final product are evaluated.	The communicative approach assesses successful communication.

Task based Language Teaching and Learning and The Action-Oriented Approach

Task based language teaching and learning as originated by Prabhu (1987), which is mostly seen as a development in the communicative approach, embarked on organizing syllabus around tasks rather than functions and notions. Thus functional-notional syllabi, "in which the focus is on the communicative skills that the students will be able to display as a result of instruction" (Nunan, 1988, p. 42) gave its place to task based syllabi in which the content was no longer formed of communicative skills (functions and notions) but rather of methodological units called tasks. The move from the communicative approach to task based language teaching and learning, thus, can be characterized as a move from organizing the syllabus around functions and notions, and practicing speech acts through various activities like simulations and dialogues to organizing syllabus around tasks, and teaching language through tasks that the students will complete in class.

While different task based lesson designs have been suggested in the literature（e. g. Candlin, 1987; Prabhu, 1987; Estaire and Zanon, 1994; Skehan, 1996; Willis, 1996), they share the common feature that a task based lesson is organized in three phases: pre-task, task and post-task phases. Tasks are also defined in various ways. Nunan (1989) defines the task as "a piece of classroom work which involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing or interacting in the target language while their attention is principally focused on meaning rather than on form" (p.10). According to Willis (1996), "a task can be defined as an activity where the target language is used by the learner for a communicative purpose in order to achieve an outcome" (p. 23). Prabhu (1987) defines the task as "an activity which needs learners to come to a conclusion from given information through some process of thought, and which allows teachers to handle and control that process" (p. 24). To Skehan (1998) a task is an activity in which: "(1) meaning is primary; (2) there is some communication problem to solve (3) there is some sort of relationship to comparable real-world activities; (4) task completion has some priority; (5) the assessment of tasks is in terms of outcome." (p. 95) Ellis (2003) defines the task in the following way:

A task is a work plan that requires learners to process language pragmatically in order to achieve an outcome that can be evaluated in terms of whether the correct or appropriate propositional content has been conveyed. To this end, it requires them to give primary attention to meaning and to make use of their own linguistic resources, although the design of the task may predispose them to choose particular forms. A task is intended to result in

language use that bears a resemblance, direct or indirect, to the way language is used in the real world. Like other language activities, a task can engage productive or receptive, and oral or written skills and also various cognitive processes. (p. 16)

While there are various definitions and ways of organization of tasks in task based language teaching and learning, 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.

CEFR (2001) places high importance on tasks and devotes a chapter (chapter 7) to tasks and their role in language teaching. In CEFR (2001)

a task is defined as any purposeful action considered by an individual as necessary in order to achieve a given result in the context of a problem to be solved, an obligation to fulfill or an objective to be achieved. This definition would cover a wide range of actions such as moving a wardrobe, writing a book, obtaining certain conditions in the negotiation of a contract, playing a game of cards, ordering a meal in a restaurant, translating a foreign text or preparing a class newspaper through group work (p. 10)

In CEFR grids, however, speech acts of the communicative approach (e.g. I can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information..CEFR, p.26) can be observed but there are no elements of the action-oriented approach. In doing so, in fact, CEFR cannot reflect successfully, at the approach level, the transition from viewing Europeans as tourists who are involved in an exchange of information in a foreign society to viewing Europeans as social actors who can live and work together harmoniously in a multilingual and multicultural society. This endeavor is undertaken by Puren (2004a, 2006e, 2008e, 2009b, 2011, 2013, 2014a, 2014b, 2016, 2017g), who (2008e, p.4), criticizes CEFR in the following way:

Neither in everyday language (French or Spanish), nor in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), is the distinction I propose here made between action in the sense of "social" or "use" action, and task in the sense of "school" or "apprenticeship" action. Indeed, here is how the new "action perspective" is defined by the authors of the CEFR:

A framework for the learning, teaching and evaluation of modern languages that is transparent, coherent and as comprehensive as possible must be based on a very general overall representation of language use and learning. The perspective favored here is, very generally also, of an action-oriented type in that it considers above all the user and learner of a language as social actors having to perform tasks (which are not only linguistic) in given circumstances and environment, within a particular field of action. If speech acts are carried out in language activities, they are themselves part of actions in a social context that only give them their full meaning. There is a task insofar as the action is carried out by one (or more) subject (s) who strategically mobilize the skills at their disposal in order to achieve a specific result. (CEFR, Chapter 2.1, p. 15)

Puren (2008e), who thus makes a distinction between 'action' as social action (real social activity) to develop social actors and 'task' as school action (simulated school activity) to develop successful communicators, goes on to argue that

We see that the authors of the CEFR do not propose different terms to designate learning action and usage action: they use indistinctly "action", "task" and "activity", undoubtedly under the influence of the communicative approach, whose reference exercise, simulation, aims precisely to neutralize the difference between school activity and social activity; indeed, they ask learners to behave in class as if they were users in society. But once these authors of the CEFR (very healthy, in my opinion, and finally!) establish the difference between user/use and learner/learning, it would have been necessary for them to make a conceptual distinction between the two types of action. I propose for my part "act" and "activity" as generic concepts, "action" for action/use or social activity, and "task" for action/learning or school activity (Puren, 2008e, p.4).

Thus, once the CEFR's distinction between language user/language use and language learner/language learning is recognized, it is also necessary to make a distinction between real social action (language use) and simulated school (or learning) action (language learning), namely, action and task, in the former students are viewed as social actors, in the latter students are viewed as language learners. In this way, Puren (2004a) clearly indicates the distinction between task and action by defining the task as "what the learner does in his/her learning process" and defining action as "what the user does in society" (p. 18). In short, the training of social actors should be made by means of real social actions since with the action-oriented approach "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 b, P. 125).

One way of realizing this move from task to action in language teaching is through project pedagogy as implemented by Dewey, Decroly and Freinet. As Puren (2008e) argues "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). At a practical level, an analysis of how a holistic project pedagogy was carried out in a local context at freshman university level has been described by Wyatt and Nunn (2019).

Implementing the action-oriented approach in the classroom, thus, necessitates a move from task to mini-projects and, in its strongest form, the real projects of project pedagogy, which are explained coherently by Puren (2006) in a grid, which indicates the departure from task based language teaching to the action-oriented approach in the following way:

Table 2. 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**)	Strongest Version (project pedagogy) (**real projects**)

Puren's (2006) analysis grid explains in full detail the different characteristics of communicative tasks, action tasks, mini-projects and projects of project pedagogy, among which the projects of project pedagogy reflect the real characteristics of the action-oriented approach. That is why they are considered as the strongest form of the application of the action-oriented approach. Puren (2009b, p. 126) argues that "in this type of pedagogy, all students activities are organized according to "pedagogical projects" which have a real (and not simulated) dimension and which they design and conduct themselves with the help of the teacher" and that pedagogical projects should not be "a simple pretext to propose situations of simulated communication ensuring the final reuse more or less free of its contents" (Puren, 2009b, p. 127). In cases where it is difficult to implement real projects which are real social actions, simulated projects can also be used but these simulated projects must be realistic rather than artificial as mostly the case in the communicative approach and task based language learning, that is, they must reflect social action as realistically as possible. In this regard, Puren (2009b) indicates that "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). Since the projects of project pedagogy require maximum individual and collective autonomy by the students, the essential point is to allow the students to choose, design and implement their own projects collectively under the guidance of the teacher rather than imposing on them projects designed by the authors of the textbooks. Whether the students will carry out these projects in the class or outside the class is a secondary issue, in which case Puren (2004a, p. 19) argues that "a project can thus be entirely carried out in class for the class, as well as in the preparation by a small group of a civilization dossier then presented in large format group; be fully simulated, as in global simulations professional training carried out in class; be carried out entirely in class but for the external company, as in the preparation in class of an exhibition, which is then presented in the hall of the town hall of the city; or combine these three types differently."

Finally, Puren (2006) indicates striking differences between task based language learning and the action-oriented approach, some of which are:

The tasks are predetermined by the teacher /textbook, actions are chosen and designed by the learners (with the help and under the teacher's own control) at the beginning of the project. Learners plan and organize their own work. Projects are not limited by the time frame of the

didactic unit or sequence, nor are they guided upstream by predetermined language objectives. They are negotiated with the teacher, who integrates the language objectives into his or her own criteria. While tasks are done in simulation, the actions are real: inter-school correspondence, class newspaper ('printed on the classroom print shop, and distributed outside), lectures, debates, exhibitions, files, leaflets,...While (in task based language learning) we are aiming only at a language objective: communicative competence, (in the action-oriented approach) we also aim to achieve an educational goal: the formation of a true citizen who is an autonomous and supportive social actor, critical and responsible, within a democratic society. This citizen must now be able to live harmoniously and act effectively in a multilingual and multicultural society. While (in task based learning) priority is given to inter-individual interactions: the reference group is the group of two, (in the action-oriented approach) reference groups (or major group) are "project groups", where all decisions are made and activities concerning the project(s) are carried out. The organization into groups and sub-groups is instituted in the classroom according to the types of activities: production workshop teams, working groups. The "large group" dimension is instituted in the "council", a place for mediation and collective bargaining. While (in task based learning) the evaluation criteria are communicative (e. g. in the CEFR: linguistic, sociolinguistic, pragmatic), (in the action-oriented approach) the specific evaluation criteria for social action are added as priorities: the success of the action and the "professional" quality of the production. (p. 1-4)

Conclusion

With the recent changes in political, social and economic domains in the European integration process from 1970s to 2000s, the Council of Europe also embarked on a transition in language teaching methodology, which is reflected in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, a transition from a view in which students are language learners aiming to achieve successful communication to a view in which they are social actors who can live and work together harmoniously in a multilingual and multicultural society, a transition from a communicative approach to an action-oriented approach. While CEFR turned its target to training social actors, its grids of communicative skills suggest that CEFR is still under the influence of the communicative approach. The question at this point is whether communicative activities and tasks whose primary focus is on communicative meaning in the exchange of information can really train social actors who can live and work together in a multilingual and multicultural society. This issue has been successfully undertaken over the years by Puren (2004a, 2009b, 2011d, 2013, 2014a, 2014b, 2016, 2017g), the issue of how to train social actors rather than mere communicators in the classroom in line with a coherent action-oriented approach. Puren, developing the action-oriented approach introduced in CEFR, puts forward the idea of co-action (moving from talking with others to acting with others) instead of interaction and suggests implementing the action-oriented approach in the classroom in the strong form as mini-projects and in its strongest form as real projects of project pedagogy.

References

Candlin, C. (1987). Towards Task-based Language Teaching. In Candlin, C. and Murphy, D. (eds.): *Lancaster Practical Papers in English Language Education*; Vo. 7. Language Learning Tasks. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey Prentice Hall, 5-22.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Council for Cultural Co-operation (1992). *Language learning teaching methodology for citizenship in a multicultural Europe: a report of symposium held in Sintra, Portugal 7-11 November 1989*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

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

Deveci, T. and Nunn, R. (2018.). COMM151: A Project-Based Course to Enhance Engineering Students' Communication Skills. *Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes, 6*(1), 26-42.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to Philosophy of Education.* Macmillian Company. New York. USA.

Dubreucq, F. (1993). Jean-Ovide Declory. *Prospects: the quarterly review of comparative education (Paris, UNESCO: International Bureau of Education)*, 23 (1/2), 249–75.

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

Estaire, S. and J. Zanon. (1994). *Planning Classwork: A Task Based Approach*. Oxford: Heinemann.

Hymes, D. (1972). On Communicative Competence. in Pride, J. B. And J. Holmes (eds): *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin: 269-93.

Kırkgöz, Y., Çelik, S., Arıkan, A. (2016). Education Journal Laying the Theoretical and Practical Foundations for a New Elementary English Curriculum in Turkey: A Procedural Analysis. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, *24*(3), 1199-1212.

Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı ̧ (MEB) [Turkish Ministry of National Education]. (2013). İlköğretim Kurumları (İlkokullar ve Ortaokullar) İngilizce Dersi (2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 ve 8. Sınıflar) Öğretim Programı [Elementary (Primary and Lower Secondary) English Language Teaching Program (Grades 2-8)]. Ankara: T.C. Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı.

Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı ̧ (MEB) [Turkish Ministry of National Education]. (2018). İngilizce Dersi Öğretim Programı (İlkokul ve Ortaokul 2,3,4,5,6,7 ve 8. Sınıflar) [English Language

Teaching Program (Primary and Secondary Schools Grades 2,3,4,5,6,7 and 8)]. Ankara: T.C. Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı.

Nunan, D. (1988). *Syllabus Design.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Nunn. R. (2014). Holistic Learning, First-Person Voice and Developing Academic Competence. *Asian EFL Journal, Professional Teaching Articles*,74, 19-32.

Nunn, R. & J. Langille (2016). Operationalizing aGlobal and Holistic Characterization of Competence in a Local Context. In *Current trends in language testing in the Pacific Rim and the Middle East: Policies,analysis, and diagnosis*. A. Aryadoust & J. Fox (Eds.) CambridgeScholars, UK (pp. 300-314). ISBN 978-1-4438-8261-3.

Nunn, R. Brandt. C. & Deveci, T. (2016). Project-Based Learning as a Holistic LearningFramework: Integrating 10 Principles of Critical Reasoning and Argumentation. *Asian ESP Journal, 12* (2) *Special Issue:* Sun Ya and Haiying Feng Eds), 9-53.

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

Puren, C. (2002b). Perspectives actionnelles et perspectives culturelles en didactique des langues-cultures : vers une perspective co-actionnelle co-culturelle. Retrieved from (13 March 2019) https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2002b/.

Puren, C. (2004a). De l'approche par les tâches à la perspective co-actionnelle. Retrieved from (13 March 2019) https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2004a/.

Puren, C. (2006). Grille d'analyse des différents types actuels de mise en œuvre de l'agir dans les manuels de langue. retrieved from (14 March 2019) https://www.christianpuren.com/biblioth%C3%A8que-de-travail/050/.

Puren, C. (2008b). La perspective de l'agir social sur les contenus de connaissance en classe de langue : de la compétence communicative à la compétence informationnelle. Retrieved from (15 March 2019) https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2008b/

Puren, C. (2008e). De l'approche communicative à la perspective actionnelle, et de l'interculturel au co-culturel. Retrieved from (15 March 2019) https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2008e/

Puren, C. (2009b). 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 (15 March 2019) https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2009g/.

Puren, C. (2009c). Les implications de la perspective de l'agir social sur la gestion des connaissances en classe de langue-culture : de la compétence communicative à la compétence informationnelle. Retrieved from (16 March 2019) https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2009c/.

Puren, C. (2011d). Mise en oeuvre de la perspectıve actionnelle : analyse comparative de la « tâche finale » dans deux manuels de fle, *latitudes 2* (2009) & *version originale 1* (2009) retrieved from (16 March 2019) http://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux-liste-et-liens/2011d/.

Puren, C. (2013). Le passage du paradigme de la communicatıon au paradigme de l'action, et ses implications dans la mise en oeuvre pratique de la perspective actionnelle. Retrieved from (12 March 2019) https://www.christianpuren.com/2013/04/22/conf%C3%A9rence-le-passage-du-paradigme-de-la-communication-au-paradigme-de-l-action/.

Puren, C. (2014a). Approche communicative et perspective actionnelle, deux organismes méthodologiques génétiquement opposés… et complémentaires. Retrieved from (17 March 2018) https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2014a/.

Puren, C. (2014b). La pédagogıe de projet dans la mıse en œuvre de la perspectıve actıonnelle. Retrieved from (16 March 2019) https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2014b/.

Puren, C. (2016). Grille d'analyse des différents types actuels de mise en oeuvre de l'agir dans les manuels de FLE. Retrieved from https://www.christianpuren.com/biblioth%C3%A8que-de-travail/050/.

Puren, C. (2017g). "L'enseignement-apprentissage des langues vivantes étrangères : entre apprentis-sage scolaire et usage social".retrieved from https://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2017g/.

Schlemminger, G. (2001). La pédagogie Freinet en classe de langue vivante. 2e édition, revue et augmentée, Nantes, ICEM – Pédagogie Freinet. Retrieved from (19 March 2019) https://www.aplv-languesmodernes.org/spip.php?article2080.

Sharma, S., Devi, R. , Kumari, J. (2018). Pragmatism in Education. *International Journal of Engineering Technology Science and Research*, 5(1), 1549-1554.

Skehan, P. (1996). A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics*, 17, 38–62.

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

Ulrich, C. (2016). John Dewey and the project-based learning: landmarks for nowadays Romanian education. *Journal of Educational Sciences and Psychology*. VI (LXVIII) (1B/2016), 54-60.

Van Ek, J.A. (1976). *The threshold level for modern language learning in schools*. London: Longman.

Van Ek, J.A., Alexander, L.G. and Fitzpatrick, M.A. (1980). *Waystage English.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Van Ek, J.A., and Trim, J.L.M. (1991). *Threshold Level 1990.* Revised and corrected edition. Cambridge: CUP.

Van Ek, J.A., and Trim, J.L.M. (1996). *Vantage Level.* Cambridge: CUP.

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

Wyatt, M. and Nunn, R. (2019). Tracing the Growth of a Community of Practice Centered on Holistic Project-Based Learning in Communication at an Engineering University in the United Arab Emirates: Insights From a Socially-Situated Teacher Cognition Perspective. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research 20* (2), Art 8. *http://dx.doi.org/10.17169/fqs-20.2.3170.*

Zorba M.G., Arıkan A., (2016). A study of Anatolian high schools' 9th grade English language curriculum in relation to the CEFR. *Uşak Üniversitesi Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (2), 13-24.