

Таутенбаева А. А.¹, Бурганбай А. Е.²

¹ Темірбек Жүргенов атындағы ҚазҰӨА

² Абай атындағы ҚазҰПУ

¹ педагогика ғылымдарының кандидаты, доцент

² магистрант

АҒЫЛШЫН ТІЛІН ҮЙРЕНУ БАРЫСЫНДА СТУДЕНТТЕРДІҢ ЫНТЫМАҚТАСТЫҚ DAҒДЫЛАРЫН ДАМУҒА АРНАЛҒАН ИНТЕРАКТИВТІ ОҚЫТУ СТРАТЕГИЯЛАРЫ

Аңдатпа

Мақалада ағылшын тілін үйрену барысында студенттердің ынтымақтастық дағдыларын дамытуға мүмкіндік беретін интерактивті оқыту стратегияларын қолданудың педагогикалық шарттары қарастырылады. Мақаланың мақсаты — коммуникативтік тілдік тәжірибені бірлесіп жоспарлау, өзара келісілген қатысу және ұжымдық жауапкершілік дағдыларын мақсатты дамытумен ұштастыратын әдістемелік модель ұсыну. Жұмыс теориялық сипатқа ие және кооперативті оқыту қағидалары мен шет тілін оқытудағы коммуникативтік тәсіл негізінде жекелеген интерактивті стратегияларды салыстыруға бағытталған. «Мозаика» әдісіне, қатысушылардың қолындағы ақпарат айырмашылығына негізделген тапсырмаларға, жазбаша мәтінді бірлесіп құрастыруға және топтық жобаларға ерекше назар аударылып, әрбір стратегия білім алушылардан талап ететін ынтымақтастық әрекеттері тұрғысынан қарастырылады. Ұсынылған модель сабақтағы өзара әрекеттестікті ортақ мақсатты айқындау, рөлдерді келісу, тапсырманы бірлесіп орындау және рефлексиялық бағалау кезеңдері арқылы ұйымдастырады. Педагогикалық сүйемелдеу, тілдік қолдау және бағалау өлшемдерінің айқындығы оқытуды ұйымдастырудың қажетті құрамдастары ретінде сипатталады. Модель топтық жұмыс үдерісі мен әрбір қатысушының жеке үлесін ескеру үшін өзара бағалауды жеке рефлексиямен ұштастырады. Ұсынылған тәсілдің практикалық маңызы нақты оқыту стратегияларын ынтымақтастықты дамыту мақсаттарымен және оны бағалау көрсеткіштерімен байланыстыруында, бұл ағылшын тілі сабақтарын жоспарлауға және модельді кейіннен эмпирикалық тұрғыдан тексеруге негіз болады.

Тірек сөздер: интерактивті оқыту; ынтымақтастық дағдылары; ағылшын тілін үйрену; кооперативті оқыту; топтық өзара әрекеттестік; өзара бағалау; білім алушылардың рефлексиясы.

Таутенбаева А. А.¹, Бурганбай А. Е.²

¹ ҚазНАИ имени Темирбека Жургенова

² ҚазНПУ имени Абая

¹ кандидат педагогических наук, доцент

² магистрант

ИНТЕРАКТИВНЫЕ СТРАТЕГИИ ОБУЧЕНИЯ ДЛЯ РАЗВИТИЯ НАВЫКОВ СОТРУДНИЧЕСТВА СТУДЕНТОВ ПРИ ИЗУЧЕНИИ АНГЛИЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКА

Аннотация

В статье рассматриваются педагогические условия, при которых интерактивные стратегии обучения могут способствовать развитию навыков сотрудничества студентов в процессе изучения английского языка. Цель статьи заключается в предложении методической модели, объединяющей коммуникативную языковую практику с целенаправленным развитием совместного планирования, согласованного участия и коллективной ответственности. Работа имеет теоретический характер и предполагает сопоставление отдельных интерактивных стратегий с опорой на принципы кооперативного обучения и коммуникативного подхода к преподаванию иностранных языков. Особое внимание уделяется методу «мозаика», заданиям с информационным разрывом, совместному созданию письменных текстов и групповым проектам; каждая стратегия рассматривается с точки зрения действий сотрудничества, которые она требует от обучающихся. Предлагаемая модель организует взаимодействие на занятии как последовательность совместного определения цели, согласования ролей, выполнения общего задания и рефлексивной оценки. Педагогическое сопровождение, языковая поддержка и прозрачные критерии оценивания рассматриваются как необходимые компоненты организации обучения. Модель сочетает взаимооценивание с индивидуальной рефлексией, позволяя учитывать групповые процессы и личный вклад участников. Практическая значимость предложенного подхода заключается в установлении связи между конкретными стратегиями преподавания, целями развития сотрудничества и показателями его оценки, что создаёт основу для планирования занятий и последующей эмпирической проверки в условиях обучения английскому языку.

Ключевые слова: интерактивное обучение; навыки сотрудничества; изучение английского языка; кооперативное обучение; групповое взаимодействие; взаимооценивание; рефлексия обучающихся.

Tautenbayeva A. A.¹, Burganbay A. E.²

¹ Temirbek Zhurgenov Kazakh National Academy of Arts

² Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University

¹ Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor

² Master's student

INTERACTIVE TEACHING STRATEGIES FOR DEVELOPING STUDENTS' COLLABORATION SKILLS IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNING

Abstract

This article examines the pedagogical conditions under which interactive teaching strategies can support the development of students' collaboration skills in English language learning. The purpose is to propose a methodological framework that integrates communicative language practice with the deliberate development of shared planning, coordinated participation, and collective responsibility. The article adopts a conceptual approach, comparing selected interactive strategies through the principles of cooperative learning and communicative language teaching. Particular attention is given to jigsaw activities, information-gap tasks, collaborative writing, and group projects, with each strategy examined in relation to the collaborative actions it requires from learners. The proposed framework organises classroom interaction around a sequence of shared goal setting, role negotiation, joint task completion, and reflective evaluation. Collaboration is operationalised through observable indicators, including equitable participation, active listening, reasoned negotiation, mutual assistance, and integration of individual

contributions into a shared outcome. Teacher guidance, language support, and transparent assessment criteria are considered essential components of this instructional design. The framework combines peer assessment with individual reflection to document both group processes and personal contributions. Its practical contribution lies in connecting specific teaching strategies with explicit collaboration objectives and assessment indicators, providing a basis for lesson planning and subsequent empirical evaluation in English language classrooms.

Keywords: *interactive teaching; collaboration skills; English language learning; cooperative learning; group interaction; peer assessment; learner reflection.*

Introduction:

English language education involves preparing learners to participate in activities that require the coordination of ideas, responsibilities, and communicative intentions. In such activities, students need to explain their reasoning, respond to alternative perspectives, negotiate decisions, and contribute to shared outcomes. This understanding of language use is reflected in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages Companion Volume, which incorporates mediation and collaborative interaction into its description of communicative activity. Its descriptors address learners' ability to facilitate participation, develop others' ideas, and construct meaning collectively. Collaboration therefore represents a substantive dimension of language education that can be incorporated into both instructional objectives and assessment practices [1].

A central pedagogical challenge concerns the relationship between participation in group activities and the development of collaboration skills. For the purposes of this article, collaboration skills are understood as the capacities required to establish shared goals, coordinate contributions, engage with peers' reasoning, provide mutual assistance, and evaluate collective progress. Their development depends on the quality of interaction within a group. Storch's longitudinal investigation of adult English as a Second Language pair work identified distinct interactional patterns characterised by differences in equality and mutuality, with some patterns offering more favourable conditions for language learning than others. These findings establish the importance of examining how learners work together when evaluating the educational value of pair and group tasks [2]. Social interdependence theory provides a foundation for explaining how the organisation of learning goals influences cooperation. Johnson and Johnson connect cooperative learning with the relationships among individual effort, collective achievement, and the instructional conditions established by teachers. Their account positions cooperation as a process that requires deliberate organisation and sustained pedagogical support [3]. Applied to English language teaching, this perspective suggests that tasks should give students meaningful reasons to exchange information, consider one another's contributions, and take responsibility for a common result. A shared product becomes educationally valuable when its production requires coordinated reasoning and allows each participant's contribution to be identified.

The relationship between collaboration and language learning can also be understood through the mediating function of dialogue. Swain and Lapkin's analysis of two French immersion students completing a joint task illustrates how learners use interaction to identify linguistic problems and work towards possible solutions. Although their study concerns French immersion rather than English language instruction, it offers a relevant account of language as a resource for both communication and collective thinking [4]. From this perspective, discussing word choice, explaining an interpretation, or negotiating the organisation of a text creates opportunities to connect linguistic activity with collaborative reasoning. The educational potential of such exchanges depends on learners' engagement with the substance of their partners' contributions. Interactive teaching strategies can provide a structure for organising these exchanges. Gillies' review identifies positive interdependence, individual accountability, supportive interaction, interpersonal skills, and group reflection as important components of cooperative learning [5]. Drawing on these principles, the present article considers four strategies: jigsaw activities, information-gap tasks, collaborative writing, and group projects. Each can be designed around a particular collaborative demand. Jigsaw activities require learners to explain and integrate

complementary information; information-gap tasks create a communicative need to request clarification and verify understanding; collaborative writing involves negotiating a shared text; and group projects require the coordination of responsibilities over successive stages of work. These connections provide a basis for selecting strategies according to explicit collaboration objectives.

Collaborative writing is particularly relevant because it produces a shared text through which joint decision-making can be examined. Storch's research timeline situates this practice within second language education and describes its development alongside changing literacy practices and technologies that facilitate joint text production [6]. Within the framework proposed here, collaborative writing is treated as an opportunity to organise discussion about content, structure, and linguistic choices. Its value for developing collaboration should be examined through the decisions learners make together, the explanations they provide, and their responses to suggested revisions. Text quality and interaction quality are consequently treated as distinct dimensions of assessment, each requiring appropriate evidence. Evidence concerning interactive strategies also calls for careful interpretation. Cochon Drouet, Lentillon-Kaestner, and Margas reviewed 69 studies of the jigsaw method and reported substantial variation in its effects across educational outcomes. Their analysis highlights inconsistencies concerning achievement, motivation, social relations, and academic self-esteem, while identifying potential explanations that require further empirical investigation [7]. These findings caution against assuming that a recognised cooperative structure will produce uniform benefits across classrooms. For English language education, an appropriate implication is to specify task demands, participation arrangements, and intended outcomes before evaluating whether a strategy supports the development of collaboration.

Teacher mediation is a further consideration. Gillies emphasises the role of teachers in preparing students for cooperative interaction and supporting productive discussion [5]. In the proposed framework, this role includes making collaborative expectations explicit, providing language resources for discussion, and observing how participation is distributed. For example, students may need support in requesting an explanation, expressing disagreement respectfully, inviting a quieter peer to contribute, or summarising a group decision. Such support connects the interpersonal requirements of collaboration with the linguistic resources needed to enact them.

Assessment must likewise capture how students contribute to collective work. A meta-analysis by Double, McGrane, and Hopfenbeck, covering 54 studies, found a small-to-medium overall effect of peer assessment on academic performance, supporting its use as a formative practice across educational settings [8]. This evidence supports considering peer assessment within interactive instruction, although it does not by itself establish improvements in collaboration skills. The present article therefore proposes combining peer assessment with teacher observation and individual reflection. Relevant indicators include responsiveness to others' ideas, the provision of useful assistance, fulfilment of agreed responsibilities, and contribution to shared decisions. Recent research further clarifies the need to connect instructional activities with the processes they are intended to develop. Zheng, Cao, and Yu identify continuing difficulties in translating collaborative writing research into classroom practice, particularly in relation to interaction quality, learners' emotional experiences, assessment, and preparation for collaborative work [9]. Their analysis supports a specific methodological concern: teachers require a coherent basis for relating the selection of an interactive strategy to observable collaborative behaviour. The problem addressed in this article is therefore the instructional alignment of collaboration objectives, task organisation, language support, and assessment criteria within English language learning. The analysis seeks to identify the collaborative actions required by selected strategies, explain the pedagogical conditions that can support these actions, and formulate indicators for evaluating students' participation and contributions. The framework organises classroom work through shared goal setting, role negotiation, joint task completion, and reflective evaluation. Its intended contribution is to make the relationship between teaching strategy and collaboration objective sufficiently explicit to guide lesson planning and subsequent empirical investigation. In this way,

the article establishes a basis for examining collaboration as an educational objective with identifiable processes and assessable outcomes.

Methods

The study adopts a qualitative conceptual design that combines a focused narrative review, comparative pedagogical analysis, and the development of an instructional framework. Its purpose is to establish how interactive teaching strategies can be organised to support students' collaboration skills in English language learning. The analysis draws on published scholarship and examines relationships among task characteristics, collaborative processes, and assessment principles. A narrative review is appropriate for integrating these interconnected areas, provided that the selection of literature and the reasoning underlying its synthesis are made explicit. Accordingly, the methodological emphasis is on conceptual coherence and the relevance of the evidence to the research purpose. [\[10\]](#)

The conceptual development follows a theory-synthesis approach. Research on cooperative learning and peer interaction provides explanations of how learners coordinate their contributions, while literature on language pedagogy informs the communicative demands of classroom tasks. Assessment scholarship contributes principles for translating collaboration into observable indicators. These perspectives serve distinct analytical functions within the proposed framework: they explain the conditions supporting collaboration, identify opportunities for practising it through English, and guide the interpretation of collaborative performance. This integration follows the principle that conceptual research should specify how selected theories contribute to the argument and how their combination supports the proposed contribution. [\[11\]](#) The literature base comprises the substantive publications discussed in the Introduction and five methodological sources introduced in this section. Selection is purposive and guided by relevance to collaborative interaction, instructional design, conceptual synthesis, and assessment. Sources are considered according to their identifiable scholarly provenance, clarity of conceptual contribution, and applicability to the research questions. Foundational publications supply theoretical explanations, empirical studies provide context-specific evidence, and reviews help identify broader patterns and limitations. These different forms of evidence are interpreted according to their respective purposes. The resulting review supports the construction of a methodological framework without claiming exhaustive coverage of the field. The analytical procedure is informed by directed qualitative content analysis, in which existing theory and relevant findings guide the initial categories used to interpret textual material. [\[12\]](#) In the present study, these categories comprise shared goals, interdependence, participation, negotiation, mutual support, and reflection. They function as interpretive questions applied to descriptions of learning activities and collaborative processes. For example, the analysis considers whether successful task completion requires contributions from several learners, how participants respond to alternative suggestions, and whether responsibility extends beyond completing an individually assigned component. Attention also extends to conditions that complicate collaboration, including uneven participation, excessive dependence on a more proficient learner, and the separation of individual contributions without subsequent integration. The comparative analysis focuses on four instructional strategies: jigsaw activities, information-gap tasks, collaborative writing, and group projects. Each strategy is examined through a common set of dimensions: the intended shared outcome, the distribution of information and responsibility, opportunities for reciprocal communication, requirements for integrating contributions, teacher support, and possible evidence of collaboration. This approach enables comparison across activities that differ in duration, organisation, and expected products. The analysis distinguishes between opportunities created by a task and the collaborative behaviour learners may demonstrate during its implementation. Consequently, the presence of pair or group work is treated as an organisational feature whose educational significance depends on the interaction it generates.

Within this comparison, collaboration is operationalised through five proposed indicators: equitable participation, active listening, reasoned negotiation, mutual assistance, and the integration of individual contributions into a shared outcome. Equitable participation concerns

meaningful opportunities to influence the task and assume responsibility. Active listening is represented by responses that acknowledge, clarify, or develop a peer's contribution. Reasoned negotiation involves explaining preferences and considering alternatives before reaching a decision. Mutual assistance includes providing support while preserving the recipient's involvement. Integration concerns the extent to which contributions are discussed and incorporated into a coherent collective product. These definitions establish the conceptual basis for subsequent instructional and assessment decisions. The instructional framework is constructed through the principle of constructive alignment, which connects intended learning outcomes with the activities through which learners practise them and the evidence used to assess their achievement. [13] Applied to the present topic, each collaboration outcome is linked to relevant communicative actions and task conditions. For example, developing reasoned negotiation requires opportunities to propose alternatives, explain choices, request clarification, and respond to disagreement. A corresponding task therefore needs a shared decision that depends on discussion, together with evidence showing how participants reach that decision. Language support, including functional expressions and prompts, is incorporated where necessary to make these actions accessible.

The proposed instructional sequence comprises shared goal setting, role negotiation, joint task completion, and reflective evaluation. These stages provide an organising structure across the four strategies while allowing adaptation to learners' proficiency, task complexity, and available classroom time. Teacher support is specified in relation to the demands of each stage, including clarifying expectations, helping learners distribute responsibility, monitoring participation, and prompting reflection on interaction. The sequence is presented as a pedagogical proposal for classroom application and subsequent investigation.

Assessment design draws on the distinction between descriptive rubrics and instruments that merely assign ratings or count behaviours. Meaningful rubric criteria require descriptions of performance quality that correspond to the intended learning outcomes. [14] Accordingly, the proposed assessment approach uses the five collaboration indicators as separate criteria. Prospective evidence includes teacher observations, peer feedback, individual reflections, and traces of joint decision-making in task products. Descriptors should address how learners contribute, respond, and coordinate their work. Linguistic accuracy and fluency require separate consideration so that judgments of collaboration remain sensitive to learners' differing English proficiency. The methodological contribution consists of a theoretically grounded framework linking interactive task design, collaborative actions, and assessment. Its internal coherence depends on maintaining explicit connections between the literature, the analytical categories, and the proposed teaching procedures. The study involves no primary participant data, and the framework's effectiveness and assessment properties remain open to empirical investigation. Its conclusions therefore concern pedagogical rationale and design principles; evidence of sustained improvement in students' collaboration skills would require subsequent classroom implementation and evaluation.

Research Results

The conceptual analysis yields three interconnected outcomes: a comparative account of the collaborative opportunities provided by four interactive teaching strategies, an instructional framework linking these opportunities to purposeful language use, and a set of descriptive criteria for evaluating collaborative performance. These outcomes represent the results of the literature-based synthesis and pedagogical modelling undertaken in this study. They provide a basis for designing and examining classroom practice, while their effectiveness in producing sustained improvements in students' collaboration skills remains subject to empirical investigation. A central finding of the synthesis concerns the relationship between task organisation and the quality of participation. The collaborative potential of an activity depends on whether learners need to engage with one another's contributions to achieve the intended outcome. Assigning students to a group establishes a setting for interaction, but the distribution of information, responsibility, and decision-making opportunities determines what that interaction requires. Gillies' investigation of

cooperative learning in a junior high school mathematics context found that students working within structured arrangements offered more elaborated assistance and developed stronger perceptions of group cohesion and responsibility for peers' learning. Although this evidence originates outside foreign language instruction, it supports the broader pedagogical rationale for explicitly structuring collaboration. [15]

The analysis further identifies the allocation of informational responsibility as a relevant condition for participation in English language tasks. Dao and McDonough found that mixed-proficiency EFL pairs demonstrated greater mutual engagement when the less proficient learner held information needed for task completion. Their findings indicate that interactional roles can influence participation alongside language proficiency. [16] In the framework developed here, this evidence informs a design principle: each learner should possess a meaningful contribution that peers need to understand and incorporate. Consequently, roles are defined through intellectual and communicative responsibility, including explaining evidence, checking understanding, or evaluating alternatives. Roles concerned only with recording or managing materials offer a narrower basis for practising collaboration.

The comparison of jigsaw activities, information-gap tasks, collaborative writing, and group projects reveals complementary opportunities for developing collaboration. Their differences concern the actions required to connect individual contributions with a collective outcome. Table 1 presents the resulting conceptual mapping.

Table 1. Collaborative opportunities and design conditions across interactive teaching strategies

Strategy	Basis of interdependence	Collaborative actions targeted	Essential design condition
Jigsaw activities	Learners contribute different sections of information needed for shared understanding.	Explaining, listening, requesting clarification, and synthesising information.	The final task requires connections among contributions, supported by preparation in expert groups.
Information-gap tasks	Participants possess incomplete or different information.	Asking precise questions, clarifying meaning, confirming understanding, and coordinating decisions.	Task completion requires reciprocal exchange and a jointly checked solution.
Collaborative writing	Learners share responsibility for the content and language of one text.	Proposing ideas, negotiating wording, explaining revisions, and resolving disagreement.	Participants contribute to planning, drafting, and revision, with decisions open to discussion.
Group projects	A shared product requires coordinated contributions over several stages.	Planning, negotiating responsibilities, monitoring progress, integrating work, and evaluating outcomes.	Intermediate checkpoints require collective review before the final product is completed.

The comparison highlights the particular value of collaborative writing for making joint decision-making visible. A shared text offers a concrete focus around which learners can discuss meaning, organise arguments, and reconsider linguistic choices. Storch's classroom study found that writing in pairs created opportunities for combining ideas and exchanging feedback; the jointly produced texts also demonstrated advantages on several assessed dimensions. However, learners expressed differing views about the experience. [17] For the present framework, the relevant implication is that the writing process provides evidence of how contributions are negotiated. A polished final text alone cannot establish whether responsibility was distributed meaningfully throughout its production. Group projects extend the temporal scope of collaboration by requiring participants to maintain coordination across planning, production, and revision. The scoping review by Jaleniauskiene and Venckiene documents varied approaches to project-based language learning in higher education, including opportunities for learner choice, authentic products, reflection, critique, and revision. [18] The present synthesis connects these features to the management of collective responsibility. Its resulting design proposition is that project work should include occasions when students examine how their separate contributions fit together. Without such integration points, a project may provide substantial individual work while generating relatively limited collaborative reasoning. A second outcome is the specification of the four-stage instructional framework introduced in the Methods section. Its stages connect the organisation of a task with the communicative actions through which collaboration becomes possible. Shared goal setting establishes a common interpretation of the expected outcome and its quality criteria. Role negotiation distributes responsibility while allowing learners to request support or reconsider an unsuitable allocation. Joint task completion involves exchanging information, evaluating suggestions, and adjusting contributions in response to peers. Reflective evaluation examines both the completed product and the interaction through which it was developed.

The distinctive feature of this framework is the connection between stages. Decisions made during planning remain open to revision when difficulties emerge, and reflection generates specific adjustments for subsequent tasks. This arrangement draws on research into socially shared regulation, which emphasises learners' awareness of collective learning processes and the value of making those processes explicit through appropriate support. Järvelä and colleagues identify design principles concerning awareness, the external expression of learning processes, and prompts that activate regulation within collaborative settings. [19] Their principles inform the inclusion of brief planning statements, progress checks, and shared reflection in the proposed framework. An illustrative application is an English-language task requiring students to prepare a recommendation for a campus improvement. Learners first agree on the audience and the criteria for a useful recommendation. They then negotiate responsibility for examining different forms of evidence. During task completion, they compare alternatives and construct a recommendation supported by contributions from the group. Reflection addresses which suggestions influenced the decision, how disagreement was handled, and what participation arrangements require adjustment. This example demonstrates the alignment of the proposed stages; it is not an account of an implemented intervention. A third outcome is a descriptive assessment framework that translates collaboration into observable actions. The five criteria specified in the Methods section are retained: equitable participation, active listening, reasoned negotiation, mutual assistance, and integration of contributions. Table 2 differentiates three proposed forms of performance for each criterion. The descriptors concern the quality and responsiveness of participation rather than the frequency of speech or the grammatical sophistication of individual contributions.

Table 2. Proposed descriptive rubric for collaboration in English language tasks

Criterion	Participation requiring support	Independent collaborative participation	Participation that supports group coordination
Equitable participation	Needs prompting to contribute or allow space for peers.	Makes relevant contributions and respects others' opportunities to participate.	Helps redistribute opportunities when participation becomes uneven.
Active listening	Needs support to clarify or respond to a peer's contribution.	Checks understanding and responds directly to peers' ideas.	Connects different contributions and helps the group resolve misunderstandings.
Reasoned negotiation	States a preference without explaining it or considering alternatives.	Explains choices and considers reasons offered by others.	Helps compare alternatives against shared criteria and formulate a justified decision.
Mutual assistance	Needs guidance to request help or provide useful support.	Offers relevant explanations and seeks assistance when necessary.	Adjusts support to peers' needs while preserving their responsibility for the task.
Integration of contributions	Focuses on an assigned component with limited attention to the whole.	Revises individual work to fit the shared outcome.	Helps identify gaps, reconcile inconsistencies, and connect contributions coherently.

The rubric provides a basis for feedback and reflection, but its introduction cannot itself be treated as evidence of skill development. Panadero and colleagues' meta-analysis found a positive effect of rubrics on academic performance, while estimates concerning self-regulated learning and self-efficacy were smaller and more uncertain. These findings support distinguishing among the outcomes attributed to assessment tools. [\[20\]](#) Within the present framework, rubric-based judgments would therefore require evidence from interaction, peer feedback, individual reflection, and the development of shared products. The synthesis also establishes an interpretive boundary between successful task performance and the development of collaboration skills. A learner may collaborate effectively in a familiar activity while requiring considerable support in a new group or a more demanding task. Demonstrating development would require repeated observations showing more independent and responsive participation across relevant situations. The contribution of the present analysis is to specify what such development could involve and how instruction can create opportunities to examine it. The resulting framework connects task conditions, communicative actions, and assessment criteria without assuming that any single interactive strategy produces equivalent outcomes for all learners.

Conclusion

The conceptual analysis identifies purposeful interdependence, shared responsibility, and responsive peer interaction as key conditions for supporting collaboration in English language learning. Jigsaw activities, information-gap tasks, collaborative writing, and group projects offer complementary opportunities to explain ideas, negotiate decisions, assist peers, and integrate

individual contributions. Their pedagogical value depends on how these actions are incorporated into tasks and supported through appropriate language resources and teacher guidance.

The proposed framework connects shared goal setting, role negotiation, joint task completion, and reflective evaluation with explicit criteria for collaborative performance. This alignment provides a methodological basis for designing activities and assessing equitable participation, active listening, reasoned negotiation, mutual assistance, and the integration of contributions. The study's contribution lies in linking instructional choices to observable collaborative actions while distinguishing collaboration from linguistic proficiency. Classroom implementation and repeated assessment are required to establish the framework's effectiveness and determine whether the targeted skills develop and transfer across tasks and group settings.

References

1. Council of Europe. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment — Companion Volume*. — Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 2020. — 278 p. — ISBN 978-92-871-8621-8. — [Electronic edition](#).
2. Storch N. Patterns of interaction in ESL pair work // *Language Learning*. — 2002. — Vol. 52, No. 1. — P. 119–158. — DOI: [10.1111/1467-9922.00179](#).
3. Johnson D. W., Johnson R. T. An educational psychology success story: Social interdependence theory and cooperative learning // *Educational Researcher*. — 2009. — Vol. 38, No. 5. — P. 365–379. — DOI: [10.3102/0013189X09339057](#).
4. Swain M., Lapkin S. Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together // *The Modern Language Journal*. — 1998. — Vol. 82, No. 3. — P. 320–337. — DOI: [10.1111/j.1540-4781.1998.tb01209.x](#).
5. Gillies R. M. Cooperative learning: Review of research and practice // *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*. — 2016. — Vol. 41, No. 3. — P. 39–54. — DOI: [10.14221/ajte.2016v41n3.3](#).
6. Storch N. Collaborative writing // *Language Teaching*. — 2019. — Vol. 52, No. 1. — P. 40–59. — DOI: [10.1017/S0261444818000320](#).
7. Cochon Drouet O., Lentillon-Kaestner V., Margas N. Effects of the Jigsaw method on student educational outcomes: Systematic review and meta-analyses // *Frontiers in Psychology*. — 2023. — Vol. 14. — Article 1216437. — DOI: [10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1216437](#).
8. Double K. S., McGrane J. A., Hopfenbeck T. N. The impact of peer assessment on academic performance: A meta-analysis of control group studies // *Educational Psychology Review*. — 2020. — Vol. 32. — P. 481–509. — DOI: [10.1007/s10648-019-09510-3](#).
9. Zheng Y., Cao Z., Yu S. Research into practice: Collaborative writing in L2 contexts // *Language Teaching*. — 2026. — First View. — P. 1–19. — DOI: [10.1017/S0261444826101232](#).
10. Snyder H. Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines // *Journal of Business Research*. — 2019. — Vol. 104. — P. 333–339. — DOI: [10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039](#).
11. Jaakkola E. Designing conceptual articles: four approaches // *AMS Review*. — 2020. — Vol. 10. — P. 18–26. — DOI: [10.1007/s13162-020-00161-0](#).
12. Hsieh H.-F., Shannon S. E. Three approaches to qualitative content analysis // *Qualitative Health Research*. — 2005. — Vol. 15, No. 9. — P. 1277–1288. — DOI: [10.1177/1049732305276687](#).
13. Biggs J. Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment // *Higher Education*. — 1996. — Vol. 32. — P. 347–364. — DOI: [10.1007/BF00138871](#).
14. Brookhart S. M. Appropriate Criteria: Key to Effective Rubrics // *Frontiers in Education*. — 2018. — Vol. 3. — Article 22. — DOI: [10.3389/feduc.2018.00022](#).

15. Gillies R. M. *The effects of cooperative learning on junior high school students during small group learning* // *Learning and Instruction*. — 2004. — Vol. 14, No. 2. — P. 197–213. — DOI: [10.1016/S0959-4752\(03\)00068-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-4752(03)00068-9).
16. Dao P., McDonough K. *The effect of task role on Vietnamese EFL learners' collaboration in mixed proficiency dyads* // *System*. — 2017. — Vol. 65. — P. 15–24. — DOI: [10.1016/j.system.2016.12.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.12.012).
17. Storch N. *Collaborative writing: Product, process, and students' reflections* // *Journal of Second Language Writing*. — 2005. — Vol. 14, No. 3. — P. 153–173. — DOI: [10.1016/j.jslw.2005.05.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.05.002).
18. Jaleniauskiene E., Venckiene D. *Project-Based Learning for Language Education in Higher Education: A Scoping Review* // *Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-Based Learning*. — 2025. — Vol. 19, No. 1. — DOI: [10.14434/ijpbl.v19i1.35846](https://doi.org/10.14434/ijpbl.v19i1.35846).
19. Järvelä S., Kirschner P. A., Panadero E., Malmberg J., Phielix C., Jaspers J., Koivuniemi M., Järvenoja H. *Enhancing socially shared regulation in collaborative learning groups: designing for CSCL regulation tools* // *Educational Technology Research and Development*. — 2015. — Vol. 63. — P. 125–142. — DOI: [10.1007/s11423-014-9358-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-014-9358-1).
20. Panadero E., Jonsson A., Pinedo L., Fernández-Castilla B. *Effects of Rubrics on Academic Performance, Self-Regulated Learning, and self-Efficacy: a Meta-analytic Review* // *Educational Psychology Review*. — 2023. — Vol. 35. — Article 113. — DOI: [10.1007/s10648-023-09823-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09823-4).