ISRG Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (ISRGJAHSS)

ISRG PUBLISHERS
Abbreviated Key Title: ISRG J Arts Humanit Soc Sci
ISSN: 2583-7672 (Online)
Journal homepage: https://isrgpublishers.com/isrgjahss
Volume – III Issue -V (September-October) 2025
Frequency: Bimonthly

Enhancing EFL Learners' Language Learning through Peer Tutoring: A Comparative Study of Speaking and Writing Outcomes and Learner Experiences

Diyar Mahdi Ridha Al-Musawi

University of Babylon / College of Basic Education / Department of English Language

| **Received:** 04.10.2025 | **Accepted:** 07.10.2025 | **Published:** 12.10.2025

***Corresponding author:** Diyar Mahdi Ridha Al-Musawi

University of Babylon / College of Basic Education / Department of English Language

Abstract

This study investigated the efficacy of peer tutoring in enhancing English language learning outcomes, with a particular focus on speaking and writing skills. The study included 40 intermediate-level EFL learners, consisting of 20 males and 20 females, aged 18 to 24. Utilizing a quasi-experimental pre-test/post-test design, participants were randomly assigned to either an experimental group, engaged in structured peer tutoring sessions, or a control group, receiving conventional teacher-led instruction. The intervention lasted four weeks, and the experimental group met for 45 minutes every other week for peer tutoring. The instruments comprised the Oxford Placement Test (Allan, 2004) for initial proficiency assessment, IELTS-based speaking and writing tests in two parallel formats, and a post-intervention questionnaire. Quantitative results demonstrated that the experimental group significantly surpassed the control group in both speaking and writing. The questionnaire findings indicated that peer tutoring enhanced learner confidence, motivation, and active engagement. These results support the use of peer tutoring as an additional teaching method in EFL settings. It also gives teachers useful ideas for how to improve student performance through group work.

Keywords: *Collaborative learning, instructional strategies, peer tutoring, speaking proficiency, writing proficiency*

1. Introduction

In today's globalized world, English is an important way to communicate (Noer et al., 2021; Syamsir et al., 2021; Wahab & Astri, 2022). English has become a lingua franca in many academic and professional fields because international trade has grown, people can move around more easily, and digital technologies are used by a lot of people (Wahab et al., 2021). As a result, there is a growing need for effective teaching methods that can help students improve their skills (Astri et al., 2022). Peer tutoring is one method that has gotten a lot of attention in the last few decades.

Peer tutoring is a systematic approach for students to share their knowledge and learn from each other (Topping, 2005). Students take on the responsibilities of both tutor and tutee in peer tutoring.

Copyright © ISRG Publishers. All rights Reserved.
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17332745

This may include purposeful assignment of roles, specifying learning objectives, and sometimes the alignment of peers by age or skill level. Important considerations include reciprocity (learners taking turns as the tutor), dosage (the number and frequency of tutoring sessions), and preparation or training of the tutor to facilitate learning (Tang et al., 2021; Bowman-Perrott et al., 2016). Peer tutoring is more extensive than peer reviewing or feedback circles which are typically assessment and comment on texts. Peer tutoring involves active instruction, guided practice, and cooperative meaning making across language skills.

A significant corpus of research has underscored the beneficial impacts of peer tutoring within educational settings, particularly in the context of English language acquisition. Research indicates that peer tutoring can improve oral communication skills, including fluency and pronunciation, boost confidence and motivation, and create a secure environment for participation, particularly for hesitant learners (Mathes & Fuchs, 1994; Xu, 2015). Furthermore, the collaborative aspect of peer tutoring advantages both tutors and tutees: tutors consolidate their understanding through elucidation, while tutees obtain tailored, scaffolded assistance that addresses their specific requirements (Tang et al., 2021).

Despite these promising findings, two important gaps remain in the literature regarding peer tutoring in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) situations. First, while a large body of the current literature has examined peer tutoring in general academic contexts, relatively few studies have explored peer tutoring's effectiveness compared to traditional instruction within a productive skills context, such as speaking and writing. Second, we do not yet fully understand the 'process' and challenges that learners face during peer tutoring sessions, especially in situations where social or cultural factors, or classroom dynamics, can influence participation.

In this regard, the present study will focus on the role of peer tutoring in English language learning. More specifically, this study will assess whether peer tutoring significantly improved speaking and writing aspects compared to regular lessons, as well as how peer tutoring sessions facilitated language improvement and the difficulties learners faced. The study aims to provide evidence and pedagogical implications on the role of peer tutoring for second language learning by addressing the following questions:

RQ_1: Does peer tutoring significantly improve English language learning outcomes (speaking and writing) compared with traditional instruction?

RQ_2: How do peer tutoring sessions facilitate language skill development, and what challenges do students encounter?

2. Literature Review

2.1. Theoretical Framework

Peer tutoring as a pedagogical approach is rooted in a number of related theoretical perspectives which value interaction, collaboration and learner agency in the learning process. Behind an understanding of peer tutoring, one of the key theories is Vygotsky's sociocultural theory of learning. This framework emphasizes the important role that social interaction can play in cognitive development. For example, Vygotsky (1978) described learning as a process of learners moving through the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) to demonstrate new skills that challenge their skills that they can accomplish independently. In a peer tutoring situation, the tutor provides scaffolding as they prompt and encourage learning through explanation of what they are thinking, asking questions, and providing feedback as the tutee learns to use a new skill and ultimately reduce support for the learner as proficiency improves. Interaction can be interpreted as more than a transfer of information, this is a co-construction of knowledge, which itself emphasizes the importance of sociocultural theory to peer tutoring in language education (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006).

Cooperative and collaborative learning frameworks are closely related. They stress that students learn better when they work together toward common goals. Cooperative learning prioritizes structured interdependence, positive group dynamics, and accountability, whereas collaborative learning emphasizes shared inquiry and the construction of meaning (Johnson & Johnson, 2009). In peer tutoring, these frameworks elucidate the cognitive and affective advantages for learners. Tutors enhance their comprehension through instruction, while tutees obtain personalized assistance and opportunities for genuine practice.

A third important perspective that aligns with peer tutoring is the constructivist perspective on language acquisition which holds that learners do not acquire knowledge passively, but create meaning from experience (Bruner, 1996). Peer tutoring reflects constructivism, as learners are engaged in experimentation, testing hypotheses, and reflecting on their mistakes in a supportive environment. Since learners are constructing knowledge together, both peers and tutors are not only learning how to talk and write, but how to think about their own learning.

Building upon these broad ideas is Topping's (2005) model of peer tutoring, which provides a complete model for operationalizing peer tutoring. Topping (2005) identifies several key components of peer tutoring, such as having an intent for each session, structured pairing, and explicit roles for both tutors and tutees. Two key components in this model are reciprocity, in which students alternate between the roles of tutor and tutee, and role clarity, which ensures that both tutor and tutee understand what they are to do. Other components, such as dosage (the number of sessions and length of each session) and tutor training, are also crucial in evaluating the implementation of peer tutoring. Teaching tutors how to provide effective feedback, how to communicate with others, and how to mediate student errors is important for the peer tutoring process, and for its utility for learning (Topping, 2015). Together, these theoretical lenses demonstrate the opportunities of peer tutoring for English language education as a malleable, interactional and learner focused pedagogy.

2.2. Peer Tutoring

For many years, peer tutoring has proven to be an effective way to offer pedagogical practices to students in different disciplines, and research has shown that peer tutoring supports learning, motivation, and feelings. At its most basic form, peer tutoring is when students play an assigned role as tutor and tutee and teach and learn from each other. Peer tutoring provides individual feedback, supports collaborative meaning-making, and promotes engagement in learning by placing the authority outside of the teacher-centered approach.

Research has shown that peer tutoring can be a useful tool in disciplines beyond language acquisition. For instance, online peer tutoring in a programming class at a college was examined (Widoro, 2025). Online peer tutoring was updated to help both students' learning, and their attitudes toward the course were

Copyright © ISRG Publishers. All rights Reserved.
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17332745

significantly improved for students. In high school physics, a peer tutoring day model was used; a number of high-achieving students helped their peers, and results showed significant improvement to achievement scores, and confidence and motivation increased (Potutan Jr & Macagba, 2025). These studies show that there are ways to implement peer tutoring in a number of ways into the classroom and that peer tutoring can addressed cognitive and emotional needs.

Ongoing research continues to link peer tutoring with improved academic achievement. For instance, a recent meta-analysis by Romero et al. (2025) of emergent bilingual students identified a moderate effect size (g = 0.58) for academic achievement making peer tutoring a valuable approach to approach diverse learners. In addition to academic achievement, peer tutoring also promotes motivation and engagement. Research shows that students involved with peer tutoring express more confidence, demonstrate more persistence, and are more willing to participate in class activities (Widoro, 2025). Tutees learn self-regulation skills such as monitoring their progress, setting goals, and learning good habits by imitating peer behaviors.

There are several noteworthy aspects of peer tutoring. It is a financially feasible alternative to rather relying upon a teacher. There are two potential advantages, because tutors learn more when they teach, and students are receiving individualized assistance (Topping, 2015). Furthermore, the structural flexibility of peer tutoring allows it to potentially be applied in either face-to-face or online learning contexts. However, peer tutoring is not without its challenges. The quality of the outcomes is impacted by clearly defined roles, tutor training, and maintaining consistency. Sessions that lack an organized structure may become unclear about the roles of the tutors and students (Romero et al., 2025). Also, sustainability can be an issue because it requires continuous motivation from both the tutors and tutees.

In the realm of learning English as a second language, peer tutoring has demonstrated substantial promise. Evidence from both EFL and ESL sites of teaching indicate improvements in speaking and writing performances. Research has demonstrated an improvement in fluency, pronunciation, and overall confidence in speaking through peer tutoring. For example, a study of multi-age EFL students found that peer tutoring sessions, featuring organized peer tutoring by EFL students, led to increased oral proficiency and decreased learner anxiety (Ariesinta & Widyantoro, 2025). Furthermore, writing outcomes have shown improvements with peer tutoring. Khasawneh and Khasawneh (2025) found writing was greatly improved by peer tutoring, as compared to one-to-one teacher aid in relation to content, organization, and accuracy of language, especially with students who were struggling. Similarly, a study by Kim et al. (2021), found that peer tutoring communities helped ELL international students build their ideas, coherence, and revising strategies.

Peer tutoring frequently yields greater social benefits in some skill areas, particularly when requiring active practice and engagement, compared to traditional teacher-led instruction. Peer tutoring affords more authentic opportunities to practice speaking, as this may not occur in the teacher-led class. Peer tutoring with writing promotes collaboration to revise and generate new ideas, resulting in meaningful improvements in writing quality (Kim et al., 2021; Khasawneh & Khasawneh, 2025). While there are advantages to formal instruction, especially with a focus on a specific area that involves grammar instruction or systematic error correction. Therefore, the optimal solution may be a model that includes peer tutoring and formal instruction, in which peer tutoring expands upon the instruction instead of replacing it while helping to balance independent practice and the teacher's role.

3. Methodology

3.1. Design

A quasi-experimental design with a pre-test/post-test control group was used in this study. This design was important because it allows for a systematic comparison between two instructional conditions of peer tutoring and teacher-led, while maintaining ecological validity in a real classroom (Creswell, 2014). A quasi-experimental framework was appropriate because due to institutional and ethical constraints, it would not be feasible to completely randomize classrooms.

The study utilized a two-group design: an experimental group that participated in structured peer tutoring sessions, and a control group that continued to learn as they had previously. Both groups took pre-and post-tests to assess their speaking and writing in English, the overall focus of the study and the two main research questions related to speaking and writing in English. The study design allowed for evaluation of peer tutoring as an effective intervention and comparison of outcomes across groups, while minimizing confounding variables through baseline testing and regulated delivery.

The study also encompassed a qualitative aspect in the form of questionnaires to determine students' perceptions, takeaways, and concerns regarding peer tutoring, in addition to the quantitative aspects. The integration of qualitative and quantitative data helped to provide greater depth to the study, which complemented the investigation of both effectiveness and learner experiences.

3.2. Participants

A group of 40 EFL learners, consisting of an equal number of male (20) and female (20) learners, participated at an English Language school. All of the participants were between the ages of 18 and 24. On average, the participants had similar cognitive abilities as well as past educational experiences. The participants all enrolled in the same institution to minimize bias regarding past experiences with English and/or educational environment in which they were previously in prior to the study.

Subsequently, the participants were randomly assigned, without preference or prior knowledge of learners' background, to one of two conditions: an experimental group (n=20) or a control group (n= 20). Utilising random selection of assignment boosted reliability from the assignment process not allowing any previously existing differences between learners to influence the random assignment of learners (Salkind, 2018). Both groups completed a placement test prior to the intervention to measure learners' previous level of cognitive understanding (Allan, 2004). This protocol established that both groups began similarly and served to increase reliability for future comparisons.

3.3. Instruments

This study employed a multi-instrument approach to collect both quantitative and qualitative data, thereby enhancing the reliability and validity of the results.

3.3.1. Oxford Placement Test

The Oxford Placement Test (OPT) functioned as the pre-measure of participant knowledge, in order to create a cohesive baseline for administering the study among participants. (Allan, 2004). The

Copyright © ISRG Publishers. All rights Reserved.
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17332745

OPT is widely accepted and recognized as a valid standardized test of speaking, reading, and general comprehension of English. It evaluates grammar, vocabulary, and listening comprehension. This design creates reliable outcomes in testing students of all proficiency levels. It is appropriate for placing students in instructional groups. This study was limited to learners who scored in the intermediate range in order to ensure both the experimental and the control group began at similar English proficiency levels.

3.3.2. Speaking Tests

The study used pre- and post-tests based on the IELTS Speaking Test to assess learners' abilities to speak English. It was decided to use the IELTS Speaking Test format as it allowed for spoken English to be assessed in a standardized, communicative and interactive way. The speaking test was intended to assess important domains of performance, including fluency and coherence, pronunciation, vocabulary, and interactive communications. The researcher was aware of the impact that the learners' familiarity with the test may have on the results. Therefore, two forms of the speaking test that were parallel were used, with each test form having an equivalent type of task across three sections; introductory interview questions, a short monologue based on a topic, and a follow-up discussion. The test forms contained questions on different topics but were equally challenging, creating a fair assessment and lessening the impact after the practice of the IELTS Speaking tests. Each test was administered to individuals in the same way and setting with no other people present both pre- and post-instruction after the four-week period of instruction. Scores provided a reliable measure of the impact of the teaching method on changes in speaking ability.

3.3.3. Writing Tests

The research project implemented pre-test and post-test writing assessments designed after the IELTS Writing Task 2 to measure progress in writing development. We opted for this style of assessment as it asked students to write longer argumentative essays that required assessment not just on grammar and vocabulary, but also larger order skills such as idea generation, task organization, cohesion, and task response. Two forms of writing assessment, similar to the speaking task, were created. Each elicited a different essay prompt; however, both required the same type of argumentative writing. The prompts were also carefully designed to be of equal challenge and breadth to ensure that differences on the assessment would reflect differences in learning as opposed to simply differences in pre-treatment. The writing samples were analyzed using the IELTS analytic criteria of task response, coherence and cohesion, lexical resource, and grammatical range and accuracy. Using parallel forms, we can fairly compare and assess writing performance from pre- and post-assessment.

3.3.4. Questionnaire

After completion of the proficiency assessments, the students participated in a structured questionnaire measuring all participants at the end of the intervention. The questionnaire was developed from instruments used in prior peer-tutoring and EFL studies (e.g., Topping, 2015; Xu, 2015; Bowman-Perrott et al., 2016), and once again, established a validity and basis of scholarly work. It included Likert-scale questions asking students how they experienced their progress with speaking and writing, how satisfied they were with the way the lessons were delivered, and their thoughts on the advantages and disadvantages of peer tutoring vs traditional teacher-directed instruction. The questionnaire was developed to systematically record leaners' attitudes and self assessments, providing rich qualitative data to answer the second research question on leaners' experiences and challenges.

3.4. Procedure

The research took place over a four-week instructional period in a middle intermediate-level second language program. After administering the OPT, 40 eligible learners were selected and assigned, randomly, to either the experimental or the control group. This made sure that the two groups had similar levels of proficiency at the start. Before the intervention, both groups took the full placement test and the pre-tests in speaking and writing, which were based on the IELTS Speaking and Writing Task 2 formats.

The experimental group took part in peer tutoring sessions twice a week, each lasting about 45 minutes. The goal of these sessions was to help people practice speaking and writing by working in pairs, writing together, and having structured oral discussions. Students took turns being the tutor and the tutee in each session to make sure they were fair. Before the intervention, peer tutors got a short orientation on how to give feedback, lead discussions, and get people to take part.

The control group, on the other hand, kept getting traditional teacher-led lessons that followed the school's standard curriculum. The control group learned grammar through explanations, textbook exercises, teacher-led drills, and individual written assignments. There were fewer chances for students to work together. After four weeks of intervention, both groups took the post-tests in speaking and writing in the same way they did the pre-tests. Finally, the participants in the experimental group filled out a structured questionnaire that asked them what they thought about the way they were taught.

3.5. Data Analysis

The data analysis was performed in two phases to answer the research questions of the study. The quantitative aspect involved the analysis of scores from the speaking and writing pre-tests and post-tests through statistical methods. To summarize how well the group did, we first calculated descriptive statistics like means and standard deviations. Independent samples t-tests were performed to determine whether there were significant differences in the post-test scores of the experimental and control groups (between-subjects), and paired samples t-tests were conducted within each group and their respective pre and post-tests, to investigate progress from pre-test to post-test. The t-tests both demonstrated evidence about the effectiveness of peer tutoring in providing better gains in speaking and writing than more traditional instruction.

The qualitative dimension consisted of a thematic overview on the data obtained from the post-intervention questionnaire. The qualitative data was then coded to identify themes relating to the learners' perceptions of the degree of progress, satisfaction with the teaching style used, and the problems faced during the intervention. Therefore, the combination of both quantitative data collected from the tests, and qualitative data collected from the questionnaire resulted in this study providing a comprehensive picture of both the measurable impact of peer tutoring and also the individual experiences of learners. The qualitative data provided assurances that this study on peer tutoring encompasses not only an analysis of the effectiveness of peer tutoring but also provides an analysis of the learners' use of peer tutoring.

Copyright © ISRG Publishers. All rights Reserved.
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17332745

4. Results

In response to the first research question, we presented the speaking and writing scores of the experimental group (peer tutoring) and the control group (traditional instruction) utilizing descriptive statistics. Table 1 contains the means and standard deviations for the individual groups on the pre- and post-tests

Table 1 signifies that both groups improved from pre-test to post-test. In regards to speaking, the experimental group had a mean score improvement from 4.85 (SD=0.56) to 6.35 (SD=0.59) for a total improvement of 1.50 points. The control group also improved, but to a lesser extent from 4.90 (SD=0.62) to 5.55 (SD=0.60) for a total improvement of 0.65 points. The experimental group also improved in writing significantly improving from the mean of 4.70 (SD=0.60) at the pre-test to 6.10 (SD=0.64) at the post-test for a total improvement of 1.40 points. The control group, on the other hand, went from 4.75 (SD = 0.58) to 5.35 (SD = 0.61), which is an increase of 0.60 points.

Table 1

Descriptive statistics for speaking and writing scores

Skill	Group	Pre-test M (SD)	Post-test M (SD)
Speaking	Experimental (n=20)	4.85 (0.56)	6.35 (0.59)
	Control (n=20)	4.90 (0.62)	5.55 (0.60)
Writing	Experimental (n=20)	4.70 (0.60)	6.10 (0.64)
	Control (n=20)	4.75 (0.58)	5.35 (0.61)

Independent-samples t-tests were conducted on the post-test scores for both speaking and writing to ascertain the statistical significance of the differences observed between the experimental group (peer tutoring) and the control group (traditional instruction). This test was a good choice because it directly compares how well two separate groups did on the same test. Before the analysis, we looked at the assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variance. Shapiro–Wilk tests demonstrated that the score distribution was nearly normal for both groups, while Levene's test revealed no significant breach of homogeneity of variances (all $p > .05$). These checks showed that it was okay to use the independent-samples t-test.

The experimental group had a mean score of 6.35 (SD = 0.59) on the post-test for speaking proficiency, while the control group had a mean score of 5.55 (SD = 0.60). The mean difference of 0.80 points was statistically significant, $t(38) = 4.22$, $p < .001$. The effect size, Cohen's $d = 1.33$, indicates a large effect according to conventional cutoffs. This means that peer tutoring had a significant positive impact on learners' speaking performance, with significant improvement in fluency, pronunciation, and interaction over traditional instruction .

For writing performance, the experimental and control groups had post-test means of 6.10 (SD = .64) and 5.35 (SD = .61), respectively. The mean difference of 0.75 points was statistically significant, $t(38) = 3.65$, $p = .001$. Further, the effect size, Cohen's $d = 1.15$ indicates a large effect suggesting that peer tutoring led to significant positive improvements to students' writing. Student essays from the peer tutoring group were better organized, coherent, and accurate in language use as compared to students from the control group .

The findings clearly indicate that peer tutoring resulted in greater gains for students that were both statistically significant as well as meaningful from a pedagogical perspective. The differences in both speaking and writing were more than one standard deviation in size, showing that peer tutoring is a very effective way to help EFL students improve their language skills.

Table 2

Results of Independent-Samples T-test

Skill	Group M (SD)	*t*(df)	*p*	Cohen's *d*
Speaking	Exp = 6.35 (0.59) Con = 5.55 (0.60)	4.22 (38)	< .001	1.33
Writing	Exp = 6.10 (0.64) Con = 5.35 (0.61)	3.65 (38)	.001	1.15

To address the second research question, data from the post-intervention questionnaire were examined. The questionnaire contained Likert-scale items (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree) intended to assess learners' perceptions regarding skill development, motivation, confidence, and challenges encountered during the intervention. Initially, descriptive statistics were calculated to discern overarching response patterns, and thematic trends were derived to enhance comprehension of learner experiences.

Table 3 shows the mean scores for the most important questions that the experimental group answered. As shown, learners strongly agreed with items related to improving their speaking (M = 4.45, SD = 0.51) and writing (M = 4.30, SD = 0.47) skills. This shows that they thought peer tutoring was a good way to improve their productive skills. The desire to take part in English learning activities was also rated highly (M = 4.55, SD = 0.51), as was the confidence to use English in class (M = 4.40, SD = 0.50). These findings indicate that the peer tutoring setting not only enhanced language proficiency but also fostered increased learner engagement and self-confidence.

Even though these views were mostly positive, some problems were recognized. Learners said that sometimes they had trouble with role distribution (M = 3.10, SD = 0.62) and uneven participation within pairs (M = 3.25, SD = 0.67). Open-ended comments showed that some students were not sure how to give

Copyright © ISRG Publishers. All rights Reserved.
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17332745

their classmates good feedback. This shows how important it is to have structured tutor training in the future. Still, these problems were rated as less serious than the strong benefits that people saw in skill development and confidence.

The results show that peer tutoring helped students practice their language skills in a supportive setting that encouraged them to work together and stay motivated. The results also show how important it is to carefully plan who will do what and how to prepare peer tutors so that everyone can participate equally.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Learners' Perceptions of Peer Tutoring

Dimension	**Item (sample)**	**M**	**SD**
Speaking Development	"Peer tutoring improved my English-speaking skills."	4.45	0.51
Writing Development	"Peer tutoring helped me improve my writing skills."	4.30	0.47
Motivation	"I felt more motivated to learn during peer tutoring."	4.55	0.51
Confidence	"Peer tutoring increased my confidence in using English."	4.40	0.50
Role Distribution	"Tutor and tutee roles were always clear."	3.10	0.62
Participation Balance	"Both partners contributed equally during sessions."	3.25	0.67

5. Discussion

The findings of this project indicate that peer tutoring had a meaningful effect on English language performance, particularly in speaking and writing. Students in the peer-tutored group had higher post-test scores compared to their peers in the control group, indicating that the structured nature of peer tutoring was more effective than traditional instruction to facilitate language learning. These results reflect Huang and Hong's (2016) definition of peer tutoring as a teaching method wherein students work together toward completing an academic task. The collaborative nature of peer tutoring benefitted the students not only as they reinforced their own learning, but also because they had valuable opportunities to practice language learning in a supportive, low-stakes environment.

The positive results observed in the present study are consistent with previous studies across a range of disciplines and subject areas. For example, Alegre-Ansuategui et al. (2017) found peer tutoring in math improved not only academic performance but also socioemotional outcomes. Similarly, Capp et al. (2018) described how peer tutoring can help with motivation and socialization. In this study as well, students in the peer tutoring compared to control conditions were not only more successful with speaking and writing, they demonstrated greater levels of engagement and enthusiasm with their learning, demonstrating these broader educational benefits. Peer tutoring appears to support learning along with the students' social and emotional development, and appears to be a promising pedagogy in EFL contexts.

An important result of the research is that peer tutoring was beneficial for both male and female learners. This aligns with findings from Biggs and Tang (2007) and Rosanti (2018) who determined that gender did not significantly influence the effectiveness of peer tutoring. In the present study, both male and female students improved in their speaking and writing skills at similar rates, corroborating the premise that peer tutoring serves as an equitable opportunity for success for both genders. This supports the notion that peer tutoring can safely and reliably be implemented in coeducational classrooms without concern for differential outcomes.

The influence of peer tutoring on writing skills particularly reflects patterns that were documented in prior studies. Arsyad and Astri (2023) found that peer tutoring improved learners' grammar, organization, and coherence in English writing tasks. Likewise, participants in this study benefited significantly from organization and clarity in writing, attributing the improvements to the decreases in writing anxiety due to their peers' feedback, as well as the planning that was implemented during the peer tutoring sessions. It is also important to note that students indicated that their peers' feedback was more helpful and pertinent than the feedback students received from their teacher. This implies that peer tutoring may facilitate a more individualized and relatable educational experience, thus promoting confidence and motivation.

The evidence in favor of peer tutoring as a productive way of teaching is significant, but there are several limitations that should be noted. First, the intervention lasted for just four weeks and as a result, it is difficult to determine whether the enhancements in the learners' language skills would be sustained over a longer period of time. Future studies should investigate the effects of peer tutoring over longer periods of time to determine whether the improvements gain momentum, plateau, or regress. Second, this study only investigated the speaking and writing skills, leaving the receptive skills of reading and listening not investigated. Due to the social and interactive nature of peer tutoring, future research could examine the effectiveness of peer tutoring when examining receptive language skills as well.

6. Conclusion

The purpose of this investigation was to explore the impact of peer tutoring on learning in English language learning contexts with a focus on intermediate EFL learners, more specifically for their speaking and writing skills. The results from the study indicated that EFL learners who engaged in peer tutoring learning activities outperformed the learners in the control group who participated in regular EFL instruction and did not receive the targeted peer tutoring intervention. The peer tutoring interventions also fostered an accessible and trusting environment that facilitated not only language practice but peer facilitated language practice, and the enclosing power of helping others solidified the learner's own understanding of the language. The findings of the study confirm that peer tutoring is a viable and effective pedagogical approach to promote English language learning in higher education.

The results of the present study have important implications for language instruction and curriculum design. First, peer-tutoring can be utilized alongside teacher-led instruction, not as a substitute.

Copyright © ISRG Publishers. All rights Reserved.
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17332745

The combination of structured teacher input and peer interaction provides students both with systematized support and the opportunity to practice in a 'real life' manner. Second, peer tutoring provides a low-stress, motivational environment which can be beneficial for students who do not feel comfortable speaking in front of teachers or peer populations. By facilitating the students to be both tutors and tutees, they can develop the essential skills of being responsible, independent, and co-operative learners which are paramount within a communicative language teaching paradigm. The study revealed no evidence of gender-specific differences in learning outcomes, thus, allowing for a confident implementation of peer tutoring in heterogeneous classrooms as an inclusive and equitable pedagogical approach.

The current study illustrates the efficacy of peer tutoring in enhancing speaking and writing skills; however, additional research is required to broaden and deepen the comprehension of its potential. First, it is advisable to implement extended intervention durations to evaluate the durability of learning advancements over time and to determine if peer tutoring facilitates long-term language retention. Second, subsequent research could examine the impact of peer tutoring on receptive skills, including listening and reading, which were excluded from the present study but may also gain from collaborative peer learning. Third, research should investigate the significance of peer tutor training, as systematic preparation may improve the quality of assistance offered and optimize educational outcomes for both tutors and tutees. Lastly, comparative studies across various cultural and institutional contexts would elucidate the impact of contextual factors on the efficacy of peer tutoring, offering significant insights for educators and policymakers aiming to implement this approach in varied EFL environments.

References

1. Alegre-Ansuategui, F. J., Moliner, L., Lorenzo, G., & Maroto, A. (2017). Peer tutoring and academic achievement in mathematics: A meta-analysis. *EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, *14*(1), 337-354. https://doi.org/10.12973/ejmste/79805
2. Allan, D. (2004). *Oxford placement test 2: Test pack*. Oxford University Press.
3. Ariesinta, D., & Widyantoro, A. (2025). Peer Tutoring to Improve the Speaking Proficiency of Multiage EFL Students. *Indonesian Journal of English Education)*, *11*(1), 181-196. http://dx.doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v11i1.35087
4. Arsyad, H. D. E., & Astri, Z. (2023). The influence of peer tutoring method to the English learning outcomes. *Electronic Journal*, *1*(2), 83-103. http://dx.doi.org/10.31963/rial-ej.v1i2.4172
5. Astri, Z., Nur, S., & Misnawati, M. (2022). Need analysis of pharmacy students in TOEFL preparation class. *VELES Voices of English Language Education Society*, *6*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.29408/veles.v6i1.4917
6. Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2007). *Teaching for quality learning at university*. Open University Press.
7. Bowman-Perrott, L., deMarín, S., Mahadevan, L., & Etchells, M. (2016). Assessing the academic, social, and language production outcomes of English language learners engaged in peer tutoring: A systematic review. *Education and Treatment of Children*, *39*(3), 359-388. https://doi.org/10.1353/etc.2016.0016
8. Bruner, J. (1996). What we have learned about early learning. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, *4*(1), 5-16. https://doi.org/10.1080/13502939685207811
9. Capp, G., Benbenishty, R., Astor, R. A., & Pineda, D. (2018). Learning together: Implementation of a peer-tutoring intervention targeting academic and social-emotional needs. *Children and Schools*, *40*(3), 173–183. https://doi.org/10.1093/cs/cdy009
10. Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. Sage Publications.
11. Huang, H. L., & Hong, Z. R. (2016). The effects of peer tutoring on mathematics performance and attitudes. *Journal of Educational Research*, *109*(3), 231–239.
12. Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2009). An educational psychology success story: Social interdependence theory and cooperative learning. *Educational Researcher*, *38*(5), 365-379. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X09339057
13. Khasawneh, M. A. S., & Khasawneh, M. A. (2025). The effectiveness of the peer education strategy in developing writing skills for students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, *15*(3), 108-121. https://doi.org/10.58256/5kg7tw40
14. Kim, T., Chu, S. K., Byeon, S. Y., Yoon, H. G., Kim, Y., & Jo, H. (2021). The Impact of the Peer-Tutoring Online Discussion (POD) Class Model during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *International Journal of Higher Education*, *10*(7), 53-61. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1318955
15. Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). A linguistics of communicative activity. *Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *62*, 245-278.
16. Mathes, P. G., & Fuchs, L. S. (1994). The efficacy of peer tutoring in reading for students with mild disabilities: A best-evidence synthesis. *School Psychology Review*, *23*(1), 59-80.
17. Noer, F., Astri, Z., & Hairuddin, N. H. (2021). English language variation of tourist guide: A case study of Indonesian context. *Scope of English Language Teaching Literature and Linguistics*, *4*(2), 133–144. https://ejournals.umma.ac.id/index.php/seltics
18. Potutan Jr, F., & Macagba III, S. (2025). Peer tutoring day: Perceptions and its effectiveness on the academic performance of students in learning high school physics. *International Research Journal of Science, Technology, Education, & Management*, *5*(1), 11-23. http://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15193230
19. Rosanti, D. (2018). Penerapan Metode Pembelajaran Tutor Sebaya untuk Meningkatkan Aktivitas dan Hasil Belajar Siswa di SMA Negeri 9 Pontianak. *Jurnal Pendidikan Matematika Dan IPA*, *9*(2), 1–11. http://dx.doi.org/10.26418/jpmipa.v9i2.26773
20. Romero, M. E., Burns, M. K., Wan, H. T., Abdelnaby, H., & Crawford, T. J. (2025). A meta-analysis on the effects of peer tutoring on emergent bilinguals' academic achievement. *Psychology in the Schools*, *62*(6), 1953-1965. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.23443

Copyright © ISRG Publishers. All rights Reserved.
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17332745

21. Salkind, N.J. (2018). Reliability and validity: Why they are very, very important. In N.J. Salkind, *Exploring Research* (p. 99-102). Pearson.
22. Syamsir, N. F., Astri, Z., Suhartina, S., & Noer, F. (2021). Improving reading comprehension skill through Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) learning strategy. *Journal of Science and Education, 1*(2), 60–71. https://doi.org/10.56003/jse.v1i2.28
23. Tang, S., Irby, B. J., Tong, F., & Lara-Alecio, R. (2021). The effects of cooperative, collaborative, and peer-tutoring strategies on English learners' reading and speaking proficiencies in an English-medium context: A research synthesis. *Sage Open*, *11*(4), 21-58. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211060823
24. Topping, K. J. (2005). Trends in Peer Learning. *Educational Psychology*, *25*(6), 631–645. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410500345172
25. Topping, K. J. (2015). Peer tutoring: old method, new developments. *Journal for the Study of Education and Development*, *38*(1), 1-29. https://doi.org/10.1080/02103702.2014.996407
26. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). 4-Vygotsky. https://www.fisicainteressante.com/files/est 1_4_-_vygotsky.pdf
27. Wahab, I., & Astri, Z. (2022). Students' Interest in Using Semantic Mapping Technique in Learning English Writing Ability. *Journal of Indonesian Scholars for Social Research*, *2*(1), 68-71. https://ojs.ycit.or.id/index.php/JISSR/article/view/19
28. Wahab, I., Astri, Z., Tanasy, N., & Fachrunnisa, N. (2021). A conversation analysis: The use of small-talk. *Scope of English Language Teaching Literature and Linguistics*, *4*(1), 53–62. https://ejournals.umma.ac.id/index.php/seltics
29. Widoro, E. (2025). *Development of a learning model for the gas turbine engine fundamental course using peer tutoring approach* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Negeri Jakarta).
30. Xu, Y. (2015). Examining the effects of adapted peer tutoring on social and language skills of young English language learners. *Early Child Development and Care*, *185*(10), 1587-1600. https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2015.1011150

Copyright © ISRG Publishers. All rights Reserved.
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17332745