

## **ANALYSIS GRID OF THE DIFFERENT CURRENT TYPES OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SOCIAL ACTION-ORIENTED APPROACH (SAOA) IN THE TEXTBOOKS OF FRENCH AS FOREIGN LANGUAGE (FFL)**

This document includes:

- the analysis grid;
- comments on the grid;
- a "Summary of the criteria for distinguishing between 'task' and 'mini-project'".

-*French version 3, September 2016*, "Grille d'analyse des différents types actuels de mise en oeuvre de l'agir dans les manuels de FLE", [www.christianpuren.com/bibliothèque-de-travail/050/](http://www.christianpuren.com/bibliothèque-de-travail/050/).

-*English translation February 2023*

### **Documents used for calibration:**

-**Task-based approach (with final communicative task)**: *Alter ego A1*, Paris: Hachette-FLE, 2006. Dossier 9 " Lieux de vie ", Leçon 3 " Cherchons colocataires ", pp. 154-157 and " Carnet de voyage... Une maison dans mon cœur ", pp. 158-159.

### **-Social Action-oriented approach**

- **Weak version**: *Le Nouvel Édito B1*, Paris: Didier, 2012. Unit 1, "Vivre ensemble," Folder 1 "Sous le même toit" pp. 14-21 and "Ateliers, 1. "Rechercher un co-locataire," p. 29.

- **Strong version**: *Version Originale 4 (B2)*, Paris : Éditions Maison des langues, 2012. Unit 5 "Vivre ensemble," pp. 56-65.

These first three documents can be downloaded at [www.christianpuren.com/bibliothèque-de-travail/050/](http://www.christianpuren.com/bibliothèque-de-travail/050/).

-**Project-based pedagogy**: strong version: "Freinet pedagogy. Reference text : Gerald SCHLEMMINGER, *La pédagogie Freinet en classe de langue vivante*. Nantes: ICEM - Pédagogie Freinet, 2nd edition, revised and expanded, 2001, 34 p.,

[www.aplv-languesmodernes.org/spip.php?article2080](http://www.aplv-languesmodernes.org/spip.php?article2080) (last accessed 28 January 2020).

<b>SOCIAL ACTION-ORIENTED APPROACH</b>						
<b>TASK-BASED APPROACH ("communicative task")</b>	↔	<b>Low version: "action task"</b>	↔	<b>Strong version: "mini-project"</b>	↔	<b>PROJECT-BASED PEDAGOGY Strong version: "Pedagogical project"</b>
1. The reference action is the communicative task: it is about managing communication situations through language interactions, the main issue being the exchange of information. The characteristics of this action are those of the tourist trip: the inchoative, the punctual, the perfective and the individual.	The reference action is the social action. The characteristics of this action are, contrary to those of the tourist trip, the repetitive, the lasting, the imperfective and the collective.				← <i>idem</i>	
	The action is of the order of the complex: it is part of the procedure, and can therefore be pre-programmed in a scenario	Action is complex: it is a process, requiring metacognition and feedback ("project management").			← <i>idem</i>	
2. Tasks are predetermined by the teacher/textbook.	→ <i>idem</i>	Learners can choose between different actions/variations of actions proposed (framework allowing choices).	Learners can introduce personalized variants of action.	The actions are chosen and designed by the learners (with the help and under the control of the teacher) at the beginning of the project. Learners plan and organize their own work.		
3. Competencies are defined and worked in terms of language activities (listening, reading, spoken interaction, spoken production, writing), speech acts (acting on the other by language) and language action (pragmatic competence)	→ <i>idem</i>	Competence is defined and worked on primarily as a complex ability to act, requiring in particular the articulation and combination of different language activities.		← <i>idem</i>		
		Other models of competence (those of the communicative approach) are also taken into account.				

4. The reference society is the foreign society (e.g. France for FLE learners).	→ <i>idem</i>	Learners are considered as social actors in their own right, engaged with the teaching in a collective project (teaching-learning).	← <i>idem</i>
		The class-society is considered as a society in its own right: there is a homology between the action/learning situation and the action/use situation.	The homology between class and outside society is instituted in the very organization of the class: Council, presidents and secretaries of session, persons in charge (of the mail, of the library, of a group, of a workshop,...).
5. The tasks are done in simulation.	→ <i>idem</i>	We first consider the possible real actions, then the realistic simulations, then the recourse to the other uses of the language (playful, aesthetic, imaginative,...).	The actions are real: inter-school correspondence, class newspaper ('printed on the printing press of the class, and distributed outside), lectures, debates, exhibitions, folders, leaflets,...
		With regard to the use of L2 in the classroom, priority is given to the convention (L2 as the working language in space and the time of teaching-learning of this language) over simulation.	
6. We only target a language objective: communicative competence.	→ <i>idem</i>	We also aim to achieve an educational goal: the training of a real citizen as a social actor autonomous and supportive, critical and responsible, in a democratic society.	← <i>idem</i>
		This citizen must now be able to live harmoniously and act effectively in a multilingual and multicultural society.	

7. The linguistic objectives of each unit/ didactic sequence are defined first in terms of communication situations and/or in terms of notional-functional content	→ <i>idem</i>	The objectives are defined from the beginning in terms of the social action(s) to be carried out, and/or the expected results of these actions: the unity of the didactic unit or sequence is the unity of action.	The projects are not limited by the time frame of the unit or the teaching sequence, nor are they framed upstream by predetermined language objectives. They are negotiated with the teacher, who integrates the language objectives into his or her own criteria.
		The actions are proposed to the students in a framework that encourages the reuse of the lexical and grammatical objectives of the unit or sequence (e.g., a specific cultural theme for the lexicon, a type of text for grammar).	
8. The cultural objectives are the metacultural (knowledge), and intercultural (usually in the narrow sense of intercultural comparison) components of cultural competence.	→ <i>idem</i>	The privileged cultural component is the co-cultural component: the ability to adopt/adapt a culture of collective action in the classroom / in external societies / professional circles.  All the components of cultural competence are likely to be mobilized	
9. Language and cultural content are entirely predetermined by the teacher/textbook. The task(s) are conceived as opportunities for the reuse of these contents. The variations in language and cultural content worked on are within the chosen theme.	→ <i>idem</i>	The variations in the language and cultural contents worked on are introduced by the variants of action and/or field of action (personal, public, educational, professional), and therefore partly chosen by the learners.	The language and cultural contents are introduced according to the actions, and worked in relation to these actions.
10. Communication is both the goal and the means: model dialogues are used; information management stops when communication is successful.	→ <i>idem</i>	Communication is a means at the service of action: no dialogue or another document model of production. The communicative objective is integrated into the objective of informational competence (i.e. the ability of a social actor to act on and through information), the management of the information integrating post- and pre-communicative activities.	

11. Priority is given to inter-individual interactions: the reference group is the group of two.	The work is done in subgroups of varying sizes.	The reference group is the large group.		The reference groups (or the large group) are "project groups", where all decisions are made and all activities concerning the project(s) are carried out. The organization in groups and subgroups is instituted in the classroom according to the types of activities: production teams, workshops, work groups. The "large group" dimension is instituted in the "Council", a place of mediation and collective negotiation.
	Decisions regarding group activities are made solely within each group.	There is the involvement of the large group in the design of the final joint task		
12. The tasks remain fully managed and operated within each group. The large group eventually serves as the audience during the performance of the simulated scene.	Groups report back to the large group on the results of their work.	The actions of the groups end(s) on a collective dimension (common decision, collective product,...).	The action(s) have a permanent collective dimension (cooperation and/or collaboration).	Individual work is systematically encouraged and facilitated in parallel with group activities: self-correcting lexicon, reading and writing files. This individual dimension is also instituted: personal work plans (based on individual work contracts negotiated with the teacher).
13. All materials are provided to learners.	→ <i>idem</i>	Learners can search and add their own documents.		All documents are researched and selected by the learners themselves. The students' productions are considered as documents in their own right, which can be integrated into the documentation and/or used collectively (the students' free texts are bound in albums available in the "Classroom Library") or individually (a student's work on the text of a letter he or she has received from his or her correspondent).
14. The documents are treated in priority according to the language activity targeted ("support logic").	→ <i>idem</i>	Documents are treated as resources for action ("documentation logic"). All "documentary logics" are likely to be implemented.		← <i>idem</i>
15. The use of L1/ of the L1(s) is avoided.	→ <i>idem</i>	L1 is introduced when it helps to carry out the action (e.g., part of the documentation in L1) or to project it into the learners' society(ies) (e.g., translation into L1 of the final production and dissemination in the learners' country). Language mediation activities are planned.		

<p>16. The evaluation is mainly done on the individual productions of the learners.</p>	<p>The evaluation also takes into account group work, but it focuses on the language production achieved (on the "product" dimension).</p>	<p>The evaluation takes into account not only the work done (the "product" dimension), but also the execution of the work (the "process" dimension).</p>	<p>← <i>idem</i></p>
<p>17. The evaluation criteria are communicative (e.g. in the <i>CEFR</i>: linguistic, sociolinguistic, pragmatic).</p>	<p>→ <i>idem</i></p>	<p>The evaluation criteria specific to social action are added as a priority: the success of the action and the "professional" quality of the production.</p>	<p>← <i>idem</i></p>

***See next page some comments on the grid;***

## COMMENTARY ON THE ANALYSIS GRID 050

This analysis grid proposes a positioning of the current forms of implementation of action in language textbooks on a continuum between two extreme boundaries, one internal, the task-based (communicative) approach, and the other external (i.e. outside the textbook), the project-based pedagogy.

I chose the different textbooks intuitively, because they seemed to me a priori characteristic of significantly different ways of conceiving the action required of the learners at the end of the "didactic unit", and thus giving it its coherence. And the big article of Gérald SCHLEMMINGER, because it is still to this day the only publication of this importance on project pedagogy "applied" to language didactics. It is nevertheless "dated" insofar as the author's reference in language didactics is the communicative approach, and the ICEM-Pédagogie Freinet has not yet reworked the question with reference to the action perspective. Hence the publication, in this same Working Library, of a more recent article by a member of another pedagogical movement, Maria-Alice Médioni, of the GFEN (see below).

This grid is part of a set of four documents offered at the same time for reading. The other three are as follows:

-Christian PUREN. 2013f. « Perspective actionnelle et pédagogie de projet, apports historiques de deux mouvements pédagogiques : l'Institut Coopératif de l'École Moderne (ICEM)-Pédagogie Freinet, le Groupe Français d'Éducation Nouvelle (GFEN) », [www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2013f/](http://www.christianpuren.com/mes-travaux/2013f/). This text constitutes the common presentation of the whole.

-Gérald SCHLEMMINGER, *La pédagogie Freinet en classe de langue vivante*. Text available in a 2nd revised and enlarged edition dated 2001 on the APLV website and on the website of the University of Karlsruhe's College of Education (Pädagogische Hochschule) (Germany).

-Maria-Alice MEDIONI. Paper 051: « L'enseignement-apprentissage des langues : un agir ensemble qui s'affirme ». This article was originally published in January 2009 on the APLV website, and is republished, with the author's kind permission, in the "Bibliothèque de travail" (Working Library) of my personal website: [www.christianpuren.com/bibliothèque-de-travail/051/](http://www.christianpuren.com/bibliothèque-de-travail/051/).

**See next page a "Summary of the criteria for distinguishing between 'task' and 'mini-project'"**

## SUMMARY OF THE CRITERIA FOR DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN "TASK" AND MINI-PROJECT

Note: some tasks can be "intermediate", *i.e.* they incorporate only some of the (mini)project type criteria: this is the case of what is called "action tasks".

English translation and publication: February, 2022.

COMMUNICATIVE TASK	MINI-PROJECT
1. pre-design of the task/project by the teacher/textbook	1. at least partial design of the task/project by the students (the "design" is the "initial task", characteristic of any project)
2. single task (single instruction)	2. several interconnected tasks ("action scenario") with choices proposed in the form of questions or alternatives, or even according to the students' initiatives
3. procedural logic: students are simply asked to perform predefined tasks correctly	3. process logic: students are asked to reflect on tasks to be completed/in progress/after completion (metacognitive activities)
5. Document processing in support logic	5. processing of documents in the documentary logic
6. work only on the proposed authentic documents	6. also work on the final or even intermediate productions of the students (note-taking, drafts, provisional summaries...)
7. Exclusive use of L2	7. use of L1 and L1+n in the service of action (in particular, multilingual documentation and projection of action in "society 1")
8. culture has no relationship other than a thematic one with the final task	8. -documentation partly on the cultures of action (= ways of carrying out the project, including the final output, in different cultures) -reflection and decision of the students on the culture of action that they will implement in the proposed action -students' reflection and decision about the teaching and learning culture they will implement in the classroom.
9. documentation and single-use production in the corresponding teaching unit	9. sustainable production (updating documentation for possible reuse, repeating documents or tasks over several units, etc.)
10. individual or inter-individual (pairs) dimension of work and final production	10. collective dimension (large groups, class groups)
11. management and purpose of activities only in the classroom and for internal classroom use	11. real or simulated projection –but realistic simulation– outside the classroom (school, family, society, other classes abroad...)
12. teacher-centered assessment with a focus on language learning	12. -individual and collective self-evaluation (groups, class groups) -evaluation of the process (conducting the mini-project, group work), of the educational value (autonomy, responsibility, solidarity...), at the end of the project or even during the course of the project (with feedback and possible modification of the project's continuation). -evaluation of the social projection (interest generated, impact...) -proactive dimension (summary of points to consider for future mini-projects)