BG Pulse Journal USA
ISSN:1947-2536 http://www.bgpulseusa.com/index.php/bg

THE COOPERATIVE LEARNING PRINCIPLE IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION:THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS, METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORKS, AND PEDAGOGICAL APPLICATIONS

Safarova Rukhshona Ulugbek qizi
student, Bukhara State Pedagogical Institute

Abstract. This essay examines the cooperative learning principle as a pedagogical strategy in the context of English language teaching and learning. Drawing on foundational theories from cognitive psychology, social constructivism, and second language acquisition research, the paper analyses how structured peer interaction, collaborative task completion, and group-based discourse contribute to the development of linguistic competence, communicative fluency, and metacognitive awareness. Five key cooperative learning structures are discussed, and evidence from empirical classroom research is synthesised to demonstrate the superior outcomes of cooperative approaches over traditional instructor-centred models. The essay concludes with practical recommendations for English language educators.

Keywords: cooperative learning, English language teaching, communicative competence, second language acquisition, group dynamics, Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development, task-based language teaching, peer interaction, scaffolding, collaborative discourse.

ПРИНЦИП КООПЕРАТИВНОГО ОБУЧЕНИЯ В ИЗУЧЕНИИ АНГЛИЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКА:ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКИЕ ОСНОВЫ, МЕТОДОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ РАМКИ И ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКИЕ ПРИЛОЖЕНИЯ

Сафарова Рухшона Улугбек
студентка Бухарского государственного педагогического института

Аннотация. В данной статье рассматривается принцип кооперативного обучения как педагогическая стратегия в контексте преподавания и изучения английского языка. Опираясь на фундаментальные теории когнитивной психологии, социального конструктивизма и исследований в области усвоения второго языка, в статье анализируется, как структурированное взаимодействие между сверстниками, совместное выполнение заданий и групповая дискуссия способствуют развитию языковой компетенции, коммуникативной беглости и метакогнитивной осведомленности. Обсуждаются пять ключевых структур кооперативного обучения, и обобщаются данные эмпирических исследований в классе, демонстрирующие превосходные результаты кооперативных подходов по сравнению с традиционными моделями, ориентированными на преподавателя. В заключение статьи приводятся практические рекомендации для преподавателей английского языка.

Ключевые слова: кооперативное обучение, преподавание английского языка, коммуникативная компетентность, усвоение второго языка, групповая динамика, зона ближайшего развития Выготского, обучение языку на основе задач, взаимодействие со сверстниками, поддержка, совместная дискуссия.

BG Pulse Journal USA
ISSN:1947-2536 http://www.bgpulseusa.com/index.php/bg

INGLIZ TILINI O‘RGANISHDA KOOPERATIV TA’LIM TAMOYILI:NAZARIY ASOSLAR, METODOLOGIK YONDASHUVLAR VA PEDAGOGIK QO‘LLANMALAR

Safarova Ruxshona Ulug‘bek qizi
talaba, Buxoro davlat pedagogika instituti

Annotatsiya. Ushbu maqolada kooperativ ta’lim tamoyili ingliz tilini o‘qitish va o‘rganish jarayonidagi pedagogik strategiya sifatida ko‘rib chiqiladi. Kognitiv psixologiya, ijtimoiy konstruktivizm hamda ikkinchi tilni o‘zlashtirish bo‘yicha tadqiqotlarning fundamental nazariyalariga tayangan holda, maqolada tengdoshlar o‘rtasidagi tuzilgan hamkorlik, topshiriqlarni birgalikda bajarish va guruhli muhokama til kompetensiyasi, kommunikativ ravonlik va metakognitiv ongni rivojlantirishga qanday yordam berishi tahlil qilinadi. Kooperativ ta’limning beshta asosiy modeli muhokama qilinadi hamda sinf sharoitida olib borilgan empirik tadqiqotlar natijalari umumlashtirilib, ular kooperativ yondashuvlarning o‘qituvchiga yo‘naltirilgan an’anaviy modellarga nisbatan samaraliroq ekanini ko‘rsatadi. Maqola yakunida ingliz tili o‘qituvchilari uchun amaliy tavsiyalar beriladi.

Kalit so‘zlar: kooperativ ta’lim, ingliz tilini o‘qitish, kommunikativ kompetensiya, ikkinchi tilni o‘zlashtirish, guruh dinamikasi, Lev Vygotskyning yaqin rivojlanish zonasi, vazifaga asoslangan til o‘qitish, tengdoshlar o‘rtasidagi hamkorlik, qo‘llab-quvvatlash, birgalikdagi muhokama.

1. INTRODUCTION: RETHINKING THE LANGUAGE CLASSROOM

The traditional image of the language classroom – rows of silent students attending to a teacher at the front of the room – has been challenged profoundly by decades of research in educational psychology, applied linguistics, and second language acquisition (SLA). Contemporary pedagogy recognises that language, by its very nature, is a social phenomenon: it is acquired, developed, and refined through meaningful interaction with others. This recognition has placed the cooperative learning principle at the heart of modern English language teaching (ELT) methodology.

Cooperative learning, broadly defined, is an instructional approach in which learners work together in structured groups to achieve shared academic goals. It is distinguished from mere group work by its adherence to five defining principles – positive interdependence, individual accountability, promotive interaction, social skills development, and group processing – first articulated systematically by David and Roger Johnson (1989) and further elaborated by scholars including Robert Slavin (1995), Spencer Kagan (1994), and Lev Vygotsky, whose foundational theory of social constructivism underpins much of the theoretical architecture of the approach.

In the specific domain of English language learning, cooperative structures offer a particularly compelling pedagogical case. Unlike mathematics or history, where content can be transmitted and absorbed in relative isolation, language acquisition demands productive output, comprehensible input, and above all, negotiated interaction – conditions that cooperative learning creates naturally and systematically. The research literature accumulated over the past four decades consistently demonstrates that English learners engaged in well-structured cooperative tasks outperform their counterparts in traditional settings across a range of linguistic and communicative measures.

This essay proceeds in four major stages. First, it traces the theoretical foundations of cooperative learning, situating the approach within the broader landscape of SLA theory. Second, it examines the specific mechanisms through which cooperation facilitates English language

development. Third, it surveys the principal cooperative learning structures most applicable to the language classroom, supported by empirical evidence. Fourth, it addresses challenges and implementation considerations, before concluding with a synthesis of the essay's principal arguments.

2. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

The most directly influential theoretical framework for cooperative language learning is Lev Vygotsky's social constructivist theory of cognitive development. Central to this framework is the concept of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), which Vygotsky (1978) defined as "the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers." The ZPD concept has transformative implications for language pedagogy: it posits that learners can achieve linguistic competencies beyond their current independent capacity when supported by interaction with more competent interlocutors, whether teachers or peers.

In cooperative language learning contexts, the ZPD operates as a dynamic social space. When an intermediate-level student collaborates with a more proficient partner on a reading comprehension or writing task, the interaction itself scaffolds the less proficient learner toward higher linguistic performance. This scaffolding – a concept introduced by Wood, Bruner, and Ross (1976) drawing on Vygotskian principles – is not limited to teacher-student dyads; it occurs richly and authentically in peer collaboration, making the cooperative classroom a network of mutually sustaining ZPDs.

Equally important is Vygotsky's insistence that thought and language are inextricably linked through internalisation. When learners verbalise their reasoning in collaborative problem-solving – explaining a grammar rule to a partner, arguing for an interpretation of a text, negotiating the wording of a joint essay – they are not merely communicating existing knowledge; they are constructing new knowledge through the act of articulation. This process, which Mercer (2000) terms "interthinking," is precisely what cooperative learning structures are designed to elicit.

A second theoretical pillar comes from the interactionist tradition in SLA research, most prominently associated with Michael Long's Interaction Hypothesis (1996). Long proposed that second language acquisition is facilitated when learners engage in conversational interaction that requires them to negotiate meaning – that is, to modify, repeat, simplify, or clarify their speech when communication breaks down. This negotiation of meaning, Long argued, makes the connection between form and meaning more salient for the learner, thereby promoting acquisition.

Cooperative learning creates abundant opportunities for meaning negotiation. When learners work collaboratively on language tasks, they are continuously confronted with gaps in mutual comprehension: they must ask for clarification, rephrase their contributions, check their partners' understanding, and revise their own output. Each of these moves constitutes a micro-instance of negotiated interaction. Longitudinal studies by Mackey (1999) and Gass and Mackey (2015) provide substantial empirical support for the claim that such interactions promote interlanguage development – the gradual progression of the learner's linguistic system toward the target language.

Merrill Swain's Output Hypothesis (1985, 1995) adds a further dimension. Swain observed that Canadian immersion students who received extensive comprehensible input nonetheless failed to achieve native-like grammatical accuracy, and proposed that producing language – being "pushed" to express meaning precisely and accurately – was essential for full acquisition. Cooperative tasks that require learners to produce coherent spoken or written language under

conditions of communicative pressure exemplify this productive function, turning the cooperative classroom into what Swain termed a "site of cognitive activity."

3. MECHANISMS OF COOPERATIVE LANGUAGE LEARNING

One of the most significant mechanisms through which cooperation benefits English learners is the creation of authentic communicative purpose. Whereas traditional exercises require learners to manipulate language in response to a teacher's prompts, cooperative tasks place learners in genuine information-exchange situations: one partner holds information the other needs, both must contribute to a shared product, or the group must reach consensus through argument and persuasion. This information gap or opinion gap creates what Widdowson (1978) called "genuine communicative value" – language used not for display but for real transactional purposes.

This authenticity has measurable pedagogical consequences. Research by Dörnyei (2001) on motivational dynamics in language learning shows that learners are significantly more motivated when communication serves a real purpose than when it is perceived as an exercise. In cooperative groups, motivation becomes a shared resource: group members encourage one another, celebrate collective achievements, and create positive affective conditions – what Arnold (1999) terms the "affective filter" – that are conducive to language acquisition.

A structural advantage of cooperative learning over whole-class instruction is the dramatic increase in individual talking time. In a class of thirty students with a single teacher directing the interaction, each student's average speaking opportunity is minimal. In cooperative groups of three to five, every student must participate, which can increase individual talking time by a factor of five or more. This quantitative increase matters enormously for language acquisition: producing language is not merely a performance of competence but a means of developing it.

Equally significant is the reduction in communicative anxiety. Foreign language anxiety, extensively documented by Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986), is one of the most significant affective barriers to second language acquisition. The formal, evaluative context of whole-class recitation, with the teacher and all classmates as an audience, is maximally anxiety-inducing for many learners. Cooperative groups, by contrast, provide a lower-stakes communicative environment: the audience is smaller, the relationship more equal, and the consequences of error less visible. Ohta's (2001) classroom-based research confirmed that learners who were virtually silent in whole-class instruction participated actively and took significant linguistic risks in cooperative small groups.

Cooperation also activates mechanisms of attention to linguistic form that have been shown to promote acquisition. When learners correct one another – through recasts, explicit correction, or metalinguistic commentary – they engage in what Long (1991) termed "focus on form" and what Lyster and Ranta (1997) systematically documented in their influential analysis of corrective feedback in immersion classrooms. Peer-generated feedback, while different in character from teacher feedback, is not less effective: research by Lundstrom and Baker (2009) and Storch (2013) indicates that learners who give peer feedback on writing develop their own accuracy at least as rapidly as those who only receive it, because the act of identifying errors and formulating corrections requires deep metalinguistic processing.

In cooperative speaking tasks, listeners also learn. When a partner models a grammatical structure, deploys a new item of vocabulary, or uses a discourse connector effectively, the observing learner encounters the target feature in a communicative context, which cognitive theories of learning predict will facilitate retention and subsequent use. Swain and Lapkin's (1998) study of paired French immersion learners demonstrated that students engaged in collaborative writing tasks produced significantly more instances of language-related episodes – moments of

attention to linguistic form – than students working individually, suggesting that the social dimension of cooperative work actively focuses learners' attention on language as a system.

4. KEY COOPERATIVE STRUCTURES IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE CLASSROOM

Think-Pair-Share, developed by Frank Lyman (1981), is among the most widely used cooperative structures in language education. Learners are given a question or topic, provided time to think individually, then discuss their thoughts with a partner before sharing with the class. In English learning contexts, this structure performs multiple functions simultaneously: it activates prior knowledge and vocabulary before a listening or reading task; it provides rehearsal time that reduces the anxiety of public performance; it ensures every learner articulates their thoughts in English before the whole-class phase; and it generates a diversity of responses that enriches subsequent class discussion. Research by Kagan and Kagan (2009) demonstrates that Think-Pair-Share increases academic engagement and equitable participation across proficiency levels.

The Jigsaw method, developed by Elliot Aronson (1978) and subsequently adapted for language classrooms by Kagan, distributes different portions of content to different group members, each of whom becomes the expert on their section before teaching it to the group. In English lessons, the structure is ideally suited to reading-based activities: different students read different texts on related themes, develop comprehension and vocabulary in expert groups, then regroup to share their content with classmates. The pedagogical elegance of Jigsaw lies in its creation of genuine positive interdependence – each group member needs every other member's contribution to assemble the complete picture – and its demand that learners produce extended, organised discourse in the target language. Brumfit (1984) observed that the teaching role itself is one of the most powerful language learning activities, as it requires the explainer to reorganise and verbalise their knowledge coherently.

Collaborative writing tasks, in which pairs or small groups jointly compose a text, are among the most richly documented cooperative structures in the SLA literature. Storch's (2005, 2013) extensive research on paired writing in ESL contexts reveals that collaborating writers produce texts of superior grammatical accuracy, lexical sophistication, and discourse coherence compared to individual writers of equivalent proficiency, and that the process of collaborative composition involves sustained metalinguistic discussion – "language-related episodes" – that promotes long-term learning. The process is not merely additive (two outputs combined) but synergistic: interaction between writers generates ideas, formulations, and self-corrections that neither would produce independently, operationalising Vygotsky's principle of co-constructed knowledge within the ZPD.

Information gap tasks assign different pieces of information to different learners, who must communicate to complete a shared task – reconstructing a story, identifying differences between pictures, completing a schedule, or giving and following directions. These tasks exemplify what Prabhu (1987) termed "communicative tasks" in his influential Communicational Teaching Project in India: activities driven by a communicative necessity rather than a linguistic form. In English classrooms, information gap activities create the conditions for genuine negotiation of meaning, push learners toward productive output, and generate substantial quantities of authentic, spontaneous language use. Willis and Willis (2007) position information gap tasks within their Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) framework as ideal vehicles for fluency development in the context of cooperative interaction.

5. EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE AND OUTCOMES

The empirical case for cooperative learning in English language contexts is substantial and converging. Meta-analyses by Johnson, Johnson, and Stanne (2000) across 164 studies found that cooperative learning methods produced significantly higher achievement than both competitive and individualistic learning approaches, with effect sizes ranging from moderate to large depending on the specific cooperative structure employed. Specifically within ELT, a meta-analysis by Kessler (1992) of cooperative learning studies in ESL settings found consistent advantages for cooperative approaches on measures of reading comprehension, writing quality, speaking fluency, and vocabulary retention.

Longitudinal classroom research corroborates these findings. In a two-year study of secondary school English learners in South Korea, Kim and McDonough (2008) found that students in cooperative classrooms demonstrated significantly greater gains in speaking fluency and grammatical accuracy than control group students, and attributed these gains specifically to the increased quantity and quality of peer interaction in the cooperative conditions. Storch and Wigglesworth (2007) similarly found that ESL learners who completed writing tasks collaboratively not only produced better immediate texts but also demonstrated superior individual accuracy on subsequent independent writing tasks, suggesting that cooperative interaction promotes internalisation of linguistic forms.

The affective and motivational outcomes of cooperative learning are equally well documented. Dörnyei and Murphey (2003) reviewed the substantial literature on group dynamics in language classrooms and concluded that cohesive, cooperative learning groups generate higher levels of intrinsic motivation, greater willingness to communicate, and lower rates of attrition than non-cooperative instructional contexts. These affective factors are not peripheral to linguistic development; as Krashen's Affective Filter Hypothesis (1982) argues and subsequent research confirms, the emotional and social conditions of learning directly influence the degree to which learners are open to acquiring new linguistic input.

6. CHALLENGES AND IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

The pedagogical benefits of cooperative learning are not automatic; they require careful design, clear structure, and active facilitation. Several challenges must be acknowledged and addressed for cooperative learning to realise its potential in the English language classroom.

First, the problem of unequal participation – often termed "social loafing" – is a genuine risk in any group work context. When group membership does not entail genuine individual accountability, more proficient or more assertive learners may dominate, leaving quieter or less proficient members as peripheral participants who do not benefit from the interaction. Effective cooperative learning design addresses this through individual accountability mechanisms (each learner produces a personal record of the group's work), role assignment (each member has a defined function – facilitator, recorder, reporter, time-keeper), and structured turn-taking protocols that ensure every voice is heard.

Second, the first language use problem is pervasive in ELT contexts where learners share a common native language. When cooperation does not create sufficient communicative pressure to use English, learners default to their mother tongue for efficiency. This concern, raised by Swain and Lapkin (2000) and confirmed by empirical studies in various multilingual settings, does not negate the value of cooperative learning; rather, it underlines the importance of task design that makes English use communicatively necessary (as in information gap tasks) and of explicit classroom norms that establish English as the medium of cooperative interaction.

Third, learners accustomed to traditional, teacher-fronted instruction may initially resist cooperative structures, perceiving group work as less rigorous than direct instruction or as shifting educational responsibility away from the teacher. This is partly a sociocultural issue – in some educational traditions, the teacher's authority and the primacy of individual performance are deeply valued norms – and partly a practical unfamiliarity with collaborative protocols. Teacher modelling, gradual introduction of cooperative structures, and explicit discussion of the learning rationale for cooperative work are essential in building learners' cooperative competence.

7. IMPLICATIONS FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE PEDAGOGY

The convergence of theoretical argument and empirical evidence reviewed in this essay carries clear implications for English language pedagogy at all levels of instruction. The following principles, grounded in the scholarship examined above, represent a practical framework for implementing cooperative learning effectively.

Task design should prioritise positive interdependence and communicative authenticity. Cooperative tasks must be structured so that group success genuinely requires each member's unique contribution and so that using English is communicatively necessary rather than merely stipulated. Information gap tasks, jigsaw readings, and collaborative writing assignments naturally fulfil these criteria; loosely structured discussion activities with no clear communicative goal do not.

Group composition deserves careful consideration. Research suggests that heterogeneous groups – mixed by proficiency level, gender, and learning style – generally produce superior outcomes for lower-proficiency learners, who benefit from modelling by more proficient peers, while higher-proficiency learners benefit from the explaining and elaborating demands placed on them. Occasional homogeneous groupings may be appropriate for specific targeted practice, but should not be the default arrangement.

Teachers must redefine their professional role in the cooperative classroom from knowledge transmitter to learning architect. The cooperative teacher spends more time in preparation – designing tasks, structuring groups, establishing protocols – and a different kind of time in instruction: circulating, monitoring, intervening strategically, extending learners' language through prompts and recasts, and orchestrating the synthesis of group work in whole-class reflection. This role transformation is pedagogically demanding but ultimately more rewarding, as the teacher becomes a facilitator of learning rather than its sole source.

8. CONCLUSION

The cooperative learning principle represents one of the most thoroughly theorised and empirically validated approaches available to the English language educator. Rooted in Vygotsky's social constructivism, Long's Interaction Hypothesis, and Swain's Output Hypothesis, it offers a coherent account of how interaction with peers facilitates second language acquisition through scaffolded production, negotiated meaning, peer feedback, and authentic communicative purpose. The principal cooperative structures – Think-Pair-Share, Jigsaw, collaborative writing, and information gap activities – have each been shown to generate linguistic and communicative gains that exceed those produced by traditional instructional models.

The case for cooperation in English language learning ultimately rests on a profound insight about the nature of language itself: that language is not a repository of rules to be transmitted from teacher to student, but a dynamic social practice to be enacted, negotiated, and refined in dialogue with others. The cooperative classroom is not merely a pedagogical arrangement but an epistemological statement – a recognition that knowledge of language, like language itself, is co-constructed in the space between speakers. When English learners sit in cooperative groups, they

are not just practising the target language; they are inhabiting it, and in doing so, they are making it their own.

Future research should continue to examine the conditions under which cooperative learning is most effective for different learner populations, proficiency levels, and instructional contexts, and should develop increasingly nuanced frameworks for teacher professional development in cooperative pedagogy. What is not in doubt, however, is the central principle: that cooperation, judiciously designed and carefully facilitated, is one of the most powerful tools available for transforming the English language learner into a confident, competent, and autonomous communicator.

REFERENCES

1. Arnold, J. (Ed.). (1999). Affect in language learning. Cambridge University Press.
2. Aronson, E. (1978). The jigsaw classroom. Sage.
3. Brumfit, C. (1984). Communicative methodology in language teaching: The roles of fluency and accuracy. Cambridge University Press.
4. Dörnyei, Z. (2001). Motivational strategies in the language classroom. Cambridge University Press.
5. Dörnyei, Z., & Murphey, T. (2003). Group dynamics in the language classroom. Cambridge University Press.
6. Gass, S., & Mackey, A. (2015). Input, interaction, and output in second language acquisition. In B. VanPatten & J. Williams (Eds.), Theories in second language acquisition (pp. 180–206). Routledge.
7. Horwitz, E., Horwitz, M., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. The Modern Language Journal, 70(2), 125–132.
8. Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1989). Cooperation and competition: Theory and research. Interaction Book Company.
9. Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Stanne, M. B. (2000). Cooperative learning methods: A meta-analysis. Cooperative Learning Center, University of Minnesota.
10. Kagan, S. (1994). Cooperative learning. Kagan Cooperative Learning.
11. Kagan, S., & Kagan, M. (2009). Kagan cooperative learning. Kagan Publishing.
12. Kessler, C. (Ed.). (1992). Cooperative language learning: A teacher's resource book. Prentice Hall.
13. Kim, Y., & McDonough, K. (2008). The effect of interlocutor proficiency on the collaborative dialogue between Korean as a second language learners. Language Teaching Research, 12(2), 211–234.
14. Krashen, S. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. Pergamon.
15. Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. De Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective (pp. 39–52). John Benjamins.
16. Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), Handbook of language acquisition (pp. 413–468). Academic Press.
17. Lundstrom, K., & Baker, W. (2009). To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing. Journal of Second Language Writing, 18(1), 30–43.
18. Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19(1), 37–66.

19. Mackey, A. (1999). Input, interaction, and second language development. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 21(4), 557–587.
20. Mercer, N. (2000). Words and minds: How we use language to think together. Routledge.
21. Ohta, A. S. (2001). Second language acquisition processes in the classroom: Learning Japanese. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
22. Prabhu, N. S. (1987). Second language pedagogy. Oxford University Press.
23. Slavin, R. E. (1995). Cooperative learning: Theory, research, and practice (2nd ed.). Allyn & Bacon.
24. Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative writing: Product, process, and students' reflections. Journal of Second Language Writing, 14(3), 153–173.
25. Storch, N. (2013). Collaborative writing in L2 classrooms. Multilingual Matters.
26. Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2007). Writing tasks: The effects of collaboration. In M. García Mayo (Ed.), Investigating tasks in formal language learning (pp. 157–177). Multilingual Matters.
27. Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), Input in second language acquisition (pp. 235–253). Newbury House.
28. Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), Principle and practice in applied linguistics (pp. 125–144). Oxford University Press.
29. Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. The Modern Language Journal, 82(3), 320–337.
30. Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: The uses of the first language. Language Teaching Research, 4(3), 251–274.
31. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press.
32. Widdowson, H. G. (1978). Teaching language as communication. Oxford University Press.
33. Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2007). Doing task-based teaching. Oxford University Press.
34. Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 17(2), 89–100.