

Bridging German as a Foreign Language Instruction and Entrepreneurship Education: A Five-Phase Pedagogical Framework for the Algerian Multilingual Higher Education Context

Hammadi Asma

Djillali Liabes University of Sidi Bel Abbès, Algeria

asma.hammadi@univ-sba.dz

Received: 01/04/2026

Accepted: 23/07/2026

Published: 28/09/2026

Abstract:

The integration of German as a Foreign Language (GFL) instruction and entrepreneurship education is increasingly vital in multilingual higher education, yet structured didactic frameworks remain scarce. To address this gap, this paper introduces a theoretically grounded, five-phase pedagogical model designed to scaffold learners from domain-specific language acquisition to authentic pitch performance. Grounded in Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) and the EntreComp framework, the model leverages multilingual resources through pedagogical translanguaging. To demonstrate its operational feasibility, we present an illustrative qualitative single-case study (N = 2) of a student-led language-learning application developed under national start-up decree conditions.

The project culminated in a business model defense before an interdisciplinary panel. This case provides preliminary proof-of-concept evidence of how authentic communicative tasks link linguistic precision with entrepreneurial agency. Finally, structural limitations, scope conditions, and avenues for future empirical scaling are discussed.

Keywords:

GFL instruction, Entrepreneurship Education, Translanguaging, Start-up Pitch, Multilingual Higher Education.

Introduction

The promotion of entrepreneurial communication skills is rapidly gaining traction in multilingual higher education. In addition to conveying specialized academic content, universities are increasingly required to prepare students for complex professional environments that demand communicative, intercultural, and entrepreneurial agility alongside domain-specific expertise. Driven by digitalization, internationalization, and broader societal shifts, the ability to present ideas in an audience-tailored manner, communicate innovative projects persuasively, and collaborate effectively within interdisciplinary teams has become vital. Language competence is no longer understood merely as a vehicle for information transmission, but as a core prerequisite for professional agency in a globalized workforce.

This evolution fundamentally reshapes modern Language for Specific Purposes (LSP) instruction, such as German as a Foreign Language (GFL). While traditional approaches frequently prioritize the acquisition of technical vocabulary and the passive decoding of professional texts, contemporary economic demands necessitate a stronger orientation toward authentic communicative action. These scenarios encompass strategic negotiations, collaborative team communication, and the persuasive presentation of business models. Concurrently, entrepreneurship education has emerged as a holistic pedagogical paradigm whose scope extends far beyond venture creation. It centers on fostering creativity, personal initiative, problem-solving capacity, and the skill to identify market opportunities and articulate innovative solutions. Today, these capabilities are recognized as essential future skills in higher education.

Despite these converging trends, a persistent conceptual divide remains between entrepreneurship education and domain-specific language instruction—a gap that has received insufficient didactic attention. While entrepreneurship programs often concentrate strictly on economic mechanics, language curricula frequently remain bound to isolated grammatical structures without systematically embedding entrepreneurial action scenarios. This research gap is particularly pronounced in multilingual higher education settings, where students navigate multiple languages simultaneously and transition across distinct communicative spheres. In such environments, delivering specialized language skills in isolation is no longer sufficient. Instead, integrative didactic models are required—frameworks that couple language learning with authentic scenarios while fostering intercultural competence. Complex task formats, such as developing a language-learning application and pitching it to potential stakeholders, offer a compelling setting for this purpose.

To address this gap, this paper introduces a theoretically grounded conceptual framework that bridges GFL instruction and entrepreneurship education. Rather than claiming broad empirical generalizability across heterogeneous student populations, the framework's operational feasibility is demonstrated through an illustrative qualitative single-case study ($N = 2$) embedded in an authentic university startup initiative under the Algerian Ministerial Decree No. 1275. By synthesizing Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), the EntreComp framework, and pedagogical translanguaging, this study offers a proof-of-concept for coupling specialized language learning with entrepreneurial action under real-world institutional constraints. The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: Section 2 establishes the theoretical foundations; Section 3 outlines the systematic five-phase architecture; Section 4 analyzes the illustrative case study; and Section 5 concludes with a discussion of implications for university-level language didactics.

1. Theoretical Framework

1.1 LSP Teaching in Transition: Toward Professional Action Competence

Concepts of domain-specific German instruction (German as a Foreign Language / GFL) initially emerged to prepare learners for clearly defined, field-specific communication scenarios (Roche, 2013). While historical approaches prioritized the

formal analysis of specialized texts and isolated vocabulary acquisition, the focal point of modern foreign language didactics has shifted decisively toward functional, communicative action competence (Funk et al., 2014). Contemporary approaches no longer view Language for Specific Purposes (LSP) as a static system of linguistic structures, but rather as a dynamic vehicle for professional agency in authentic contexts.

In this view, specialized language competence entails structuring and delivering information in an audience-tailored manner, collaboratively formulating technical arguments, and solving complex problems within a team. This pragmatic orientation aligns with the action-oriented principles of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), which conceptualizes learners as social agents using language to navigate real-world and professional tasks (Council of Europe, 2020). For higher education, this shift necessitates a departure from traditional, text-centric instructional formats toward complex learning environments—such as case-study simulations and project-based learning—that directly synthesize language instruction with domain-specific action.

1.2 Entrepreneurship Education as a Communicative Task

Over the past two decades, entrepreneurship education has evolved from a specialized subfield of business economics into a cross-disciplinary, holistic pedagogical paradigm in higher education (Kyguolienė & Švipas, 2019). At its core lies the cultivation of an entrepreneurial mindset that transcends purely economic skills, encompassing creative problem-solving, proactivity, and the constructive management of uncertainty.

International reference frameworks, such as the European Commission's EntreComp framework, highlight that communication plays a pivotal role within entrepreneurial competence models (Bacigalupo et al., 2016). Innovative ideas only realize their full socio-economic potential when they can be persuasively articulated, critically debated, and collaboratively refined. Entrepreneurial competence is thus intrinsically bound to a linguistic and communicative dimension, as it presupposes audience-appropriate argumentation, negotiation, and presentation skills. This interplay is particularly visible in the format of the start-up pitch: under tight time constraints, complex and often highly technical concepts must be concisely structured and their economic rationale presented convincingly. Although language instruction and entrepreneurship education pursue fundamentally complementary learning outcomes, they are still rarely integrated systematically in university curricula.

1.3 Multilingualism and Translanguaging as a Resource

Driven by internationalization and academic mobility, contemporary universities are characterized by profound linguistic and cultural diversity. In migration and applied linguistics research, multilingualism is no longer viewed as a cognitive barrier, but rather as a dynamic communicative asset. Grounded in the concept of translanguaging, modern multilingual didactics emphasize that plurilingual individuals do not operate within compartmentalized linguistic silos; instead, they draw upon their entire repertoire in an integrated, fluid manner to resolve complex communicative tasks (García & Li Wei, 2014).

Such flexible language practices are particularly vital when launching ventures in multilingual markets. For university LSP instruction, this implies that competence development need not be rigidly restricted to a single target language (Cenoz & Gorter, 2021). Authentic task formats—such as student startup initiatives—enable learners to navigate fluidly between languages and registers. For instance, pedagogical insights acquired in a GFL context can be strategically translated into a primary language or regional business language (e.g., Arabic) for a final pitch, thereby directly addressing real-world local market demands.

1.4 Research Gap and Objective

Existing studies largely examine specialized professional communication in isolation from entrepreneurial action, while entrepreneurship programs frequently overlook language-didactic considerations. This paper operates at this theoretical nexus by introducing an action-oriented didactic framework that synthesizes the principles of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), the core competencies of entrepreneurship education, and multilingual translanguaging strategies. To demonstrate its operational feasibility, the model is subsequently illustrated through a real-world project within a qualitative single-case study.

2. The Action-Oriented Five-Phase Pedagogical Model

2.1 Didactic Core Principles

The proposed model is grounded in four established pillars of constructivist learning theory: authenticity, action orientation, collaboration, and critical reflection. It operates on the premise that entrepreneurial communication competence is not acquired through the passive memorization of isolated grammatical or lexical structures, but rather through the active mastery of authentic professional scenarios (Long, 2015). Within this paradigm, language functions fundamentally as a tool for meaningful action (*Language as Action*).

The model integrates four interconnected competence dimensions:

- **Linguistic Competence:** Precise, audience-tailored deployment of domain-specific discourse structures and cohesive argumentation (Roche, 2013).
- **Entrepreneurial Competence:** Strategic opportunity identification, creative problem-solving, and venture-oriented innovation capacity in alignment with the EntreComp framework (Bacigalupo et al., 2016).
- **Intercultural Competence:** Nuanced navigation of socio-cultural variations in business communication and pitch contexts.
- **Collaborative Competence:** Interpersonal negotiation, team-based ideation, and discursive decision-making under real-world project constraints.

2.2 Phase Architecture

The development of competence unfolds sequentially across five distinct phases. This architecture synthesizes the principle of authentic target tasks (Long, 2015) with the

competence areas of the EntreComp framework (Bacigalupo et al., 2016) and the action-oriented descriptors of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (Council of Europe, 2020). Table 1 outlines the theoretical foundation, learning objectives, activities, and expected outcomes for each phase.

Table 1. *Systematic Architecture of the Action-Oriented Five-Phase Framework*

Phase	Theoretical Foundation	Primary Learning Objective	Learner Activity	Target Linguistic Competence	Entrepreneurial Competence (EntreComp)	Expected Outcome / Product
Phase 1: Activation and Framing	TBLT Pre-task Phase (Long, 2015); LSP Didactics	Build specialized vocabulary and decode genre rules	Analyzing authentic pitch video samples; decoding discourse structures	Receptive LSP mastery; genre-specific lexical framing	Spotting opportunities; recognizing market needs	Analytical grid of pitch mechanics and terminology repository
Phase 2: Project Ideation	Experiential Learning (Lack��us, 2020); Project Method	Identify market gaps and conceptualize solutions	Collaborative ideation; defining app architecture	Discursive negotiation; collaborative ideation register	Creativity; ethical and sustainable thinking	Preliminary problem-solution fit matrix
Phase 3: Strategic Structuring	Scaffolded Writing; AI-assisted Sparring	Formulate value propositions and refine rhetoric	Drafting pitch decks; formulating USPs; testing arguments via AI	Coherent LSP text production; precise technical terminology	Mobilizing resources; strategic planning	Draft pitch deck and Business Model Canvas (BMC)
Phase 4: Authentic Pitching	Real-World Target Tasks (Nunan, 2004); Translanguaging	Deliver pitch to interdisciplinary audience	Live presentation and defense before expert committee	Pedagogical translanguaging; persuasive rhetoric	Coping with uncertainty; value-driven pitching	Live pitch performance and expert evaluation

	Metacognitive		Retrospective	Metacognitive		
Phase 5: Reflection and Transfer	tive Learning (Council of Europe, 2020)	Evaluate process and transfer competence	ve self/peer review; team process analysis	tive register; reflective feedback discourse	Learning through experience; self-efficacy	Anonymized reflective portfolio report

Note. Adapted from *Second Language Acquisition and Task-Based Language Teaching* (p. 312), by M. H. Long, 2015, Wiley-Blackwell; *EntreComp: The Entrepreneurship Competence Framework*, by M. Bacigalupo et al., 2016, Publications Office of the European Union; and *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Companion Volume*, by Council of Europe, 2020.

2.3 Comparative Analysis with Traditional LSP Instruction

To demonstrate the pedagogical innovation of the proposed five-phase framework, Table 2 contrasts its core operational dimensions against traditional Language for Specific Purposes (LSP) instruction. Rather than viewing the final pitch as an isolated summative examination, this framework conceptualizes it as an integrated, authentic performance suited to the demands of contemporary, practice-oriented higher education.

Table 2. *Comparative Matrix: Traditional LSP Instruction vs. Action-Oriented GFL Model*

Dimension	Traditional LSP Instruction	Action-Oriented GFL Framework
Learning Objective	Isolated specialized language competence (vocabulary acquisition)	Comprehensive entrepreneurial communication competence (Bacigalupo et al., 2016; Roche, 2013)
Concept of Language	Language as a static, structural linguistic system	Language as a dynamic, professional vehicle for action (Council of Europe, 2020)
Pedagogical Method	Textbook-centered, deductive instruction	Project- and problem-based experiential learning (Funk et al., 2014)
Core Activities	Decontextualized grammar exercises and text decoding	Real-world case studies, startup projects, and live pitches (Long, 2015)
Learner Role	Passive consumers absorbing instructor-led knowledge	Autonomous problem solvers and interdisciplinary agents (Kyguolienė & Švipas, 2019)

Instructor Role	Primary knowledge provider and instructor	Learning facilitator, coach, and feedback provider (Funk et al., 2014)
Assessment Format	Summative written exams; isolated translation tasks	Live pitch defenses, reflective portfolios, and formative evaluation (Council of Europe, 2020)
Competence Scope	Unidimensional linguistic proficiency	Multidimensional (linguistic, entrepreneurial, intercultural, collaborative) (García & Li Wei, 2014)
Practical Relevance	Low (simulated academic exercises)	High (direct articulation with local innovation ecosystems) (Cenoz & Gorter, 2021)

Note. Conceptual synthesis based on Bacigalupo et al. (2016), Cenoz and Gorter (2021), Council of Europe (2020), Funk et al. (2014), García and Li Wei (2014), Kyguolienė and Švipas (2019), Long (2015), and Roche (2013).

3. Methodological Framework and Data Analysis Procedure

3.1 Research Design and Data Corpus

To explore the operational feasibility of the proposed five-phase framework, this study adopts an illustrative qualitative single-case study (Yin, 2018). Rather than claiming full Design-Based Research (DBR) or quantitative generalizability—which require multiple iterative redesign cycles and large sample sizes—this study examines the preliminary feasibility of the model within a real-world higher education startup initiative.

The study centers on a university project involving two GFL Master's students (N = 2) at Djilali Liabes University of Sidi Bel Abbès, who developed a digital language-learning application under Algerian National Ministerial Decree No. 1275 (*Diplôme-Start-up*). To protect the intellectual property rights and commercial confidentiality of the project, raw data files—specifically the internal 30-slide pitch deck—were analyzed under non-disclosure conditions and remain confidential. In accordance with ethical research standards and data protection guidelines, all empirical evidence drawn from this artifact is presented through anonymized, translated, and structural excerpts.

The empirical data corpus comprises three triangulated qualitative data sources:

1. **German-Language Pedagogical Artifacts (L2):** Written Business Model Canvases (BMC), specialized GFL glossaries, and initial pitch drafts generated during Phases 1–3.
2. **Visual & Rhetorical Presentation Deck (L1/L2):** The anonymized 30-slide PowerPoint presentation used during the official startup defense under Decree No. 1275, serving as a multimodal artifact of cross-linguistic transfer.
3. **Evaluation and Reflection Data:** Anonymized evaluation rubrics from the independent interdisciplinary committee alongside structured retrospective self-reflection logs from the participating students.

3.2 Qualitative Data Analysis Procedure

Data analysis was conducted following Kuckartz's (2019) category-based qualitative content analysis. To ensure analytical rigor and systematic coding, a hybrid deductive-inductive coding framework was established:

- **Deductive Main Categories:** Derived directly from the theoretical framework (EntreComp dimensions and TBLT task-achievement criteria):
 - **CAT 1:** Technical LSP Terminology and Conceptual Precision (German / L2)
 - **CAT 2:** Strategic Business Framing and Value Proposition
 - **CAT 3:** Pedagogical Translanguaging and Cross-Linguistic Transfer
- **Inductive Subcategories:** Developed directly from student reflection logs and presentation slides, capturing specific challenges in register shifting (e.g., translating German pedagogical concepts into persuasive Arabic pitch rhetoric).

3.3 Operationalization of AI Sparring and Pedagogical Translanguaging

- **Pedagogical Translanguaging:** Translanguaging was explicitly operationalized as a scaffolded pedagogical strategy rather than unstructured code-switching. While theoretical conceptualization, literature review, and GFL glossary building were conducted in German (L2/target LSP), the final pitch deck and oral defense were delivered in Arabic (L1/local business register). This intentional shift allowed learners to leverage their full communicative repertoire to address the specific expectations of an interdisciplinary panel under Decree No. 1275.
- **AI-Supported Sparring Boundaries:** Generative AI tools (LLMs) were integrated exclusively in Phase 3 as a formative sparring partner. Learners utilized structured prompts to simulate counterarguments from potential investors and refine rhetorical style. To maintain academic integrity and prevent passive reliance, students were required to verify all AI-generated outputs against specialized dictionaries and document their prompt-revision steps in a metacognitive log.

3.4 Sample Context, Evaluator Triangulation, and Methodological Safeguards

- **Case Selection Context:** The single-case design involving two GFL Master's students represents an information-rich, purposeful sample (Yin, 2018) suited for evaluating feasibility under specialized institutional conditions. The primary objective is not statistical generalizability across heterogeneous language classrooms, but the empirical illustration of how humanities students can operationalize LSP training within an entrepreneurial ecosystem.
- **Mitigating Researcher and Mentor Bias:** An inherent constraint in practitioner-researcher designs is the dual role of the instructor as both academic mentor and primary investigator. To safeguard analytical objectivity and mitigate interpretative bias, three methodological controls were implemented:
 1. **External Evaluator Triangulation:** The primary assessment of project viability and presentation performance was conducted by an independent,

interdisciplinary expert committee appointed under Decree No. 1275, completely independent of the course instructor.

2. **Artifact-Based Analysis:** Qualitative findings were derived directly from objective presentation artifacts (the 30-slide pitch deck) and standardized rubrics rather than subjective instructional impressions.
3. **Structured Content Analysis:** Data coding strictly followed Kuckartz's (2019) systematic qualitative protocol with explicit main categories, ensuring a transparent data-to-category chain.

4. Empirical Results and Discussion

4.1 Structural Analysis of Presentation Artifacts

To evaluate the operational feasibility of the five-phase framework, the 30-slide presentation deck used during the final project defense under Ministerial Decree No. 1275 was analyzed using Kuckartz's (2019) structured qualitative content analysis.

The structural breakdown demonstrates how specialized pedagogical concepts developed in German (L2) were systematically operationalized into an authentic business pitch register in Arabic (L1). Table 3 details the mapping of the slide contents to the corresponding LSP domains and framework phases.

Table 3. *Qualitative Content Analysis of Presentation Artifacts Across Framework Phases (Kuckartz, 2019)*

Main Category (Kuckartz, 2019)	Associated Range	Slide	Target Domain / Business Content	Structural and Cross-Linguistic Transfer Evidence
CAT 1: Problem- Solution Fit and Ideation	Slides 3–6		Problem definition (المشكلة), solution architecture (الحل), product branding (المنتج, شعار المنتج)	Direct mapping of Phase 2 (Ideation): High degree of visual rhetoric; transformation of GFL educational analysis into a concrete product definition (App Logo, MVP).
CAT 2: Target Market and Empirical Validation	Slides 7, 16–18		Target audience (الفئة المستهدفة), empirical user survey (نتائج استطلاع رأي المستخدمين), competitor matrix (المنافسة)	Operationalization of Phases 1 and 3: Integration of user survey data (Nutzererwartungen) showing empirical rigor and competitive positioning.

CAT 3: Financial Logistics and Monetization	Slides 8–14	Revenue streams (نموذج الإيرادات: Subscriptions, In- App purchases, Premium features, Ad revenue, Revenue sharing, Payment gateways)	Granular breakdown of Phase 3 (Strategic Structuring): The specialized economic concept of "Revenue Models" is articulated across six distinct sub- dimensions. Application of standardized strategic tools (SWOT: <i>Stärken</i> , <i>Schwächen</i> , <i>Chancen</i> , <i>Risiken</i>), bridging theoretical analysis with operational planning.
CAT 4: Strategic Environment Analysis	Slides 15, 19–20	SWOT Analysis (نقاط تحليل SWOT: القوة، الضعف، الفرص، التهديدات), Marketing Strategy, Operational Roadmap	Culmination of Phases 3 and 4: Methodical alignment with Alexander Osterwalder's 9- building-block BMC structure (مخطط (نموذج العمل التجاري).
CAT 5: Business Model Synthesis (BMC Framework)	Slides 21–30	Comprehensive Business Model Canvas (9 Core Components: Value Proposition, Customer Segments, Channels, Revenue, etc.)	

Note. Data derived from student presentation deck (N = 2) generated under Ministerial Decree No. 1275 (MESRS, 2022). Qualitative content analysis conducted according to *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse: Methoden, Praxis, Computerunterstützung* (4th ed.), by U. Kuckartz, 2019, Beltz Juventa. Business Model Canvas framework adapted from Osterwalder and Pigneur (2010).

4.2 Feasibility Evidence and External Evaluation

The qualitative evaluation demonstrates that the five-phase model successfully scaffolded the development of the startup project. Anonymized evaluation scores and written feedback from the independent interdisciplinary jury highlight key performance indicators across three central dimensions (Table 4).

Table 4. *Anonymized Jury Evaluation Dimensions and Qualitative Indicators*

Evaluation Dimension	Assessed Criteria	Qualitative Jury Verdict / Evidence
----------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------------

Conceptual Viability	Feasibility of the language-learning application	High market relevance; clear identification of target audience needs. Successful transfer of
Linguistic and Rhetorical Adaptability	Flexibility across registers (German LSP to Arabic Pitch)	specialized concepts into persuasive, audience-appropriate business discourse.
Strategic Argumentation	Defense of Business Model Canvas during Q&A	Robust handling of critical questions regarding sustainability and market competitors.

Note. Source: Compiled from anonymized official jury evaluation rubrics and defense protocols under Ministerial Decree No. 1275 (MESRS, 2022) at Djilali Liabes University of Sidi Bel Abbès.

It is critical to distinguish between project success and model effectiveness. The jury's positive appraisal—recommending the project for the official national "Start-up Label"—confirms the practical feasibility and realization of the project within this specific institutional setting. However, it does not constitute full empirical proof of pedagogical efficacy across diverse learner populations. The outcome serves as a proof-of-concept for operational feasibility, demonstrating that humanities students can successfully operationalize LSP skills in an entrepreneurial domain under real-world constraints.

4.3 The Role of Pedagogical Translanguaging in LSP Execution

A key pedagogical finding concerns the dynamic shift between German (L2) and Arabic (L1). While the preliminary literature review, conceptual scaffolding, Business Model Canvas drafting, and specialized lexicon building occurred in German during Phases 1–3, the final presentation deck (Slides 1–30) and oral defense were delivered in Arabic.

Far from representing a compromise of GFL learning objectives, this cross-linguistic execution demonstrates advanced pedagogical translanguaging (García & Li Wei, 2014; Cenoz & Gorter, 2021). As evidenced by the structural analysis of Slides 21–30, the underlying logic of the presentation—specifically the 9-building-block Business Model Canvas and the granular monetization channels (Slides 8–14)—strictly follows international and German LSP conventions. Learners utilized their full communicative repertoire: German served as the cognitive-conceptual language for acquiring LSP knowledge, while Arabic served as the context-authentic delivery register required by the Algerian expert panel under Decree No. 1275.

4.4 Contribution to University LSP Didactics and Digital Tools

From a higher education perspective, the framework bridges academic language theory and professional practice. For instructors, this implies a role transition from traditional knowledge transmitters to learning facilitators and coaches who stimulate metacognitive reflection and provide formative feedback.

Furthermore, the framework offers a structured pathway for the integration of generative AI. Large Language Models (LLMs) can be utilized selectively in Phase 3 as collaborative sparring partners to refine rhetorical drafts or simulate jury questioning. To safeguard academic integrity, students are required to verify AI outputs against specialized dictionaries and maintain metacognitive prompt-revision logs, ensuring that the learner remains the primary social agent.

Conclusion

Contemporary LSP instruction must not limit itself to the mere transmission of grammar and specialized terminology. Modern higher education requires didactic concepts that conceive foreign languages as instruments of professional action, preparing students for complex, authentic communication scenarios. Addressing this need, this paper introduced a theoretically grounded, five-phase pedagogical framework designed to bridge German for Specific Purposes (GFL/LSP) instruction and entrepreneurship education within multilingual contexts.

The scientific contribution of this paper lies in the theoretical synthesis of three traditionally separated fields: university-level LSP didactics, entrepreneurship education (the EntreComp framework), and pedagogical translanguaging. By integrating Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), the framework offers a structured, scaffolded pathway leading learners step-by-step from specialized academic discourse to authentic entrepreneurial communication.

The illustrative qualitative single-case study (N = 2) provided preliminary evidence for the operational feasibility of the model under real-world institutional constraints (Algerian National Ministerial Decree No. 1275). It demonstrated how humanities students can successfully operationalize target-language (L2 German) expertise, translate it into a business concept, and defend it before an interdisciplinary panel using their full communicative repertoire (L1 Arabic pitch delivery).

Structural Limitations

While the outcome serves as a proof-of-concept, a strict scientific distinction must be maintained between initial project feasibility and broad empirical pedagogical validation. The interpretative scope of this study is subject to four main structural limitations:

1. **Sample Scope and Generalizability:** The empirical illustration relies on a single project team (N = 2) consisting of highly motivated Master's students. Findings demonstrate structural feasibility rather than universal pedagogical effectiveness across larger, mixed-ability classrooms.
2. **Absence of Control Groups:** Without a comparative cohort receiving traditional LSP instruction, claims regarding superior pedagogical efficiency remain speculative.
3. **Researcher and Mentor Dual-Role Bias:** The dual role of the instructor as both academic mentor and primary investigator introduces potential interpretative bias, which was mitigated—but not entirely eliminated—by relying on independent external jury evaluations and objective slide artifacts.

4. **Single-Cycle Observation:** As a single-cycle implementation tied to the project defense under Decree No. 1275, long-term competency retention and iterative curriculum redesign cycles (characteristic of full Design-Based Research) could not be evaluated.

Outlook and Future Research

Future research should focus on empirical scaling. To validate the framework beyond preliminary feasibility and systematically evaluate its impact on linguistic accuracy, communicative confidence, and entrepreneurial self-efficacy, follow-up studies should:

- Implement the model across larger, more heterogeneous student cohorts.
- Integrate multi-cycle Design-Based Research (DBR) iterations or quasi-experimental design.
- Explore its adaptability across other international LSP contexts and language combinations.

Overall, this work demonstrates that intertwining domain-specific language learning with entrepreneurial action consistently operationalizes foreign language competence as a medium for real professional agency.

Bibliography

- Bacigalupo, M., Kampylis, P., Punie, Y., & Van den Brande, G. (2016). *EntreComp: The Entrepreneurship Competence Framework* (EUR 27939 EN). Publications Office of the European Union. <https://doi.org/10.2791/150888>
- Basturkmen, H. (2010). *Developing courses in English for Specific Purposes*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230290518>
- Belcher, D. (Ed.). (2009). *English for Specific Purposes in theory and practice*. University of Michigan Press. <https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.217391>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2021). *Pedagogical translanguaging*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108888257>
- Council of Europe. (2020). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment – Companion volume*. Council of Europe Publishing. <https://rm.coe.int/common-european-framework-of-reference-for-languages-learning-teaching/16809ea0d4>
- Dudley-Evans, T., & St John, M. J. (1998). *Developments in English for Specific Purposes: A multi-disciplinary approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Flechsigt, K. H., & Haller, H. J. (2005). Die Projektmethode. In H. Gudjons & R. Winkel (Hrsg.), *Handbuch Didaktische Modelle* (S. 120–135). Klett.
- Funk, H., Kuhn, C., Skiba, D., Spaniel-Weise, D., & Wicke, R. E. (2014). *Aufgaben, Übungen, Instruktionen* (Deutsch Lehren Lernen – DLL, Band 6). Klett-Langenscheidt.
- García, O., & Li Wei. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765>
- Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for Specific Purposes: A learning-centred approach*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511733031>

- Kuckartz, U. (2019). *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. Methoden, Praxis, Computerunterstützung* (4. Aufl.). Beltz Juventa.
- Kyguolienė, A., & Švipas, L. (2019). Entrepreneurship education framework: Theoretical insights. *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues*, 7(1), 616–628. [https://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2019.7.1\(43\)](https://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2019.7.1(43))
- Lackéus, M. (2020). Comparing the impact of three different ways of embedding entrepreneurship in higher education. *Small Business Economics*, 55(3), 869–885. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-019-00270-1>
- Long, M. H. (2015). *Second language acquisition and Task-Based Language Teaching*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Ministère de l'Enseignement Supérieur et de la Recherche Scientifique (MESRS). (2022). *Arrêté N° 1275 du 27 Septembre 2022 portant mécanisme « un diplôme... une start-up / un diplôme... un brevet »*. République Algérienne Démocratique et Populaire.
- Neck, H. M., Neck, C. P., & Murray, E. L. (2021). *Entrepreneurship: The practice and mindset* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-Based Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667305>
- OECD. (2019). *Trends shaping education 2019*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/trends_edu-2019-en
- Osterwalder, A., & Pigneur, Y. (2010). *Business model generation: A handbook for visionaries, game changers, and challengers*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Roche, J. (2013). *Mehrsprachigkeitstheorie: Erwerb – Kognition – Transnationalität – Fachsprache*. Narr Francke Attempto.
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.