

UNIVERSITY OF TARTU
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH STUDIES

**Designing a Speaking-Oriented Elective Course within the Action-
Oriented Approach for 9th Grade Students at Tallinn Mustamäe
Humanitarian Gymnasium: Course Syllabus and Scenario-Based Module**

MA THESIS

Alina Abramova

SUPERVISOR: *Jun. Lect. ANNELI SIGUS, MA*

TARTU

2026

ABSTRACT

This thesis presents a design proposal for a Year 9 elective course, Speaking in English, in an Estonian lower-secondary context. Grounded in the Action-Oriented Approach and CEFR-oriented perspectives, the course is organised into scenario-based sequences that treat learners as social agents and provide repeated cycles of preparation, performance, feedback and reflection. The main design outputs include a course overview with aligned learning outcomes and a detailed four-lesson module, Planning a Class Event, supported by teacher notes, student materials and an assessment package. Assessment is primarily formative and criteria-referenced within a pass/fail framework. The thesis does not include piloting; instead, it offers an implementable, theory-based course design.

Keywords: Action-Oriented Approach; CEFR; speaking skills; scenario-based learning; elective course design

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	2
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	5
INTRODUCTION	6
1. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR DESIGNING AN ACTION-ORIENTED SPEAKING MODULE	10
1.1. Elective Speaking Courses and Course Design in EFL.....	10
1.2. Speaking Competence, Approaches and Classroom Challenges in EFL	12
1.3. The Action-Oriented Approach in School Speaking Courses	14
1.4. Assessment and Feedback in Action-Oriented Speaking Courses.....	17
2. DESIGNING THE ELECTIVE COURSE “SPEAKING IN ENGLISH” AND A SCENARIO-BASED MODULE	20
2.1. Context and Design Constraints.....	20
2.2. Design Approach and Procedure	23
2.3. Course Overview and Syllabus.....	25
2.3.1. Intended Learning Outcomes	26
2.3.2. Syllabus Structure: Scenario-Based Organisation	27
2.3.3. Lesson Routine and Scaffolding Principles	32
2.4. Assessment and Feedback Model.....	33
2.4.1. Assessment Principles	33
2.4.2. What Counts as “Pass”	34
2.4.3. Evidence Sources and Assessment Tools	35
2.4.4. Feedback Cycle	36
2.5. Detailed Scenario-Based Module	37
2.5.1. Module Rationale and Selection.....	37
2.5.2. Scenario Description (Social Context, Roles and Final Outcome).....	38
2.5.3. Intended Learning Outcomes for The Module	40
2.5.4. Module Overview: Lesson Sequence and Task Logic	40
2.5.6. Scaffolding, Differentiation and Plurilingual Support.....	44
2.5.7. Assessment Evidence and Criteria Within The Module	45
2.6. Design Rationale and Readiness for Implementation	46
CONCLUSION	48
REFERENCES	50

APPENDICES.....	51
Appendix 1 – Student-Friendly Course Syllabus: <i>Speaking in English</i>.....	51
Appendix 2 – Year Course Overview	52
Appendix 3 – Teacher Lesson Plan Pack (Scenario 4: Planning a Class Event)	58
Appendix 4 – Student Materials: Planning a Class Event (Scenario 4)	63
Appendix 5 – Assessment Tools (Scenario 4: Planning a Class Event)	68
Appendix 6 – CEFR Mapping Table (course outcomes ↔ descriptor scales ↔ evidence sources)	70
RESÛMEE	72

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AoA – Action-Oriented Approach

B1 – CEFR level B1

CEFR – Common European Framework of Reference for Languages

CLT – Communicative Language Teaching

EFL – English as a Foreign Language

L1 – first language

PBL – Project-Based Learning

TBLT – Task-Based Language Teaching

INTRODUCTION

According to the National Curriculum for Basic Schools, foreign-language teaching in Estonia is expected to develop age-appropriate communicative competence, enabling learners to understand, interpret, and use the foreign language purposefully in both speech and writing (Riigiteataja 2011). By the end of Year 9, learners are required to reach level B1 of the CEFR, which includes describing experiences, events, dreams, and goals and briefly justifying opinions and plans (Council of Europe 2001; Riigiteataja 2011). In classroom practice, however, many learners find it challenging to talk about themselves, their ambitions, and their future plans in English, and some are reluctant to participate in oral activities at all. An elective course centred on oral expression offers additional space for systematic speaking practice that supports these curricular requirements, including preparation for the B1 examination and broader confidence-building in oral communication.

This thesis is situated within the action-oriented vision of language education developed in the CEFR and the CEFR Companion Volume and further elaborated in Action-Oriented Approach (AoA) literature (Council of Europe 2001, 2020; Piccardo & North 2019; Fischer 2021; Germain-Rutherford 2021; Ismail & Kumar 2023). In this perspective, learners are regarded as social agents who mobilise linguistic and other resources to accomplish meaningful tasks in real or realistic contexts (Council of Europe 2020: 35; Piccardo & North 2019: 18). The Council of Europe also presents AoA as a task- and scenario-based way of organising language education around purposeful action rather than isolated practice of forms. Scenario-based elective courses are particularly compatible with this orientation, as they can be designed around coherent sets of tasks with clear outcomes and space for learner reflection. Existing initiatives such as the LINCdire project illustrate how sample action-oriented scenarios can be used to structure such learning (LINCdire n.d.).

At the same time, AoA-informed courses and materials for Estonian basic schools remain limited, especially at lower secondary level and with a specific focus on B1 oral production and interaction. While the national curriculum sets clear communicative targets and the CEFR and its Companion Volume offer descriptors and examples, teachers who wish to work from an action-oriented perspective often need to adapt or design their own materials. This situation creates a need for concrete, curriculum-aligned models of elective courses and modules that demonstrate how AoA principles and CEFR B1 descriptors can be translated into a feasible structure for Year 9 English.

Within this context, the elective course “Speaking in English” is planned as a Year 9 speaking-focused elective course framed by the Action-Oriented Approach and targeting B1 oral production and interaction skills. The course consists of 35 academic hours over one school year (one lesson per week). Instead of a small number of very long projects, the syllabus is organised into several shorter action-oriented scenarios of varying length (from one to four lessons). These scenarios address real-life concerns of Year 9 learners, such as presenting oneself, discussing interests and everyday life, and talking about future study and life plans. The course follows the principle of constructive alignment, meaning that intended learning outcomes, classroom activities, and assessment criteria are designed to be coherent with one another. Assessment is organised in a pass/fail format and is based on participation in tasks and achievement of oral-expression outcomes. In the thesis, one of these scenarios is developed into a detailed module, including its learning outcomes, tasks, lesson sequence and assessment guidelines.

With this background, the thesis has two main aims:

- To design an elective, AoA-based English oral expression course for Year 9 learners in Estonia, aligned with the national curriculum and CEFR B1 descriptors for oral production and interaction.

- To develop and document one scenario-based module from this course in detail, providing a theoretically grounded and practically usable model that can be implemented or adapted by English teachers in Estonian basic schools.

The study adopts a design- and document-based methodology. Rather than testing the course empirically, it focuses on creating a detailed, curriculum-driven syllabus and lesson materials. The process includes: reviewing literature on the Action-Oriented Approach, the CEFR and its Companion Volume, and the Estonian national curriculum; identifying B1-level oral production and interaction descriptors relevant to Year 9 and formulating learning outcomes accordingly (Council of Europe 2020; Euroopa keeleõppe raamdokumendi sõsarväljaanne 2023); outlining the overall elective course structure with several scenarios; and designing one scenario-based module in detail (lesson guidelines, tasks, assessment criteria).

The structure of the thesis reflects this focus. Chapter 1 provides the theoretical and contextual framework. It discusses communicative competence and its treatment in communicative language teaching and in the CEFR (Council of Europe 2020), introduces the key ideas of the Action-Oriented Approach and scenario-based teaching (Bourguignon 2006; Piccardo & North 2019), and summarises the main requirements of the Estonian national curriculum for foreign languages, with a particular focus on B1 oral production and interaction in Year 9 (Riigiteataja 2011; Euroopa keeleõppe raamdokumendi sõsarväljaanne 2023). Chapter 1 also explains the design-based methodological approach of the thesis and the steps taken in developing the elective course and the selected module.

Chapter 2 presents the design of the elective course “Speaking in English” and the detailed scenario-based module that constitutes the main outcome of the thesis. It first describes the overall course concept: the target group, aims, structure across the school year, scenarios, and assessment principles. It then focuses on one chosen scenario, specifying its

intended learning outcomes, the sequence of lessons, the tasks and materials, and the assessment guidelines. The chapter explains how the design draws on AoA principles and CEFR B1 descriptors and how it is aligned with the Estonian national curriculum. The concluding sections of Chapter 2 summarise the main design decisions, discuss their potential usefulness for teachers, and suggest directions for future development or empirical implementation.

In this thesis, communicative competence is used in the broad CEFR sense, including linguistic, sociolinguistic and pragmatic competences (Council of Europe 2001, 2020). Speaking competence is interpreted through CEFR B1 descriptors for spoken production and interaction (Council of Europe 2001, 2020; Euroopa keeleõppe raamdokumendi sõsarväljaanne 2023). The Action-Oriented Approach (AoA) is understood as described in the CEFR and the Companion Volume, where learners act as social agents who accomplish meaningful tasks in specific contexts (Council of Europe 2001, 2020; Council of Europe n.d.; Piccardo & North 2019). For practical purposes, the course refers to the full 35-lesson Year 9 elective, the syllabus to its scenario-based plan and assessment principles, and the module to one four-lesson scenario developed in implementable detail.

1. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR DESIGNING AN ACTION-ORIENTED SPEAKING MODULE

1.1. Elective Speaking Courses and Course Design in EFL

Elective courses in lower-secondary education can provide additional time and flexibility to address learners' needs and interests beyond the compulsory curriculum. In foreign-language classrooms, they are particularly useful for skills that require sustained oral practice, such as speaking and interaction, which are often difficult to prioritise within the limited time of the main syllabus (Ur 1996; Harmer 2007). For learners around the end of basic school, who are typically working towards level B1 in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, a speaking-focused elective can support the development of descriptors such as describing experiences, giving brief reasons and explanations, and maintaining interaction on familiar topics (Council of Europe 2001, 2020).

In addition, elective subjects can contribute to learner autonomy and motivation by giving students a greater sense of choice and personal relevance in their learning (Harmer 2007; Brown 2007). When elective courses are organised around meaningful communicative tasks and topics that reflect learners' real-life concerns, they resonate with the CEFR Companion Volume's emphasis on action-oriented, context-embedded communicative activities (Council of Europe 2020). In this way, a speaking-oriented elective course can offer both increased opportunities for oral practice and a motivating framework that complements the compulsory English curriculum.

In language course planning, the syllabus refers to the selection, grading and sequencing of content and learning experiences, while the curriculum provides the broader educational framework and policy expectations within which a course is situated (Macalister and Nation 2020). From a curriculum design perspective, effective courses are not built by simply listing topics or textbook units; instead, Macalister and Nation (2020) argue for a systematic process that begins with analysing learner needs and the teaching context,

followed by formulating clear learning outcomes, selecting and sequencing content, and deciding how achievement will be assessed and evaluated. This process is typically cyclical rather than linear, allowing teachers to revisit earlier decisions as they gain a better understanding of learners and constraints.

Within this broader view of course design, constructive alignment (Biggs 1999, as cited in Macalister and Nation 2020) provides a widely used organising principle. Constructive alignment emphasises coherence between three elements: intended learning outcomes, teaching and learning activities, and assessment tasks. Learners are seen as actively constructing meaning, while teachers are responsible for designing learning environments in which the planned activities and assessments genuinely require learners to demonstrate the outcomes that have been specified. In an action-oriented foreign-language course this implies that outcomes are formulated in terms of communicative action (for example, CEFR can-do descriptors), classroom work is organised around tasks and scenarios that instantiate these outcomes, and assessment criteria describe successful completion of those tasks in line with the relevant CEFR level (Council of Europe 2001, 2020).

Constructive alignment is particularly compatible with the Action-Oriented Approach, which already foregrounds purposeful action, clearly defined communicative goals and observable task outcomes (Piccardo and North 2019). At the same time, strict alignment may be challenging in practice: teachers need to balance pre-planned outcomes with the flexibility required to respond to learners' emerging needs and to keep tasks meaningful rather than purely test-like. For elective speaking courses this means that alignment should provide a clear structure for designing scenarios, materials and assessment, but still leave room for learner choice, negotiation of topics and formative feedback. The more detailed principles for assessment, including the choice between graded and pass/fail evaluation, are discussed in Section 1.4.

1.2. Speaking Competence, Approaches and Classroom Challenges in EFL

Nature of Speaking Competence

Speaking is commonly described as both a productive and an interactive skill. It involves real-time processing, turn-taking and negotiation of meaning, requiring learners to manage accuracy, fluency and appropriacy under time pressure. Spoken language is therefore often characterised by incomplete or reformulated utterances, responsiveness to interlocutors and the use of communication strategies such as asking for clarification or paraphrasing (Bygate 1987; Ur 1996; Brown 2007; Harmer 2007).

In traditional four-skill models of language teaching, speaking is treated as one discrete skill alongside listening, reading and writing. In the CEFR and the Action-Oriented Approach, this view is elaborated into different communicative modes, particularly spoken production, spoken interaction and mediation. The CEFR describes communicative language activities in terms of what users can do in specific tasks and contexts, while the Action-Oriented Approach further frames learners as social agents who use language to carry out purposeful action in real or realistic situations (Council of Europe 2001, 2020; Piccardo & North 2019). This perspective foregrounds interaction, co-construction of meaning and the mobilisation of plurilingual resources rather than isolated practice of linguistic forms.

For learners at the end of basic school, corresponding roughly to level B1, the CEFR describes spoken production and interaction in terms of being able to connect simple phrases to describe experiences and plans, to briefly give reasons and explanations for opinions and actions, and to maintain interaction on familiar topics despite pauses and reformulation (Council of Europe 2001, 2020). The descriptors also highlight underlying aspects such as overall fluency, range of language, accuracy and coherence, which can be observed in learners' oral performance (Council of Europe 2001, 2020; Euroopa keeleõppe raamdokumendi sõsarväljaanne 2023). In many educational contexts these B1 descriptors

serve as shared reference points for defining speaking competence at the end of lower secondary education and for designing classroom speaking tasks and assessment criteria.

Several methodological frameworks have guided speaking instruction in EFL classrooms. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) foregrounds communicative competence and classroom interaction as the main goal of language instruction rather than the mastery of discrete structures (Richards and Rodgers 2014: 153–156). Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) develops this perspective by organising teaching around tasks in which learners use the target language to achieve an outcome, with meaning-focused communication that approximates real-world use (Willis 1996: 23; Ellis 2003: 9, 16). Project-Based Learning (PBL) extends TBLT by engaging learners in longer-term collaborative projects that integrate content learning and language use and culminate in a tangible product (Stoller 2006: 19–40).

The Action-Oriented Approach (AoA), rooted in the CEFR, builds on these communicative models while shifting the focus more explicitly to agency and complexity. It views learners as social agents who mobilise their linguistic and general competences to accomplish real-life tasks and projects in collaborative settings (Piccardo and North 2019: 52, 107).

Developing speaking skills in school contexts remains challenging due to limited input, performance anxiety and uneven participation (Ur 1996; Harmer 2007). In many exam-oriented contexts, oral skills receive relatively little instructional time compared to reading and writing, which further reduces opportunities for practice (Ur 1996; Harmer 2007). Consequently, a number of authors argue for pedagogical frameworks that combine communicative practice with clearly defined, meaningful outcomes (Brown 2007; Council of Europe 2020). Approaches that employ authentic tasks and build in regular formative feedback are described as particularly helpful in sustaining learner motivation and

encouraging learners to take risks when speaking (Brown 2007; Council of Europe 2020; Piccardo and North 2019). Within an action-oriented perspective, such support is realised through carefully scaffolded tasks and scenarios with explicit goals, preparation phases and post-task feedback, which aim to reduce anxiety and make speaking activities more purposeful, especially for less confident learners (Council of Europe 2020).

1.3. The Action-Oriented Approach in School Speaking Courses

The Action-Oriented Approach (AoA) was introduced in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages as a response to changing views of language learning and use. In the CEFR, users and learners are described as social agents who draw on a range of linguistic and general competences to accomplish tasks in specific situations rather than simply reproducing linguistic forms (Council of Europe 2001, 2020). This perspective has been further elaborated in recent work that emphasises agency, mediation and plurilingual/pluricultural competence as central constructs in language education (Council of Europe 2020; Piccardo and North 2019).

Within this perspective, the AoA integrates communicative, cognitive and sociocultural dimensions of learning. The communicative dimension is foregrounded when learners use language to negotiate meaning, manage interaction and mediate information for others in spoken and written tasks. The cognitive dimension is visible in the planning, decision making and problem solving that tasks require, as learners analyse information, select relevant resources and reflect on their strategies. The sociocultural dimension emerges in the roles, relationships and norms embedded in scenarios: learners act as members of particular communities, draw on their plurilingual repertoires and are expected to collaborate, respect different perspectives and adapt to interlocutors (Council of Europe 2020; Piccardo and North 2019). These dimensions are not treated separately but are built into the same scenarios, so that communicative success depends on cognitive engagement

and on participation in socially meaningful situations. It highlights purposeful tasks and scenarios that mirror real-life domains of action and typically unfold over several lessons. In such scenarios, learners plan, negotiate and carry out projects that lead to a visible outcome or product, mobilising both linguistic and non-linguistic resources (Piccardo and North 2019; Council of Europe 2020). Classroom learning is therefore not seen merely as preparation for future language use, but as a context in which meaningful action already takes place.

Compared with earlier communicative approaches, AoA both builds on and extends Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT). Like CLT and TBLT, it focuses on learning to use the language in interaction and makes extensive use of tasks and pair- or group work (Richards and Rodgers 2014; Willis 1996; Ellis 2003). However, AoA places stronger emphasis on learners' situated agency, on longer didactic sequences organised around scenarios rather than single tasks, and on the integration of mediation and plurilingual/pluricultural competences into classroom work (Council of Europe 2020; Piccardo and North 2019). In many textbook implementations of CLT and TBLT, tasks tend to be narrowly defined classroom activities. AoA, similarly to project-based learning (PBL), explicitly encourages longer-term projects and scenarios that connect classroom work with broader social contexts and roles. While PBL has traditionally been described in the literature as an approach where content learning is organised around projects that lead to a concrete product (Stoller 2006), AoA frames such projects through CEFR-based communicative descriptors and emphasises learners' agency, mediation and plurilingual resources (Council of Europe 2020; Piccardo and North 2019).

In addition, like other communicative approaches such as CLT, TBLT and PBL, AoA can foster transversal competences such as collaboration, problem solving and intercultural awareness, as learners work together, negotiate meaning and draw on their full linguistic

repertoires in order to complete tasks. What is more specific to AoA is that these transversal competences are explicitly highlighted in the CEFR Companion Volume and in AoA-inspired descriptions of language education, where they are formulated as part of the intended learning outcomes alongside linguistic aims (Council of Europe 2020; Piccardo and North 2019). This makes AoA a coherent conceptual framework for designing scenario-based speaking courses and modules in school settings, where communication is treated as purposeful social activity rather than as isolated practice of language items.

In school settings, the AoA can be applied through scenario-based modules that integrate several tasks leading to a shared outcome — for example, preparing a class presentation, organising an event, or conducting a short interview project. Such scenarios encourage cooperation, peer interaction and self-evaluation, reflecting the learner-centred philosophy of the national curriculum (Riigiteataja 2011).

The CEFR Companion Volume (Council of Europe 2020) recommends flexible use of descriptors across modes — production, interaction and mediation — allowing teachers to design integrated tasks that correspond to real communication outside the classroom. When implemented in a limited-time elective module, AoA supports both language development and learner motivation by providing a clear sense of purpose and achievement.

In the Action-Oriented Approach, learning is organised around tasks and scenarios that mirror real-world communication (Council of Europe 2020; Piccardo and North 2019).

A task is a purposeful action performed through language, while a scenario provides a broader context in which several tasks are linked by a common goal (Bourguignon 2006). For example, a scenario such as organising a class event may include tasks like writing invitations, conducting interviews, and presenting results.

Designing tasks for a speaking-focused module requires balancing fluency and accuracy, offering structured support (pre-task phase) and reflection (post-task phase) (Bygate 1987; Ur 1996).

The scaffolding model commonly adopted in AoA-based designs involves three stages: pre-task activation of knowledge, task execution through interaction, and post-task reflection on outcomes (Piccardo and North 2019). This sequence keeps learners focused on meaning while encouraging self-evaluation and peer feedback.

The Action-Oriented Approach emphasises co-construction of knowledge and active participation. Learners work together as social agents, solving problems and making decisions through language (Piccardo and North 2019). Collaborative tasks enhance motivation and help students develop both linguistic and social competences.

Autonomy is fostered by allowing learners to make choices about roles, content and presentation formats, and by including reflection tools such as self-assessment checklists and learning journals (Council of Europe 2020). Digital tools and simple recording platforms can support peer interaction and enable students to review their performance outside the classroom.

When integrated into a short elective module, these principles create a clear and motivating learning path: students engage in purposeful speaking tasks that reflect real life, cooperate towards shared outcomes and evaluate their progress in relation to CEFR-based can-do descriptors.

1.4. Assessment and Feedback in Action-Oriented Speaking Courses

Effective assessment in an elective module should maintain coherence between learning outcomes, teaching activities and assessment procedures. This relationship, known as constructive alignment, ensures that learners are assessed on the competences they were expected to develop (Biggs 1999, as cited in Macalister and Nation 2020). In practice, this

means that all speaking tasks and criteria directly reflect the communicative aims of the module and the CEFR descriptors for level B1 (Council of Europe 2020).

The Estonian national curriculum encourages the use of formative and non-differentiated assessment to support learning (Riigiteataja 2011). Pass/fail evaluation allows students to focus on progress rather than grades and reduces performance anxiety, which is particularly important in speaking-oriented courses. Formative assessment, based on observation and feedback, aligns with the learner-centred philosophy of the Action-Oriented Approach (Piccardo and North 2019).

Within an action-oriented perspective, speaking assessment can draw on several CEFR descriptor scales that capture different aspects of oral performance, for example spoken production, spoken interaction and mediation, as well as qualitative features such as range, fluency, coherence, pronunciation and accuracy (Council of Europe 2001, 2020; Euroopa keeleõppe raamdokumendi sõsarväljaanne 2023). In many contexts these descriptors are operationalised through CEFR-based rating scales or can-do statements, which make the expected level of performance more transparent for both teachers and learners (Council of Europe 2020). Evaluation can combine teacher observation, peer assessment and learner self-assessment, so that learners are actively involved in monitoring their own progress and setting attainable goals (Brown 2007).

Research on classroom speaking suggests that formative feedback is most useful when it focuses on communicative success and intelligibility rather than on isolated errors (Ur 1996; Harmer 2007; Brown 2007). Feedback may be given orally or in written form after speaking tasks and scenarios, highlighting what helped communication and what could be improved. Regular use of reflection tools, such as learner journals or simple checklists linked to can-do descriptors, can strengthen learner autonomy and make progress in speaking more visible over time (Council of Europe 2020).

Taken together, the literature reviewed in this chapter highlights several interrelated principles for designing speaking instruction in school settings. Elective courses can offer additional, more flexible opportunities for oral communication and learner choice; speaking competence can be described through CEFR-based descriptors that focus on what learners can do with language; and course design benefits from constructive alignment between outcomes, classroom activities and assessment (Ur 1996; Brown 2007; Council of Europe 2001, 2020; Macalister and Nation 2020). The Action-Oriented Approach brings these strands together by framing learners as social agents who engage in purposeful tasks and scenarios, often drawing on their plurilingual repertoires in collaborative work (Piccardo and North 2019; Council of Europe 2020).

These theoretical ideas form the basis for the practical part of the thesis. In Chapter 2, they are used as design principles for planning a speaking-focused, action-oriented elective course for lower-secondary learners and for developing one scenario-based module in more detail, including its learning outcomes, tasks and assessment criteria.

2. DESIGNING THE ELECTIVE COURSE “SPEAKING IN ENGLISH” AND A SCENARIO-BASED MODULE

2.1. Context and Design Constraints

This thesis presents a design proposal for a speaking-oriented elective course, “Speaking in English”, for Year 9 learners at Tallinn Mustamäe Humanitarian Gymnasium. The course is intended as a one-year elective with a total of 35 academic hours (typically one 45-minute lesson per week). As an elective, the course is designed to complement the compulsory English curriculum by providing additional opportunities for spoken production and interaction in purposeful, scenario-based tasks. The design is situated within the action-oriented vision of language education articulated in the CEFR and further developed in the CEFR Companion Volume (Council of Europe 2001, 2020) and in Action-Oriented Approach literature (Piccardo & North 2019).

The target group consists of lower-secondary learners at the end of basic school, with an expected overall proficiency around level B1. In this context, English is learned alongside other languages that learners use in everyday life and schooling. Many learners therefore approach English learning with multilingual repertoires and varied linguistic experiences. This multilingual reality is treated as a practical and pedagogical condition of course design rather than as a “problem to eliminate”. In line with CEFR-oriented and action-oriented perspectives, learners’ existing linguistic resources are viewed as potentially supportive for meaning-making, mediation, and task completion, especially when tasks require planning, collaboration, and negotiation (Council of Europe 2020). Consequently, the design allows for teacher-guided and purposeful use of learners’ full repertoires when it serves task goals (e.g., planning, clarifying meaning, or reflecting on performance), while maintaining English as the main working language during core speaking tasks. In practice, this is operationalised through brief, purposeful “planning/clarifying slots” (typically 1–3 minutes) where learners may use their full linguistic repertoires to generate ideas or check meaning. Each slot is

followed by an explicit switch back to English (“English time”) for the core speaking performance (see the lesson procedures in Appendix 3).

In the lesson plans (Appendix 3), plurilingual support is operationalised through brief, purposeful “planning/clarifying slots” (typically 1–3 minutes) where learners may use their full linguistic repertoires for idea generation, comprehension checks, or negotiation of task meaning. Each slot is followed by an explicit switch back to English (“English time”) for the core speaking performance and assessed interaction.

Several institutional and curricular constraints shape the course design. First, the course needs to remain compatible with the expectations of lower-secondary education in Estonia and with the school-level curriculum framework, including the general aims for developing communicative competence and preparing learners to participate in real-life communication. Second, the elective format typically limits the extent of high-stakes summative assessment; instead, it encourages an assessment approach that prioritises participation, observable task performance, and formative development. For this reason, the course is designed with an emphasis on transparent learning outcomes, repeated opportunities for practice, and feedback processes that help learners understand progress in relation to CEFR-relevant descriptors (Council of Europe 2001, 2020). Specific assessment arrangements and criteria (including the rationale for pass/fail evaluation and the role of peer- and self-assessment) are described in detail later in Chapter 2.

A further major design constraint is the limited contact time. One weekly lesson does not allow for long, uninterrupted project work without the risk of losing continuity, particularly for speaking-focused learning that depends on sustained engagement and routine practice. In addition, classroom speaking in school contexts is commonly affected by uneven participation, anxiety, and the tendency for oral work to receive less instructional time than other skills (Ur 1996; Harmer 2007). These constraints strongly influence task design

decisions: scenarios need to be structured as coherent sequences with clear intermediate goals, explicit preparation stages, and predictable lesson routines that support participation. Rather than relying on a few very long projects, the course is organised into several shorter scenarios (of varying length), each culminating in a clear communicative outcome or product. This supports continuity, makes progress more visible, and allows learners to experience repeated cycles of preparation, performance, feedback, and reflection.

The course design also needs to be feasible for implementation in ordinary school conditions. Materials, instructions, and assessment tools therefore aim to be teacher-friendly and replicable. The design assumes typical classroom resources (board, projector, basic digital tools) and does not depend on specialised technology. At the same time, the elective format provides an opportunity to implement scenario-based work with a higher degree of learner choice, collaboration, and role-based communication than is often possible in the compulsory curriculum. This is consistent with the Action-Oriented Approach, which frames learners as social agents who use language to accomplish purposeful tasks in realistic contexts and whose success is evaluated in terms of effective action and communication rather than isolated mastery of forms (Council of Europe 2020; Piccardo & North 2019).

Finally, the design constraints outlined above directly inform the methodological logic of the course. In order to ensure coherence between what learners are expected to achieve and what they actually do in class, the course follows the principle of constructive alignment (Biggs 1999, as cited in Macalister & Nation 2020). Learning outcomes are formulated with reference to CEFR-oriented speaking descriptors; classroom activities are organised as scenario-based task sequences that require learners to demonstrate these outcomes; and assessment criteria focus on observable indicators of successful task completion and communicative effectiveness. In the next section, the design approach and procedure are described more systematically, followed by a full overview of the course

syllabus and a detailed scenario-based module developed as the main design output of the thesis.

2.2. Design Approach and Procedure

This thesis follows a design-based orientation in which the main outcome is a pedagogical design that is grounded in theory and ready for classroom implementation. The work does not include an empirical intervention or piloting; instead, it develops a coherent, theoretically justified course and module package that can later be implemented and evaluated in practice. In this sense, the thesis is primarily concerned with translating an action-oriented view of language education into concrete design decisions related to learning outcomes, scenarios, tasks, materials and assessment tools.

The design approach is informed by two complementary frameworks. First, the Action-Oriented Approach as articulated in the CEFR and the CEFR Companion Volume provides the overarching pedagogical rationale: learners are viewed as social agents who use language to accomplish purposeful tasks in realistic contexts, and learning is organised around scenarios that integrate spoken production, interaction and, where relevant, mediation (Council of Europe 2001, 2020; Piccardo & North 2019). Second, principles of course and syllabus design, particularly constructive alignment, guide the internal coherence of the course: intended learning outcomes, classroom activities and assessment criteria are designed to support one another, so that learners are systematically prepared to meet the targeted outcomes through repeated opportunities for practice and feedback (Biggs 1999, as cited in Macalister & Nation 2020).

The design procedure consisted of several iterative steps. First, the overall course context and constraints were specified (target group, contact time, elective format, and classroom realities of speaking work). Second, intended learning outcomes were formulated using CEFR-oriented can-do statements and descriptor scales relevant to spoken production

and interaction at approximately B1 level (Council of Europe 2001, 2020). These outcomes were treated as the primary reference point for subsequent design decisions. Third, a scenario-based course structure was drafted: the course was organised into several scenarios reflecting real-life concerns of Year 9 learners, each culminating in a tangible communicative outcome (e.g., a spoken product, a role-based performance, or a collaborative presentation). Each scenario was planned as a sequence of lessons with intermediate goals, preparation stages and opportunities for reflection.

Fourth, task sequences and supporting materials were designed for each scenario, with particular attention to scaffolding speaking. Scaffolding was operationalised through predictable lesson routines (e.g., preparation → performance → feedback/reflection), language support (useful phrases, functional language and interaction strategies), and structured interaction formats that reduce speaking anxiety and promote participation (Ur 1996; Harmer 2007). The design also includes planned opportunities for learner choice and collaboration, consistent with the action-oriented emphasis on agency and co-construction of meaning (Council of Europe 2020; Piccardo & North 2019). Where relevant, tasks allow purposeful use of learners' plurilingual repertoires in preparation or reflection phases, while keeping English as the main working language during core speaking tasks (Council of Europe 2020).

Fifth, an assessment and feedback model was specified to fit the elective format. Assessment was conceptualised primarily as formative and criteria-referenced: learners' speaking performance is evaluated in relation to CEFR-relevant descriptors and task completion criteria, and feedback focuses on communicative success and progress rather than isolated errors (Council of Europe 2020; Brown 2007). To support transparency and learner autonomy, the assessment package includes teacher observation tools, simplified learner-friendly criteria, and opportunities for peer- and self-assessment.

Finally, one scenario was selected and developed into a detailed module as the main design artefact of the thesis. The selection was based on relevance to learners' likely needs and interests, the potential for sustained speaking interaction, and the suitability of the scenario for illustrating key AoA principles. The detailed module includes learning outcomes, lesson-by-lesson task sequences, teacher notes, materials and assessment guidelines. Throughout the design process, decisions were reviewed against the principles outlined in Chapter 1 to ensure coherence and traceability: each major element of the course (outcomes, scenarios, tasks and assessment) can be linked back to the action-oriented rationale and to the alignment requirement that planned learning activities genuinely prepare learners for the targeted outcomes.

The result of this procedure is a course overview and a detailed module package that can be implemented by a teacher in a comparable school context. While the effectiveness of the design is not empirically tested within the scope of this thesis, the design outputs are intended to be sufficiently explicit and practical to allow future classroom piloting and evaluation.

2.3. Course Overview and Syllabus

The elective course Speaking in English is a 35-lesson Year 9 elective (1×45 minutes per week) organised into a two-lesson course launch, eight four-lesson scenarios, and a one-lesson wrap-up/reflection (Table 1). Each scenario follows a consistent routine—prepare → perform → receive feedback → reflect—so that learners practise speaking through repeated cycles in realistic school contexts rather than through isolated speaking exercises.

The course follows constructive alignment: for each scenario, intended speaking outcomes are linked to a clear final speaking product (e.g., a pitch, a meeting outcome, an interview, or a short presentation). Lesson tasks are sequenced to prepare learners for that product, and evidence is collected through teacher observation during live speaking

(checklists) and brief learner reflection tasks (see Appendices for the tools). This ensures that what is taught, practised, and assessed remains consistent throughout the scenario cycle (Biggs 1999, as cited in Macalister & Nation 2020). To support implementation, each scenario uses predictable scaffolds (e.g., role cards, planning prompts, and a language bank) and includes feedback and reflection after performance.

2.3.1. Intended Learning Outcomes

By the end of the course, learners are expected to be able to:

1. introduce themselves and others and maintain brief social interaction in familiar situations (e.g., greetings, small talk, asking and answering questions);
2. describe experiences, interests and everyday activities in connected speech and respond to follow-up questions;
3. take part in discussions on familiar topics by expressing opinions, agreeing/disagreeing politely, and giving simple reasons and explanations;
4. participate actively in pair- and group-work tasks by negotiating meaning, taking turns, and using interaction strategies (e.g., asking for clarification, paraphrasing, checking understanding);
5. plan and deliver short spoken products (e.g., a short presentation, a pitch, a role-based performance) with an appropriate degree of coherence and intelligibility;
6. use functional language and compensatory strategies to keep communication going in common situations despite gaps in vocabulary or occasional errors.

These outcomes are aligned with CEFR-oriented expectations for B1 spoken production and interaction and are operationalised through scenario-based tasks and assessment tools described below.

These outcomes were selected by mapping (a) end-of-basic-school expectations in the Estonian National Curriculum for oral expression to (b) CEFR B1 descriptor scales for

spoken interaction and production. They were prioritised because they recur across the course scenarios (introducing, describing experiences, discussing, negotiating, presenting), are realistic for Year 9 learners in an elective format, and can be observed through short scenario outcomes with regular formative feedback rather than through extended projects.

2.3.2. Syllabus Structure: Scenario-Based Organisation

Rather than relying on one or two extended projects, the syllabus is organised into several shorter action-oriented scenarios of varying length (typically 3–4 lessons). Each scenario is framed as a realistic social situation relevant to Year 9 learners, defined by a clear context, learner roles, constraints and an audience, and it culminates in a tangible outcome (e.g., a proposal presented to others, a short performance, or a decision communicated in a meeting). Full scenario cards (situation, roles, constraints, final outcome and intermediate lesson-by-lesson goals) are provided in Appendix 2, together with a week-by-week overview of the 35-lesson course plan. Scenario 4 is developed into a detailed four-lesson module in Section 2.5 and Appendix 3 (lesson plans), with student materials in Appendix 4 and assessment tools in Appendix 5. Scenarios are designed as coherent sequences with intermediate goals and preparation stages (planning, language support, rehearsal), which are made explicit in the scenario cards (Appendix 2) and operationalised in the detailed module lesson plans (Appendix 3). This organisation aims to support continuity across weekly lessons, to keep task goals transparent, and to provide repeated cycles of preparation → performance → feedback/reflection, which are essential for speaking development in school contexts (Ur 1996; Harmer 2007; Council of Europe 2020).

Table 1 provides an overview of the planned scenarios. Full scenario cards (including situation, roles, constraints, final outcome and intermediate goals) are provided in Appendix 2, together with a week-by-week overview of the 35-lesson course plan. A student-friendly syllabus overview is provided in Appendix 1.

Table 1. Overview of scenarios in the elective course *Speaking In English*

Scenario	Lessons	Scenario context, roles and audience (key constraints)	Final outcome (product)	Main speaking focus
Course launch	2	Course orientation: learners agree on course routines and produce a low-stakes baseline speaking sample; roles: classmates in pairs/groups; audience: peers and teacher; key constraints: brief diagnostic, focus on interaction routines.	Course agreement + baseline speaking snapshot (diagnostic) + one personal speaking goal.	classroom interaction routines; self-goals
Scenario 1. “Who am I? Introducing myself in English”	4	A school/youth exchange welcome situation: learners meet a new peer and introduce themselves to build first contact; roles: new peer & interviewer; audience: classmates (paired).	2–3 minute “About me” talk + partner follow-up Q&A.	spoken production + interaction (greetings, follow-up questions, repair)
Scenario 2. “My	4	School club fair: learners represent a club to attract	60–90 second club pitch +	persuasion basics;

Interests: Club Fair”		new members; roles: club representative & visitor; audience: peers (rotating visitors).	Q&A in a rotating “club fair” carousel.	asking/answering questions; turn-taking
Scenario 3. “School Life: Class Meeting”	4	Class meeting to improve class life: learners discuss a concrete class issue and agree on two actions to take; roles: chair + contributors; audience: the class; key constraints: negotiated decision + spoken summary.	Class meeting discussion leading to two agreed actions + a spoken summary of decisions.	discussion skills: opinions, agree/disagree politely, giving reasons, summarising
Scenario 4. “Planning a Class Event”	4	Student Council call for proposals: learners plan a low-cost, inclusive class event for Class Community Week; roles: event planners (with rotating responsibilities); audience: class + teacher (as Student Council representative); key constraints: time/budget/inclusivity + pitch + Q&A.	2–3 minute group event proposal pitch + Q&A (feasible plan within constraints).	negotiation + collaborative planning + Q&A strategies

Scenario 5. “Media & Well-being: Advice for Younger Students”	4	Peer advice task: learners prepare simple, age-appropriate guidance on healthy screen time for younger students; roles: peer advisers; audience: imagined Grade 6 audience (presented to classmates as a trial audience); key constraints: clear advice + reasons + mediated summary of key points.	Spoken advice for younger students + mediated summary of key ideas (in own words) + brief Q&A.	mediation + giving advice + explaining reasons
Scenario 6. “Future Pathways: Plans and Choices”	4	Future pathways mini-fair: learners discuss plans and choices and justify them in short interviews; roles: speaker & interviewer; audience: peers; key constraints: time-limited rounds + follow-up questions + reasons.	Short interview performance about future plans + spoken justification with follow-up questions.	talking about plans; giving reasons; interaction under time limits
Scenario 7. “Travel / Exchange:	4	Exchange/day-trip planning: learners negotiate priorities and create a realistic itinerary together;	Negotiated itinerary + spoken presentation	functional language for planning + negotiation;

Planning Together”		roles: planners in teams; audience: the class; key constraints: budget/time realism + negotiated compromise + spoken presentation + Q&A.	of the plan + Q&A.	pluricultural awareness
Scenario 8. “Showcase & Reflection”	4	End-of-course showcase: learners present a short “best-of” speaking performance and reflect on progress using can-do statements; roles: presenters & reviewers; audience: the class; key constraints: short performance + constructive peer feedback + goal-setting.	Short speaking showcase performance + self-assessment (can-do reflection) + next-step goal.	integrated speaking; reflection using can-do statements
Course wrap-up / reflection	1	Course closure and transfer: learners review progress, share strategies for continuing speaking practice, and set a realistic next-step plan; roles: individual reflector + peer	Learning reflection + “transfer plan” (one specific next-step goal + one concrete	reflection talk; goal setting

		partner; audience: peers and teacher; key constraints: specific goal and one concrete action for independent practice.	action for continued speaking practice).	
--	--	--	--	--

Full scenario cards (situation, roles, constraints, final outcome and intermediate lesson-by-lesson goals) are provided in Appendix 2, together with a week-by-week overview of the 35-lesson course plan. Scenario 4 is developed into a detailed four-lesson module in Section 2.5 and Appendix 3 (lesson plans), with student materials in Appendix 4 and assessment tools in Appendix 5. Appendices 1–6 provide the full implementation package (student-facing syllabus, scenario cards, lesson plans, materials, assessment tools and CEFR mapping) referenced throughout this chapter.

2.3.3. Lesson Routine and Scaffolding Principles

Across scenarios, lessons follow a consistent routine that supports participation and reduces speaking anxiety: (1) warm-up and activation of prior knowledge; (2) preparation and scaffolding (functional language, planning time, modelling, rehearsal); (3) main speaking task; (4) feedback and reflection using learner-friendly criteria. Scaffolding is adjusted to learner needs and may include structured prompts, role cards, functional phrases, optional support for lower-confidence learners, and extension tasks for stronger learners. In addition, reflection tools such as short checklists or learning journals are used to help learners notice progress and identify the next steps in their speaking development.

Assessment in the course is organised in a pass/fail format and is primarily formative, focusing on active participation, completion of scenario outcomes, and progress in relation to the course learning outcomes. The assessment logic and tools (teacher observation

checklist, simplified criteria, and peer/self-assessment forms) are presented in Section 2.4 and included in the assessment package in Appendix 5.

2.4. Assessment and Feedback Model

Assessment in the elective course Speaking in English is organised in a pass/fail format and is primarily formative and criteria-referenced. This choice reflects the elective nature of the course and the intended function of the syllabus: to provide additional speaking practice, encourage participation, and support progress in relation to CEFR-oriented speaking outcomes. In school contexts, speaking development is strongly influenced by learners' willingness to participate and take risks; therefore, assessment is designed to reduce performance anxiety and to foreground communicative success, preparation, and sustained engagement rather than isolated error-counting (Ur 1996; Harmer 2007; Brown 2007). At the same time, the model maintains transparency and accountability by linking assessment criteria to the intended learning outcomes and CEFR-relevant descriptors, in line with constructive alignment principles (Biggs 1999, as cited in Macalister & Nation 2020; Council of Europe 2001, 2020).

2.4.1. Assessment Principles

The assessment model is based on four core principles:

- Alignment with outcomes: assessment criteria reflect the course learning outcomes and the communicative demands of scenario-based tasks (Council of Europe 2001, 2020).
- Assessment through action: learners demonstrate progress mainly while completing meaningful speaking tasks (rather than through separate decontextualised tests), consistent with AoA logic (Piccardo & North 2019; Council of Europe 2020).
- Transparency: learners are provided with learner-friendly criteria and examples of successful performance before key tasks; reflection tools help them

understand what “good performance” means and how to improve (Council of Europe 2020).

— Formative feedback: feedback focuses on communicative effectiveness and strategy use (e.g., interaction strategies, clarity, participation), and supports next-step goal setting rather than simply evaluating correctness (Brown 2007; Ur 1996).

In this course, alignment is ensured through outcome-to-evidence mapping (Appendix 6) and scenario-specific observation criteria used during live speaking tasks (Appendix 5). “Assessment through action” is implemented by collecting evidence primarily from scenario outcomes (pitches, meetings, interviews) rather than separate speaking tests. Transparency is supported through learner-friendly can-do checklists shared before performance and used in reflection (Appendix 5 / Appendix 4I). Formative feedback is built into each scenario cycle via brief in-task prompts, post-task “two strengths + one target” feedback (Appendix 4H), and a recurring next-step goal set by learners after key outcomes.

2.4.2. What Counts as “Pass”

Because the course uses a pass/fail model, the criteria are defined as minimum observable evidence of participation and task achievement across scenarios. A learner receives a Pass if the teacher can confirm that the learner has met all of the following minimum requirements:

1) Attendance and replacement evidence

- The learner attends at least 28 out of 35 lessons (approximately 80%).
- If the learner is absent, they complete the specified replacement speaking task (see Appendix 5) so that the teacher can still collect minimum evidence.

2) Scenario outcome completion (course-level requirement)

- The learner completes the final outcome for at least 6 out of 8 scenarios.

- Scenario 4 (the detailed module) is compulsory: the learner must complete the Scenario 4 final outcome.
- If a learner misses a scenario outcome lesson, they complete an equivalent replacement task (e.g., a short recorded speaking product and a brief planning note) agreed with the teacher.

3) Minimum speaking performance standard (B1-oriented)

- Across the collected evidence, the learner demonstrates the ability to (a) maintain brief interaction on familiar topics, (b) express simple opinions with brief reasons, and (c) respond to follow-up questions with reasonable intelligibility, even if hesitation and occasional errors occur.

4) Reflection and self-monitoring

- The learner completes the required self-assessment/reflection tasks for the scenarios that count toward the pass (minimum 6), using the learner-friendly can-do checklists (Appendix 5). These reflections are collected (paper or digital) and briefly checked by the teacher for completion and goal specificity; they are stored as part of the learner's course portfolio but are not graded.

A Fail is assigned if the learner does not meet one or more minimum requirements above (e.g., insufficient attendance without replacement evidence, fewer than 6 completed scenario outcomes, or missing the compulsory Scenario 4 outcome), or if the learner repeatedly refuses to take any speaking role in scenario work, resulting in missing core evidence, i.e., evidence of the minimum speaking performance standard described in (3): (a) maintaining brief interaction, (b) giving simple opinions with brief reasons, and (c) responding to follow-up questions with reasonable intelligibility.

2.4.3. Evidence Sources and Assessment Tools

To ensure fairness and consistency, pass/fail decisions are based on multiple sources of evidence collected across scenarios:

- Teacher observation checklist during main speaking tasks and scenario outcomes (task achievement, interaction strategies, intelligibility, participation).
- Scenario products/outcomes (e.g., a pitch, a role-based performance, a group proposal) as tangible evidence of completed action.
- Learner self-assessment using simplified can-do criteria linked to course outcomes and selected CEFR descriptor scales.
- Reflection tools (short checklists/journal prompts) used after scenario outcomes to support autonomy and make progress visible over time.

Peer feedback may be used selectively as formative support (e.g., audience questions or “two stars and a wish”), but it is not used as a decisive source of evidence for pass/fail decisions.

All assessment tools and learner-facing templates are included in Appendix 5 (Assessment package). The mapping of course outcomes to selected CEFR descriptor scales is provided in Appendix 6, which supports the transparency of the criteria and the traceability of design decisions.

2.4.4. Feedback Cycle

Feedback is built into each scenario as a repeated cycle: pre-task preparation → performance → feedback → reflection and goal-setting. During tasks, the teacher may provide brief supportive prompts that keep communication going, while more systematic feedback is provided after task completion. Feedback prioritises communicative success (e.g., clarity of message, interactional effectiveness, strategy use) and includes one or two concrete improvement targets that learners can apply in the next scenario. This approach

aims to make speaking practice sustainable, predictable, and motivating within the limited contact time of one weekly lesson (Ur 1996; Harmer 2007).

Operationally, feedback is delivered at two levels: (1) immediate micro-support during tasks (e.g., prompting clarification questions, supporting turn-taking, encouraging repair) and (2) post-task feedback focused on communicative success. After each key outcome, learners receive brief group-level feedback (“two strengths + one target”) and set one personal next-step goal that is revisited at the start of the next scenario.

2.5. Detailed Scenario-Based Module

This section presents a detailed four-lesson module, *Planning a Class Event*, developed as the main design artefact of the thesis. The module is framed as a realistic school situation: the Student Council invites each class to submit one low-cost, inclusive event proposal for Class Community Week. Learners work in teams as “event planners” and prepare a feasible proposal to persuade an authentic audience (the class and the teacher acting as a Student Council representative). Over four lessons, teams move from (1) scenario launch and idea generation within constraints, to (2) a structured planning meeting where they negotiate and decide, to (3) pitch drafting and rehearsal with feedback, and finally to (4) a 2–3 minute group pitch with Q&A followed by reflection and goal-setting.

The module is planned using a backward-design logic: the final scenario outcome (a feasible event proposal delivered as a group pitch with Q&A) defines the assessment evidence and success criteria, which then guide the selection and sequencing of supporting tasks. This ensures constructive alignment between intended learning outcomes, classroom activities, and the pass/fail assessment approach.

2.5.1. Module Rationale and Selection

A scenario focused on planning a class event was selected because it mirrors a realistic domain of action for Year 9 learners and naturally requires sustained spoken

interaction (negotiation, decision making, agreeing/disagreeing, giving reasons and proposing solutions). It also allows for clear intermediate goals and a tangible final outcome, which supports learner motivation and makes progress visible across weekly lessons (Ur 1996; Harmer 2007). The scenario aligns with the course-level learning outcomes (Section 2.3) and provides opportunities for structured scaffolding to reduce speaking anxiety and ensure more even participation. In the module, these principles are implemented through a constraints card (time/budget/inclusivity), role cards that distribute responsibilities, and a structured meeting agenda that requires negotiated decisions (Appendix 4). Speaking support is provided via a functional language bank and prompt cards, followed by guided rehearsal with peer feedback (“two strengths + one target”) before the final pitch (Appendix 4; Appendix 3).

Although the elective course is not designed as direct exam preparation, the module supports Year 9 speaking demands by practising core B1-relevant functions (e.g., sustaining interaction, giving brief reasons, responding to follow-up questions) under realistic time pressure and with intelligibility-focused feedback. These elements are transferable to the oral components and interactional expectations associated with end-of-year performance in basic school.

If feasible, the class may implement the selected event later in the course as an optional extension, which strengthens the “action in the real world” dimension without changing the core four-lesson module structure.

2.5.2. Scenario Description (Social Context, Roles and Final Outcome)

The scenario is framed as a realistic school situation: the class is given an opportunity to organise one class event (e.g., a themed afternoon, charity mini-event, cultural activity, or end-of-term class gathering). Each group acts as an “event team” that must propose a plan that is feasible within school constraints and convincing to an audience.

The teacher introduces a concrete trigger: the Student Council is collecting proposals for Class Community Week and will approve one low-cost, inclusive event idea per class. The pitch audience is the class and the teacher (acting as a Student Council representative). After pitches, the class votes for the most feasible proposal (optional real-life implementation can follow later).

The scenario culminates in two linked outcomes: (1) a group pitch with Q&A where each team presents its plan to the class (and teacher) as an authentic audience, and (2) a class decision, where one plan (or a combined plan) is selected for implementation. If implementation is feasible, the selected plan is carried out later in the course as a short real-life action; if not, the decision stage is retained and the selected plan is finalised as a realistic implementation-ready proposal. Within these constraints, learners make key decisions themselves: selecting the event type, deciding priorities (cost, fun, inclusivity), distributing responsibilities, and shaping the persuasive message. This supports learner agency and co-construction of meaning, as learners must negotiate and justify choices rather than reproduce pre-set answers.

To support balanced participation, each group assigns roles:

- Coordinator (manages agenda and turn-taking; summarises decisions);
- Budget & realism checker (checks constraints and realism);
- Programme & logistics manager (plans schedule, place, materials);
- Communication & promotion manager (shapes the pitch and persuasive message).

Logistics focuses on schedule/place/materials list; the budget role estimates costs and checks limits. If groups have 3 learners, combine roles (e.g., Coordinator + Promotion; Logistics + Budget). If groups have 5 learners, split Promotion into “message” and “Q&A support” or add an “inclusivity checker”.

The final outcome is a 2–3 minute group pitch presenting the event proposal to an audience (class and teacher), followed by a short Q&A (1–2 questions). Each learner has a defined speaking responsibility in the pitch, ensuring that the outcome reflects both interaction and spoken production in a purposeful context.

2.5.3. Intended Learning Outcomes for The Module

By the end of the module, learners will be able to:

- co-plan in a small group by taking turns and building on others' ideas (e.g., adding, agreeing/disagreeing politely), while keeping the discussion focused on the shared goal;
- use interaction strategies to maintain communication during planning and Q&A (e.g., asking for clarification, paraphrasing, checking understanding, summarising group decisions);
- express and justify choices by giving brief reasons and explanations for suggestions, preferences, and decisions related to a familiar school context;
- mediate within the group by summarising what has been decided and what still needs to be done;
- deliver a short group pitch with a clear structure and sufficient intelligibility and coherence for the audience to follow;
- participate in a short Q&A by asking and answering follow-up questions using simple repair strategies when needed.

The outcomes are formulated as observable actions (“what the learner does and how”), so that each can be evidenced through the meeting interaction, the pitch/Q&A performance, and the short self-assessment.

2.5.4. Module Overview: Lesson Sequence and Task Logic

The module follows a predictable speaking-support routine: preparation → performance → feedback → reflection, which helps learners participate more confidently and enables systematic scaffolding (Ur 1996; Harmer 2007). Table 2 summarises the module sequence.

The four lessons follow a clear progression: (1) scenario launch + functional language and constraints, (2) a structured meeting to negotiate and decide, (3) pitch drafting and rehearsal with feedback, (4) final pitch + Q&A and reflection. Each lesson produces a small output that directly prepares the group for the final pitch.

Table 2. Module overview: Planning a Class Event

Lesson	Lesson aim (speaking focus)	Key tasks (AoA logic)	Output / evidence
1	Launch scenario; build functional language; ensure entry to speaking	scenario briefing; role allocation; language bank; micro- dialogues; brainstorming	role cards; idea list; short pair exchanges
2	Negotiate options; practise interaction strategies	structured “team meeting” with agenda; decision making;	meeting notes; teacher observation checklist

		meeting summary	
3	Prepare the pitch; rehearse with feedback	pitch structure; rehearsal rounds; revision	improved pitch plan
4	Perform pitch + Q&A; reflect and set goals	final pitches; Q&A; self-assessment and goal-setting	final performance; self-reflection sheet

2.5.5. Lesson-by-lesson implementation plan and materials (Scenario 4)

This section summarises the lesson-by-lesson implementation of Scenario 4. The full lesson plans follow the format used in teacher training (lesson outcomes, materials, procedure with teacher moves, evidence collection, and replacement speaking task options) and are provided in Appendix X, together with all ready-to-use materials (handouts/templates) in Appendix Y. The four lessons form a coherent AoA task sequence from scenario launch to a final public outcome (pitch + Q&A).

Table 3. Scenario 4 lesson sequence (overview)

Lesson	Intended speaking outcome	Key teacher moves (high-level)	Materials used	Evidence collected
1 Launch + support	learners can propose ideas and ask clarification	introduce narrative roles + constraints;	Slides: scenario brief; Handout: Language	observation notes + exit ticket

		model 4–5 phrases; short guided speaking	Bank; Role cards	
2 Meeting (negotiate & decide)	learners can negotiate and reach a decision in role	structure meeting turns; enforce role responsibilities; prompt follow- up questions	Meeting agenda; Planning sheet	checklist (meeting)
3 Pitch build + rehearsal	learners can deliver their part with reasons	draft pitch; timed rehearsal; peer feedback prompts	Pitch planner; Feedback form	rehearsal checklist + self- assessment
4 Final pitch + Q&A + reflection	learners can pitch + answer questions	manage audience rules; Q&A prompts; reflection and goal-setting	Final performance sheet; Reflection sheet	final checklist + reflection sheet

The sequence operationalises AoA principles by placing a concrete social situation at the centre of each lesson: learners act in roles, make decisions under constraints, and produce a public outcome for an audience. Learner agency is built in through group decision-making (event choice, distribution of responsibilities, pitch content) and through personalised goal-setting after feedback. Multilingual resources may be used selectively

during planning/brainstorming and reflection (e.g., to generate ideas or clarify meaning), while English remains the main working language during core speaking tasks and assessed performances.

2.5.6. Scaffolding, Differentiation and Plurilingual Support

Support is provided through predictable routines (start-of-lesson “pick 2 phrases” from Language Bank, timed speaking turns + role reminder, micro-feedback: two stars + one target, exit reflection ticket), role cards, structured meeting agendas, functional language banks and rehearsal cycles. Interaction strategies (clarification requests, paraphrasing, checking understanding, summarising) are explicitly practised and then required during the meeting task and Q&A (Council of Europe 2020; Ur 1996).

To support mixed confidence levels, the module includes:

- sentence starters and optional prompt cards for less confident learners;
- extension prompts for stronger learners (e.g., anticipating objections, summarising group decisions, reformulating another speaker’s idea);
- rotating roles so that each learner has a manageable and meaningful speaking responsibility.

All learners receive the Language Bank; prompt cards are optional support. Learners choose 2–3 phrases to try in the task; the teacher briefly models and practises them before the main speaking.

Learners may use other languages strategically during preparation (planning, clarifying task instructions, brainstorming) if this supports task completion and lowers barriers, while the core speaking tasks and final outcome are conducted in English. In practice, this can include brief L1-supported brainstorming of event ideas, followed by a deliberate move to English when formulating the pitch message and Q&A answers. Learners may also compare key functional phrases across languages (e.g., polite disagreement,

clarifying questions) to notice pragmatic differences and select appropriate English forms. The scenario can naturally incorporate a pluricultural angle (e.g., planning an inclusive event that values different backgrounds), while keeping the assessed spoken outcome in English. Reflection may include brief comparisons of functional phrases across languages when this supports noticing and retention (Council of Europe 2020).

2.5.7. Assessment Evidence and Criteria Within The Module

Assessment within the module follows the course's pass/fail and formative logic (Section 2.4). Evidence includes:

- teacher observation during the meeting and final pitch (participation, task achievement, interaction strategies, intelligibility);
- artefacts from the process (meeting summary + pitch planner / pitch outline);
- learner self-assessment and reflection after the final performance;
- (optional, non-assessing) audience question notes used to generate Q&A practice.

Only English-speaking performance related to the scenario outcome is used for assessment decisions. Plurilingual support (e.g., brief L1 brainstorming) and audience notes are used as learning scaffolds and are not assessed as separate components.

Minimum evidence for Pass in this module (for a pass/fail course):

A learner is considered to have met the minimum requirements in this module if they provide evidence in all of the following areas:

- Participation evidence: the learner participates in at least two core speaking moments (the planning meeting and/or the final pitch/Q&A), as observed by the teacher or demonstrated through an agreed replacement speaking task alternative.
- Outcome contribution: the learner completes an assigned role contribution (e.g., delivering their pitch part and/or summarising group decisions).

- Reflection evidence: the learner completes the short self-assessment and sets one next-step goal.

If a learner misses a lesson that provides key evidence, they complete the corresponding replacement speaking task:

- Lesson 1 (brainstorming/role allocation): completed brainstorming sheet + 30–45s voice note “my event idea”.
- Lesson 2 (planning meeting): 60–90s voice note meeting summary (2 decisions + my contribution) OR answers to two negotiation/clarification prompts.
- Lesson 3 (rehearsal): pitch planner section + 45–60s rehearsal recording of the assigned part.
- Lesson 4 (final pitch/Q&A): 60–90s recording of the pitch part + answers to two Q&A questions + completed self-assessment.

Learner-friendly criteria are shared before the final task and revisited during reflection to support transparency and learner autonomy (Council of Europe 2020; Brown 2007).

All lesson plans (Appendix 3), student materials (Appendix 4), assessment tools (Appendix 5) and the CEFR mapping (Appendix 6) are provided to support implementation and are referenced at the relevant points in this chapter.

2.6. Design Rationale and Readiness for Implementation

This chapter presented the design of the elective course *Speaking in English* and a detailed scenario-based module, *Planning a Class Event*, as the main design outputs of the thesis. The design decisions were guided by the Action-Oriented Approach and CEFR-oriented perspectives on communicative language activities: learners are treated as social agents who collaborate to accomplish purposeful tasks in realistic contexts, and speaking development is supported through scenario-based sequences that integrate preparation,

performance, feedback and reflection (Council of Europe 2001, 2020; Piccardo & North 2019). In addition, the chapter operationalised constructive alignment by formulating learning outcomes first, planning tasks and scenarios that require learners to demonstrate these outcomes, and defining criteria and evidence sources that make achievement observable and transparent (Biggs 1999, as cited in Macalister & Nation 2020).

The proposed assessment model fits the elective format by prioritising formative feedback, participation and task achievement while maintaining clear minimum expectations through a pass/fail approach. This aims to support sustained learner engagement and reduce speaking anxiety, which is a common barrier in classroom speaking practice (Ur 1996; Harmer 2007; Brown 2007). The detailed module illustrates how these principles can be translated into teacher-friendly lesson sequences with explicit scaffolding, interaction support and learner reflection tools.

As the thesis does not include piloting, the design outputs should be understood as a theoretically grounded, implementable proposal rather than evidence of effectiveness. Nevertheless, the course overview, module plan, materials and assessment tools are presented in a sufficiently explicit form to enable classroom implementation in comparable school contexts. Future work could include piloting the module, collecting teacher and learner feedback, and analysing learner performance in relation to CEFR-oriented descriptors to further refine the design and evaluate its impact.

CONCLUSION

The aim of this thesis was to develop a theoretically grounded and implementable design for a speaking-oriented elective course for Year 9 learners and to demonstrate how Action-Oriented Approach principles can be translated into concrete classroom practice. Building on CEFR-oriented views of language learning and use, the thesis treated learners as social agents who use English to accomplish purposeful tasks in realistic contexts, and it conceptualised speaking development through scenario-based sequences that integrate preparation, interaction, feedback and reflection.

Chapter 1 established the theoretical foundation for the design by synthesising literature on speaking competence, classroom challenges in speaking, communicative and task-based approaches, and the Action-Oriented Approach. Particular attention was paid to how AoA extends earlier communicative traditions by emphasising scenario-based organisation, learner agency, mediation and the pedagogical value of learners' plurilingual repertoires. In addition, the chapter highlighted the relevance of constructive alignment for ensuring coherence between intended outcomes, learning activities and assessment.

Chapter 2 presented the design outputs of the thesis. The elective course *Speaking in English* was developed as a one-year course (35 academic hours) structured around several shorter scenarios, each culminating in a tangible communicative outcome. Intended learning outcomes were formulated in a CEFR-oriented can-do logic, with a focus on B1-relevant spoken production and interaction. To address common barriers in classroom speaking, the design incorporated predictable lesson routines and systematic scaffolding, including functional language support, interaction strategies, rehearsal opportunities and reflection tools. The assessment model was specified to fit the elective format: it prioritises formative feedback and observable task achievement within a transparent pass/fail framework supported by teacher observation, peer feedback and learner self-assessment.

The detailed module, *Planning a Class Event*, illustrated how the course principles can be operationalised in a coherent four-lesson scenario. The module includes explicit roles, constraints and intermediate goals that guide learners from idea generation and negotiation to a final group pitch and Q&A. Its lesson-by-lesson structure demonstrates how speaking development can be supported through preparation phases, structured interaction formats, feedback cycles and learner reflection. Together, the course overview, the detailed module and the accompanying materials form a teacher-friendly package that can be implemented in comparable school settings.

A key limitation of the present thesis is the absence of piloting and empirical evaluation. The work therefore does not claim evidence of effectiveness; rather, it offers a theory-based, ready-to-implement design proposal. Future work could pilot the module and course structure in a real classroom, collect teacher and learner feedback, and analyse learner performance in relation to CEFR-oriented descriptor scales. Such evaluation could inform further refinement of tasks, scaffolding and assessment criteria, as well as adjustments for different learner profiles and school constraints.

Despite these limitations, the thesis contributes a coherent design model for speaking-oriented elective teaching that is aligned with an action-oriented view of language education. By connecting AoA principles with practical planning tools, scenario sequences and assessment templates, the work provides a concrete example of how CEFR-oriented frameworks can be translated into feasible classroom materials that support learner participation, confidence and meaningful spoken communication.

REFERENCES

- Biggs, John. 1999. *Teaching for Quality Learning at University*. Buckingham: Open University Press. (Cited in Macalister and Nation 2020.)
- Bourguignon, Claire. 2006. From Communicative to Action-Oriented Approaches: Towards a New Language Education Paradigm. In Enrica Piccardo (ed.). *Research Symposium TESL Ontario*, 20–35. Toronto: TESL Ontario.
- Brown, H. Douglas. 2007. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. 5th ed. New York: Pearson Education.
- Bygate, Martin. 1987. *Speaking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. (2001). Available at <https://rm.coe.int/16809ea0d4>, accessed in on 19 January 2026.
- Council of Europe. 2020. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment – Companion Volume with New Descriptors*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Ellis, Rod. 2003. *Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Euroopa keeleõppe raamdokumendi sõsarväljaanne. 2023. https://hm.ee/sites/default/files/documents/2023-01/S%C3%B5sarv%C3%A4ljaanne_Jaanuar%202023.pdf (accessed 14 September 2025).
- Harmer, Jeremy. 2007. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. 4th ed. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Macalister, John and I. S. P. Nation. 2020. *Language Curriculum Design*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.
- Piccardo, Enrica and Brian North. 2019. *The Action-Oriented Approach: A Dynamic Vision of Language Education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Richards, Jack C. and Theodore S. Rodgers. 2014. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Riigiteataja. 2011. *Põhikooli riiklik õppekava*. Lisa 8. Võõrkeeled. Vabariigi Valitsuse 6. jaanuari 2011. a määrus nr 1. Available at https://www.riigiteataja.ee/akt/lisa/1250/6202/5011/18m_pohi_lisa8.pdf#, accessed on 19 January 2026.
- Riigiteataja. 2011. *Põhikooli riiklik õppekava*. Vastu võetud 06.01.2011 nr 1. RT I, 14.01.2011, 1. Redaktsioon jõustunud 01.09.2025, kehtiv kuni 31.08.2026. Available at <https://www.riigiteataja.ee/akt/110082024002?leiaKehtiv>, accessed on 19 January 2026.
- Stoller, Fredricka L. 2006. “Establishing a Theoretical Foundation for Project-Based Learning in Second and Foreign Language Contexts.” In *Project-Based Second and Foreign Language Education*, edited by Beckett and Slater, 19–40. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Ur, Penny. 1996. *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Willis, Jane. 1996. *A Framework for Task-Based Learning*. Harlow: Longman.
- LINGuistic and Cultural Diversity REinvented (LINCdIRE). n.d. <https://www.lincdireproject.org> (accessed December 2025).
- Council of Europe. n.d. *The Action-oriented Approach*. <https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages/the-action-oriented-approach> (accessed 11 December 2025).

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Student-Friendly Course Syllabus: *Speaking in English*

Course title: *Speaking in English* (Year 9 elective)

Duration: 35 academic hours (1 lesson per week, 45 minutes)

Main goal: to practise speaking regularly and confidently through realistic scenarios and teamwork.

What we do in this course

- We work in **short scenarios** (4 lessons).
- In each scenario you have a **role**, a **clear task**, and a **final speaking outcome** (a pitch, a meeting, an interview, a presentation, etc.).
- Lessons follow a simple routine: **prepare** → **speak** → **get teacher feedback** → **reflect**.

What you will be able to do by the end of the course

By the end of the course, you can:

1. start and maintain simple conversations (greetings, small talk, questions/answers);
2. describe experiences, interests and everyday life in connected speech;
3. give opinions and **brief reasons**, agree/disagree politely;
4. take part in group discussions: take turns, ask for clarification, respond to others;
5. prepare and deliver short speaking products (pitch/presentation/role-play) clearly;
6. work in a team to complete a speaking task and produce a shared outcome;
7. use communication strategies (paraphrasing, asking for clarification) when you lack words;
8. reflect on your speaking and set small, realistic personal goals.

How you pass the course (Pass/Fail)

You receive **PASS** if you meet the minimum requirements below:

- **Attendance:** you attend at least 28 out of 35 lessons (about 80%). If you are absent, you complete the replacement speaking task (a short voice note or an in-class mini-performance) agreed with the teacher.
- **Scenario outcomes:** you complete the final outcome in at least 6 out of 8 scenarios. Scenario 4 (Planning a Class Event) is compulsory.
- **Participation:** you take a speaking role in scenario work so the teacher can collect evidence (meeting / pitch / interview / discussion / Q&A).
- **Reflection:** you complete the short self-assessment/reflection tasks for the scenarios you complete (minimum 6).

- To pass, you need to meet the minimum standard for the core speaking evidence task (Scenario 4) or complete a replacement speaking task if needed (Appendix 5).

You may receive **FAIL** if you do not meet one or more minimum requirements above (e.g., insufficient attendance without replacement speaking task, fewer than 6 scenario outcomes completed, or missing the compulsory Scenario 4 outcome).

If you miss a key lesson (especially a scenario outcome lesson), you can still pass by completing a short replacement speaking task: a 1–2 minute voice note OR a short in-class mini-performance, plus a completed self-assessment checklist.

Scenario 4 provides core speaking evidence for the course pass/fail decision (see Appendix 5).

Classroom rules (speaking-friendly)

- English is the main working language during speaking tasks. You may use your other language(s) briefly to plan or check meaning, but the core speaking performance is in English (“English time”).
- Mistakes are normal: we focus on **communicating meaning**, not on “perfect grammar”.
- We respect speakers: no laughing at mistakes, we support each other.
- Everyone has a speaking role and a chance to contribute.
- If a rule is broken, the teacher will stop the activity, remind the rule, and restart the task (“reset”) so everyone can speak safely.
- If someone repeatedly blocks others from speaking (e.g., dominating, mocking, refusing to take turns), the teacher may change roles/groups to protect participation.
- Participation rules are connected to passing the course: if a learner repeatedly refuses to take any speaking role, they must complete a replacement speaking task to provide minimum evidence.

Appendix 2 – Year Course Overview

Lesson	Scenario / Topic	Scenario context, roles and audience (key constraints)	Final outcome (product)	Main speaking focus
1	Course launch	orientation to course; baseline speaking routines	course agreement + baseline speaking snapshot (diagnostic)	classroom interaction routines; self-goals
2				
3	Scenario 1. “Who am I?”	school / youth exchange context; roles: new peer &	2–3 min “about me” talk + partner	spoken production + interaction
4				

5	Introducing myself in English”	interviewer; audience: classmates (paired)	Q&A (recorded notes or checklist)	(greetings, follow-up questions, repair)
6				
7	Scenario 2. “My Interests: Club Fair”	preferences + recommendations	short club pitch + Q&A carousel (rotating audience questions)	persuasion basics; asking/answering questions; turn-taking
8		agreeing/disagreeing politely		
9		fluency		
10		interaction		
11	Scenario 3. “School Life: Class Meeting”	class meeting; roles: chair + contributor; audience: class; constraint: agree on 2 actions	group discussion leading to a class decision + spoken summary of decisions	discussion skills: opinions, agree/disagree politely, giving reasons, summarising
12				
13				
14				
15	Scenario 4. “Planning a Class Event” (DETAILED MODULE)	planning a feasible class event; roles (rotating): coordinator/logistics/promotion; audience: class + teacher; constraints: time/budget/inclusivity	2–3 min group pitch + Q&A (event proposal)	negotiation + collaborative planning + Q&A strategies
16				
17				
18				
19	Scenario 5. “Media & Well-being: Advice for Younger Students”	creating advice for Grade 6; roles: peer advisers; audience: younger learners; input: short texts/videos	spoken recommendation + mediated summary of key points (in own words)	mediation + giving advice + explaining reasons
20				
21				
22				
23	Scenario 6. “Future Pathways: Plans and Choices”	career/paths mini-fair; roles: speaker & interviewer; audience: peers	short interview + spoken justification of a choice (follow-up questions)	talking about plans; giving reasons; interaction under time limits
24				
25				
26				
27	Scenario 7. “Travel / Exchange:	planning an exchange visit/day trip; roles:	negotiated itinerary + spoken	functional language for planning +
28				

29	Planning Together”	planners; audience: class; constraints: time/budget	presentation of the final plan	negotiation; pluricultural awareness
30				
31	Scenario 8. “Showcase & Reflection”	end-of-course showcase; roles: presenters & reviewers; audience: class	short speaking showcase + self-assessment + next-step goal setting	integrated speaking; reflection using can-do statements
32				
33				
34				
35	Course wrap-up / reflection	reflection and transfer	learning reflection + “transfer plan” (how to keep improving)	reflection talk; goal setting

Scenario cards (full descriptions)

Course launch

- Situation / story: Learners get oriented to the course format (scenario-based speaking), agree on class routines, and produce a short baseline speaking sample to set personal goals.
- Roles & audience: whole class; pairs/small groups for short interactions; audience: peers + teacher.
- Constraints: low-stakes diagnostic; focus on routines (turn-taking, “I don’t understand”, asking for repetition).
- Final outcome: course agreement + baseline speaking snapshot (diagnostic).
- Intermediate goals (by lessons):
 - L1: course overview + speaking routines; goal-setting language; short pair tasks;
 - L2: diagnostic speaking snapshot + reflection (one personal goal).
- Evidence: brief teacher observation notes + learner self-goal statement.

Scenario 1: Who am I? Introducing myself in English

- Situation / story: The class prepares for a school/youth exchange context where students meet new peers. Learners act as “buddy pairs” and practise introducing themselves in a friendly, natural way.
- Roles & audience: Speaker + interviewer (paired); audience: classmates (paired / small group sharing).
- Constraints: 2–3 minutes; include key points (e.g., name, background, interests, one “fun fact”); partner asks follow-up questions.
- Preparation stages: Planning → Language support → Rehearsal → Final performance + reflection.

- Final outcome: 2–3 min “About me” talk + partner Q&A (recorded notes / checklist).
- Intermediate goals (by lessons):
 - L3: build a language bank for self-introduction + practise follow-up questions;
 - L4: conduct a structured partner interview and select information for the talk;
 - L5: draft and rehearse the talk with peer support (clarity, order, intelligibility);
 - L6: deliver the final talk + Q&A and complete brief self-assessment (next-step goal).
- Evidence: peer/teacher observation checklist + learner self-assessment; optional audio/video recording.

Scenario 2: My Interests: Club Fair

- Situation / story: The school runs a club fair. Learners represent a real or imaginary club and try to attract new members by explaining what the club does and why it is worth joining.
- Roles & audience: club representative(s) + visitors; rotating peer audience (carousel).
- Constraints: short pitch (60–90 sec) + Q&A; visitors must ask at least 1–2 questions; polite agreeing/disagreeing encouraged.
- Preparation stages: Planning → Language support → Rehearsal → Final performance + reflection.
- Final outcome: short club pitch + Q&A in carousel format.
- Intermediate goals (by lessons):
 - L7: brainstorm clubs/interests and build persuasive phrases + question stems;
 - L8: plan pitch structure (hook–what we do–why join–how to join);
 - L9: rehearsal + feedback on clarity/turn-taking;
 - L10: perform carousel pitches + reflection (one speaking goal).
- Evidence: observation checklist + brief self-assessment; optional pitch planner sheet.

Scenario 3: School Life: Class Meeting

- Situation / story: Learners take part in a class meeting to discuss a concrete class-life issue and reach agreement on actions. The goal is to negotiate politely and make decisions together.
- Roles & audience: chair (meeting leader) + contributors (speakers); audience: class.
- Constraints: the group must agree on two actions; chair must keep the meeting moving; end with a clear spoken summary of decisions.
- Preparation stages: Planning → Language support → Rehearsal → Final performance + reflection.
- Final outcome: group discussion leading to a class decision + spoken summary of decisions.

- Intermediate goals (by lessons):
 - L11: meeting language (opinions, agreeing/disagreeing politely, giving reasons); set agenda + choose issue;
 - L12: structured meeting practice in small groups; focus on turn-taking and clarification;
 - L13: decision-making round (prioritise, compromise, agree on two actions); prepare summary;
 - L14: final meeting performance + spoken summary + reflection (one interaction goal).
- Evidence: teacher/peer observation checklist + meeting notes (two actions agreed) + brief self-assessment.

Scenario 4: Planning a Class Event

- Situation / story: The Student Council invites each class to propose one low-cost, inclusive class event for Class Community Week. Learners work in teams as event planners and must design a realistic proposal that fits the constraints and persuades an authentic audience.
- Roles & audience: rotating roles within teams (coordinator / logistics / budget & feasibility / promotion); audience: class + teacher (as Student Council representative).
- Constraints: time, budget, inclusivity; clear division of speaking roles; 2–3 min pitch + Q&A.
- Preparation stages: Planning → Language support → Rehearsal → Final performance + reflection.
- Final outcome: 2–3 min group pitch + Q&A (event proposal).
- Intermediate goals (by lessons):
 - L15: scenario launch + constraints clarification; idea generation; role allocation + language support for planning;
 - L16: structured planning meeting (negotiation, agreeing/disagreeing politely, decision-making);
 - L17: pitch planning + rehearsal with feedback (clarity, turn-taking, persuasiveness);
 - L18: final pitch + Q&A + reflection (next-step speaking goal).
- Evidence: observation checklist + short learner self-assessment; optional audio/video of pitch; meeting notes or a brief team plan.

A full lesson-by-lesson implementation is provided in Appendix 3.

Scenario 5: Media & Well-being: Advice for Younger Students

- Situation / story: Learners create practical advice for Grade 6 students about healthy screen time and online well-being. They work as peer advisers and aim to be clear, supportive, and convincing.
- Roles & audience: peer advisers (pairs/groups); audience: younger learners (imagined Grade 6 audience), presented to classmates as a “trial audience”.
- Constraints: advice must be simple, age-appropriate, and include reasons/examples; input includes short texts/videos that teams summarise.

- Preparation stages: Planning → Language support → Rehearsal → Final performance + reflection.
- Final outcome: spoken recommendation + mediated summary of key points (in own words).
- Intermediate goals (by lessons):
 - L19: explore inputs (short texts/videos) + extract key ideas; build advice language (should/shouldn't, it's good to..., because...);
 - L20: draft advice points + add reasons/examples; practise mediation (paraphrasing, summarising);
 - L21: rehearse delivery (clarity, supportive tone) + peer feedback;
 - L22: final advice talk + short Q&A; reflection (one communication goal).
- Evidence: observation checklist + mediation notes (key points in own words) + brief self-assessment.

Scenario 6: Future Pathways: Plans and Choices

- Situation / story: A class “mini-fair” where learners discuss future plans (study/work paths). They practise short interviews and justify their choices under time limits.
- Roles & audience: speaker + interviewer (rotating); audience: peers.
- Constraints: short interview format; speaker must give reasons and respond to follow-up questions; time limits per round.
- Preparation stages: Planning → Language support → Rehearsal → Final performance + reflection.
- Final outcome: short interview + spoken justification of a choice (with follow-up questions).
- Intermediate goals (by lessons):
 - L23: launch + vocabulary for pathways; language for plans (going to / would like to) + reasons;
 - L24: interview question practice (follow-ups, clarification) + role-plays;
 - L25: timed interview rounds + feedback on interaction (turn-taking, clarity, repair);
 - L26: “mini-fair” performance + reflection (next-step goal).
- Evidence: teacher/peer checklist + learner self-assessment; optional short recording of one interview round.

Scenario 7: Travel / Exchange Planning Together

- Situation / story: Learners plan a class exchange visit/day trip. They must negotiate priorities and build a realistic itinerary that fits budget/time constraints.
- Roles & audience: planners (teams); audience: class.
- Constraints: time/budget; clear itinerary structure; negotiated decisions (must show compromise).
- Preparation stages: Planning → Language support → Rehearsal → Final performance + reflection.
- Final outcome: negotiated itinerary + spoken presentation of the final plan.
- Intermediate goals (by lessons):

- L27: launch + preferences/priorities; functional language for suggestions and negotiation;
 - L28: build itinerary draft + justify choices; practise disagreement politely + compromise;
 - L29: rehearse presentation + anticipate questions; add intercultural/pluricultural notes (simple awareness points);
 - L30: final presentation + Q&A + reflection (one speaking goal).
- Evidence: itinerary plan (written outline) + observation checklist + brief self-assessment.

Scenario 8: Showcase & Reflection

- Situation / story: End-of-course showcase where learners present a short speaking “best-of” performance and act as supportive reviewers for peers.
- Roles & audience: presenters & reviewers; audience: class.
- Constraints: short format; evidence-based reflection using can-do statements; constructive peer feedback.
- Preparation stages: Planning → Language support → Rehearsal → Final performance + reflection.
- Final outcome: short speaking showcase + self-assessment + next-step goal setting.
- Intermediate goals (by lessons):
- L31: select showcase content + review can-do statements; plan speaking focus;
 - L32: rehearsal + feedback (intelligibility, structure, interaction);
 - L33: showcase performances + peer review;
 - L34: reflection session: can-do self-check + written next-step goal.
- Evidence: showcase checklist + self-assessment + peer feedback notes.

Course wrap-up / reflection (Lesson 35)

- Situation / story: Final transfer lesson focused on progress, strengths, and “how to keep improving” beyond the course.
- Roles & audience: individual reflection + pair discussion; audience: peers/teacher.
- Constraints: goal must be specific and realistic; includes one strategy for independent speaking practice.
- Final outcome: learning reflection + “transfer plan” (how to keep improving).
- Evidence: reflection notes + one next-step action commitment.

Appendix 3 – Teacher Lesson Plan Pack (Scenario 4: Planning a Class Event)

Lesson 1 — Launching the scenario & building speaking support (45 min)

Lesson aim: introduce scenario and roles; build functional language; ensure everyone speaks early.

Materials: role cards; language bank; prompt cards; brainstorming sheet.

Time	Activity + instructions	Aims/learning outcomes + comments
-------------	--------------------------------	--

0–3	Warm-up (pairs): “What makes a class event enjoyable?” One idea each.	Activate schema; ensure everyone speaks once early; collect success criteria language.
3–8	Scenario briefing (whole class): Present the scenario as a concrete situation: propose one realistic class event and pitch it to an audience. Show final outcome requirements (2–3 min pitch + Q&A) and success criteria (clarity, feasibility, collaboration, B1 interaction strategies). Introduce roles + constraints (Role Cards + Constraints Card, Appendix 4). Quick CCQs: “What is the final product?”, “Who is the audience?”, “What limits do we have?”	Learners understand the situation, roles, audience and constraints; alignment with final outcome is explicit; comprehension checked (CCQs).
8–18	Functional language input (whole class): Present language bank (suggesting / agreeing / disagreeing / clarification). Model 2–3 short exchanges.	Build speaking support for negotiation + repair; provide ready-to-use chunks and model use in context.
18–28	Controlled practice (pairs): Prompt-card micro-dialogues. Rotate partners once.	Practise target phrases in short turns; build confidence + fluency before group work; teacher monitors for common upgrades.
28–33	Form groups + assign roles (groups of 4): Each group assigns roles (Coordinator / Budget & feasibility / Logistics / Promotion–Spokesperson). Teacher may re-balance to ensure each learner has a speaking responsibility; roles can rotate in Lesson 2 if needed.	Structure collaboration; guarantee distributed speaking turns for pitch/Q&A; prevent “silent members”.
33–42	Brainstorming task (groups): Generate 3–4 event ideas and check each against constraints (budget/time/place/inclusivity). Ensure each learner contributes.	Produce feasible options; practise negotiation language; keep ideas realistic within constraints.

42–45	Exit reflection (individual): “Today I used...” + “Next time I will...” (1 sentence each).	Self-monitoring; set a concrete next step for Lesson 2.
-------	---	---

Anticipated problems & solutions:

- **Silence / anxiety:** use sentence starters + “one idea each” turn rule in warm-up and brainstorming.
- **Unrealistic ideas (time/budget):** refer back to the Constraints Card + ask 2 CCQs (“Is it possible in 45 minutes?”, “Is it within budget?”).
- **L1 overuse:** allow brief L1 only for planning/meaning checks; remind “English time” for the speaking parts.

If a learner is absent: complete the brainstorming sheet + record a **30–45s voice note:** “my event idea” + choose **2 useful phrases** from the language bank.

Teacher note: before sharing the full language bank, elicit **4–6 learner-generated phrases** (in English or via brief L1 brainstorming), add them to the board, then provide the complete Language Bank (Appendix 4).

Lesson 2 — Negotiation task: team meeting (45 min)

Aim: practise turn-taking, negotiation, reaching a decision, interaction strategies.

Materials: meeting agenda; strategy card; teacher checklist.

Time	Activity + instructions	Aims/learning outcomes + comments
0–3	Warm-up recap (whole class): “Pick 2 phrases you will use today.” (from language bank).	Activate support language; set personal focus before meeting.
3–10	Meeting prep + micro-dialogues (pairs → share): Show agenda: choose event → decide programme → budget/logistics → promotion message → responsibilities. Prompt cards: in pairs, draw 2–3 cards and create a 30–45 sec micro-dialogue (propose, disagree politely, clarify, compromise). Rehearse once, perform once to another pair, swap cards and repeat.	Rehearse key interaction moves; reduce cognitive load for the main meeting; teacher notes 2–3 common upgrades for feedback.

10–30	Main task: planning meeting (groups): Groups run meeting; Coordinator manages turns; agree on a feasible plan. Teacher monitors using checklist.	Negotiation + collaborative decision-making; evidence of interaction strategies (turn-taking, clarification, reasons).
30–38	Feedback (whole class): Give each group “2 strengths + 1 target” (interaction + clarity).	Formative feedback focused on communicative success + one improvement priority.
38–45	Next-step planning (groups): Decide what to include in pitch; assign speaking parts for next lesson.	Prepare for pitch stage; ensure everyone has a speaking role.

Anticipated problems & solutions:

- **Dominant speaker / uneven turns:** assign “turn tokens” (each learner must speak at least 2 times) + coordinator monitors turn-taking.
- **Decision-making stalls:** use a 2-minute timer per agenda item + “vote on top 2” rule.
- **L1 overuse:** allow brief L1 only for planning/clarifying; remind “English time” for negotiation moves.

If a learner is absent: record a **60–90s voice note:** “meeting summary + 2 decisions + my role contribution” OR answer 2 teacher prompts (negotiation/clarification).

Teacher note: if a group struggles, provide **two sentence starters** (e.g., “I suggest... because...”, “Can we compromise by...?”) and step back.

Lesson 3 — Pitch preparation & rehearsal (45 min)

Aim: improve coherence and intelligibility; practise Q&A; use peer feedback.

Materials: pitch planner; peer feedback form; language bank.

Time	Activity + instructions	Aims/learning outcomes + comments
0–3	Warm-up (whole class): “One reason” round: each learner gives one reason for the event.	Practise giving reasons in short turns; warm up for persuasion.
3–13	Pitch structuring (groups): Use pitch planner (opening → 3 main points → closing).	Organise message for clarity; connect plan to persuasive structure.

13–23	Rehearsal 1 (group → another group): Perform to another group; listeners complete peer feedback form.	Low-stakes performance; collect specific feedback on clarity, turns, reasons.
23–30	Revision (groups): Incorporate feedback; improve clarity, reasons, turn transitions.	Upgrade language + coherence; fix weak points before final rehearsal.
30–40	Rehearsal 2 (groups): Shorter rehearsal with one focus target (e.g., smoother turns / clearer reasons).	Build confidence; sharpen one measurable element for final performance.
40–45	Reflection (individual): Choose 1 personal goal for final performance.	Individual ownership of next step; link to self-assessment.

Anticipated problems & solutions:

- **Reading from notes / low eye contact:** set “keyword notes only” rule + rehearse once without paper.
- **Weak persuasion (no reasons):** require each speaker to add **one reason/example** (“because... / for example...”).
- **Transitions between speakers:** teach 2–3 linking phrases (“Now X will explain...”, “Next we’ll talk about...”).

If a learner is absent: submit pitch planner + record **45–60s rehearsal** of their assigned part (or a full mini-pitch if roles changed).

Teacher note: keep feedback focused: **one clarity point + one interaction point** (do not overload learners).

Lesson 4 — Final pitch + Q&A and reflection (45 min)

Aim: perform final outcome; reflect; set next speaking goal.

Materials: teacher checklist; self-assessment sheet.

Time	Activity + instructions	Aims/learning outcomes + comments
0–2	Confidence warm-up (whole class): “One thing I will do well today.”	Reduce anxiety; set positive intention.

2–32	Performances + Q&A (whole class): Each group: 2–3 min pitch + 1–2 questions. Teacher uses checklist. Use at least two phrases from the Language Bank during your pitch/Q&A.	Summative evidence for scenario outcome; interaction under real-time conditions; everyone participates.
32–38	Feedback (whole class): Highlight communicative success + strategy use; 1 improvement focus.	Close the cycle with clear takeaways; reinforce strategy-based success.
38–45	Self-assessment (individual): Can-do reflection + set 1 next-step goal.	Document progress; support transfer beyond the scenario.

Anticipated problems & solutions:

- **Performance anxiety / silence:** allow 30 seconds prep time + supportive “first question” prompts from teacher if needed.
- **Q&A breakdown:** provide 3–4 question stems on the board; model one Q&A exchange before starting.
- **Time overrun:** use a visible timer; stop after 3 minutes and move to Q&A.

If a learner is absent: record their pitch part (60–90s) + record answers to **2 Q&A questions** + submit self-assessment with one next-step goal.

Teacher note: during feedback, highlight **communicative success first**, then give **one actionable target**.

Appendix 4 – Student Materials: Planning a Class Event (Scenario 4)

A) Role Cards (one per student)

1) Coordinator (Chair)

Your job: manage turn-taking, keep time, summarise decisions. Useful phrases:

- “Let’s start.” / “What is our goal today?”
- “What do you think, [Name]?”
- “Let’s hear from [Name].”
- “Can you say that again?” / “Do you mean...?”
- “So, we agree that...”

- “We need to decide now.” / “Let’s vote.”
- “We have 2 minutes left.”
- “OK, next point.”
- “To summarise: our decision is...”

2) Budget & feasibility manager

Your job: check money/time realism; keep ideas simple and doable. Useful phrases:

- “Is it possible in 30–45 minutes?”
- “This is too expensive.” / “We need a cheaper idea.”
- “We can use free materials.” / “We can borrow it from school.”
- “We need a simple plan.”
- “Do we have enough time for this?”
- “A cheaper option is...”
- “Let’s choose the easiest version.”
- “We need a plan B.”

3) Programme & logistics manager

Your job: plan the programme (steps), place, materials, timing. Useful phrases:

- “First we will..., then..., finally...”
- “We can do it in the classroom / gym / schoolyard.”
- “We need: ... (paper, chairs, music, etc.).”
- “It will take about ... minutes.”
- “We need to prepare ... before the event.”
- “Who brings / prepares ...?”
- “We should keep it simple.”
- “Let’s write the programme.”

4) Communication & promotion manager (Spokesperson)

Your job: make the pitch clear and persuasive; prepare benefits + closing. Useful phrases:

- “Our event is...” / “We propose...”
- “It will be fun because...”
- “It is good for the class because...”
- “Everyone can join because...”

- “This is easy to organise because...”
- “Our main benefits are...”
- “Please support our idea.” / “Vote for our event!”
- “Any questions?”

B) Language Bank (functional phrases)

Suggesting:

- “I suggest...” / “What if we...?” / “We could...” / “Let’s...”

Asking for opinions:

- “What do you think?” / “Do you agree?” / “Any other ideas?”

Agreeing:

- “I agree.” / “Good idea.” / “Yes, because...” / “That works.”

Disagreeing politely:

- “I’m not sure.” / “I see your point, but...” / “Maybe another option...”

Giving reasons:

- “because...” / “The main reason is...” / “For example...”

Clarifying / checking understanding:

- “What do you mean by...?” / “Could you explain?”
- “So you mean...?” / “Did I understand correctly?”

Turn-taking:

- “Can I add something?” / “Let [Name] speak.” / “Go ahead.”

Summarising:

- “To summarise...” / “So our decision is...” / “We agreed on...”

Q&A / responding:

- “That’s a good question.” / “Our answer is...” / “We chose it because...”

C) Constraints Card (Scenario 4)

Your proposal must follow these rules:

- Budget: low-cost. Assume a maximum of €20 for the whole class (hypothetical limit). Try to keep it cheaper.
- Time: event duration 30–45 minutes (no long preparation during lessons).

- Place: school/classroom/gym/schoolyard (no external venue).
- Inclusivity: suitable for different interests and abilities; everyone can join.
- School rules: respectful content; safe activities; no dangerous materials; keep noise reasonable if during lesson time.

D) Brainstorming Sheet (group)

Event idea #1: _____

- Why fun? _____
- Inclusive? How? _____
- Time (30–45 min)? Yes / No (fix: _____)
- Budget low-cost? Yes / No (fix: _____)
- Materials needed: _____
- Quick rating (1–5): ____

(Repeat for ideas #2–#3)

Best idea (choose one): _____

Reason (1 sentence): _____

E) Meeting Agenda + Meeting Notes (Lesson 2)

Team meeting agenda (20 minutes)

1. Choose the best idea (1 minute vote)
2. Programme (steps): first / then / finally
3. Place + materials + time plan
4. Budget & feasibility check (simple + realistic)
5. Promotion message (benefits + inclusivity)
6. Assign responsibilities (who says what in the pitch)

Meeting notes (fill in):

- Final decision (event): _____
- Programme (3 steps): 1) ____ 2) ____ 3) ____
- Place: ____ Materials: ____ Time plan: ____
- Budget plan (0–20€): ____
- Inclusivity: “Everyone can join because...” _____

- Speaking roles for pitch: Speaker 1 ___ / 2 ___ / 3 ___ / 4 ___

F) Pitch Planner (group, 2–3 minutes)

Opening (who/what/when/where): _____

Main point 1 (what we will do / programme): _____

Main point 2 (feasibility: time/place/materials/budget): _____

Main point 3 (benefits + inclusivity): _____

Closing (call to action): _____

Speaking parts (names):

- Speaker 1 (opening): _____
- Speaker 2 (programme): _____
- Speaker 3 (feasibility): _____
- Speaker 4 (benefits + closing): _____

Q&A preparation (2 questions + answers):

- Q1: ___ A: ___
- Q2: ___ A: ___

G) Prompt Cards (optional support)

1. Suggest one activity for the event.
2. Ask for clarification: “What do you mean by...?”
3. Disagree politely and offer an alternative.
4. Give one reason (because...) + one example (for example...).
5. Check constraints: time/budget/place.
6. Ask someone’s opinion and invite them to speak.
7. Summarise the group decision in 1–2 sentences.
8. Prepare one “benefit” sentence for the pitch.
9. Prepare one inclusivity sentence (“Everyone can join because...”).
10. Prepare one Q&A question for another group.

H) Peer Feedback (two strengths + one target)

Group: ___ Listener: ___

- Two strengths: 1) ___ 2) ___

- One target (next time): ____
- One good phrase I heard: ____

I) Self-Assessment (after final pitch)

Tick ✓

- I spoke at least twice during the scenario.
- I used at least 2 phrases from the language bank.
- I gave at least one reason (“because...”) during the pitch/Q&A.
- I asked/answered a follow-up question.

My next-step goal (1 sentence): _____

Appendix 5 – Assessment Tools (Scenario 4: Planning a Class Event)

A) Scenario 4 – Teacher observation checklist (Final pitch + Q&A)

Learner: _____ Group: _____ Date: _____

Task: group pitch (2–3 min) + Q&A (follow-up questions)

Tick ✓

1) Task achievement & clarity

- The learner delivers their assigned speaking part (not silent).
- Message is mostly clear (main idea understood).
- The learner includes at least one reason (because...) or an example.

2) Interaction (B1-level classroom interaction)

- The learner responds to a question or asks a question (Q&A).
- The learner uses at least one interaction strategy:
- asking for clarification (“What do you mean...?”)
- checking understanding (“So you mean...?”)
- polite disagreement / compromise (“I see your point, but...”)
- turn-taking support (“Let [Name] speak”, “Can I add...?”)

3) Language support use

- Uses at least two phrases from the Language Bank (Appendix 4B).
- Uses basic linking / structuring (e.g., first/then/finally; to summarise).

4) Intelligibility

- Mostly understandable to the audience (pronunciation/pace good enough).
- If a problem happens, the learner repairs (repeats/rephrases) or asks for help.

Overall result (Scenario 4 evidence):

- Meets the minimum standard (PASS evidence) Not yet (needs replacement task)

Teacher note (one strength + one target):
 Strength: _____ Target: _____

B) Scenario 4 – Group outcome checklist (feasibility + constraints)

Group: ____ Date: ____

Tick ✓

- Proposal respects time (30–45 min).
- Proposal respects budget (low-cost; within the agreed low-cost limit).
- Proposal is inclusive (everyone can join).
- Roles are visible (more than one speaker; clear turn distribution).
- Pitch structure is clear (opening → main points → closing).

Group comment: _____

C) Peer feedback form (used in Lesson 3 rehearsal)

Use Appendix 4H (“Two strengths + one target”).
(No duplicate form here to keep appendices compact.)

D) Learner self-assessment (after final performance)

Use Appendix 4I (can-do ticks + next-step goal).
(If you want it to look more “assessment-y”, можно добавить одну строку ниже к форме:)

My evidence (what I did): _____

E) Pass/Fail decision rule (Scenario 4 module)

Scenario 4 provides core speaking evidence for the course pass/fail decision.

A learner meets the minimum standard (PASS evidence) for Scenario 4 if:

Participation

completes the final pitch lesson evidence: speaks in the pitch and/or Q&A (not silent)

Task achievement

communicates their message clearly enough to be understood (main idea + at least one reason/example)

Interaction

asks or answers at least one question and shows at least one interaction strategy (clarification/checking/turn-taking/polite negotiation)

Use of support

uses at least two phrases from the Language Bank (Appendix 4B) during rehearsal/performance

If the learner does not meet the minimum standard in Lesson 4, they complete a replacement speaking task (see section F).

F) Replacement speaking tasks (if absent / if minimum standard not met)

Lesson 1 replacement speaking task:

completed brainstorming sheet (Appendix 4D) + 30–45s voice note “my event idea” + choose 2 phrases (Appendix 4B)

Lesson 2 replacement speaking task:

60–90s voice note: meeting summary (2 decisions + my contribution) OR answer 2 teacher prompts (negotiation/clarification)

Lesson 3 replacement speaking task:

pitch planner (Appendix 4F) + 45–60s rehearsal recording of assigned part

Lesson 4 replacement (core evidence):

60–90s recording of the learner’s pitch part + recorded answers to 2 Q&A questions + completed self-assessment (Appendix 4I)

G) Outcome-to-evidence map (quick overview)

Course outcome (Scenario 4)	Evidence source
Negotiate and plan collaboratively	Lesson 2 meeting performance + notes (Appendix 4E)
Deliver a clear short pitch	Lesson 4 pitch performance + teacher checklist (Appendix 5A)
Handle Q&A / follow-up questions	Lesson 4 Q&A + teacher checklist (Appendix 5A)
Apply constraints (time/budget/inclusivity)	Constraints Card + feasibility checklist (Appendix 5B)
Reflect and set a next-step goal	Self-assessment (Appendix 4I)

Appendix 6 – CEFR Mapping Table (course outcomes ↔ descriptor scales ↔ evidence sources)

Outcome (course/module)	CEFR mode/scale (B1)	Descriptor summary (paraphrase)	Evidence in course tasks
Maintain simple conversations	Spoken interaction	can keep interaction on familiar topics	scenario role-plays; teacher checklist (Appendix 5A)
Describe experiences/interests	Spoken production	can give connected descriptions	mini-talk; pitch opening; self-assessment sheets (Appendix 4I)

Give opinions + brief reasons	Interaction/production	can justify opinions briefly	debates; meetings; pitch reasons (Appendix 4F)
Use interaction strategies	Interaction strategies	can clarify / paraphrase to keep talk going	meeting task + Q&A; teacher notes (Appendix 5A)
Deliver short spoken product clearly	Production	can present a short structured message	itches (Appendix 4F), presentations, showcase
Collaborate to reach decisions	Interaction	can negotiate and decide with others	meeting agenda summary (Appendix 4E); observation
Compensate for gaps	Strategies	can manage breakdowns	teacher checklist notes (Appendix 5A); reflection
Reflect and set goals	Learning-to-learn linked to CEFR use	can use criteria to notice progress	self-assessment sheets (Appendix 4I); journal

RESÜMEE

TARTU ÜLIKOOL
ANGLISTIKA OSAKOND

Alina Abramova

ENG: Designing a Speaking-Oriented Elective Course within the Action-Oriented Approach for 9th Grade Students at Tallinn Mustamäe Humanitarian Gymnasium: Course Syllabus and Scenario-Based Module

EST: Kõnelemisele suunatud valikaine kursuse kavandamine tegevuspõhise lähenemise raames Tallinna Mustamäe Humanitaargümnaasiumi 9. klassi õpilastele: kursuse õppekava ja stsenaariumipõhine moodul

Magistritöö

2026

Lehekülgede arv: 75

Annotatsioon:

Magistritöö eesmärk on kavandada teooriale tuginev ning õpetajale rakendatav 9. klassi valikaine Speaking in English (35 akadeemilist tundi, 1×45 min nädalas) ning töötada välja üks stsenaariumipõhine moodul detailsel kujul. Töö lähtekohaks on tegutsemispõhine käsitus (Action-Oriented Approach) ning Euroopa keeleõppe raamdokument (CEFR) ja selle sõsarväljaanne (Council of Europe 2001, 2020). Lähenemine käsitleb õppijat sotsiaalse tegutsejana (social agent), kes kasutab keelt eesmärgipäraste ülesannete täitmiseks realistlikes olukordades. Rääkimisoskuse arendamine on kavandatud stsenaariumide kaudu, kus õppetegevused moodustavad loogilise järjestuse: ettevalmistus → sooritus → tagasiside → refleksioon.

Töö on disainipõhine (design-based) ning ei sisalda mooduli piloteerimist ega empiirilist sekkumist. Põhitulemuseks on rakendatav disainipakett: kursuse üldkava koos õpiväljunditega, stsenaariumide ülevaade, hindamis- ja tagasisidemudel ning üks detailselt kirjeldatud moodul Planning a Class Event (4 tundi). Kursuse õpiväljundid on sõnastatud CEFR-i “can-do” loogikast lähtudes ning suunatud ligikaudu B1 taseme suulisele produktsioonile ja suulisele suhtlusele. Õppetöö kavandamisel rakendatakse konstruktiivse kooskõla põhimõtet (constructive alignment), et õpiväljundid, õppetegevused ja hindamiskriteeriumid oleksid omavahel kooskõlas.

Hindamine on korraldatud valikaine formaadiga sobivalt lävendihindamisena (pass/fail) ning on eelkõige kujundav ja kriteeriumipõhine. Hindamis- ja tõendusmaterjalina kasutatakse õpetaja vaatluselehti, kaasõppijate tagasisidet, enesehindamist ning refleksioonivahendeid. Mooduli tasandil näidatakse, kuidas stsenaarium, rollid, vaheeesmärgid ja sõnaline toetus (scaffolding) aitavad vähendada rääkimisärevust ning toetada ühtlasemat osalemist, mis on koolikontekstis sageli rääkimisoskuse arendamise kitsaskoht.

Töö peamiseks piiranguks on piloteerimise puudumine, mistõttu ei esitata järeldusi disaini tõhususe kohta. Töö väärtus seisneb teooriale tugineva ja rakendatava valikaine kavandi pakkumises koos õppematerjalide ja hindamisvahendite paketiga, mida on võimalik tulevikus klassiruumis katsetada ja hinnata. Edasise tööna on soovitatav moodulit piloteerida, koguda õppijate ja õpetaja tagasisidet ning analüüsida õppijate sooritusi CEFR-i kirjeldajate alusel, et disaini vajadusel täpsustada ja täiendada.

Märksõnad:

tegutsemispõhine käsitus; Euroopa keeleõppe raamdokument; rääkimisoskuse arendamine; stsenaariumõpe; valikaine kavandamine

Lihtlitsents lõputöö reprodutseerimiseks ja lõputöö üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemiseks

Mina, Alina Abramova,

1. annan Tartu Ülikoolile tasuta loa (lihtlitsentsi) enda loodud teose

Designing a Speaking-Oriented Elective Course within the Action-Oriented Approach for 9th Grade Students at Tallinn Mustamäe Humanitarian Gymnasium: Course Syllabus and Scenario-Based Module,

mille juhendaja on Anneli Sigus,

1.1. reprodutseerimiseks säilitamise ja üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemise eesmärgil, sealhulgas digitaalarhiivi DSpace-is lisamise eesmärgil kuni autoriõiguse kehtivuse tähtaja lõppemiseni;

1.2. üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemiseks Tartu Ülikooli veebikeskkonna kaudu, sealhulgas digitaalarhiivi DSpace'i kaudu kuni autoriõiguse kehtivuse tähtaja lõppemiseni.

2. olen teadlik, et punktis 1 nimetatud õigused jäävad alles ka autorile.

3. kinnitan, et lihtlitsentsi andmisega ei rikuta teiste isikute intellektuaalomandi ega isikuandmete kaitse seadusest tulenevaid õigusi.

Alina Abramova

20.01.2026

Autorsuse kinnitus

Kinnitan, et olen koostanud käesoleva magistritöö ise ning toonud korrekselt välja teiste autorite panuse. Töö on koostatud lähtudes Tartu Ülikooli maailma keelte ja kultuuride instituudi anglistika osakonna oma õppekava magistritöö juhendist ning on kooskõlas heade akadeemiliste tavadega.

Allkirjastatud digitaalselt

Alina Abramova

20.01.2026

Lõputöö on lubatud kaitsmisele.

Anneli Sigus

20.01.2026