E-ISSN: 3031-8629
P-ISSN: 3032-3258

Halaman 120-126
Volume 2 Nomor 3 Tahun 2025

The Effect Of Peer Tutoring On Students' English Reading Skills At SMAN 1 Kuripan

Mutiara Siti Fatimah[1], Baiq Zuhrotun Nafisah[2], Sugianto[3]

[123]English Language Education Department, FBMB, Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika

Jl. Pemuda No. 59 A, Mataram, Indonesia 83125

e-mail: mutiaraundikma@gmail.com

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini menguji perbedaan hasil keterampilan membaca teks naratif antara pembelajaran tutor sebaya dan pembelajaran berpusat pada guru pada siswa kelas X SMAN 1 Kuripan tahun ajaran 2024/2025. Penelitian menggunakan desain dua kelompok dengan pretest dan posttest, melibatkan 60 siswa dari kelas X1 (30 siswa, eksperimen) dan X4 (30 siswa, kontrol). Tes membaca terdiri atas sepuluh pertanyaan esai dengan skor 0 atau 10 per butir. Nilai rata-rata posttest kelompok eksperimen adalah 88,67 (SD = 6,424), sedangkan kelompok kontrol 61,00 (SD = 7,358). Skripsi melaporkan t(58) = 15,515 dan p < 0,001. Hasil ini menunjukkan perbedaan posttest yang besar dan signifikan secara statistik, tetapi interpretasi kausal perlu mempertimbangkan ketidakjelasan prosedur randomisasi dan hasil uji normalitas yang tidak seluruhnya memenuhi asumsi.

Kata kunci: tutor sebaya; keterampilan membaca; teks naratif; pembelajaran bahasa Inggris

ABSTRACT

This study examined differences in narrative-text reading outcomes between peer tutoring and teacher-centered instruction among tenth-grade students at SMAN 1 Kuripan in the 2024/2025 academic year. A two-group pretest–posttest experimental design involved 60 students: 30 in Class X1 (peer tutoring) and 30 in Class X4 (comparison). Reading was assessed using ten essay questions scored as correct or incorrect. The reported posttest mean was 88.67 (SD = 6.424) in the experimental group and 61.00 (SD = 7.358) in the comparison group. The thesis reported t(58) = 15.515, p < .001, indicating a substantial posttest difference. However, the allocation procedure was not sufficiently documented to establish individual randomization, and the reported normality tests raise assumption concerns. The findings are therefore interpreted as evidence of a group difference rather than definitive proof of causation.

Keywords: peer tutoring; reading skills; narrative text; EFL instruction

INTRODUCTION

Reading is a meaning-making process in which readers combine textual information with prior knowledge to identify main ideas, details, references, and inferences (Nunan,

2003; Grabe, 2009). In EFL classrooms, students may recognize individual words without understanding how events, characters, and causal relations are organized in a narrative. Effective reading instruction consequently needs to support both language knowledge and active comprehension strategies (Alderson, 2000; Brown, 2004).

Peer tutoring is a structured form of peer-assisted learning in which students support one another through explanation, questioning, clarification, and feedback. Topping (1996) identifies peer tutoring as a flexible approach to learning interactions, while Vygotsky (1978) provides a theoretical account of learning through socially mediated assistance. Students may feel more comfortable asking classmates to explain unfamiliar vocabulary or passages than interrupting teacher-led lessons.

The source thesis identified difficulties among students at SMAN 1 Kuripan in recognizing main ideas, finding supporting details, understanding contextual meaning, and retrieving information from narrative texts. The researcher proposed peer tutoring as a strategy to make reading lessons more interactive and to provide immediate help from capable classmates. In this approach, students take roles as tutors and tutees while the teacher structures and monitors learning.

Research by English education scholars affiliated with Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika provides pertinent comparisons. Haerazi and Irawan (2020) examined the ECOLA reading technique in relation to motivation and self-efficacy, while Hanan, Muhlisin, and Suadiyatno (2020) investigated genre-based directed reading-thinking activities and critical thinking. Imran, Firman, and Raudhatunnisa (2019) examined Think-Talk-Write in reading comprehension. These studies illustrate the value of strategically structured reading instruction, though they did not test the peer tutoring intervention examined here.

Imran and Sandiarsa S. (2018) examined Teammates Consult for motivation and narrative-text reading. Sandiarsa and Suhaili (2019) compared Buzz Group and Critical Debate in speaking instruction, and Sandiarsa, Tantra, and Ratminingsih (2014) compared PQRST and SQ3R strategies in reading. Their varied contexts underscore the importance of strategy choice and interaction, without constituting direct replication of this study.

Further locally relevant research by Haerazi, Prayati, and Vikasari (2019) examined contextual teaching and reading comprehension, and Prayati, Haerazi, Irawan, and Vikasari

(2020) developed culture-based English materials. Taken together, this literature situates peer tutoring within a wider body of learner-centered EFL pedagogy. The present study asked whether students taught through peer tutoring achieved different reading scores from those receiving teacher-centered instruction.

RESEARCH METHOD

Design and Participants

The thesis described a quantitative experimental study with pretest and posttest comparison groups. It reported a population of 231 tenth-grade students across seven classes at SMAN 1 Kuripan and a sample of 60 students: Class X1 (n = 30) for peer tutoring and Class X4 (n = 30) for teacher-centered learning. Although the thesis labeled the design "true experimental," it did not document how individual students or intact classes were randomly allocated. For this reason, the study is described here as a two-group experimental comparison without assuming verified random assignment.

Intervention and Instruments

The study took place from 23 July to 16 August 2024. The experimental class received peer tutoring activities centered on narrative texts, while the control class received teacher-centered instruction. Both groups completed pretests and posttests. The reading instrument contained ten essay items, each awarded 10 points for a correct answer and zero for an incorrect answer, yielding a possible total score of 100. The thesis identified main ideas, vocabulary, specific information, references, and inferences as reading indicators. Instrument validity, rater procedures, and item-level reliability were not reported in sufficient detail to assess independently.

Analysis

The thesis used IBM SPSS Statistics 25 and reported descriptive statistics, normality tests, Levene's test, and an independent-samples t-test comparing posttest scores. A significance threshold of .05 was applied. Results below are reproduced from the thesis tables, with interpretive cautions where assumptions or reporting require attention.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

The posttest group statistics showed a mean of 88.67 (SD = 6.424) for peer tutoring

and 61.00 (SD = 7.358) for teacher-centered instruction, giving a mean difference of 27.67 points. Both groups contained 30 students.

Table 1. Posttest descriptive statistics

Group	n	Posttest mean	SD
Peer tutoring (X1)	30	88.67	6.424
Teacher-centered (X4)	30	61.00	7.358

The thesis reported an independent-samples result of $t(58) = 15.515$, $p < .001$, with a mean difference of 27.667 points, a standard error of 1.783, and a 95% confidence interval from 24.097 to 31.236. Levene's test was nonsignificant ($F = 0.152$, $p = .698$), consistent with the equal-variance analysis shown in the thesis.

Table 2. Independent-samples posttest comparison

t	df	p (reported)	Mean difference	95% CI
15.515	58	< .001	27.667	24.097–31.236

The source displays SPSS significance as .000; it is reported here as $p < .001$, not as a zero probability.

The normality table requires particular caution. The Shapiro–Wilk p-values were .138 for experimental pretest, .008 for experimental posttest, .009 for control pretest, and .066 for control posttest. Thus, at least two of the four distributions showed significant departures from normality. The thesis narrative incorrectly interpreted the normality evidence as uniformly acceptable. Given $n = 30$ per group, the t-test may be reasonably robust in some circumstances, but a distributional diagnostic or sensitivity analysis would strengthen the inference.

Discussion

The reported posttest difference favors peer tutoring over the comparison instruction for these classes. Students receiving peer support may have benefited from opportunities to ask questions, clarify unfamiliar language, explain answers, and receive immediate

feedback. Such interactions correspond with the peer-assisted learning mechanisms discussed by Topping (1996) and the socially mediated learning framework of Vygotsky (1978).

Narrative comprehension requires readers to track events, identify central ideas, connect details, and infer implied meanings (Grabe, 2009; Nunan, 2003). A structured tutor–tutee exchange can make these cognitive steps explicit through verbal explanation and repeated questioning. Nevertheless, the study did not measure tutoring interaction quality or strategy use directly, so these mechanisms remain plausible interpretations rather than established mediators.

The results can be considered alongside Indonesian EFL reading research. Haerazi and Irawan (2020) evaluated ECOLA instruction, Hanan et al. (2020) studied directed reading-thinking activities, and Imran et al. (2019) investigated Think-Talk-Write. Haerazi et al. (2019) also linked contextualized instruction with reading comprehension. Although the strategies differ, these studies provide context for designing active reading tasks rather than relying exclusively on teacher explanation.

The work of Imran and Sandiarsa S. (2018) is particularly close in its attention to peer-oriented narrative reading. Other research involving Sandiarsa S. addressed structured classroom discussion (Sandiarsa S. & Suhaili, 2019) and strategic reading (Sandiarsa S. et al., 2014). Together with Prayati et al. (2020), these studies suggest that learning design, interaction, and meaningful material selection are useful areas of investigation in EFL classrooms. They do not independently confirm the effect size observed at SMAN 1 Kuripan.

Several limitations affect the strength of the conclusion. The thesis did not sufficiently document random allocation, and the analysis compared posttest means rather than directly adjusting for baseline pretest differences. Some normality assumptions were not met. Additionally, the test used dichotomously scored essay items, but scoring consistency and item reliability were not described in detail. Future analysis should examine pretest equivalence, use an adjusted model where appropriate, and verify assumptions against the original scores.

CONCLUSION

Students taught narrative reading through peer tutoring at SMAN 1 Kuripan obtained

a higher reported posttest mean (88.67) than students taught through teacher-centered instruction (61.00). The source thesis reported a statistically significant between-group difference, $t(58) = 15.515$, $p < .001$. This finding supports further classroom use and investigation of peer tutoring, while incomplete allocation details and mixed normality evidence limit causal certainty.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Teachers can pilot peer tutoring with clear tutor selection, training, monitoring, and reading tasks aligned with comprehension indicators. Future researchers should document assignment procedures, report pretest comparability, test instrument reliability, and use appropriate robustness checks or baseline-adjusted analyses.

REFERENCES

Alderson, J. C. (2000). Assessing reading. Cambridge University Press.

Brown, H. D. (2004). Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices. Pearson Education.

Grabe, W. (2009). Reading in a second language: Moving from theory to practice. Cambridge University Press.

Haerazi, H., & Irawan, L. A. (2020). The effectiveness of ECOLA technique to improve reading comprehension in relation to motivation and self-efficacy. International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning, 15(1), 61–76. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v15i01.11495

Haerazi, H., Prayati, Z., & Vikasari, R. M. (2019). Practicing contextual teaching and learning (CTL) approach to improve students' reading comprehension in relation to motivation. English Review: Journal of English Education, 8(1), 139–146. https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v8i1.2011

Hanan, A., Muhlisin, M., & Suadiyatno, T. (2020). Actuating reading comprehension through genre-based directed reading thinking activities (G-BDRTA) viewed from critical thinking skills. JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching, 8(4), 402–411. https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v8i4.2778

Harmer, J. (2007). The practice of English language teaching (4th ed.). Pearson Longman.

Imran, F., & Sandiarsa S., K. D. (2018). Teammates consult strategy towards students'

motivation and reading narrative text. Jo-ELT, 5(1), 7–11. https://doi.org/10.33394/jo-elt.v5i1.2293

Imran, F., Firman, E., & Raudhatunnisa, S. (2019). Applying think-talk-write (TTW) in the teaching of reading comprehension in relation to students' critical thinking skills. JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching, 7(1), 57–65. https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v7i1.1439

Nation, I. S. P. (2009). Teaching ESL/EFL reading and writing. Routledge.

Nunan, D. (2003). Practical English language teaching. McGraw-Hill.

Prayati, Z., Haerazi, H., Irawan, L. A., & Vikasari, R. M. (2020). Developing culture-based English instructional materials to improve students' thinking, ELT achievement, and classroom interaction. Lingua Cultura, 14(2), 211–218. https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v14i2.6650

Sandiarsa S., K. D., & Suhaili, M. (2019). A comparative study between "Buzz Group" and "Critical Debate" toward students' speaking achievement. JUPE: Jurnal Pendidikan Mandala, 4(5). https://doi.org/10.36312/jupe.v4i5.874

Sandiarsa S., K. D., Tantra, D. K., & Ratminingsih, N. M. (2014). A comparative study of PQRST and SQ3R strategies based on the text types upon the eighth grade students' reading competency at SMPN 4 Singaraja. Jo-ELT, 1(1), 49–64. https://doi.org/10.33394/jo-elt.v1i1.2401

Topping, K. J. (1996). The effectiveness of peer tutoring in further and higher education: A typology and review of the literature. Higher Education, 32, 321–345. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00138870

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press.