

ІМПС для студентів освітньої програми «Логопедія» та комплексу навчальних ігор, спрямованих на розвиток мовних та мовленнєвих навичок, згоди та творчих навичок, а також розширення знань про світ, свою країну, своє місто та повсякденні життєві проблеми.

Методи. Дослідження проводилося шляхом вивчення літературних джерел з теми, зокрема, ігрові діяльності та ігрового методу, проведення опитування науково-педагогічних працівників та здобувачів освіти у формі анкети щодо навчальних ігор, ставлення до них, використання ігор у вивченні різних курсів, ігрових форм, елементів та ефективності, вивчення навчальної програми освітньої програми «Логопедія».

Результати. Дослідження показує, що науково-педагогічні працівники, загалом, використовують ігровий метод навчання з різною частотою, вважають, що ігрові методи мотивують та підвищують інтерес студентів до вивчення дисципліни, знижуючи рівень їхньої тривожності. Значна частина викладачів віддає перевагу діловим іграм, командним іграм, зазначаючи, що навчальні ігри можна використовувати під час вивчення різних навчальних дисциплін, при цьому не надаючи великого значення ігровим елементам. Переважна більшість студентів відзначають різні переваги навчальних ігор, віддають перевагу вікторинам або іграм на згоду, бачать позитивний вплив ігрових елементів на мотивацію до кращого навчання, віддають перевагу командним (груповим) іграм, вважають, що навчальні ігри не заважають серйозному сприйняттю

навчальної дисципліни, та хотіли б, щоб ігровий метод використовувався під час вивчення ІМПС.

Оригінальність. Результати дослідження та опитування були враховані під час розробки підручника та створення набору навчальних ігор.

Висновок. Навчальні ігри – це ігри, які спеціально розроблені для навчальних цілей або мають додаткову навчальну цінність. Вивчення іноземної мови професійного спрямування із застосуванням ігрового методу студентами спеціальної освіти має особливе значення, оскільки майбутня професійна діяльність логопедів досить часто включає ігрову діяльність та використання різних видів ігор для досягнення терапевтичних цілей. Запропоновані навчальні групові ігри на згоду з використанням карток для використання на заняттях з ІМПС спрямовані на розвиток мовних та мовленнєвих навичок, а також на мотивацію студентів до вивчення іноземної мови, роблять процес навчання цікавішим, створюють сприятливу атмосферу в групі та знижують рівень тривожності. Відгуки студентів після використання цих навчальних ігор свідчать про те, що використання ігрового методу досягає поставлених цілей.

Ключові слова: іноземна мова професійного спрямування, ігровий метод, ігрова діяльність, навчальна гра, навчальний процес, розвиток мовних та мовленнєвих навичок, мотивація до навчання, навчальна атмосфера.

Одержано редакцією 03.08.2026
Прийнято до публікації 16.08.2026

 <https://doi.org/10.31651/2524-2660-2026-3-83-92>

 <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-5402-5517>

LUBKO Serhii

Postgraduate Student at the Department of Educational Management, Art Management, and Social Work,
Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University of Cherkasy, Ukraine

 lubko.serhii@gmail.com

UDC 378.147:[37.011.3-051:811.111](045)

DEVELOPING ENGLISH PRODUCTIVE COMPETENCE: THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

Summary. Introduction. This article explores the multifaceted theoretical foundations of English productive competence, particularly within the specialised context of pre-service foreign language (FL) teacher education. The need for this exploration stems from a shift in tertiary language pedagogy from isolated skills and decontextualised practice toward a more dynamic, cognitively demanding, and socially situated understanding of language use. The study is premised on the view that methodologies based mainly on reproduction, memorisation, or discrete-point testing may be insufficient when used in isolation to develop the generative and interactional speaking abilities required of future teachers. Rather than merely reproducing prepared language, teacher-trainees must learn to generate it spontaneously while simultaneously managing classroom discourse.

The primary purpose of this paper is to provide a comprehensive theoretical overview of the psycholinguistic, cognitive, and pedagogical mechanisms involved in producing fluent, accurate, and complex spoken discourse in English as a FL. Although productive competence includes both spoken and written production, the present analysis focuses on speech because pre-service teachers must use English in real time to manage classroom interaction. Addressing the problem from the

perspectives of applied linguistics, cognitive psychology, and language pedagogy, the paper emphasises the distinctive requirements placed on future educators. Its central goal is to describe the cognitive architecture of speech production, analyse affective and interactional barriers to participation, and explain how structured collaborative mechanisms may contribute to professional pedagogical competence.

Methods. The research uses a narrative theoretical review, conceptual modelling, and cross-disciplinary synthesis integrating psycholinguistics, cognitive psychology, language assessment, and sociocultural pedagogy to clarify the mechanisms underlying FL speech production and pedagogical competence.

Results. The central argument of this paper is that English productive competence can be conceptualised as a complex, dual-layered construct encompassing cognitive speech processing, structural linguistic resources, interactional control, and pedagogical modelling. The study describes the processing demands associated with speech formulation and examines anxiety-related silence as a barrier to productive participation. It then considers how the Output Hypothesis may promote noticing, hypothesis testing, and metalinguistic reflection. Another significant aspect is the proposed integration of Project-Based Collaborative Learning

(PBCL) with a spiral model of language development. The analysis suggests that carefully structured, socially mediated environments may help future teachers develop both advanced personal language proficiency and professionally appropriate teacher talk.

Implications for further research. The study concludes that collaborative approaches should be investigated as a complement to, rather than an automatic replacement for, other forms of instruction. Future empirical research should test the conditions under which PBCL supports pre-service teachers' productive competence in university classrooms and should validate the proposed criteria and developmental profiles.

Keywords: *productive competence; pre-service FL teachers; cognitive load; output hypothesis; communicative-cognitive spiral model; project-based collaborative learning; teacher talk.*

Introduction. This study investigates the theoretical framework of English Productive Competence (PC) within pre-service foreign language (FL) teacher education, addressing a shift from fragmented instruction to a dynamic, socially situated model. It argues that isolated and predominantly reproductive methodologies are unlikely, on their own, to prepare future educators for the complex and spontaneous discourse management required in contemporary English classrooms.

The Theoretical Framework. The conceptualisation of PC in modern FL pedagogy has evolved significantly from isolated behavioural skills to a holistic, generative mechanism.

First of all, to grasp the essence of PC, it is important to trace its evolution within FL education. Structural and audiolingual approaches often treated language learning as habit formation and used techniques such as repetition, pattern practice, and substitution drills (Richards and Rodgers, 2014, pp. 58–80). Such techniques can support controlled practice, but when treated as the principal goal they may prioritise formal reproduction over the expression of meaning. The communicative turn redirected attention from isolated forms toward the ability to select and organise linguistic resources for purposeful interaction (Canale and Swain, 1980, pp. 1–5).

However, contemporary FL education represents a broader movement from exclusively teacher-centred transmission toward learner participation and meaningful language use. Within the communicative paradigm, productive skills are not viewed as isolated, static abilities but as components of communicative competence, which integrates linguistic resources with sociolinguistic appropriateness, discourse organisation, and strategic action (Canale and Swain, 1980, pp. 27–31; Canale, 1983, pp. 6–11). The action-oriented perspective of the CEFR similarly relates

language performance to tasks, participants, conditions, and purposes (Council of Europe, 2020, pp. 29–35). This shift implies that a learner is expected not only to know grammatical structures and lexical units but also to understand how they are used to disagree, negotiate, clarify, adjust tone, and maintain interaction. Thus, productive skills are an important constituent of PC.

PC highlights the inherently generative nature of linguistic expression. Speaking is not simply the retrieval of prefabricated sentences from memory; rather, it involves transforming communicative intentions into linguistic form under real-time conditions. The speaker must conceptualise a message, retrieve lexical items, organise grammar and phonology, articulate the utterance, and monitor its effect while responding to an interlocutor (Levelt, 1989, pp. 8–26; Hardacre and Güvendir, 2018, pp. 1–7). In genuine FL communication, a fixed script is therefore insufficient: the speaker must adapt wording, structure, and delivery to the evolving interaction.

Furthermore, this generative capacity relies on the coordination of linguistic knowledge, discourse organisation, strategic resources, attention, and contextual judgement. Oral and written production are related but operate under different temporal and interactional conditions: writing normally permits planning and revision, whereas speaking often requires immediate selection and adjustment. Practice in one mode may support awareness of vocabulary, grammar, and discourse structure, but transfer to spontaneous speech is not automatic. Productive competence should therefore be understood as a holistic capacity to mobilise formal knowledge appropriately, solve communicative problems, and adapt output to purpose and audience rather than as the simple accumulation of memorised forms (Canale and Swain, 1980, pp. 27–31; Canale, 1983, pp. 6–11). Accordingly, while PC encompasses both oral and written production, the remainder of this article concentrates on spoken PC and the real-time demands of classroom discourse.

The Psycholinguistic and Cognitive Mechanisms of Language Production.

FL speaking is a demanding process whose degree of conscious control varies with proficiency, task familiarity, planning time, and communicative pressure. To clarify the nature of PC, it is useful to map the path of an utterance from intention to articulation. Compared with highly automatised first-language performance, L2 production often places greater demands on lexical retrieval, grammatical encoding, monitoring, and attentional coordination (Kormos, 2006, pp.

154–178; Hardacre and Güvendir, 2018, pp. 1–7).

Another essential point is the application of Levelt's foundational model of speech production to the L2 context. Levelt distinguishes conceptual preparation, linguistic formulation, articulation, and monitoring, while L2 adaptations explain how limited automaticity and attentional constraints affect these processes (Levelt, 1989, pp. 8–26; Kormos, 2006, pp. 166–178). The stages are analytically distinguishable but may overlap dynamically, and dual-task research confirms that additional attentional demands can reduce the efficiency of lexical selection and monitoring (Declerck and Kormos, 2012, pp. 782–796) (Table 1).

Table 1
The Modular Model of Speech Production

Stage	Cognitive Process	Challenge for FL Learners
Conceptualization	Macro/Micro-planning of the message.	Navigating unfamiliar cultural codes.
Formulation	Lexical retrieval and grammatical encoding.	Effortful lexical retrieval and grammatical encoding.
Articulation	Neuromuscular execution.	Coordinating unfamiliar L2 phonetic and articulatory patterns.
Self-Monitoring	Internal/External error checking.	Heavy monitoring may increase repairs and hesitation.

The charted stages require clarification:

1. *Conceptualisation* (pre-verbal planning): the speaker generates a pre-verbal message based on communicative intent. This involves selecting what information to express (macro-planning) and organising it logically for the listener and context (micro-planning). For FL learners, this phase may be complicated by unfamiliar pragmatic conventions and by the need to allocate limited attention before linguistic encoding begins.

2. *Formulation* (grammatical and lexical encoding): the pre-verbal message is mapped onto linguistic forms. The speaker retrieves lexical items from the mental lexicon and applies morphological, syntactic, and phonological encoding procedures. In L2 production, this stage can be especially demanding when relevant knowledge remains declarative and has not yet become sufficiently accessible for real-time use.

3. *Articulation* (motor execution): the phonetic plan is translated into coordinated speech movements. L2 learners may experience difficulty when unfamiliar sound contrasts, stress patterns, or articulatory sequences are not yet automatised. The challenge should not be described as the speech organs 'fighting' the first language, but as the gradual development of more stable L2 phonetic encoding and motor routines.

4. *Self-monitoring*: throughout production, speakers use internal and external feedback to inspect their plan and spoken output.

Monitoring can support accuracy and repair, but excessive attention to form under time pressure may interrupt message formulation, increase self-correction, and reduce fluency. Effective development therefore requires a workable balance between monitoring and continued participation.

Thus, productive speaking competence is a coordinated cognitive and linguistic skill that develops through proceduralisation and repeated meaningful use. Practice can make lexical retrieval, grammatical encoding, articulation, and monitoring more efficient, but automatised is gradual and remains sensitive to task conditions, proficiency, and the speaker's communicative goals (Kormos, 2006, pp. 166–178; Declerck and Kormos, 2012, pp. 790–794).

The Structural Composition of Productive Competence.

Commonly, PC is analysed through the multi-component framework of Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency (CAF). These dimensions are useful for describing performance, although they should not be treated as a complete definition of communicative adequacy.

To make the abstract concept of PC methodologically analysable, FL research often distinguishes complexity, accuracy, and fluency. Pallotti stresses that these constructs require clear definitions and should be separated from broader communicative adequacy, while Skehan relates their interaction to task demands and limited attentional resources (Kormos and Dénes, 2004, pp. 145–164; Pallotti, 2009, pp. 590–601; Skehan, 2009, pp. 510–532). Each component captures a different aspect of language production:

1. *Complexity* relates to the elaboration and diversity of the language produced, including syntactic organisation, lexical range, and the use of less frequent or more demanding forms. It can indicate that a learner is extending available resources, although greater structural elaboration is not automatically more appropriate in every communicative situation.

2. *Accuracy* denotes the extent to which production conforms to relevant target-language norms. Depending on the task, it may include grammatical, lexical, phonological, and pragmatic appropriateness. Accuracy should be evaluated in relation to errors that affect intelligibility or communicative effectiveness rather than as a demand for error-free speech.

3. *Fluency* captures temporal and processing aspects of speech, including speed, pausing, repair, continuity, and the listener's overall perception of ease. Fluent FL speech is not necessarily uninterrupted or maximally

rapid; natural pausing and strategic reformulation may contribute to effective communication.

Furthermore, because speaking usually takes place under temporal constraints, learners must distribute limited attention among meaning, formulation, accuracy, complexity, and interaction. This can produce trade-off effects, but the relationship is not a fixed biological law: it varies with proficiency, task structure, planning time, familiarity, and the measures used. Focusing strongly on a new grammatical form may temporarily slow delivery, while prioritising speed may increase the likelihood of local errors. Such patterns should therefore be interpreted as context-sensitive tendencies rather than proof that improvement in one dimension necessarily damages another (Skehan, 2009, pp. 510–532).

For instance, a learner attempting to use a newly learned conditional structure may pause more frequently because lexical and grammatical encoding require additional attention. Conversely, a learner who prioritises maintaining the conversational floor may rely on simpler syntax or tolerate minor morphological inaccuracies. Dual-task findings similarly show that increased processing demands can affect lexical selection and monitoring (Declerck and Kormos, 2012, pp. 790–794). Accordingly, the CAF framework provides a useful basis for analysing oral PC, provided that its indicators are interpreted in relation to the purpose and conditions of the performance.

Anxiety-Related Silence and Limited Participation in FL Classrooms.

University FL classrooms may unintentionally cultivate patterns of silent or minimal participation, often associated with language anxiety, fear of negative evaluation, limited willingness to communicate, or uncertainty about expected responses. A learner can possess substantial receptive knowledge yet hesitate to initiate spontaneous oral output. Foreign-language classroom anxiety has long been associated with communication apprehension and evaluative concerns, while meta-analytic evidence indicates a moderate negative relationship between L2 anxiety and achievement that varies across contexts and measures (Horwitz et al., 1986, pp. 125–132; Teimouri et al., 2019, pp. 373–381).

In strongly teacher-dominated classrooms, rapid nomination, limited wait time, and correction that repeatedly interrupts a learner's turn may shift attention away from meaning and discourage extended participation. This does not mean that correction is inherently harmful; its effect depends on timing, form, pedagogical

purpose, and the learner's readiness. Teacher talk can either open or restrict opportunities for learner contribution, and supportive interaction requires teachers to align questioning, feedback, and turn management with the immediate learning goal (Walsh, 2002, pp. 3–23). Anxiety, low confidence, and fear of evaluation may further intensify the perceived risk of speaking (Horwitz et al., 1986, pp. 125–132).

The connection between anxiety and silence should not be presented as a single exact biological mechanism. Research suggests instead that anxiety can divert attentional and working-memory resources toward self-evaluation and task-irrelevant concerns, thereby making comprehension, lexical retrieval, and formulation less efficient. Under public time pressure, some learners may experience delayed responses, fragmented production, avoidance, or very short answers, but these outcomes differ across individuals and situations (MacIntyre and Gardner, 1994, pp. 295–301).

Another essential point is that persistent avoidance reduces opportunities to test linguistic hypotheses, notice gaps, receive feedback, and revise output. Producing language can draw attention to resources that are missing or unstable, although output does not guarantee acquisition by itself and its effects depend on subsequent input, feedback, and task design (Izumi et al., 1999, pp. 443–448; Swain, 2005, pp. 471–478). Overcoming silence therefore requires more than forcing anxious students to speak. Structured pair and group work, planning time, rehearsal, varied participation formats, and carefully timed feedback can distribute interactional pressure while preserving meaningful productive demands; silent learners may also participate cognitively in collaborative language-related activity even when their number of turns is limited (Fernández-Dobao, 2016, pp. 33–61).

The Spiral Nature of Developing Productive Competence.

The transition from input to noticed intake, interaction, and output, together with a spiral view of learning, suggests that producing language can function as an important catalyst for the further development of PC.

To overcome the limitations of passive exposure, modern FL pedagogy distinguishes between language that is available to the learner and language features that are actually attended to and processed. Research on noticing emphasises conscious registration of relevant features in input, while the Output Hypothesis highlights the role of production in revealing gaps, testing tentative forms, and promoting reflection (Schmidt, 1990, pp. 129–

158; Swain, 2005, pp. 471–483). Experimental work further shows that output may promote noticing and later performance under some task conditions, but that effects are not automatic or uniform (Izumi et al., 1999, pp. 421–452).

For analytical purposes, the present article links Input, Noticing/Intake, Knowledge Development, Interactional Uptake, and Output. Input represents the linguistic data available in the learning environment. Noticing or intake refers to the learner's attention to relevant features rather than to exposure alone (Schmidt, 1990, pp. 142–149). Knowledge development involves the gradual organisation and increased accessibility of linguistic resources. Interactional uptake refers here to the learner's active response to feedback, negotiation, and collaborative manipulation of form. Output is the spoken or written language produced to achieve a communicative purpose and to test what can currently be expressed. This sequence is an authorial synthesis rather than a universally established five-stage processing model; it is used to relate output research to a communicative-cognitive view of recurrent learning (Swain, 2005, pp. 471–478; Vovk, 2023, pp. 64–65).

Crucially, this progression is not a finite straight line but a recurrent process in which learners revisit language and communicative problems at increasing levels of complexity. Vovk's communicative-cognitive framework describes types and stages of learning that connect perception, reproduction, reflection, and increasingly independent production (Vovk, 2023, pp. 64–65). In the model proposed here, later output, feedback, and reflection become resources for a subsequent cycle. Through repeated cycles, learners may develop greater flexibility, precision, and independence rather than merely repeating the same script (Schmidt, 1990, pp. 142–149; Swain, 2005, pp. 471–478; Vovk, 2023, pp. 64–65) (Table 2: author's analytical integration of noticing and output research with Vovk's communicative-cognitive framework).

Table 2

The Cyclical Framework
of Language Acquisition

Analytical stage	Communicative-cognitive stage	Correlation Focus
Input	Perception	Exposure to the target language and the global context of communication.
Noticing / Intake	Initial Reproduction / Apperception	Attending to relevant features, relating them to prior knowledge, and forming tentative representations.
Knowledge Development	Incubation	Organising and increasing the accessibility of linguistic and conceptual resources.
Interactional Uptake	Creative Reproduction	Responding to feedback and using language in scaffolded, variable problem-based situations.
Output	Independent Speech Production	Producing increasingly independent and meaningful spoken or written discourse.
Next Cycle	Output and feedback become resources for further learning.	The learner revisits related problems with greater complexity and independence.

Within the illustrated cyclical trajectory, Swain's Output Hypothesis argues that comprehensible input alone may be insufficient for advanced productive development and that learners need opportunities to produce language that stretches their current resources. Output can perform three related functions—promoting noticing, testing linguistic hypotheses, and supporting metalinguistic reflection—although empirical findings indicate that these benefits depend on the design and sequencing of tasks (Izumi et al., 1999, pp. 421–452; Swain, 2005, pp. 471–483):

1. *The noticing function* occurs when learners attempt to communicate an idea but realise that they lack the vocabulary or syntactic resources needed to express it. Recognising this gap can direct attention toward relevant information in subsequent input and feedback.

2. *The hypothesis-testing function* frames production as an opportunity to try out tentative linguistic choices. When learners formulate an utterance and observe an interlocutor's response or receive feedback, they can confirm, modify, or abandon aspects of their current interlanguage system.

3. *The metalinguistic function* involves using language to reflect on language. When learners collaboratively construct or revise a text, they may discuss why a particular tense, lexical item, or discourse pattern is more appropriate, thereby making aspects of form available for deliberate analysis.

Considering the above, pushed output should not be described as literally rewiring proficiency or as always forcing deeper processing. A more defensible conclusion is that appropriately designed production tasks can create conditions for noticing, hypothesis testing, syntactic processing, feedback, and revision. In Izumi et al.'s study, the benefits of output differed across task phases, which underlines the importance of subsequent exposure and opportunities to reprocess language (Izumi et al., 1999, pp. 443–448). In a spiral curriculum, output can therefore support movement toward more independent performance when it is connected with meaningful input, interaction, and reflection.

The Dual-Dimensional Construct of Productive Competence

In this article, PC is conceptualised as a dual-layered construct for pre-service FL teachers, requiring both advanced personal linguistic proficiency and the ability to use language as a pedagogical tool.

First, it is important to distinguish the target audience of this research from general language learners, because pre-service FL teachers face specialised professional demands.

They need sufficient linguistic resources to discuss pedagogical theory, explain content, respond to questions, and maintain classroom interaction. In the author's view, a C1-oriented profile may serve as an institutional target in some contexts, but it should not be treated as a universal requirement. The CEFR is descriptive rather than prescriptive, and programmes should select the descriptors and tasks relevant to their own professional setting (Council of Europe, 2020, pp. 29, 36–42). General proficiency must therefore be connected with the classroom-specific language needed to prepare and teach lessons (Freeman et al., 2015, pp. 129–139; Richards, 2017, pp. 7–15).

Another essential point is the second layer of PC: professional pedagogical language use. Teacher-trainees do not merely speak English; they use it intentionally to manage activities, communicate lesson content, assess understanding, and provide feedback. Freeman et al. describe this bounded repertoire as English-for-Teaching (Freeman et al., 2015, pp. 132–136), while Walsh shows how teacher talk can create or obstruct opportunities for learner involvement (Walsh, 2002, pp. 3–23). Constructive teacher talk includes eliciting extended responses, adjusting pace and wording, using checking questions, allowing appropriate wait time, and selecting feedback that matches the pedagogical goal. For example, a teacher may recast *“He attend university”* as *“Yes, he attends university every day,”* but should also decide whether immediate reformulation or delayed feedback better serves the activity.

More importantly, professional PC includes the ability to formulate clear instructions, manage transitions, mitigate directives, clarify misunderstandings, and respond contingently to learner contributions. Instructions such as *“First open your books at page five; then read the dialogue silently”* require sequencing and linguistic economy, while behaviour-management language should preserve authority without unnecessary face threat. The challenge is not flawless performance but context-sensitive adjustment under real-time classroom pressure. Research on teaching through English distinguishes general language proficiency from the specialised ability to enact pedagogical practices, and classroom discourse research demonstrates that timing and turn design can substantially influence learner participation (Council of Europe, 2020, pp. 29–43; Freeman et al., 2015, pp. 129–139; Richards, 2017, pp. 7–30; Walsh, 2002, pp. 3–23) (Table 3: author's framework based on the CEFR, English-for-Teaching, teaching-through-English, and teacher-talk research).

Table 3

**The Dual-Layered Framework
of Pre-Service Teachers' Productive
Competence**

Competence Layer	Primary Focus	Practical Classroom Application
Personal Linguistic Proficiency (advanced, context-defined)	Advanced fluency, structural complexity, and lexical accuracy.	Discussing professional topics, using authentic literature, explaining content, and maintaining clear classroom communication.
Pedagogical Modelling (“Teacher Talk”)	Interactional adjustments, scaffolding, and sociopragmatic appropriateness.	Delivering instructions, eliciting and extending responses, managing interaction, and providing constructive feedback.

Thus, a pre-service teacher's PC must extend beyond general conversational fluency to include the specialised and reflective skills needed to use English for classroom management, explanation, elicitation, feedback, and assessment. The teacher's speech becomes one of the principal tools through which learning opportunities are organised, but its effectiveness depends on pedagogical judgement rather than linguistic complexity alone (Freeman et al., 2015, pp. 129–139; Richards, 2017, pp. 7–30).

Project-Based Collaborative Learning

In this article, Project-Based Collaborative Learning (PBCL) is conceptualised as a possible means of combining structured collaboration, meaningful professional tasks, recurrent output, feedback, and spiral development of PC.

The theoretical insights drawn from psycholinguistics, the Output Hypothesis, and the dual-layered demands of teacher education raise the question of how PC can be cultivated. PBCL should be distinguished from unstructured group work. Cooperative learning depends on positive interdependence, individual accountability, promotive interaction, and explicit structuring rather than on simply placing students together (Johnson and Johnson, 2009, pp. 365–379). Similarly, language-learning research shows that the quality of interaction depends on equality and mutuality within the pair or group; not every pattern of collaboration is equally conducive to learning (Storch, 2002, pp. 119–158).

Within PBCL, peer interaction can function as a form of scaffolding when learners jointly plan, explain, question, and revise a professional product. Pre-service teachers designing a lesson plan, for example, may compare alternative instructions, negotiate terminology, rehearse explanations, and justify how a grammar point should be presented. Such dialogue externalises aspects of planning and makes linguistic problems available for joint attention. However, internalisation should not be assumed merely

because students work together: participation patterns, relative expertise, task roles, and teacher mediation shape the available learning opportunities (Storch, 2002, pp. 119–158; Sato and Ballinger, 2016, pp. 1–30). Research on silent learners also suggests that cognitive engagement can occur without equal speaking time, so contribution should be assessed through varied evidence (Fernández-Dobao, 2016, pp. 33–61).

Furthermore, this collaborative progression can be aligned with Vovk's communicative-cognitive framework, in which learners revisit linguistic and communicative activity at increasing levels of reflection and independence (Vovk, 2023, pp. 64–65). In the interpretation proposed here, each collaborative project may function as a new loop in the spiral: students activate prior knowledge, apply it to a professional problem, receive feedback, revise language and pedagogical decisions, and produce a more independent performance. Evidence from pre-service teachers' perceptions of team-based lesson-planning projects indicates potential benefits for creativity, motivation, and learning opportunities, although such findings do not establish universal effectiveness (Apoko, 2024, pp. 312–317). PBCL is therefore presented as a theoretically grounded framework for empirical testing, not as an automatically optimal method.

The Evaluation of Productive Competence.

The theoretical evaluation of English PC requires explicit criteria, observable indicators, representative tasks, and cautiously interpreted developmental profiles.

Any systematic evaluation of PC should define what is being assessed, which tasks will elicit it, how performances will be rated, and what conclusions may legitimately be drawn from scores. Speaking assessment literature emphasises the alignment of construct, task, rating criteria, and rater procedures, while validity must be argued from evidence rather than assumed from the existence of a rubric (Luoma, 2004, pp. 113–169; Kane, 2013, pp. 1–17). Based on the CAF framework and the specialised demands of teacher education, the present article organises evaluation around three connected criteria (Dörnyei & Kormos, 1998, pp. 349–385; Walsh, 2002, pp. 3–23; Pallotti, 2009, pp. 590–601; Freeman et al., 2015, pp. 129–139):

1. *Linguistic-structural*: includes grammatical and lexical accuracy, syntactic and lexical range, phonological intelligibility, and the ability to select forms appropriate to the task. It should be evaluated through patterns across performances rather than through isolated slips, with attention to whether errors interfere with meaning or pedagogical clarity.

2. *Discursive-strategic*: includes fluency, coherence, turn management, repair, and the ability to use compensatory strategies when lexical retrieval or formulation becomes difficult. Circumlocution, clarification, hesitation devices, and reformulation can maintain communication and should not automatically be treated as evidence of failure.

3. *Professional-pedagogical*: is tailored to future educators and concerns the effective use of classroom language for instructing, explaining, eliciting, checking understanding, managing behaviour, and giving feedback. Observable indicators include adjusting speech to learners, sequencing instructions, responding to learner turns, and preserving the pedagogical purpose of interaction.

For analytical purposes, this article proposes three developmental profiles – initial, intermediate, and advanced, across the above criteria (Luoma, 2004, pp. 139–191; Pallotti, 2009, pp. 590–601; Skehan, 2009, pp. 510–532) (Table 4: author-proposed profiles for future empirical validation, informed by CAF and speaking-assessment literature). They are not presented as established universal levels or as direct equivalents of CEFR bands. Rather, they are provisional descriptors intended to organise future observation and instrument development. Any empirical use would require task specifications, rater training, evidence of reliability, and validation of the interpretations made from performances (Luoma, 2004, pp. 139–191; Kane, 2013, pp. 1–17; Council of Europe, 2020, pp. 36–42):

1. *Initial (threshold) profile*: is characterised by limited automaticity and high processing demands. Learners may rely on memorised or pre-written language, pause frequently, use a narrow range of forms, and find it difficult to adapt classroom language when an interaction departs from the prepared script. Anxiety may intensify these difficulties but should not be inferred from hesitation alone.

2. *Intermediate (sufficient) profile*: demonstrates growing adaptive capability. Students can generate spontaneous speech and perform basic pedagogical functions, but their complexity, accuracy, and fluency may vary considerably across tasks. They can use some repair and stalling strategies, although unexpected questions or classroom-management demands may still lead to simplified or hesitant language.

3. *Advanced (professional) profile*: is characterised by relatively efficient formulation, a broad and accessible linguistic repertoire, coherent discourse, and context-sensitive pedagogical language. Pre-service teachers can manage classroom interaction, adjust register and pace, reformulate

explanations, mitigate directives, and provide feedback with few disruptive breakdowns; this does not imply flawless or native-like speech.

Table 4

Proposed Developmental Profiles
of Pre-Service Teachers' Productive
Competence

Developmental profile	Linguistic-structural	Discursive-strategic	Professional-pedagogical
Initial (threshold)	Limited syntactic complexity; frequent systemic errors.	Frequent hesitation; limited compensatory strategies; extended silent pauses.	Relies on rigid scripts and has limited ability to adapt speech rate or wording.
Intermediate (sufficient)	Produces some spontaneous speech, with variable CAF performance across tasks.	Uses stalling and repair devices; may prioritise fluency or accuracy.	Can deliver basic instructions but may struggle with unexpected classroom demands.
Advanced (professional)	Accessible advanced grammar and pedagogical lexis; occasional non-disruptive errors.	Sustained fluency; effective repair and circumlocution; few disruptive pauses.	Flexible teacher talk, context-sensitive register, and appropriately mitigated directives.

Defining these parameters is necessary for evaluating any pedagogical intervention, including PBCL, but a valid assessment cannot rely on a single performance or an untested table of descriptors. It should sample different speaking purposes and degrees of preparation, use transparent analytic criteria, document rater procedures, and justify how scores or qualitative judgements support the intended conclusions (Kane, 2013, pp. 1–17; Luoma, 2004, pp. 170–191).

The overarching framework of this article is illustrated in Figure 1.

MIND MAP
DEVELOPING ENGLISH PRODUCTIVE COMPETENCE: THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS
Concept map of the article's key concepts, mechanisms, and conclusions



Figure 1. Developing English Productive Competence: The Overarching Framework

Conclusion. To summarise, this paper has outlined the theoretical and conceptual foundations of English productive competence

within pre-service FL teacher education. The analysis tracks the movement from a predominantly reproductive view of language practice toward an understanding of production as generative, context-sensitive, cognitively demanding, and socially mediated.

The psycholinguistic model shows that conceptualisation, formulation, articulation, and monitoring place interrelated demands on L2 speakers, particularly when linguistic processes are not yet automatised. The CAF framework offers useful dimensions for describing performance, but complexity, accuracy, and fluency must be interpreted in relation to task conditions and communicative adequacy rather than as fixed measures of competence.

The study also addresses anxiety-related silence and limited participation without reducing them to one biological mechanism. Output can support noticing, hypothesis testing, and metalinguistic reflection, but its contribution depends on interaction, feedback, subsequent input, and opportunities for revision. For future teachers, productive competence is dual in the analytical sense adopted here: it includes both personal language resources and the professional ability to use English for managing, explaining, eliciting, responding, and creating learning opportunities.

Finally, the theoretical exploration supports the empirical investigation of structured PBCL rather than declaring it an optimal framework in advance. Positive interdependence, individual accountability, meaningful professional products, peer interaction, recurrent performance, and reflection may provide conditions in which learners co-construct knowledge and practise pedagogical language. The actual effect of PBCL is likely to depend on task complexity, group relations, proficiency distribution, teacher mediation, and the alignment of assessment with intended outcomes.

Implications for further research. The proposed account suggests that the productive competence required in contemporary FL classrooms is unlikely to develop through isolated drills alone. Subsequent studies should operationalise the dual-layered construct, validate the proposed criteria and developmental profiles, and compare PBCL with alternative instructional arrangements. Empirical work should include multiple speaking tasks, transparent rating procedures, learner and teacher perspectives, and evidence concerning which collaborative conditions support development and for whom.

References

- Apoko, T.W. (2024). EFL pre-service teachers' perspectives on team-based project in developing English lesson plans in primary teacher program. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 9(2), 305–320. <https://doi.org/10.21093/ijeltal.v9i2.1716>.
- Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J.C. Richards & R.W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication* (pp. 2–27). Longman.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/I.1.1>.
- Council of Europe. (2020). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment—Companion volume*. Council of Europe Publishing. URKL: <https://rm.coe.int/common-european-framework-of-reference-for-languages-learning-teaching/16809ea0d4>.
- Declerck, M., & Kormos, J. (2012). The effect of dual task demands and proficiency on second language speech production. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 15(4), 782–796. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728911000629>.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Kormos, J. (1998). Problem-solving mechanisms in L2 communication: A psycholinguistic perspective. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20(3), 349–385. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263198003039>.
- Fernández-Dobao, A. (2016). Peer interaction and learning: A focus on the silent learner. In M. Sato & S. Ballinger (Eds.), *Peer interaction and second language learning: Pedagogical potential and research agenda* (pp. 33–61). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/llt.45.02fer>.
- Freeman, D., Katz, A., Garcia Gomez, P., & Burns, A. (2015). English-for-Teaching: Rethinking teacher proficiency in the classroom. *ELT Journal*, 69(2), 129–139. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccu074>.
- Hardacre, B., & Güvendir, E. (2018). Cognitive perspectives in teaching speaking. In J. I. Lontas (Ed.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching* (pp. 1–7). John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0232>.
- Horwitz, E.K., Horwitz, M.B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(2), 125–132. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1986.tb05256.x>.
- Izumi, S., Bigelow, M., Fujiwara, M., & Fearnow, S. (1999). Testing the Output Hypothesis: Effects of output on noticing and second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21(3), 421–452. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263199003034>.
- Johnson, D.W., & Johnson, R.T. (2009). An educational psychology success story: Social interdependence theory and cooperative learning. *Educational Researcher*, 38(5), 365–379. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X09339057>.
- Kane, M.T. (2013). Validating the interpretations and uses of test scores. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 50(1), 1–73. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jedm.12000>.
- Kormos, J. (2006). *Speech production and second language acquisition*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 221 p.
- Kormos, J., & Dénes, M. (2004). Exploring measures and perceptions of fluency in the speech of second language learners. *System*, 32(2), 145–164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2004.01.001>.
- Levelt, W.J.M. (1989). *Speaking: From intention to articulation*. MIT Press. 565 p.
- Luoma, S. (2004). *Assessing speaking*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511733017>.
- MacIntyre, P.D., & Gardner, R.C. (1994). The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language. *Language Learning*, 44(2), 283–305. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1994.tb01103.x>.
- Pallotti, G. (2009). CAF: Defining, refining and differentiating constructs. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(4), 590–601. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp045>.
- Richards, J.C. (2017). Teaching English through English: Proficiency, pedagogy and performance. *RELC Journal*, 48(1), 7–30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217690059>.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009024532>.
- Sato, M., & Ballinger, S. (2016). Understanding peer interaction: Research synthesis and directions. In M. Sato & S. Ballinger (Eds.), *Peer interaction and second language learning: Pedagogical potential and research agenda* (pp. 1–30). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/llt.45.01int>.
- Schmidt, R.W. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 129–158. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/11.2.129>.
- Skehan, P. (2009). Modelling second language performance: Integrating complexity, accuracy, fluency, and lexis. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(4), 510–532. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp047>.
- Storch, N. (2002). Patterns of interaction in ESL pair work. *Language Learning*, 52(1), 119–158. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00179>.
- Swain, M. (2005). The Output Hypothesis: Theory and research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 471–483). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Teimouri, Y., Goetze, J., & Plonsky, L. (2019). Second language anxiety and achievement: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 41(2), 363–387. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263118000311>.
- Vovk, O.I. (2023). Communicative and cognitive framework for foreign language acquisition: Types of learning. *Cherkasy University Bulletin: Pedagogical Sciences*, (3), 63–76. <https://doi.org/10.31651/2524-2660-2023-3-63-76>.
- Walsh, S. (2002). Construction or obstruction: Teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 6(1), 3–23. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168802lr0950a>.

ЛУБКО Сергій

аспірант катедри освітнього менеджменту, артменеджменту та соціальної роботи,
Черкаський національний університет імені Богдана Хмельницького, Україна

РОЗВИТОК АНГЛОМОВНОЇ ПРОДУКТИВНОЇ КОМПЕТЕНТНОСТІ: ТЕОРЕТИЧНІ ЗАСАДИ

У статті досліджується багатогранне теоретичне підґрунтя англомовної продуктивної компетентності, зокрема у спеціалізованому контексті підготовки майбутніх учителів іноземної мови (ІМ).

Необхідність дослідження пов'язана з переходом від ізолюваного формування мовленнєвих навичок і переважно репродуктивних вправ до динамічнішого,

когнітивно складнішого та соціально зумовленого розуміння мовленнєвої діяльності.

В основу дослідження покладено положення про те, що методики, зорієнтовані головню на механічне заучування, відтворення готових зразків або дискретне тестування, за умови їх ізолюваного застосування можуть бути недостатніми для розвитку генеративних

та інтеракційних умінь майбутнього вчителя. Студенти мають не лише відтворювати ІМ, а й спонтанно продукувати її, одночасно керуючи аудиторним дискусією.

Метою цієї статті є комплексний теоретичний огляд психолінгвістичних, когнітивних та педагогічних механізмів, пов'язаних зі здатністю продукувати вільне, коректне та структурно складне усне мовлення англійською мовою як іноземною. Хоча продуктивна компетентність охоплює як усне, так і письмове продукування, аналітичну увагу зосереджено на усному мовленні через його безпосередню роль у керуванні аудиторною взаємодією. Розглядаючи проблему крізь призму прикладної лінгвістики, когнітивної психології та методики навчання мов, стаття наголошує на специфічних вимогах до майбутніх педагогів.

Головна мета дослідження полягає в описі когнітивної архітектури продукування мовлення, аналізі афективних та інтеракційних бар'єрів і поясненні того, як структуровані колаборативні механізми можуть сприяти формуванню професійної педагогічної компетентності.

Методи. У дослідженні використано наративний теоретичний огляд, концептуальне моделювання та міждисциплінарний синтез із залученням психолінгвістики, когнітивної психології, теорії мовного оцінювання та соціокультурної педагогіки для з'ясування механізмів продукування іноземного мовлення й професійної педагогічної комунікації.

Результати. Головний аргумент статті полягає в тому, що англійську продуктивну компетентність майбутнього вчителя доцільно концептуалізувати як складний дворівневий конструкт, що охоплює

когнітивне опрацювання мовлення, структурні мовні ресурси, інтеракційний контроль і педагогічне моделювання. У дослідженні описано вимоги до етапу формування мовлення та розглянуто пов'язане з тривожністю мовчання як бар'єр продуктивної участі.

Проаналізовано, як гіпотеза продукування може сприяти помічанню мовних прогалин, перевірці гіпотез і метамовній рефлексії. Іншим важливим аспектом є запропоноване поєднання проектно-орієнтованого колаборативного навчання (ПОКН) зі спіральною моделлю мовленнєвого розвитку. Теоретичний аналіз дає підстави припустити, що цілеспрямовані соціально опосередковані середовища можуть допомогти майбутнім учителям розвивати як особисте володіння мовою, так і професійне мовлення вчителя.

Перспективи подальших досліджень. Колаборативні підходи запропоновано розглядати як доповнення до інших форм навчання, а не як їх автоматичну заміну. Подальші емпіричні дослідження мають перевірити умови, за яких ПОКН підтримує продуктивну компетентність майбутніх учителів в університетських аудиторіях, а також валідизувати запропоновані критерії та профілі розвитку.

Ключові слова: продуктивна англійська компетентність; майбутні вчителі іноземної мови; когнітивне навантаження; гіпотеза продукування мовлення; комунікативно-когнітивна спіральна модель; проектно-орієнтоване колаборативне навчання; мовлення вчителя.

Одержано редакцією 04.08.2026
Прийнято до публікації 28.08.2026

 <https://doi.org/10.31651/2524-2660-2026-3-92-97>

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3275-9399>

ПАЛЬЧИКОВА Олександра

кандидатка педагогічних наук, доцентка, завідувачка кафедри англійської філології,
Криворізький державний педагогічний університет

 apalchykova@ukr.net

УДК [378.147:37.011.3-051:811.111]:159.942.5:811.111'243:[355.48(470+571):477](045)

РОЛЬ ЕМПАТІЇ У ФОРМУВАННІ ЕЛІТАРНОЇ МОВНОЇ ОСОБИСТОСТІ ПІД ЧАС НАВЧАННЯ АНГЛОМОВНОЇ КОМУНІКАЦІЇ

У статті обґрунтовано необхідність розгляду емпатії як ключового психологічного чинника формування елітарної мовної особистості здобувачів освіти під час навчання англійської комунікації.

З'ясовано, що воєнні реалії, пов'язані з переживанням стресу, психологічних травм, вимушеним переміщенням і постійною загрозою безпеці, зумовлюють потребу в підготовці майбутнього вчителя англійської мови, здатного створювати психологічно безпечне освітнє середовище через урахування психоемоційного стану суб'єктів навчання, прояв співчуття, співпереживання, терпіння до їхніх індивідуальних освітніх потреб і темпу засвоєння навчального матеріалу.

Встановлено, що емпатія впливає на формування елітарної мовної особистості майбутнього вчителя англійської мови, здатної враховувати індивідуально-психологічні особливості суб'єкта навчання, прогнозувати його реакцію на почуте, усвідомити динаміку засвоєння навчального матеріалу задля добору комунікативних стратегій, необхідних для заохочення спілкування англійською мовою, а також надавати

підтримку у разі виникнення труднощів зі сприйняттям інформації чи тривожних станів під час відповіді.

Ключові слова: освіта в умовах війни; емпатія; лінгвістична емпатія; англійська мова; англійська комунікація; мовна особистість; елітарна мовна особистість; майбутні учителі англійської мови.

Постановка проблеми. Виклики воєнного часу, прискорені реформувальні та євроінтеграційні процеси, економічні, політичні, соціальні зрушення в Україні зумовили зміни в усіх галузях, зокрема й в освітній. Так, під час підготовки майбутніх учителів англійської мови особливу увагу слід приділяти психологічному аспекту формування їхньої мовної особистості, позаяк мова є не лише засобом передавання інформації, а й інструментом професійного мислення, емоційної підтримки особистості, формування довіри. У зв'язку з цим, емпатія є важливою умовою ефективного здійснення комунікації через прояв співчуття, піклування,