UDC 81’243:378.147
DOI https://doi.org/10.32782/tps2663-4880/2026.49.18

THE ACTION-ORIENTED APPROACH TO FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING IN HIGHER EDUCATION: A LINGUODIDACTIC ANALYSIS AND A MODEL FOR PRACTICAL LESSON ORGANIZATION

ДІЯЛЬНІСНО-ОРІЄНТОВАНИЙ ПІДХІД ДО ВИКЛАДАННЯ ІНОЗЕМНИХ МОВ У ЗАКЛАДАХ ВИЩОЇ ОСВІТИ: ЛІНГВОДИДАКТИЧНИЙ АНАЛІЗ ТА МОДЕЛЬ ОРГАНІЗАЦІЇ ПРАКТИЧНИХ ЗАНЯТЬ

Makarchuk O.M.,
orcid.org/0000-0002-5423-4377
Doctor of Medicine,
Professor at the Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology of Postgraduate Education
Ivano-Frankivsk National Medical University

Kosylo N.V.,
orcid.org/0000-0002-2788-6775
Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor at the Department of Linguistics
Ivano-Frankivsk National Medical University

Lashkiv T.V.,
orcid.org/0009-0004-7434-9464
Senior Lecturer at the Department of Linguistics
Ivano-Frankivsk National Medical University

Bohovych O.M.,
orcid.org/0000-0002-2602-2334
Senior Lecturer at the Department of Linguistics
Ivano-Frankivsk National Medical University

The article examines the action-oriented approach in higher education foreign language teaching, rooted in the CEFR’s conceptualization of learners as social agents who mobilize linguistic and other competences to accomplish meaningful tasks in academic, professional, social and intercultural contexts. It stresses that language activities – reading, listening, speaking, writing, interaction and mediation – function as resources for purposeful action rather than isolated objectives. Drawing on the CEFR and its Companion Volume, the study highlights learner agency, collaboration, plurilingualism, pluriculturalism and online interaction, while distinguishing the action-oriented perspective from communicative language teaching and task-based language teaching: the latter focus on meaningful communication and tasks, yet the former places the learner’s social action more explicitly at the centre, asking not only whether learners can communicate but what they can accomplish through communication.

Results show that the action-oriented character of a lesson arises from the functional relationship between activities and a final meaningful objective, not from isolated communicative exercises. A key distinction is drawn between a topic (e.g., employment, medicine) and an action-oriented objective (e.g., finding a suitable job, conducting a patient consultation). Receptive, productive, interactive and mediation activities are integrated according to the requirements of realistic social or professional situations. Linguistic conceptualisation and systematisation prepare learners for purposeful use rather than serving as ends in themselves.

The study proposes an eight-stage flexible sequence: anticipation and prediction; global comprehension; detailed comprehension and identification; linguistic conceptualisation; systematisation and controlled practice; collaborative action-oriented task; independent purposeful action and observable outcome; reflection and assessment. This model is transferable to ESL/EFL and ESP contexts (medical English, business English, public health). It also supports intercultural awareness and mediation. The article concludes that the approach offers a coherent methodological framework for higher education, connecting language learning with authentic action.

Key words: foreign language teaching, action-oriented approach, activity-oriented approach, action-oriented scenario, TBLT, linguodidactics, communicative competence, mediation, FLE, ESL/EFL, ESP.

Стаття досліджує діяльнісно-орієнтований підхід у викладанні іноземних мов у вищій освіті, який ґрунтується на концепції Загальноєвропейських рекомендацій з мовної освіти (CEFR), згідно з якою здобувачі освіти розглядаються як соціальні агенти, що мобілізують мовні та інші компетентності для виконання значущих завдань в академічних, професійних, соціальних та міжкультурних контекстах. Підкреслюється, що мовленнєва діяльність – читання, аудіювання, говоріння, письмо, взаємодія та медіація – слугує ресурсами для цілеспрямованої дії, а не ізольованими навчальними цілями. Дослідження акцентує увагу на агентності здобувача освіти, співпраці, багатомовності, полікультурності та онлайн-взаємодії, водночас відрізняючи діяльнісно-орієнтований підхід від комунікативного навчання мови та навчання на основі завдань: останні зосереджуються на значущому спілкуванні та завданнях, проте

діяльнісно-орієнтований підхід більш чітко ставить соціальну дію в центр уваги, запитуючи не лише про те, чи можуть здобувачі спілкуватися, а й про те, що вони можуть досягти за допомогою спілкування.

Результати показують, що діяльнісно-орієнтований характер заняття виникає з функціонального взаємозв'язку між видами діяльності та кінцевою значущою метою, а не з ізольованих комунікативних вправ. Важливе розрізнення проводиться між темою (наприклад, працевлаштування, медицина) та діяльнісно-орієнтованою метою (наприклад, знайти підходящу роботу, провести консультацію пацієнта). Рецептивні, продуктивні, інтерактивні види діяльності та медіація інтегруються відповідно до вимог реалістичних соціальних або професійних ситуацій. Мовна концептуалізація та систематизація готують здобувачів до цілеспрямованого використання, а не виступають самоціллю.

Дослідження пропонує гнучку восьмиетапну послідовність: передбачення та прогнозування; глобальне розуміння; детальне розуміння та ідентифікація; мовна концептуалізація; систематизація та контрольована практика; спільне діяльнісно-орієнтоване завдання; самостійна цілеспрямована дія та спостережуваний результат; рефлексія та оцінювання. Ця модель може бути адаптована до контекстів ESL/EFL та ESP (медична англійська, ділова англійська, охорона здоров'я). Вона також сприяє розвитку міжкультурної свідомості та медіації. У висновках стверджується, що підхід пропонує цілісну методологічну основу для вищої освіти, поєднуючи вивчення мови з діяльністю.

Ключові слова: викладання іноземних мов, діяльнісно-орієнтований підхід, діяльнісно-орієнтований сценарій, навчання мови на основі завдань, лінгводидактика, комунікативна компетенція, медіація, французька мова як друга/іноземна, англійська мова як друга/іноземна, англійська мова за професійним спрямуванням.

Introduction. Foreign language education in higher education is increasingly expected to prepare learners for communication in academic, professional, social, and intercultural environments. In these environments, language is rarely used for the purpose of producing linguistic forms alone. People use language to obtain and exchange information, solve problems, make decisions, cooperate with others, negotiate, create documents, participate in professional activities, and accomplish socially meaningful goals. Consequently, reading, listening, speaking, writing, interaction, and mediation can be understood as resources for purposeful action rather than as isolated learning objectives.

This understanding of language use is central to the action-oriented approach associated with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). The CEFR conceptualizes language users and learners primarily members of society who have tasks to accomplish under particular conditions and within particular domains. Language activities are therefore embedded in wider social contexts, while learners mobilize their competences strategically to achieve particular results [1, p. 9–13]. The CEFR Companion Volume further develops this perspective. It emphasizes the situated and integrated nature of language learning and language use and gives greater prominence to learner agency, interaction, mediation, plurilingualism, pluriculturalism, and online interaction [2, p. 29–31; 3, p. 1–29]. From this perspective, learners are not merely recipients of linguistic knowledge but active participants who use language to create and mediate meaning, often collaboratively.

The action-oriented perspective, while sharing these principles, places particular emphasis on learners as social agents, purposeful and collaborative action, and the relationship between classroom activity and social action beyond the classroom.

Theoretical Background and Analysis of Recent Research and Publications. The theoretical foundation of the present study is the action-oriented perspective of the CEFR. The CEFR describes language users and learners as social agents who perform tasks using their available competences in particular contexts, under particular conditions and constraints [1 p. 157–167]. This conceptualization has important implications for foreign language pedagogy. If learners are viewed as social agents, classroom activities should provide opportunities for them to make decisions, interact with others, solve problems, negotiate meaning, and use language for recognizable purposes. The Council of Europe further distinguishes receptive, productive, interactive, and mediation activities. These activities frequently occur in combination rather than separately in actual communication [2, p. 47–121].

The action-oriented approach is related to communicative language teaching and task-based language teaching (TBLT), but it should not be regarded as identical to either of them. All three perspectives challenge approaches in which linguistic forms are practised without meaningful communicative purposes. However, the action-oriented approach places the learner's social action more explicitly at the centre of the learning process [2, p. 29–31]. In communicative language teaching, the ability to communicate meaningfully and appropriately is a major objective. In TBLT, learners use language while accomplishing tasks that have a communicative purpose [4, p. 1–36]. In the action-oriented approach, however, communication is considered within a broader social action. The question is not only "Can learners communicate?" but also "What can learners accomplish through communication?" For example, "employment" represents a topic, whereas "finding a suitable job" represents an action-oriented objective. The latter may require learners to interpret job advertisements, identify relevant qualifications, compare opportunities, prepare application documents, participate in an interview, negotiate alternatives, and make

a decision. Thus, the distinction between a topic and an action-oriented objective is important for lesson design. A topic provides a field of vocabulary and content; an action-oriented objective provides a reason for mobilizing that vocabulary and content.

In the French language-teaching tradition, the concept of the "*scenario d'apprentissage-action*" has been associated particularly with the work of Claire Bourguignon. An action-oriented scenario organizes learning activities around a meaningful social action and a final objective rather than around a linguistic topic alone [5 p. 1–16]. This perspective is also compatible with the broader CEFR understanding of action-oriented learning as involving purposeful, collaborative tasks.

Language educator and testing researcher Brian North emphasizes three particularly important dimensions of the action-oriented approach: affordances, agency, and collaborative tasks [6, p. 10–13]. From this perspective, learners do not simply reproduce predetermined linguistic forms. They use available resources, make strategic choices, and collaborate with others in order to achieve an intended result. The concept of learner agency is therefore central. Agency refers to the learner's capacity to act purposefully and to take responsibility for decisions within a learning or communicative situation. An action-oriented lesson should consequently create conditions in which learners can exercise such agency rather than merely respond to teacher-controlled questions.

The importance of activity-oriented approaches has also been discussed in Ukrainian foreign language education research. Ukrainian scholars Alla Zasluzhena, Alla Sabitova, and Viktoria Donchenko examine the action-oriented approach in higher education and draw attention to the need to clarify its interpretation and implementation [7, p. 11–16]. Researchers Inna Obikhod, Nataliia Zakordonets, and Olha Plavutska analyse the communicative-activity approach and emphasize active learner participation and communication-oriented learning [8, p. 104–113]. Researcher Vita Fylypska focuses specifically on activity-oriented technologies of foreign language teaching in higher education and clarifies such concepts as the activity-oriented approach, activity-oriented method, and activity-oriented learning technology [9, p. 1536–1547]. University teachers and researchers Olena Mudra and Tetiana Koropatnitska examine activity-oriented foreign language education in Germany and Ukraine from organizational and methodological perspectives [10, p. 37–44].

Recent international research confirms the relevance of action-oriented principles to higher education. Academic researchers and educators from Lithuania Evelina Jaleniauskiene and Dalia Venckiene, in a scoping review of project-based language learning in higher education, identify substantial conceptual alignment between project-based language learning and the action-oriented approach and emphasize authentic learning environments, student choice, reflection, collaboration, and publicly oriented outcomes [11].

Problem statement. Despite this body of research, an important methodological issue remains insufficiently specified: how exactly can an action-oriented perspective organize the internal structure and sequencing of a practical foreign language lesson? In particular, there is a need to clarify the relationship between comprehension activities, linguistic work, communicative practice, collaborative tasks, and the final purposeful action. A further issue concerns the methodological transfer of principles identified in FLE materials to English-language and professionally oriented contexts.

The present study addresses this issue through a linguodidactic analysis of selected materials from "Tendances. Méthode de français" [12, 13]. The textbook is treated not as the object of evaluation in itself but as a case through which the organization of action-oriented learning sequences can be examined and generalized.

For the purposes of this study, an action-oriented scenario is defined as a structured sequence of interconnected learning activities organized around a meaningful social, communicative, academic, or professional objective and leading towards an observable outcome.

The scenario normally includes:

1) a recognizable situation or context;
2) a meaningful objective or mission;
3) linguistic and non-linguistic resources required for action;
4) a sequence of interconnected tasks;
5) opportunities for individual and collaborative decision-making;
6) an observable communicative, practical, or social outcome.

An action-oriented scenario should therefore not be reduced to a collection of communicative exercises. Its defining characteristic is the functional relationship between individual activities and the final objective.

In this study, linguistic conceptualization refers to the process through which learners move from identifying linguistic forms in a communicative context to understanding their meaning, function, and conditions of use. Learners may examine examples,

identify patterns, formulate hypotheses, compare forms, and establish the relationship between form and communicative function. Systematization refers to the subsequent organization and consolidation of the identified linguistic material through structured lexical, grammatical, phonetic, or discourse-oriented practice. Such practice is not treated as an independent goal but as preparation for the purposeful use of linguistic resources in the final task. This distinction is important because the action-oriented approach does not eliminate explicit work with language. Rather, linguistic work is functionally connected to the action that learners are expected to perform.

Research Aim and Objectives. The purpose of this study is to examine the implementation of the action-oriented approach in higher education foreign language teaching through a linguodidactic analysis of selected materials from "Tendances. Méthode de français" and to formulate a generalized model for organizing a practical foreign language lesson on the basis of an action-oriented scenario.

To achieve this aim, the following objectives are defined as: to clarify the key concepts underlying the action-oriented approach, including the social agent, action-oriented scenario, task, purposeful action, linguistic conceptualization, and communicative outcome; to identify the principal action-oriented principles represented in the analysed FLE materials; to analyse the organization and sequencing of learning activities within selected action-oriented scenarios; to determine how receptive, productive, interactive, and mediation activities can be functionally integrated within a common communicative objective; to establish the relationship between linguistic preparation and the final action-oriented task; to formulate a generalized model for organizing a practical foreign language lesson that can be adapted to FLE, ESL/EFL, and ESP contexts.

Research Methodology. The study employs a qualitative linguodidactic methodology combining descriptive, comparative, interpretive, and systematic analysis. The methodological framework is grounded in the action-oriented perspective of the CEFR and its Companion Volume, which conceptualize learners as social agents and emphasize purposeful activity, collaboration, interaction, mediation, and the situated nature of language use [1]. The principal research method is a linguodidactic analysis of learning materials. The analysis focuses on the relationship between communicative situations, learning objectives, tasks, linguistic resources, learner interaction, and expected outcomes. The aim is not to evaluate the textbook as a commercial product but to identify methodological principles that can inform practical foreign language lesson organization. The empirical material consists of selected materials from "Tendances. Méthode de français", published by CLE International. The A1 edition was published in 2016 and presents a practical methodology organized around concrete objectives, tasks, projects, real-life situations, and action-oriented scenarios. The method also integrates classroom interaction, comprehension tasks, pair and group work, role-play, and audiovisual materials.

The following analytical dimensions were applied:

Descriptive analysis was used to identify the structure, content, and sequence of learning activities. Comparative analysis served to distinguish activities whose primary function is isolated linguistic practice from activities that contribute directly to the accomplishment of a broader communicative objective. Interpretive analysis was applied to establish how linguistic material is connected with communicative situations and action-oriented objectives. Systematization was used to organize the identified principles into a generalized model of an action-oriented practical lesson. The unit of analysis is therefore the learning sequence organized around a communicative or practical objective, rather than an isolated exercise.

The study is qualitative and exploratory. It does not involve a controlled experimental intervention and does not provide statistical evidence of the effectiveness of the analysed materials or the proposed model. The results should therefore be interpreted as linguodidactic observations and methodological generalizations requiring further empirical valida-

Table

Analytical dimension	Focus of analysis	Action-oriented function
Situation	social, everyday, academic, or professional context	establishes a meaningful context
Objective/Mission	what learners are expected to accomplish	gives purpose to learning
Input	written, oral, audiovisual, or digital material	provides resources for action
Linguistic resources	vocabulary, grammar, discourse, pronunciation	enables task accomplishment
Interaction	individual, pair, group, or whole-class activity	supports collaboration and negotiation
Task sequence	relationship between successive activities	builds towards the final objective
Outcome	product, decision, performance, or communicative result	demonstrates purposeful action
Reflection	evaluation and self-assessment	supports learner agency

tion. The FLE materials are treated as a case study. Their application to ESL/EFL and ESP is presented as a methodological extension of the identified principles rather than as an independently tested empirical finding.

Presentation of the main research. The analysis demonstrates that the action-oriented scenario can serve as a central organizing principle for a practical foreign language lesson. In "Tendances", learning is associated with concrete situations and objectives, and linguistic material is introduced in connection with situations in which learners may need to use the language. The A1 materials explicitly present a practical orientation: learners work towards goals, accomplish tasks, and participate in projects within situations related to everyday life. Bibliographic descriptions of the A1 edition likewise characterize the method as practical and organized around objectives, tasks, projects, and action-oriented scenarios. This organization creates a functional relationship between language input and language use. Vocabulary and grammar are not presented as ends in themselves but as resources that learners need in order to participate in the situation and accomplish the associated objective. For example, an action-oriented scenario related to welcoming friends may require learners to invite someone, accept or refuse an invitation, welcome guests, organize a celebration, maintain a conversation, and discuss a special occasion. These activities constitute a coherent social situation rather than a list of unrelated speaking exercises.

The central analytical finding can therefore be formulated as follows: the action-oriented character of a lesson is determined not by the presence of individual communicative activities but by the functional relationship between those activities and a meaningful final objective. This distinction is important for higher education because practical language courses often contain many speaking, reading, writing, and grammar exercises without necessarily establishing a coherent relationship between them.

One of the most important distinctions emerging from the analysis is the difference between a topic and an action-oriented objective. A topic identifies the general content area of a lesson: employment, travelling, health, education, professional communication. An action-oriented objective specifies what learners are expected to accomplish: find a suitable job, plan a journey, solve a travel problem, prepare for a professional consultation, negotiate a decision, create a document for a particular audience. This distinction is particularly relevant to English for Specific Purposes. «Medicine» is a topic, while «conduct a patient's consultation», «explain a medical procedure in accessible language», or «present a patient case to a colleague» represents an action-oriented objective. The latter formulation immediately determines what linguistic and communicative resources learners need.

The action-oriented perspective provides a rationale for integrating receptive, productive, interactive, and mediation activities. A realistic professional or social situation rarely requires only one language activity. A person may need to read information, listen to another participant, ask questions, explain information, negotiate a decision, and produce a written document within the same communicative event. The analysed materials demonstrate this principle through scenarios related to everyday and professional life. Consider a job-search scenario. Learners may read job advertisements and application information; listen to an employer or adviser; speak about qualifications, experience, and motivation; write a CV, application form, or cover letter; interact with peers during decision-making; mediate information by explaining or reformulating relevant information for another participant. These activities should not be treated as independent exercises. Their relationship is functional: learners read because they need information, listen because they need to respond, speak because they need to explain or negotiate, and write because they need to produce a concrete outcome. The CEFR Companion Volume explicitly recognizes receptive, productive, interactive, and mediation activities as dimensions of language use, often occurring in combination [2]. Mediation involves activities such as facilitating understanding, conveying information, and collaboratively constructing meaning. This makes mediation particularly relevant to action-oriented lesson design. For example, a learner may read a complex professional document and then explain its essential information to a colleague, or listen to a patient's concerns and reformulate them for another healthcare professional.

Although the empirical material analysed in this study concerns French as a Foreign Language, the underlying linguodidactic principles are not inherently language-specific. For example, an English-language «Finding a Job» scenario could require students to analyse English-language job advertisements, identify required qualifications, compare several positions, prepare a CV and cover letter, participate in a simulated interview, and select the most appropriate employment opportunity. A travel scenario could require students to compare accommodation and transport options, negotiate an itinerary within a limited budget, make a reservation, respond to an unexpected problem, and present their final travel plan. The same principles can be applied

even more directly in ESP. In medical English, for example, an action-oriented scenario could be organized around the objective to prepare for and conduct a doctor-patient consultation. The sequence could include:

1) analysing a short patient case;
2) identifying relevant medical terminology;
3) reading a patient's history;
4) listening to a model consultation;
5) identifying appropriate questions;
6) practising explanations of symptoms and procedures;
7) conducting a simulated consultation;
8) responding to unexpected patient questions;
9) explaining medical information in accessible language;
10) producing a short, written consultation record or patient-information document.

Here, medical vocabulary and grammar are not separate objectives. They are resources required for successful professional action. A similar structure can be used in business English. Thus, the language changes, the professional content changes, and the level of complexity changes, but the underlying pedagogical logic remains: situation -→ objective → resources → interaction task sequence outcome → reflection.

The analysis suggests that an action-oriented practical lesson can be represented as the following progression:



Anticipation and prediction

The lesson begins with a meaningful situation, document, audio recording, video, image, website, advertisement, email, form, or other input. Learners use contextual clues to predict where the situation takes place; who the participants are; what they may be doing; what the communicative purpose may be; what problem or objective may be involved. Prediction should not be treated merely as a warm-up activity. It prepares learners cognitively and communicatively for the situation. For example, before watching a short professional video, students may examine a screenshot and answer:

– Where does the interaction take place?
– Who are the participants?
– What is their professional relationship?
– What problem might they be discussing?
– What language might be necessary in this situation?

Such activities activate prior knowledge and create hypotheses that learners can subsequently confirm or revise.

2. Global comprehension

Learners then encounter the principal document or interaction and focus on its overall meaning. At this stage, attention is directed towards participants, setting, topic, communicative purpose, main problem, and overall message. Possible activities include identifying the correct situation; selecting an appropriate summary; answering general comprehension questions; identifying the participants; matching speakers with statements; arranging events in chronological order. The purpose of this stage is to establish global understanding before learners focus on linguistic details.

3. Detailed comprehension and identification

The next stage involves closer examination of the input. Learners identify relevant vocabulary, grammatical structures, discourse patterns, functional expressions, pragmatic features, and information required for the final task. At this stage, learners may classify expressions, compare examples, identify patterns, or extract information from the document.

4. Linguistic conceptualization

Learners are then guided towards explicit understanding of the linguistic material. Instead of receiving every rule through direct teacher explanation, learners may compare examples, formulate hypotheses, identify patterns, explain differences, establish relationships between form and meaning, and determine when a particular structure is appropriate. The teacher's role is to facilitate conceptualization and clarify misunderstandings. The crucial question is not only: «What does this form mean?» but also: «Why is this form used here, and how will I use it when performing the final task?»

5. Systematization and controlled practice

The linguistic material is subsequently consolidated through focused practice.

Exercises may include vocabulary matching, sentence completion, transformation, controlled

dialogues, grammatical choice, pronunciation practice, and functional language practice. However, the function of such exercises differs from purely form-oriented instruction. Their purpose is to provide learners with sufficient control and automaticity to mobilize the linguistic resources during the final task. The sequence should therefore gradually move: controlled practice → guided use → freer use → purposeful action.

6. Collaborative action-oriented task

Learners return to the initial situation or a closely related problem. They now have to use the linguistic resources developed during the preceding stages. The task may require them to solve a problem, choose between alternatives, negotiate, reach a decision, prepare a document, conduct an interview, participate in a professional simulation, create a presentation or mediate information for another participant. At this stage, learner agency becomes particularly important. Learners should have some possibility of choosing strategies, information, arguments, or solutions.

7. Independent purposeful action and outcome

The lesson culminates in an observable outcome. The outcome may be tangible (a completed form, a CV, an email, a report, a presentation, a professional document) or communicative (a negotiated decision, an agreed solution, a defended position, a successful interaction, a recommendation). The outcome should correspond to the learners' proficiency level and the linguistic resources available to them.

8. Reflection and assessment

The final stage involves reflection on both the outcome and the learning process. Learners may consider:

– What did I accomplish?
– Which language resources did I use?
– What was difficult?
– How effectively did I collaborate?
– Could I perform the same action in a real-life situation?
– What do I need to improve?

Self-assessment and peer assessment can support learner agency and make the relationship between learning objectives and performance more transparent.

This sequence should not be interpreted as a rigid prescription. The CEFR does not require teachers to follow one fixed lesson procedure. Rather, the model represents a methodological synthesis derived from the analysis conducted in this study. Its principal feature is the functional relationship between stages. Anticipation prepares learners to interpret the situation. Comprehension provides information. Identification makes relevant linguistic and discourse resources visible. Conceptualization establishes understanding of their meaning and use. Systematization consolidates the resources. The action-oriented task provides the reason for mobilizing them. The final outcome demonstrates what learners have been able to accomplish. Reflection closes the cycle and supports learner agency. Consequently, the model can be summarized as: input → understanding → linguistic preparation → interaction → action → outcome reflection. The significance of this organization lies in the fact that linguistic instruction is not separated from communicative action. Grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and discourse are incorporated into a broader process of purposeful language use.

Action-oriented learning also provides opportunities for intercultural development. Social actions are shaped by cultural expectations and conventions. Learners therefore need not only linguistic knowledge but also the ability to interpret and respond appropriately to culturally specific patterns of behaviour. For example, learners can analyse similarities and differences in forms of greeting, forms of address, clothing, food, ceremonial practices, or patterns of interaction. Such activities can contribute to the development of intercultural awareness when learners are encouraged to interpret cultural differences and consider appropriate ways of acting in intercultural situations.

Mediation adds another important dimension. It includes activities in which learners facilitate understanding, convey information, and collaborate to construct meaning. Mediation can therefore be integrated naturally into action-oriented scenarios. For example, in a medical English lesson, one student may read a technical medical text and explain its essential information to another student acting as a patient. In a professional meeting, a learner may summarize one participant's position for another participant. In an academic context, students may transform complex information into a presentation for a non-specialist audience. Such activities move beyond the simple transmission of information and require learners to adapt language to the communicative needs of others.

The proposed model has several implications for the organization of practical foreign language classes in higher education. Lesson planning should begin with the intended action or outcome, rather than with a list of grammatical structures. Teachers should identify the linguistic resources learners need to accomplish that action. Learning activities should be sequenced so that each stage contributes functionally to the final objective. Interaction and collaboration should be incorporated whenever they correspond

to the nature of the target action. Mediation should be considered alongside reception, production, and interaction, particularly in academic and professional contexts. Assessment should consider not only linguistic accuracy but also learners' ability to accomplish the intended task.

This approach is particularly relevant to ESP. For medical students, for example, the relevant action may be to conduct a consultation, explain a procedure, present a case, communicate with a colleague, or prepare patient information. For business students, it may involve negotiating with a client or presenting a proposal. For public health students, it may involve analysing health information, explaining a public health intervention, discussing policy options, or preparing an information campaign. In each case, the professional situation determines the linguistic resources and communicative activities required.

Conclusions. The study has demonstrated that the action-oriented approach can provide a coherent linguodidactic framework for organizing practical foreign language lessons in higher education. Its principal methodological value lies in connecting language learning with purposeful action and in treating learners as active participants who mobilize linguistic and other competences to accomplish meaningful tasks.

The linguodidactic analysis of selected materials from "Tendances. Méthode de français" shows that the action-oriented character of learning does not depend on the presence of isolated communicative exercises. Rather, it emerges from the functional integration of learning activities within a sequence directed towards a meaningful objective and an observable outcome. The analysis has identified several interrelated characteristics of an action-oriented practical lesson. First, learning is organized around a recognizable social, communicative, academic, or professional situation. Second, the lesson has a clearly defined objective or mission. Third, receptive, productive, interactive, and mediation activities can be integrated according to the requirements of the task. Fourth, vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, and discourse resources are introduced and practised because learners need them to accomplish the intended action. Fifth, learners are given opportunities to collaborate, make decisions, negotiate meaning, and assume responsibility for the outcome. Finally, the learning sequence culminates in a communicative, practical, or social result followed by reflection.

The analysis also makes it possible to distinguish a topic from an action-oriented objective. A topic identifies the content area of a lesson, whereas an action-oriented objective specifies what learners are expected to accomplish. This distinction is particularly important in higher education and ESP, where language learning should be connected with academic and professional practices. On the basis of the analysed materials, an action-oriented practical lesson can be organized as a progression from anticipation and global comprehension through detailed comprehension, linguistic identification and conceptualization, systematization, collaborative task performance, independent purposeful action, outcome, and reflection. This sequence should be understood as a flexible methodological model rather than a rigid teaching procedure.

The identified principles are not limited to French. They can be adapted to any Second/Foreign Language. In English-language teaching, action-oriented scenarios may address employment, travel, academic communication, workplace interaction, problem-solving, digital communication, and professional activities. In ESP, scenarios can be constructed around profession-specific tasks such as medical consultations, business negotiations, academic presentations, or public health communication. The study therefore contributes to foreign language pedagogy by systematizing a set of linguodidactic principles that can be used to organize practical lessons around purposeful action. Its contribution is methodological rather than experimental: the proposed model has been derived from qualitative analysis and has not yet been empirically validated.

Further research should therefore involve the implementation of the proposed model in different higher education contexts and languages, including English and ESP, as well as the development of empirical criteria for evaluating learners' performance in complex communicative and professionally oriented tasks.

REFERENCES:

1. Council of Europe. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2001. 260 p.

2. Council of Europe. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment – Companion Volume. Strasbourg : Council of Europe Publishing, 2020. 280 p.

3. Council of Europe. A Guide to Action-oriented, Plurilingual and Intercultural Education. Strasbourg : Council of Europe Publishing, 2023. 77 p.

4. Ellis R. Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2003. 387 p.

5. Bourguignon C. Apprendre et enseigner les langues dans la perspective actionnelle : le scénario d'apprentissage-action. *Association des Professeurs de Langues Vivantes*. URL: https://www.aplv-languesmodernes.org/spip.php?article865 (Last accessed: 07.09.2026).

6. North B. The CEFR Companion Volume and the Action-oriented Approach. *Italiano LinguaDue*. 2022. Vol. 14, No. 2. P. 1–23. DOI: https://doi.org/10.54103/2037-3597/19566.

7. Заслужена А. А., Сабітова А. П., Донченко В. М. Діяльнісно-орієнтований підхід при вивченні іноземної мови у ЗВО. *Інноваційна педагогіка*. 2023. Вип. 59, т. 1. С. 11–16. DOI: https://doi.org/10.32782/2663-6085/2023/59.1.

8. Обіход І. В., Закордонец Н. І., Плавуцька О. П. Реалізація комунікативно-діяльнісного підходу у сучасній системі навчання іноземної мови. *Наукові записки Тернопільського національного педагогічного університету імені Володимира Гнатюка. Серія: Педагогіка*. 2021. № 2. С. 103–113. DOI: https://doi.org/10.25128/2415-3605.21.2.14.

9. Филипська В. І. Діяльнісно орієнтовані технології навчання іноземних мов у ЗВО. *Вісник науки та освіти*. 2024. № 4 (22). С. 1536–1547. DOI: https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-6165-2024-4(22)-1536-1547.

10. Мудра О. В., Коропатніцька Т. П. Діяльнісно-орієнтоване навчання в Німеччині та Україні: порівняльний аналіз організаційних та методичних аспектів. *Педагогічна інноватика: сучасність та перспективи*. 2024. № 4. С. 37–44. DOI: https://doi.org/10.32782/ped-uzhnu/2024-4-6.

11. Jaleniauskiene E., Venckiene D. Project-Based Learning for Language Education in Higher Education: A Scoping Review. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-Based Learning*. 2025. Vol. 19, No. 1. P. 1–25. DOI: https://doi.org/10.14434/ijpbl.v19i1.35846.

12. Girardet J., Gibbe C., Pécheur J., Parizet M.-L. Tendances A1 : méthode de français. Paris : CLE International, 2016. 160 p.

13. Girardet J., Pécheur J., Gibbe C., Parizet M.-L. Tendances A2 : méthode de français. Paris : CLE International, 2016. 160 p.

Стаття поширюється на умовах ліцензії відкритого доступу CC BY 4.0

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 22.09.2026
Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 06.11.2026
Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 24.11.2026