PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE OF CLA (COLLABORATIVE LEARNING APPROACH) IN THE CLASSROOM

Bukhara State University, Foreign Languages Faculty,
11.2-INGK-24 group
Yaminova Hanifabonu

Supervisor: **Ubaydullayeva Muattar Urinbekovna**
Teacher of Bukhara State University
(English linguistics department)
Muattarubaydullayeva39@gmail.com
m.u.ubaydullayeva@buxdu.uz

Annotation: *This article examines the principles and practice of Collaborative Learning Approach (CLA) in relation to the peer review process and the construction of scientific knowledge. The study focuses on how peer review functions as a dynamic process of negotiation, collaboration, and textual revision among authors, reviewers, and editors. Using discourse analysis, rhetorical analysis, and genre-based approaches, the article explores how scientific texts are shaped through interaction and revision. The findings demonstrate that peer review is not merely a mechanism of quality control but also a social and rhetorical process through which scientific knowledge is collaboratively constructed. The article also highlights the importance of genre knowledge, textual negotiation, and academic communication in modern scholarly practice.*

Key words: *Collaborative learning approach, peer review, textual dynamics, scientific knowledge, discourse analysis, negotiation, genre knowledge, rhetorical analysis, academic communication, textual revision.*

Annotatsiya: *Ushbu maqola hamkorlikda o‘qitish yondashuvi (Collaborative Learning Approach — CLA) tamoyillari va amaliyotini ilmiy bilimlarni yaratishdagi “peer review” jarayoni bilan bog‘liq holda o‘rganadi. Tadqiqot mualliflar, taqrizchilar va muharrirlar o‘rtasidagi muzokara, hamkorlik va matnni qayta ishlash jarayonlariga e’tibor qaratadi. Diskurs tahlili, ritorik tahlil va janrga asoslangan yondashuvlar orqali ilmiy matnlarning qanday shakllanishi ko‘rib chiqiladi. Natijalar shuni ko‘rsatadiki, peer review nafaqat sifat nazorati mexanizmi, balki ilmiy bilimlarni birgalikda yaratishga xizmat qiluvchi ijtimoiy va ritorik jarayondir. Shuningdek, maqolada janr bilimlari, matnli muzokaralar va akademik kommunikatsiyaning ahamiyati yoritiladi.*

Kalit so’zlar: *Hamkorlikda o‘qitish yondashuvi, peer review, matn dinamikasi, ilmiy bilim, diskurs tahlili, muzokara, janr bilimlari, ritorik tahlil, akademik kommunikatsiya, matnni qayta ishlash.*

Аннотация: *Данная статья рассматривает принципы и практику подхода Collaborative Learning Approach (CLA) в связи с процессом рецензирования и формированием научного знания. Исследование сосредоточено на том, как процесс peer review функционирует как динамическая система переговоров, сотрудничества и текстовой переработки между авторами, рецензентами и редакторами. С помощью дискурсивного и риторического анализа, а также жанрового подхода исследуется процесс формирования научных текстов через взаимодействие и редактирование. Результаты показывают, что peer review является не только механизмом контроля качества, но и социальным и риторическим процессом совместного конструирования научного знания. В статье также подчеркивается важность жанровой компетенции, текстовых переговоров и академической коммуникации.*

Ключевые слова: *Подход совместного обучения, peer review, текстовая динамика, научное знание, дискурсивный анализ, переговоры,*

жанровое знание, риторический анализ, академическая коммуникация, текстовая переработка.

Introduction

Collaborative Learning Approach (CLA) has become one of the most influential methods in modern education because it encourages students to learn through interaction, communication, and cooperation. Unlike traditional teacher-centered approaches, CLA emphasizes shared learning experiences where learners actively participate in discussion, problem-solving, and knowledge construction. This approach is especially important in academic and scientific environments, where collaboration and peer interaction are essential for developing critical thinking and communication skills.[1]

One important area where collaborative learning can be clearly observed is the process of peer review in scientific publishing. Peer review is generally understood as the evaluation of academic work by experts in the same field. However, scholars such as Carol Berkenkotter and Thomas N. Huckin argue that peer review is much more than a technical assessment process. According to their perspective, peer review represents a dynamic and interactive process in which scientific knowledge is socially constructed through negotiation, revision, and rhetorical exchange.

The concept of “sites of contention” and “sites of negotiation” explains how authors, reviewers, and editors interact through textual communication. Reviewers may challenge the validity of claims, question methodologies, or request additional evidence, while authors respond by defending, clarifying, or revising their arguments. As a result, the final published article becomes a collaborative product shaped through continuous interaction.

1. [1] Carol Berkenkotter, & Thomas N. Huckin. (1995). *Genre Knowledge in Disciplinary Communication: Cognition/Culture/Power*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

This process reflects the core principles of Collaborative Learning Approach because participants learn from each other through discussion, critique, and revision. Peer review demonstrates that academic writing is not simply an individual act but a social and communicative practice influenced by disciplinary expectations, rhetorical conventions, and institutional power structures.

The present study aims to examine the principles and practice of CLA through the lens of peer review and textual negotiation in scientific discourse. The study addresses the following research questions:

1. How does peer review function as a collaborative learning process?
2. What textual and rhetorical strategies are used during negotiation between authors and reviewers?
3. How does peer review contribute to the construction of scientific knowledge?
4. What is the role of genre knowledge and discourse conventions in academic publishing?

Method

This study employs a qualitative research methodology based on discourse analysis, rhetorical analysis, genre analysis, and case study approaches. These methods are particularly appropriate because they allow the researcher to investigate how scientific knowledge is constructed through textual interaction and collaborative revision.

The theoretical foundation of this study is based primarily on the work of Carol Berkenkotter and Thomas N. Huckin, who describe peer review as a socio-cognitive and rhetorical process. Additional theoretical support is drawn from the works of John M. Swales, Ken Hyland, and Bruno Latour.

The analysis focuses on several components of peer review communication:

- reviewer reports;
- author responses;
- editorial comments;
- revised manuscript sections;
- rhetorical strategies used in negotiation.

The study applies discourse analysis to examine how language is used to express criticism, agreement, uncertainty, and authority during peer review interactions. Particular attention is given to hedging expressions, evaluative language, modal verbs, and persuasive strategies.

Rhetorical analysis is also used to investigate how authors defend their claims and negotiate with reviewers. The analysis explores how language choices help writers maintain academic politeness while simultaneously protecting their authorial voice and scientific credibility.

Genre analysis is applied to understand how peer review reinforces disciplinary conventions and academic writing norms. In this context, peer review is viewed as a hidden academic genre with specific communicative purposes and expectations.

In addition, the study adopts a macro-level perspective by examining how individual acts of revision contribute to broader disciplinary practices and the social construction of scientific knowledge.

Results

The findings of the study demonstrate that peer review functions as both a site of contention and a site of negotiation within academic discourse. The analysis reveals that scientific knowledge is not simply discovered and reported but is actively shaped through interaction among authors, reviewers, and editors.

One major finding is that reviewer comments frequently focus on issues related to methodology, interpretation, evidence, clarity, and rhetorical organization. These comments often challenge the strength of the author's

claims and require additional justification or revision. As a result, authors engage in extensive textual modification in order to align their work with disciplinary expectations and reviewer demands.

The study also reveals that revision is not limited to grammatical correction. Instead, revision often involves significant rhetorical restructuring. Authors may weaken or strengthen claims, add supporting evidence, clarify arguments, or reorganize sections of the manuscript. This demonstrates that peer review contributes directly to the construction of scientific meaning.

Another important finding concerns the role of hedging and boosting strategies. Reviewers often encourage authors to soften overly strong claims through hedging expressions such as “may suggest,” “appears to indicate,” or “could be interpreted as.” At the same time, authors use boosting expressions strategically when defending the importance of their findings. This interaction reflects the delicate balance between caution and authority in scientific communication.

The findings further show that peer review reinforces disciplinary genre conventions. Through reviewer feedback, authors learn how to structure arguments, present evidence, and position themselves within their academic community. In this way, peer review functions as an educational process that develops genre knowledge and academic writing competence.

The study additionally identifies clear power dynamics within peer review interactions. Editors and reviewers possess significant influence over publication decisions, while authors must negotiate criticism carefully in order to maintain both scientific credibility and professional relationships.

Overall, the results confirm that peer review is a collaborative and socially constructed process in which scientific texts evolve through negotiation, revision, and rhetorical interaction.2

Analysis

The analysis demonstrates that Collaborative Learning Approach principles are strongly reflected in the peer review process. Although peer review may appear confrontational at times, it ultimately functions as a collaborative system aimed at improving scientific communication and knowledge production.

One important aspect of the analysis is the concept of negotiation. Authors and reviewers participate in continuous dialogue through comments, revisions, and responses. This interaction resembles collaborative learning because participants exchange perspectives, challenge assumptions, and jointly develop more refined interpretations.

Another significant point concerns the relationship between language and power. Reviewer comments often influence how authors present their findings and structure their arguments. Consequently, scientific writing becomes shaped not only by evidence but also by institutional expectations and disciplinary norms.

The analysis also highlights the importance of rhetorical competence. Successful authors are not only knowledgeable researchers but also skilled communicators who understand how to negotiate criticism diplomatically. They must respond professionally, justify their decisions logically, and maintain academic politeness even when disagreements arise.

Furthermore, the study shows that genre knowledge plays a central role in academic publishing. Authors who understand the conventions of scientific

2. [2] John M. Swales. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge University Press.

discourse are more successful in navigating peer review processes. Through repeated participation, novice researchers gradually internalize these conventions and become more competent members of their disciplinary communities.

The role of textual revision is particularly important. Revision serves as a mechanism through which scientific ideas become more precise, coherent, and acceptable to the academic community. Therefore, peer review should not be viewed merely as evaluation but as a collaborative learning process that improves both texts and researchers themselves.

Discussion

The findings of this study support the argument that scientific knowledge is socially constructed through interaction and negotiation rather than produced in isolation. Peer review represents an important example of collaborative learning in academic practice because it encourages dialogue, reflection, and revision.

The concept of “sites of contention” illustrates how disagreement and criticism contribute positively to scientific development. Reviewer critiques force authors to reconsider assumptions, provide stronger evidence, and clarify interpretations. Although this process may sometimes appear adversarial, it ultimately improves the quality and reliability of published research.

At the same time, “sites of negotiation” demonstrate the collaborative dimension of academic writing. Authors and reviewers engage in rhetorical negotiation to determine how claims should be presented, how evidence should be interpreted, and how arguments should align with disciplinary standards. Through this process, scientific texts become collective achievements rather than purely individual creations.

The study also emphasizes the educational value of peer review. For novice researchers, participation in peer review provides opportunities to develop academic writing skills, rhetorical awareness, and genre competence.

In many cases, authors learn disciplinary conventions not through formal instruction but through direct interaction with reviewers and editors.

Another important issue is the role of power dynamics in academic publishing. While peer review promotes quality control, it may also reinforce dominant paradigms and disciplinary hierarchies. Established scholars and reviewers often possess authority that influences which ideas are accepted and which are rejected. Consequently, peer review reflects both collaboration and institutional power.

In the context of Collaborative Learning Approach, these findings suggest that effective learning environments should encourage discussion, negotiation, feedback, and revision rather than passive knowledge transmission. Academic writing classrooms can benefit from incorporating peer review activities that simulate authentic scholarly communication.

Finally, the increasing use of digital publishing platforms and open peer review systems may transform traditional peer review practices in the future. Greater transparency could reduce hidden power dynamics and create more collaborative forms of academic interaction.

Conclusion

This study has examined the relationship between Collaborative Learning Approach and the textual dynamics of peer review in the construction of scientific knowledge. The findings demonstrate that peer review is not simply a technical process of evaluation but a complex social, rhetorical, and collaborative activity.

The research shows that scientific texts are shaped through continuous interaction among authors, reviewers, and editors. Through critique, revision, and negotiation, participants collaboratively construct academic knowledge and reinforce disciplinary standards. This process reflects the key principles of Collaborative Learning Approach, including communication, cooperation, feedback, and shared meaning-making.

The study also highlights the importance of rhetorical competence, genre knowledge, and academic communication skills in successful scientific publishing. Writers must not only present evidence effectively but also negotiate criticism strategically and adapt to disciplinary expectations.

Overall, peer review can be understood as both a site of contention and a site of negotiation where scientific knowledge evolves through textual interaction. Understanding these dynamics is essential for students, researchers, and educators involved in academic writing and scholarly communication.

Future research may explore peer review practices in digital environments, compare peer review systems across disciplines, or investigate how open peer review influences collaboration and transparency in scientific publishing.

REFERENCES

1. Carol Berkenkotter, & Thomas N. Huckin. (1995). *Genre Knowledge in Disciplinary Communication: Cognition/Culture/Power*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
2. John M. Swales. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge University Press.
3. Ken Hyland. (2000). *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing*. Longman.
4. Bruno Latour. (1987). *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers Through Society*. Harvard University Press.
5. Greg Myers. (1990). *Writing Biology: Texts in the Social Construction of Scientific Knowledge*. University of Wisconsin Press.
6. International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. (2023). *Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals*.

7. Ken Hyland. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. Continuum.

8. Vijay Kumar Bhatia. (1993). *Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings*. Longman.