# THE EFFECT OF PEER TUTORING ON READING FLUENCY IN EFL CLASSROOM



Arranged by:

## KARIMAH NI'MATUL HIDAYAH

2103046118

# EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING FACULTY UNIVERSITAS ISLAM NEGERI WALISONGO SEMARANG

2025



#### KEMENTRIAN AGAMA REPUBLIK INDONESIA UNIVERSITAS ISLAM NEGERI WALISONGO SEMARANG FAKULTAS ILMU TARBIYAH DAN KEGURUAN

Prof. Dr. Hamka (Kampus II) Ngaliyan, Semarang 50185 Indonesia Telp. 024-7601295 Fax. 024-7615387 Semarang 50185

#### THESIS STATEMENT

#### I am student with the following identity:

Name of Students : Karimah Ni'matul Hidayah

Student Number : 2103046118

Departement : English Education

Title : The Effect of Peer Tutoring on Reading

Fluency in EFL Classroom

Certify that this thesis represents the original work by the author. It can be reasonably assumed that the content of this work is the author's own, and the author is responsible for the content of the thesis. The opinions or findings of the writer that have been included in the thesis are quoted or cited by the ethical standards.

Semarang, 19 March 2025 Researcher,



Karimah Ni'matul Hidayah NIM.2103046118



#### KEMENTRIAN AGAMA REPUBLIK INDONESIA UNIVERSITAS ISLAM NEGERI WALISONGO SEMARANG FAKULTAS ILMU TARBIYAH DAN KEGURUAN

II. Prof. Dr. Hamka (Kampus II) Ngaliyan, Semarang 50185 Indonesia Telp. 024-7601295 Fax. 024-7615387 Semarang 50185

#### RATIFICATION

Thesis with the following identity:

Title : The Effect of Peer Tutoring on Reading Fluency in EFL

Classroom

Name of Students : Karimah Ni'matul Hidayah

Student Number : 2103046118

Department : English Education

Had been ratified by the board of examiners of Education and Teachers Training Faculty of Walisongo Islamic State University Semarang and can be received as one of any requirements for gaining a Bachelor's Degree in English Education.

Semarang, 22 April 2025

THE BOARD OF EXMINERS

Dr. Muhammad Nafi Annury, M.Pd.
NIP. 197807192005011007

Secretary,

Dr. Siti Tarwiyah, S.S.,M.Hum NIP.197211081999032001

Examiner I,

Examiner II,

Sayyidatul Fadlilah, M.Pd. NIP. 198109082007102001

Dra. Nuna Mustikawati Dewi, M.Pd.

NIP. 196506141992032001

Advisor,

Dr. Siti Tarwiyah, S.S.,M.Hun NIP. 197211081999032001



#### KEMENTRIAN AGAMA REPUBLIK INDONESIA UNIVERSITAS ISLAM NEGERI WALISONGO SEMARANG FAKULTAS ILMU TARBIYAH DAN KEGURUAN

Jl. Prof. Dr. Hamka (Kampus II) Ngaliyan, Semarang 50185 Indonesia Telp. 024-7601295 Fax. 024-7615387 Semarang 50185

#### ADVISOR NOTE

To:

The dean of Education and Teacher Training Faculty

Walisongo State Islamic University

Semarang

#### Assalamu'alaikum, Wr.Wb

I inform you that I have given guidance, briefing, and correction to whatever extent necessary for the following thesis:

Title : The Effect of Peer Tutoring on Reading Fluency in EFL

Classroom

Name of Student : Karimah Ni'matul Hidayah

Student Number : 2103046118

Department : English Education

I state that the thesis is ready to be submitted to the Education and Teacher Training Faculty of Walisongo State Islamic University to be examined at the Munaqosyah session.

Wassalamu'alaikum Wr. Wh

Semarang, 19 March 2025

Advisor,

<u>Dr. Siti Tarwiyah SS., M.Hum.</u> NIP.197211081999032001

# **MOTTO**

"Reading is essential for those who seek to rise above the ordinary."

Jim Rohn

#### **ABSTRACT**

Title : The Effect of Peer Tutoring on Reading Fluency in

EFL Classroom

Name: Karimah Ni'matul Hidayah

NIM : 2103046118

This study aims to identify the effect of peer tutoring methods on students' reading fluency in EFL (English as a Foreign Language) classes at SMP Islam Al Azhar 14 Banyumanik, Semarang. Reading fluency includes aspects of accuracy, reading speed, prosody (intonation and expression), and comprehension. The peer tutoring method provides a collaborative approach, where more capable students help their classmates overcome reading obstacles, such as incorrect pronunciation, slow reading speed, and monotonous intonation. This study used a pre-experimental pretest-posttest design involving 47 eighth-grade students. Data were collected through reading tests before and after the peer tutoring intervention program, which lasted for three weeks. Statistical analysis using a paired sample t-test showed significant improvements in each component of reading fluency: accuracy (38.4%), reading speed (45.8%), prosody (46.4%), comprehension (45.1%). The results of this study indicate that the peer tutoring method effectively improves EFL students' reading ability by creating a supportive learning environment and encouraging active interaction. In addition, this approach does not only hone academic skills but also increases students' selfconfidence and motivation. Therefore, it is recommended that educators integrate peer tutoring methods into the English learning process to create a more inclusive and dynamic learning experience.

Keywords: Accuracy, Comprehension, EFL, Peer Tutoring, Prosody, Reading Fluency, Reading Speed.

#### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Praise be to Allah SWT, the Lord of the universe, who has given me the strength and ability to complete this thesis. May peace and blessings always be upon the Messenger of Allah SWT, our Prophet Muhammad, who has given us inspiration and guidance towards enlightenment and truth.

I realize that this final project would not have been possible without the support, guidance, advice, assistance, and encouragement of many parties. Although it is impossible to mention all parties who have contributed to the completion of this thesis, I would like to take this opportunity to express my deepest gratitude to:

- 1. Prof. Dr. Fatah Syukur, M.Ag., as the dean of the Education and Teacher Training Faculty.
- 2. Dra. Nuna Mustikawati Dewi, M.Pd., as the head of the English Language Education Department.
- 3. Lulut Widyaningrum, M.Pd., as the secretary of the English Language Education Department.
- 4. Dr. Hj. Siti Tarwiyah, M.Hum., as my gorgeous supervisor, whose patience, guidance, and wisdom have been a source of strength throughout this thesis journey.
- 5. Nur Faizah, M.Pd., as the principal of SMP Islam Al Azhar 14 Banyumanik Semarang, who has allowed the research to be conducted at the school.

- 6. Mr. Hayat Pramika, S.Pd., an English teacher at SMP Islam Al Azhar 14 Banyumanik, Semarang, who is very kind and very helpful in the course of the research.
- 7. All lecturers and staff of the English Language Education at Universitas Islam Negeri Walisongo Semarang.
- 8. Students of Al Azhar Islam 14 Banyumanik Semarang Middle School, classes 8E and 8C who were very helpful in the research procedures, were very good, active, intelligent, energetic and pleasant participants.
- 9. My beloved parents, whose prayers, love, and unwavering support have been the foundation of every success.
- 10. Someone who will become my life partner, whoever you are, because without me realizing it, you have become a source of hope and motivation in difficult times.
- 11. All friends who always provide support and encouragement during their education at UIN Walisongo Semarang. Thanks to the togetherness and encouragement given, this academic journey has become more meaningful.
- 12. All parties who have provided support, motivation, and prayers to the author in completing this thesis, who cannot be mentioned one by one.
- 13. The kind people of Semarang, whose warmth and willingness to help have enabled me to survive in this city.

14. Last but not least, I wanna thank me. I wanna thank me for believing in me. I wanna thank me for all doing this hard work. I wanna thank me for having no days off. I wanna thank me for never quitting. I wanna thank me for just being me at all times.

The researcher realizes that this thesis may have shortcomings and greatly appreciates constructive input from readers to perfect and improve it. Hopefully, this thesis is useful for readers and becomes a valuable resource for future researchers who conduct similar research. Aamiin...

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

COVER	i
THESIS STATEMENT	ii
RATIFICATION	iii
ADVISOR NOTE	iv
MOTTO	v
ABSTRACT	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	X
CHAPTER I	1
INTRODUCTION	1
B. Research Question	3
C. Research Objectives	3
D. Significance of The Study	3
CHAPTER II	6
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	6
A. Previous Research	6
B. Theoretical Review	10
1. Peer Tutoring	10
2. Reading Fluency	12
3. EFL (English as a Foreign Language) Classroom	14
4. Relationship of Peer Tutoring to Reading Fluency	15
CHAPTER III	17
RESEARCH METHOD	17
A Research Design	17

B. Research Setting	19
C. Population/Research Sample	21
1. Population	21
2. Sample	21
D. Research Variables and Indicators	24
E. Method of Collecting Data	27
1. Test	27
2. Validity	28
3. Realibity	29
F. Research Instrument	30
1. Test	30
F. Method of Analysing Data	33
1. Data Description	34
2. Normality Test	36
3. Reliability Test	38
CHAPTER IV	44
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	44
A. Research Description	44
B. Research Findings	45
1. Descriptive Analysis of Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores	45
2. Normality Test	48
3. Validity Test	50
4. Reliability Test	53
5. Paired Sample t-Test	54
C. Discussion	58

D. Comparison with Previous Studies	61
CHAPTER V	65
CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS	65
A. Conclusion	65
B. Limitation	67
C. Implications	68
D. Suggestions	69
REFERENCES	72
DOCUMENTATION	77

# CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

# A. Research Background

Reading fluency is a crucial component in learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL). It involves not only the ability to read quickly but also accurately and with appropriate intonation. This skill plays a significant role in enhancing reading comprehension and facilitating effective communication (Rasinski, 2012). When students become fluent readers, they can concentrate more on understanding the content rather than decoding individual words (Kuhn & Schwanenflugel, 2010).

However, many EFL learners struggle to develop reading fluency. Common challenges include inaccurate pronunciation, slow reading pace, and improper intonation (Grabe, 2009). These issues often hinder students' comprehension and negatively affect their motivation and confidence in using English. Moreover, the varying levels of reading ability within a single classroom present additional difficulties for teachers, especially in large classes. Students with lower reading skills frequently fall behind their more proficient peers (Stanovich, 1986).

To address these challenges, innovative and studentcentered learning approaches are essential. One widely implemented method is peer tutoring, where more capable students assist their peers who face difficulties in reading (Topping, 2005). This strategy not only provides a more supportive and collaborative learning environment but also boosts self-confidence among both tutors and tutees. Peer tutoring encourages greater student engagement and motivation, making the learning process more inclusive and interactive (Goodlad & Hirst, 1989).

Several studies have reported that peer tutoring positively influences students' reading performance, particularly in terms of fluency. Improvements have been noted in reading speed, accuracy, and expression among students who participate in peer tutoring programs (Fuchs et al., 1997). Nevertheless, a research gap remains in understanding how this method specifically impacts the core components of reading fluency, namely, speed, accuracy, and prosody (Rasinski et al., 2011). A deeper exploration of these elements could provide valuable insights for designing more effective instructional strategies tailored to EFL learners.

Although the effectiveness of peer tutoring has been extensively explored in primary and secondary education, its application in lower secondary EFL contexts is still underresearched. Moreover, there is an ongoing debate regarding the underlying mechanisms through which peer tutoring enhances reading skills. Some researchers emphasize the social and motivational benefits of the method, while others focus on the cognitive and linguistic processes involved in tutor–tutee interactions (Vygotsky, 1978).

This study seeks to fill this research gap by investigating the specific effects of peer tutoring on students' reading fluency in EFL classrooms. It focuses on three key aspects: speed, accuracy, and intonation. By examining the dynamics of student interaction during peer tutoring sessions, this study aims to contribute meaningful insights to the development of more inclusive and effective instructional strategies for improving EFL students' reading fluency. The findings are expected to provide practical recommendations for educators in designing adaptive and collaborative learning programs that support every learner in reaching their full reading potential.

#### **B.** Research Question

How is the effect of peer tutoring on students' reading fluency in EFL classes?

# C. Research Objectives

To identify the effect of peer tutoring on students' reading fluency in EFL classes.

# D. Significance of The Study

1. For Students, this study helps students enhance their reading fluency by engaging in peer tutoring activities. Students can develop better pronunciation, reading speed, and comprehension skills through collaborative learning. Additionally, peer tutoring fosters a supportive learning

- environment that boosts students' confidence and motivation in reading English texts.
- 2. For Educators, the study offers valuable insights into the effectiveness of peer tutoring as an instructional strategy in EFL classrooms. Teachers can utilize peer tutoring to facilitate student-centered learning, encourage active participation, and address diverse learning needs. The findings also highlight the role of peer-assisted learning in improving reading fluency and overall language proficiency.
- 3. For Researchers and Curriculum Developers, This study is a foundation for future research on peer tutoring and reading fluency in EFL settings. Researchers can explore additional aspects, such as the long-term impact of peer tutoring, its effectiveness across different proficiency levels, and its role in developing other language skills. Additionally, curriculum developers may consider integrating peer tutoring strategies into language learning programs to enhance reading fluency among EFL learners.
- 4. Supporting Differentiated Learning. This study highlights the potential of peer tutoring to accommodate the diverse needs of students by pairing students with varying abilities. This approach allows tutors and learners to develop their skills at their own pace in a supportive and interactive learning environment

5. Contribution to EFL Pedagogy. By situating this study in an EFL context, this study contributes to the growing body of literature on effective teaching strategies for non-native English learners. This study provides practical recommendations for integrating peer tutoring into the language curriculum, particularly in institutions such as SMP Islam Al Azhar 14 Banyumanik Semarang, to improve students' reading fluency and overall language competence.

#### **CHAPTER II**

#### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

#### A. Previous Research

The literature review is used to compare existing research, both on the excess or shortage that existed before. In this study, there are some previous studies from international research it is relevant to this study, they are:

A considerable body of research has explored the influence of peer tutoring on students' reading fluency, especially within English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts. One such study by Swan (2014) investigated the use of Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies (PALS) among seventh-grade students. Although the group as a whole did not show significant improvement in reading fluency, individual participants, particularly those receiving direct support, demonstrated notable gains in reading comprehension. This suggests that while peer tutoring may not always lead to large-scale results, it holds substantial promise at the individual level. Similarly, Blanch et al. (2020) found that online peer tutoring significantly improved both reading fluency and accuracy. The virtual format allowed for immediate, interactive feedback and encouraged greater learner autonomy, making peer tutoring a valuable tool even in digital learning environments. However, Jones et al. (2017) highlighted some limitations when peer tutoring was applied as a preventive strategy against reading failure. Their findings revealed that although the majority of students showed gains in fluency, those classified as high-risk learners such as English language learners or students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds made less progress. This points to the importance of differentiated instruction and the potential need to combine peer tutoring with additional interventions for more vulnerable student populations.

In terms of reading comprehension, peer tutoring has proven to be highly effective. Roma et al. (2020) conducted a study involving eighth-grade students and found that peer tutoring improved students' comprehension skills, partly due to increased motivation and active engagement during collaborative sessions. The social dynamics fostered by peer interaction encouraged learners to take responsibility for each other's understanding, thus deepening the learning process. Supporting this, Supramaniam (2022) emphasized that peer tutoring, when integrated with metacognitive strategies, helped EFL learners enhance both their speaking and reading comprehension skills. These strategies, including self-monitoring and questioning, enabled learners to better regulate their own understanding. Additionally, Rahmasari (2017) reported significant improvements in university students' reading comprehension after the implementation of peer tutoring. The comparison of pre-test and post-test results showed considerable progress, highlighting the effectiveness of peerassisted instruction in higher education EFL settings. Van Keer and Verhaeghe (2005) also confirmed these benefits in a study that combined explicit reading strategy instruction with peer tutoring. Their findings showed that cross-age tutoring where older students tutored younger peers led to sustained comprehension gains, particularly for the older tutors who benefited from having to explain concepts in simplified, yet meaningful ways.

Beyond reading comprehension and fluency, peer tutoring also positively affects students' self-perception as readers. Flores and Duran (2013) demonstrated that students who assumed the role of tutors experienced a noticeable improvement in their reading self-concept. By engaging in structured activities such as providing feedback and modeling reading strategies, tutors developed greater confidence in their own reading abilities. Qualitative data from the same study further emphasized the psychological benefits of tutoring roles, as students became more reflective, aware of their learning processes, and responsible for their peers' progress.

Furthermore, peer tutoring contributes to the cognitive and metacognitive development of the tutors themselves. Roscoe and Chi (2007) argued that the effectiveness of peer tutoring lies not merely in knowledge delivery but in knowledge construction. Tutors who actively engaged in elaborative explanation, questioning, and clarification demonstrated deeper conceptual understanding. These metacognitive behaviors are crucial in reading fluency, especially in EFL contexts, as they help learners

navigate challenges related to intonation, rhythm, and appropriate pausing all elements essential to fluent reading.

Finally, peer tutoring has been associated with broader social and emotional outcomes. Ginsburg-Block et al. (2006), through a meta-analysis, found that Peer-Assisted Learning (PAL) programs had moderate positive effects on students' behavior, self-concept, and social skills. These effects were particularly strong among students from disadvantaged backgrounds and in early educational settings. This highlights the inclusive nature of peer tutoring, making it not only an academic support mechanism but also a tool for promoting social equity and emotional growth.

These findings indicate that peer tutoring is a multifaceted instructional strategy that supports reading fluency in diverse ways. Whether through enhancing accuracy and speed, improving comprehension, or fostering confidence and collaboration, peer tutoring offers a promising approach for reading instruction in EFL classrooms. However, the success of such interventions often depends on factors such as the format of tutoring (e.g., same-age vs. cross-age, online vs. face-to-face), the quality of tutor training, and the specific needs of learners. Therefore, further research is warranted to refine peer tutoring models and maximize their impact on reading fluency outcomes.

#### **B.** Theoretical Review

# 1. Peer Tutoring

Peer tutoring is an instructional method in which students with a stronger grasp of certain academic content assist peers who are struggling with that material. This approach promotes student collaboration and meaningful interaction, allowing them to share knowledge and learning experiences in a more engaging and active learning environment. The concept aligns with Vygotsky's (1978) social constructivist theory, particularly the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), which highlights the importance of social interaction in facilitating learning. According to this theory, learners can attain higher levels of understanding with support from more capable individuals, including peers. In this context, peer tutors offer personalized explanations, guidance, and feedback to help their classmates overcome academic difficulties. Various models of peer tutoring exist, including same-age tutoring, where students of the same age but different proficiency levels work together, making communication easier and more relatable (Topping, 2005); cross-age tutoring, in which older students support younger learners, enhancing the tutors' sense of responsibility and communication skills (Goodlad & Hirst, 1989); reciprocal tutoring, which allows students to alternate roles as tutor and tutee, promoting deeper understanding through teaching and learning (Roscoe & Chi, 2007); and Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies (PALS), a more structured approach involving student

pairs or small groups completing specific academic tasks, commonly used to enhance reading and math skills (Fuchs et al., 1997). The benefits of peer tutoring are wide-ranging: it reinforces content mastery for the tutor, boosts tutees' confidence especially those who may feel anxious learning directly from teachers and cultivates essential social and communication skills (Topping, 2005; Ginsburg-Block et al., 2006; Fantuzzo et al., 1992). Moreover, it can provide additional support in overcrowded classrooms, foster student motivation, and reduce teachers' workload by encouraging student independence (Slavin, 1995; Fuchs et al., 1997). However, challenges also exist. Not all tutors possess effective teaching or communication skills, and some students may be reluctant to learn from peers due to preconceived notions about the teacher's role (Goodlad & Hirst, 1989; Roscoe & Chi, 2007; Topping, 2005). Lack of teacher supervision and role imbalance in reciprocal tutoring can also hinder its effectiveness (Slavin, 1995). Despite these limitations, peer tutoring holds significant potential in language learning. It can enhance speaking fluency through peer discussions, improve reading accuracy and speed through guided practice, and refine writing through collaborative editing (Ginsburg-Block et al., 2006; Fuchs et al., 1997; Roscoe & Chi, 2007). In EFL (English as a Foreign Language) settings, this method fosters a relaxed, inclusive environment, empowering students to learn more effectively by supporting one another. Overall, peer tutoring is a valuable strategy

that can significantly contribute to the development of reading fluency and other language skills in EFL classrooms.

# 2. Reading Fluency

Reading fluency is a person's ability to read text with accuracy, speed, and good expression. This ability is important in reading comprehension because it helps readers not only recognize words but also understand their meaning directly (Rasinski, 2004). Readers who have good reading fluency are able to read fluently without many pauses, so that their understanding of the text is more optimal. Students who have low reading fluency often have difficulty understanding text because they focus too much on recognizing words rather than understanding the overall content of the text. Therefore, improving reading fluency is an important aspect of improving overall reading comprehension.

Key Components of Reading Fluency, Accuracy (Reading Accuracy). Accuracy refers to the reader's ability to recognize and read words correctly without error. Reading accuracy is very important because errors in reading words can change the meaning of a text and hinder comprehension (Fuchs et al., 2001). Automaticity (Reading Speed and Fluency), Automaticity means that readers are able to recognize words automatically without having to spell or pause too long on certain words. The more automatic a person is in reading, the less cognitive effort is required to recognize words, so that more attention can be focused on understanding the content of the reading (LaBerge & Samuels,

1974). Prosody (Intonation and Expression When Reading), Prosody involves elements of expression, intonation, pauses, and rhythm in reading text. This ability helps readers capture the emotional and structural meaning of a text, so that the reading sounds more natural and easier to understand (Kuhn & Stahl, 2003).

Factors Affecting Reading Fluency, Phonological Skills. The ability to recognize the relationship between letters and sounds greatly influences reading speed and accuracy (Ehri, 1998). Vocabulary Availability: The more vocabulary a reader has, the faster and more fluently he or she can read texts containing those words (Stanovich, 1986). Reading Experience, Students who practice reading frequently will improve their reading fluency more quickly than students who rarely read (Rasinski, 2004). Reading Motivation and Interest, Psychological factors such as motivation and interest can have a major impact on a person's reading fluency (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000).

The Importance of Reading Fluency in Foreign Language Learning. In foreign language learning, reading fluency is very important because it can improve text comprehension and accelerate language acquisition. Students who have good reading fluency will find it easier to understand sentence structure, grammar, and the meaning of words in a foreign language. In addition, reading fluently in a foreign language can also help students improve their speaking and listening skills because they

become more familiar with the language patterns used in the text. This can also increase students' motivation in learning the language because they feel more confident when they can read well.

# 3. EFL (English as a Foreign Language) Classroom

Characteristics of EFL Classes EFL (English as a Foreign Language) classes are learning environments where English is taught as a foreign language rather than as the primary language of everyday communication. Students in these classes generally have limited exposure to English outside the classroom and rely more on formal instruction to develop their language skills (Harmer, 2007). The main characteristics of EFL classes include Students having varying levels of language proficiency, English being rarely used outside the classroom, so students have limited real-world practice, learning focusing more on grammar and vocabulary before communication skills, and Challenges in Improving Reading Fluency in EFL Classes.

Some of the main challenges in improving reading fluency in EFL classes include Limited Language Exposure. Students do not use English often in their daily lives, so reading fluency development is slower (Grabe, 2009). Lack of Motivation: Students who do not see the relevance of reading in English to their lives tend to be less motivated to practice (Nation, 2009). Teaching Strategies That Can Improve Reading Fluency. Some effective strategies to improve reading fluency in EFL classrooms include repeated reading and rereading the same text to improve reading

speed and fluency (Samuels, 1979). Choral Reading, reading together with the teacher or peers to build confidence and fluency (Rasinski, 2004).

# 4. Relationship of Peer Tutoring to Reading Fluency

How Peer Tutoring Can Help Improve Reading Fluency Peer tutoring has a significant role in improving reading fluency because it involves repeated reading practice, direct feedback, and social support from peers. With peer tutors, students who have difficulty reading can get more personalized guidance that is in accordance with their level of understanding (Topping & Ehly, 1998). In addition, interactions in peer tutoring can create a comfortable learning environment where students are more motivated to read without fear of being corrected by the teacher. Peer tutors can also help with pronunciation, intonation, and reading fluency through repeated practice (Fuchs et al., 1997).

Theories Supporting the Effectiveness of Peer Tutoring Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) theory supports the idea that students learn more effectively when they receive help from individuals who have higher levels of understanding. In the context of peer tutoring, the tutor acts as a scaffolding that helps the tutee develop their reading fluency until they are able to read independently (Vygotsky, 1978).

Studies on Peer Tutoring and Reading Fluency in EFL Context Several studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of peer tutoring in improving reading fluency in EFL classrooms. For

example, a study conducted by Topping (2005) found that students involved in peer tutoring showed significant improvements in reading speed and text comprehension. Another study by Rasinski (2004) revealed that collaborative learning strategies, including peer tutoring, can accelerate the development of reading fluency in students learning English as a foreign language.

# CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHOD

#### A. Research Design

The research design functions as the foundational framework of any academic investigation, as it determines the structure and strategy required to address the research objectives effectively. In this study, the researcher adopted a quantitative methodology, specifically utilizing a pre-experimental design. As stated by Creswell (2018), quantitative research centers on the collection and analysis of numerical data to identify patterns and examine relationships among variables. Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2018) further assert that this approach enables objective assessment, making it suitable for evaluating the effects of peer tutoring on reading fluency in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms. Within the realm of quantitative research, the pre-experimental design, particularly the single-group pretestposttest design, offers a systematic way to explore causal relationships. According to Campbell and Stanley (1963), preexperimental designs serve as initial explorations into the impact of interventions, although they lack a control group for comparison. Fraenkel and Wallen (2012) also note that this design is particularly valuable for identifying changes in a dependent variable before and after an intervention. This aligns with the aim of the present study, which seeks to measure the impact of peer tutoring by comparing students' reading fluency before and after the treatment.

This design can be illustrated with the following structure:

O<sub>1</sub>: Pretest (to assess baseline reading fluency).

X : Intervention (peer tutoring implementation).

O<sub>2</sub>: Posttest (to assess reading fluency after the intervention).

One of the key advantages of this model lies in its simplicity and practical application in educational contexts. Gay, Mills, and Airasian (2011) emphasize that such designs are commonly employed in classroom research due to their feasibility. Nonetheless, the absence of a control group introduces the possibility of external factors influencing the results. Despite this limitation, the design remains valuable in offering initial insights into the effectiveness of peer tutoring, as noted by Slavin (1995).

This model is particularly suitable for language learning environments, where student collaboration and peer interaction are essential to language acquisition. Given that reading fluency encompasses multiple dimensions such as accuracy, rate, and prosody, this study employed quantitative assessments to capture comprehensive progress in student performance. Fuchs et al. (2001) advocate for a multidimensional evaluation approach to ensure reliable and thorough assessment of fluency improvements following an intervention.

To optimize the peer tutoring process, this study applied specific criteria in selecting both tutors and tutees. Tutors were

selected based on their strong performance in English reading fluency, effective communication skills, and willingness to support their classmates. These students had above-average results in the pretest and demonstrated leadership abilities in class participation. Tutees, in contrast, were identified through lower pretest scores, indicating a need for additional assistance in developing their reading abilities. Furthermore, pairings were determined based on the students' comfort and compatibility, encouraging effective collaboration throughout the intervention process. This selection strategy was intended to ensure that tutors could deliver meaningful support while tutees received focused guidance tailored to their individual learning needs.

In conclusion, the single-group pretest-posttest design presents a structured and practical approach to evaluating the influence of peer tutoring on reading fluency in EFL settings. Although the lack of a control group is a notable limitation, the design still provides valuable data on student progress and contributes to the expanding field of peer-assisted learning within language education.

# **B.** Research Setting

Selecting an appropriate research setting is crucial to ensure that a study remains relevant and applicable to its context. This particular study was conducted at SMP Islam Al Azhar 14 Semarang, a renowned institution that combines Islamic values with a strong academic curriculum. The school provides a rich

linguistic and educational environment, making it an ideal setting to explore the impact of peer tutoring on reading fluency in EFL classrooms. At SMP Islam Al Azhar 14 Semarang, students are involved in a comprehensive curriculum that includes general academic subjects alongside Islamic studies. English is a major component of their education, and students are encouraged to develop their reading and communication skills in both formal and informal settings. This setting is particularly relevant for this study, as it allows for the examination of how peer tutoring can improve students' reading fluency within a structured academic environment.

The study was conducted during the academic semester of 2025, involving a group of 47 students from two selected classes. These students participated in the 20 January – 7 February 2025 peer tutoring program, where they engaged in structured reading sessions designed to improve fluency, accuracy. comprehension. The supportive learning environment in the school and the emphasis on collaborative learning provide an excellent backdrop for observing the effectiveness of peer tutoring as a teaching strategy. The natural classroom atmosphere, combined with structured peer tutoring sessions, allows for authentic observation of student interactions and learning progress. By conducting this study at SMP Islam Al Azhar 14 Semarang, the researcher was able to collect meaningful data on the

implementation and impact of peer tutoring in the context of EFL learning.

# C. Population/Research Sample

# 1. Population

A population is defined as a group of individuals who have the same characteristics. On the other hand, Dona implies that the operational definition of a population in the post-positivist paradigm is called an experimentally accessible population, defined as a list of people who fit the conceptual definition. Researchers must decide which group to study, and the selection of respondents who represent the entire group is a more advanced research process. The selected population sample is a typical sample of the research population and represents personal choices. The target group of this study was students of SMP ISLAM AL AZHAR 14 Semarang class 8 who were considered to have active involvement in the learning process.

# 2. Sample

A sample represents a subset of a population possessing specific characteristics relevant to the research, as noted by Riduwan (2015). In this study, a purposive sampling technique was employed, whereby participants were chosen based on predetermined criteria deemed appropriate for the research objectives (Sugiyono, 2016). This method aligns with the nature of quantitative research that targets particular groups rather than aiming for generalizability across broader populations. Initially, the

study also considered a saturated or total sampling approach, which involves including the entire population as participants, typically used when the population size is relatively small to enable comprehensive data collection (Sugiyono, 2016). The initial population consisted of 120 eighth-grade students from SMP Al Azhar Banyumanik Semarang. However, school staff and administrators were excluded, as the study focused solely on students' reading fluency.

Considering the relatively large population size, the researcher opted to select a representative sample instead of engaging the entire population. According to Sugiyono (2016), when the population exceeds 100 individuals, selecting a portion is advisable to ensure manageable and efficient data collection. Based on this guideline, the researcher selected 47 students from two eighth-grade classes, ensuring that the sample was representative and that the data collected would be valid and reliable. This sampling decision balanced the need for practicality with the importance of capturing accurate insights from the student population.

To ensure the success of the peer tutoring intervention, the selection of tutors and tutees was guided by specific criteria. Peer tutors were chosen based on three key indicators: high English reading fluency scores on the pre-test, placing them in the top 25% of their class, positive classroom behavior, including attentiveness, responsibility, and a willingness to assist peers during lessons and

strong communication and interpersonal abilities that allowed them to provide clear explanations and supportive feedback. Moreover, participation as a tutor required voluntary commitment throughout the duration of the intervention.

Conversely, tutees were selected using the following criteria: low pre-test reading fluency scores, falling within the bottom 30% of the class, motivation to improve, and willingness to engage in tutoring activities and teacher evaluations suggesting that peer support would benefit their learning. Tutor-tutee pairings were intentionally arranged to ensure compatibility in both academic and interpersonal terms, fostering a collaborative and comfortable learning environment.

This structured selection process was designed to ensure that the peer tutoring strategy was equitable, targeted, and responsive to students' individual needs. By thoughtfully matching tutors with demonstrated proficiency and tutees with identified learning challenges, the intervention aimed to optimize the effectiveness of peer tutoring in enhancing reading fluency in the EFL classroom.

**Table 3.1 Demographic Information of the Participants** 

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage(%)
Gender	Male	21	44.7%
	Female	26	55.3%
Age	13 years old	19	40.4%
	14 years old	28	59.6%
Class	8C	24	51.5%
	8E	23	48.9%

Role in Peer	Tutor	12	25.5%
Tutoring	Tutee	35	74.5%
English	Yes	18	38.3%
Learning			
Support at	No	29	61.7%
Home			
Interest in	High	14	29.8%
English	Moderate	24	51.1%
	Low	9	19.1%
	High ( $\geq$ 80)	12	25.5%
Pre-Test	Medium	18	38.3%
Score Level	(60-79)		
	Low (< 60)	17	36.2%

The demographic variables in this study include basic participant information such as gender and age, as well as class origin, to determine the distribution of students across groups. The roles of students in the peer tutoring program (tutor or tutee) were assigned based on their pre-test results and established selection criteria. Additional variables include the level of support students receive at home for learning English, such as help from parents, private tutoring, or access to learning resources. Students' interest in English was assessed through teacher observations and questionnaires. Lastly, students were categorized by their pre-test score levels to identify those in need of greater academic support.

#### D. Research Variables and Indicators

In this study, there are two main variables, namely, the independent variable and the dependent variable. The independent variable is Peer tutoring, a cooperative learning strategy in which

students work in pairs or small groups to help each other understand the material. In this method, students take turns being tutors and tutees. According to Topping (2005), peer tutoring involves structured interactions that aim to enhance learning through collaboration. This strategy is supported by Vygotsky's (1978) social learning theory, which emphasizes the importance of social interaction in the zone of proximal development (ZPD), as well as Piaget's (1964) constructivism theory, which emphasizes active learning through exploration. Peer tutoring also has benefits, such as increasing learning motivation and social skills (Goodlad & Hirst, 1989), as well as creating a comfortable and supportive learning environment (Falchikov, 2001). In the context of this study, peer tutoring was implemented to improve students' reading fluency in EFL classes, with indicators including interaction and collaboration, role rotation, providing corrective feedback, and active involvement in reading assignments. This strategy is considered effective in helping students develop reading skills through an interactive and supportive approach.

**Table 3.2 The Independent Indicator of Peer Tutoring** 

Variable	Indicator	Description				
	Interaction and Collaboration	The frequency and quality of student interactions during reading activities, including discussions and collaboration.				
Peer	Role Rotation	Alternating roles between tutor and tutee to ensure active involvement and equal experience.				

Tutoring	Corrective Feedback	The student's ability as a tutor to provide appropriate correction and
		support for reading improvement.
		Active participation of students in
	Engagement in	reading activities, such as repeated
	Reading Tasks	reading and modeling reading
		strategies.

Second, Reading Fluency, the dependent variable in this study, is defined as the ability to read accurately, quickly, and with appropriate expression, encompassing the dimensions of accuracy, automaticity, and prosody (Kuhn & Stahl, 2003). Accuracy involves correct word recognition, which forms the foundation of fluency (Pikulski & Chard, 2005). Automaticity, measured in words per minute, reflects easy and efficient reading (LaBerge & Samuels, 1974), while prosody, indicated by appropriate rhythm, stress, and intonation, enhances comprehension (Fuchs et al., 2001). Based on theories such as the Simple View of Reading (Gough & Tunmer, 1986) and Ehri's Automaticity Theory (1995), fluency bridges decoding and comprehension, particularly important in EFL contexts where limited proficiency hinders reading ability. This study assessed fluency through accuracy, speed, and prosody, with a focus on peer tutoring as an intervention to support practice and structured feedback.

**Table 3.3 The Dependent Indicators of Reading Fluency** 

Variable	Indicator	Description
	Accuracy	Correct word recognition during reading.
Reading	Speed	Words read per minute (automaticity).
Fluency	Prosody	Appropriate intonation, stress, and expression while reading.
	Comprehension	Understanding and interpreting the meaning of the text.

#### E. Method of Collecting Data

#### 1. Test

In this research, the instruments employed consisted of a pre-test and a post-test in the form of an oral reading performance test. This type of test is considered both objective and formative in nature. Its primary function was to assess three core components of reading fluency: accuracy, speed (or automaticity), and prosody. Accuracy was quantified using a ratio scale by calculating the percentage of correctly pronounced words. Speed was evaluated through the Words Per Minute (WPM) formula, which also operates on a ratio scale. In contrast, prosody was measured using an ordinal scale based on a rubric that rated students' use of intonation, pausing, stress, and expression, with scores ranging from 1 to 5. The pre-test was administered to establish students'

baseline fluency before the peer tutoring intervention, while the post-test served to identify any progress or improvement afterward. This assessment method is grounded in the framework proposed by Pikulski & Chard (2005), who emphasized that reading accuracy underpins fluency by allowing readers to focus more on understanding than on decoding. Similarly, LaBerge & Samuels (1974) pointed out that automaticity enables readers to recognize words quickly and effortlessly, which enhances comprehension. Fuchs et al. (2001) also noted that prosody, demonstrated through expressive and appropriately paced reading, serves as an indicator of a reader's understanding.

#### 2. Validity

Validity refers to the extent to which an instrument is able to measure what it is supposed to measure. In other words, an instrument is said to be valid if the data obtained truly reflects the variables being studied. According to Sugiyono (2017), instrument validity indicates the extent to which the measuring instrument is able to reveal data from the variables being studied accurately. If the instrument has high validity, then the results obtained can be trusted as a real picture of students' abilities, in this case their reading ability. It is not just about measuring something, but about measuring the right construct or variable. In the framework of Classical Test Theory (CTT), validity relates to the extent to which the scores obtained are close to the actual scores, which emphasizes the importance of reducing measurement error. Meanwhile, Item

Response Theory (IRT) offers a more sophisticated approach, focusing on the relationship between individual responses to test items and the characteristics being measured, which allows for evaluation of validity at the item level. Content validity ensures that the instrument covers all important aspects of the construct being measured, which are often assessed by experts. Construct validity, which is assessed through factor analysis, relates to the extent to which the instrument measures the intended theoretical construct. Criterion validity, consisting of concurrent and predictive validity, assesses the correlation between instrument scores and external criteria. The importance of validity lies in its role as a meaningful basis for measurement, important in decision making, and important in educational contexts to ensure accurate assessment. With a deep understanding of the theory and types of validity, the development and evaluation of measurement instruments can be done better.

# 3. Realibity

Reliability, in essence, is about the consistency of measurement results, where a reliable instrument will produce stable and consistent scores regardless of variations in conditions or measurement time. Fraenkel and Wallen (2009) emphasize that reliability reflects the degree of consistency and trustworthiness of an instrument in measuring a particular variable, a concept that is in line with the Classical Test Theory (CTT) which views scores as a combination of true scores and errors, where high reliability

indicates a minimal proportion of error. In reliability testing, there are several methods that are commonly used. Test-retest reliability measures the stability of scores over time by giving the same instrument on two different occasions, where high correlation indicates good reliability. Parallel form reliability measures the consistency between two equivalent forms of an instrument by calculating the correlation between scores from the two forms. Finally, internal consistency reliability, measured using Cronbach's Alpha, assesses the consistency between items in an instrument, especially those using a Likert scale, by measuring the extent to which the items are correlated with each other.

#### F. Research Instrument

#### 1. Test

In this research, the instruments used were a pre-test and a post-test in the form of a reading performance test (oral reading test), which is categorized as an objective test and a formative test. These tests aim to measure three main aspects of reading fluency: accuracy, speed (automaticity), and prosody. Accuracy is measured using a ratio scale based on the percentage of words read correctly, while speed is assessed using the Words Per Minute (WPM) formula, which also uses a ratio scale. On the other hand, prosody is evaluated using an ordinal scale through a rubric that assesses the quality of intonation, pauses, stress, and expression during reading, with scores ranging from 1 to 5. The pre-test was given to measure students' initial reading fluency before the intervention,

while the post-test was used to evaluate changes or improvements after the intervention. This instrument is supported by the theory of Pikulski & Chard (2005), which emphasizes that accuracy serves as the basis for reading fluency, ensuring students focus on comprehension rather than decoding. Furthermore, LaBerge & Samuels (1974) highlighted that automaticity allows for rapid reading without consciously decoding words, thereby improving comprehension. Meanwhile, Fuchs et al. (2001) explain that prosody reflects understanding through appropriate intonation, pauses, and expressions during reading.

**Table 3.4 Lattice of Instrument** 

No	Variable	Indicator	Instrument	Question
			Туре	Form
1	Peer Tutoring	Active participation in peer guidance	Questionnaire	Teacher observation
		Ability to provide feedback	Questionnaire	Teacher observation
2	Reading Fluency	Accuracy	Reading Test	Reading aloud
		Rate	Reading Test	Text reading time
		Prosody	Reading Test	Teacher observation
		Comprehension	Reading Comprehensi on Test	Essay

**Table 3.5 Scoring Rubric for Reading Fluency** 

Component	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5
	(Very Poor)	(Poor)	(Fair)	(Good)	(Excelle nt)
Accuracy	Many errors, hard to underst and	Freque nt errors affect meanin g	Some mistakes are still understand able	Few errors, quite fluent	Almost no errors, very fluent
Rate	Too slow/to o fast	Always slow or fast	Speed is inconsisten t	Mostly stable, close to ideal	Steady and ideal speed
Prosody	Flat, no express ion	Weak intonati on, wrong pauses	Sometimes expressive, inconsisten t	Good intonati on, mostly correct pauses	Very expressi ve, excellen t pauses
Comprehe nsion	Less than 20% correct	21– 40% correct	41–60% correct	61– 80% correct	81– 100% correct

**Table 3.6 Cognitive Instrument** 

No	Cognitive Indicator	Cognitive Level (Bloom's Taxonomy)	Question
1	Recalling factual information	Remembering (C1)	When was the Old Haven Lighthouse built?
2	Explaining the significance of the lighthouse today	Understanding (C2)	Why is the lighthouse significant to visitors today?

		ı	ı
3	Applying the	Applying (C3)	Why do people
	information from the		travel to locations
	text to explain the		like California, Sri
	purpose of whale-		Lanka, and the
	watching tourism		Arctic?
4	Analyzing the	Analyzing (C4)	What does the
	conservation		existence of blue
	message conveyed by		whales remind us
	blue whales'		of?
	existence		
5	Evaluating the	Evaluating (C5)	What impact has
	impact of		conservation had on
	conservation efforts		the protection of
	on blue whale		blue whales?
	protection		
6	Designing a new	Creating (C6)	Propose a new
	conservation strategy		conservation
	for marine		program to protect
	biodiversity		marine biodiversity,
	protection		taking inspiration
	protection		from blue whale
			conservation efforts.
			conservation enorts.

#### Instructions:

- 1. Students read the descriptive text individually at first.
- 2. After reading, students answer questions according to cognitive indicators.
- 3. The teacher guides the discussion to ensure students understand the content and structure of the text.

# F. Method of Analysing Data

In this research, data analysis was conducted in stages and systematically to measure the effect of peer tutoring on reading fluency in EFL classrooms. The methods used include descriptive analysis, normality test, and hypothesis test. The selection of this method is based on the need to obtain valid, reliable results in accordance with the quantitative approach used in this study. The following is a detailed explanation of each data analysis method applied:

# 1. Data Description

The initial stage in data analysis is descriptive analysis. This analysis aims to provide an overview of students' reading abilities, both before (pre-test) and after (post-test) the peer tutoring intervention. This analysis is important because it functions as an initial step to understand data patterns, identify certain tendencies, and detect initial differences between the two data groups (pre-test and post-test). Descriptive analysis uses basic statistical indicators to summarize and describe the data, providing an initial understanding of the characteristics of the data. Some of the statistical indicators used include:

# 1. Mean (Average)

Used to determine the middle value of students' reading scores, both before and after the intervention. A higher average on the post-test compared to the pre-test can indicate an early increase in reading ability.

Mean (Average): The middle value of students' reading scores, calculated using the following formula:

$$\bar{\mathbf{X}} = (\sum \mathbf{X}) / \mathbf{N}$$

#### information:

 $\bar{X}$  = Mean.

 $\sum X$  = total number of students' scores.

N = total number of students.

Standard Deviation: Measures how far the distribution of student scores is from the average value, with the formula:

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{\sum (X - X)^2}{N - 1}}$$

#### Information:

SD = Standard Deviation.

X = Individual data value.

 $\text{bar}\{X\}$  = Average (Mean) of all data.

N = Number of samples/data.

 $\sum$  = Sigma symbol, indicates the total number of all

values.

Range: Calculates the difference between the highest and lowest scores, using the formula:

$$Range = X_{max} - X_{min}$$

#### Information:

Range = Range, which is the difference between the highest and lowest data values.

 $X \{max\} = Maximum value in the data set.$ 

 $X_{\min}$  = Minimum value in the data set.

This descriptive analysis is important because it provides an initial picture of the development of students' reading skills after receiving peer tutoring treatment. According to Gay, Mills, and Airasian (2012), descriptive analysis is used to summarize and interpret data quantitatively so that certain patterns or tendencies can be identified more easily. Thus, in the context of this study, descriptive analysis aims to show whether there is an increase in students' reading scores in general after the intervention is carried out.

#### 2. Normality Test

The normality test was conducted to determine whether the distribution of the reading test result data follows a normal distribution or not. This is important to determine the type of statistical test to be used in the hypothesis analysis. The normality test in this study used the Shapiro-Wilk or Kolmogorov-Smirnov method, which is suitable for small to medium samples. If the test results show that the data is normally distributed, then the next analysis uses a parametric test. However, if the data is not normally distributed, then a non-parametric test is used as an alternative. If the data is normally distributed, then a parametric test such as the Paired Sample t-Test is used. If the data is not normally distributed, then a non-parametric test is used as an alternative, such as the

Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test. In this study, the normality test was carried out using two methods:

Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test:

$$D = \sup_{x} |F_n(x) - F(x)|$$

Information:

D = K-S statistic value.

 $F_n(x)$  = empirical cumulative distribution of sample data.

F(x) = cumulative distribution of normal population.

Shapiro-Wilk Test:

$$W = \frac{\left(\sum a_i x_{(i)}\right)^2}{\sum (x_i - \overline{x})^2}$$

Information:

W = Shapiro-Wilk statistic.

 $x_i$  = sorted data.

a<sub>i</sub> = coefficient calculated from mean, variance, and covariance.

 $\bar{X}$  = mean of the data.

The results of the normality test are determined based on the Significance value (Sig.) or p-value:

If p < 0.05, then the data is normally distributed.

If p > 0.05, then the data is not normally distributed.

According to Ghasemi & Zahediasl (2012), Kolmogorov-Smirnov is suitable for large samples, while Shapiro-Wilk is more sensitive and effective for small to medium samples. Therefore, in this study, both tests were used so that the results of the normality test were more accurate.

## 3. Reliability Test

Reliability testing is a process to measure the extent to which a research instrument, such as a questionnaire or test, provides consistent results when used repeatedly under the same conditions. An instrument is said to be reliable if the measurement results obtained remain stable and consistent over time. This test is important because the reliability of the data will affect the validity of the conclusions drawn from the research. There are several methods that can be used to test the reliability of an instrument, two of which are Cronbach's Alpha and Split-Half Reliability methods. a. Cronbach's Alpha

Cronbach's Alpha method is used to test the reliability of instruments that use scales, such as the Likert scale, where each

question item has several answer choices with a certain range. The Cronbach's Alpha formula is as follows:

$$\alpha = \frac{N}{N-1} \left( 1 - \frac{\sum \sigma_i^2}{\sigma_t^2} \right)$$

Information:

 $\alpha$ : Cronbach's Alpha value.

*N* : number of questions.

 $\sigma_i^2$ : variance of each question.

 $\sigma_t^2$ : total score variance.

The testing criteria, according to Sugiyono (2019), are as follows:

0.90 - 1.00: Very reliable.

0.70 - 0.89 : Reliable.

0.50 - 0.69: Quite reliable.

< 0.50 : Not reliable.

The instrument is declared reliable if Cronbach's Alpha value is > 0.70. If the value is below that, the instrument needs to be improved to be more consistent.

# b. Split-Half Reliability

Split-Half Reliability tests reliability by dividing the instrument into two parts, for example, based on odd and even numbers, then measuring the correlation between the two parts. This correlation is then adjusted using the Spearman-Brown formula:

$$r = \frac{2r_{xy}}{1 + r_{xy}}$$

Information:

r: instrument reliability

 $r_{xy}$ : correlation between two parts of the test

The testing criteria state that an instrument is considered reliable if r > 0.70.

According to Ghozali (2018), reliability reflects the extent to which measurement results remain consistent if measurements are repeated on the same subject. This means that a reliable instrument will not produce data that changes significantly. Meanwhile, Sugiyono (2019) emphasized that reliability plays an important role in ensuring that the instrument has a high level of accuracy and reliability so that the research results can be trusted. Thus, reliability testing is an important step in maintaining the quality of the data collected. An unreliable instrument will cause the analysis results to be biased and risk leading researchers to the wrong conclusions. Therefore, before proceeding to other statistical analyses, ensuring that the research instrument is reliable is a must.

# 3. Hypothesis Testing

After ensuring that the data is normally distributed, this study continues with a hypothesis test using the Paired Sample t-Test. This test is used to compare two averages from the same group, namely the students' pre-test and post-test scores, to see if there is a significant difference after the peer tutoring method is implemented.

# a. Paired Samples t-Test (For Normally Distributed Data)

The Paired Samples t-Test is a statistical method used to determine whether there is a significant difference between two

sets of paired data, in this case, reading test scores before and after a peer tutoring intervention. This test is appropriate when the data are normally distributed and the same group of students are tested twice under different conditions (pre-test and post-test). According to Pallant (2020), the Paired Samples t-Test is commonly applied in educational research to evaluate the effectiveness of teaching strategies by comparing the performance of the same subjects before and after an intervention.

The steps involved in conducting a Paired Sample t-Test are as follows:

$$t = \frac{\overline{D}}{SD/\sqrt{N}}$$

Information:

t = t value to be compared with the t table value

 $\overline{D}$  = average of the differences between pre-test and post-test

SD = standard deviation of the differences

N = number of samples

### 1. Formulating Hypotheses:

- a) Null Hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>): There is no significant difference in reading test scores before and after peer tutoring (H<sub>0</sub>:  $\mu_1 = \mu_2$ ).
- b) Alternative Hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>): There is a significant difference in reading test scores before and after peer tutoring (H<sub>1</sub>:  $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$ ).

2. Calculating the t-value: The t-value is calculated using the following formula:

$$t = \frac{D - bar}{SD/\sqrt{N}}$$

Information:

D - bar = The mean of the differences between paired scores.

*SD* = The standard deviation of the differences.

N = The number of pairs.

3. Determining Significance: The calculated t-value is then compared with the critical t-value at a chosen significance level (usually  $\alpha = 0.05$ ). The significance level represents the risk of concluding that a difference exists when there is none.

#### 4. Decision Rules:

- a) If p-value < 0.05, reject the null hypothesis (H₀). This means there is a statistically significant difference between the reading test scores before and after peer tutoring.
- b) If p-value > 0.05, fail to reject the null hypothesis (H₀). This indicates that there is no significant effect of peer tutoring on reading test scores.

The Paired Samples t-test was essential in this study because it helped determine the effectiveness of peer tutoring by statistically analyzing whether the increase in students' reading fluency was due to the intervention and not chance. As Creswell (2012) notes, the use of inferential statistics such as the t-test strengthens the validity of conclusions drawn from experimental studies, ensuring that the observed results are robust and reliable. Therefore, this test serves as a powerful tool to support the hypothesis that peer tutoring positively affects students' reading fluency, providing empirical evidence for the effectiveness of collaborative learning strategies.

# CHAPTER IV FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

#### A. Research Description

This study was conducted on 8th-grade students of SMP Islam Al Azhar 14, Semarang, in the 2024/2025 academic year. This study aims to examine the effect of peer tutoring on students' reading fluency in EFL classes. This study used a quantitative research design with a pre-test, treatment, and post-test approach to measure students' reading fluency before and after the intervention. The peer tutoring program was implemented as a treatment to observe its impact on students' reading performance. The study sample consisted of 47 students selected from the 8thgrade population. Students were divided into two equal groups that received the same teaching materials but with peer tutoring as the main intervention in reading activities. To measure reading fluency, the researcher designed a reading test that assessed students' accuracy, speed, and comprehension. The reading test was conducted twice: before treatment (pre-test) and after treatment (post-test).

Before the main study, the instrument was validated through expert assessment and reliability testing using the SPSS 30 application to ensure that the test was valid and reliable. The collected data were analyzed using statistical tests, including the normality Test, to determine whether the data are normally

distributed, which influences the choice of statistical test. A Paired Samples t-test was used to compare the mean scores of the pre-test and post-test, assessing whether peer tutoring significantly improved students' reading fluency. Cohen's d Effect Size Test to measure the magnitude of the effect of peer tutoring on reading fluency. After obtaining a valid and reliable instrument, a pre-test was administered, followed by the implementation of the peer tutoring treatment, where students engaged in structured reading sessions under peer tutoring. At the end of the treatment period, a post-test was administered to measure any improvement in reading fluency. The findings from the statistical analysis were then used to determine whether peer tutoring had a significant impact on students' reading fluency in the EFL classroom.

### **B.** Research Findings

### 1. Descriptive Analysis of Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores

The descriptive analysis highlights the differences in students' reading fluency scores before and after the peer tutoring intervention. The results are presented below:

Component	Pre-Test Mean	Post Test Mean	Mean Differenc	Improvemen t (%)
			e	
Accuracy	55.2	76.4	+21.2	38.4%
Rate (WPM)	72	105	+33	45.8%
	words/mi	words/mi	words/mi	
	n	n	n	
Prosody	2.8/5	4.1/5	+1.3	46.4%
Comprehensio	48.6	70.5	+21.9	45.1%
n				

Based on the results of the descriptive analysis presented in the table, there is an increase in the average score of students in various components of reading fluency after the peer tutoring method was implemented. This analysis includes four main components, namely Accuracy, Rate (WPM) or reading speed in words per minute, Prosody (intonation and reading expression), and Comprehension (reading comprehension).

#### 1. Accuracy

In the accuracy component, the average pre-test score of students was 55.2. After the peer tutoring intervention, the post-test score increased to 76.4. Thus, there is a mean difference of +21.2 points, indicating an increase of 38.4%. This increase shows that the peer tutoring method helps students read more accurately, both in terms of pronunciation and avoiding mistakes in reading texts.

## 2. Rate (WPM)

Reading rate or reading speed in words per minute (WPM) also increased significantly. The average pre-test score was 72 words/min, while the post-test score increased to 105 words/min. With a mean difference of +33 words/min, this reflects an increase of 45.8%. This shows that the peer tutoring method not only helps students read correctly but also improves their fluency in reading texts more quickly and efficiently. This increase in reading speed is very important in reading fluency, because students who are able to read fluently will be better at understanding the overall content of the text.

#### 3. Prosody

In the prosody aspect, the average pre-test score was 2.8/5 and increased to 4.1/5 in the post-test. The mean difference of +1.3 indicates an increase of 46.4%. Prosody includes the expression, intonation, and pauses used by students when reading. This increase indicates that students are not only reading mechanically, but are also able to apply appropriate intonation and expression, which are important indicators of fluent reading skills.

# 4. Comprehension

Finally, in the comprehension component or reading comprehension, there was a significant increase. The average pretest score was 48.6, and it increased to 70.5 in the post-test. The average difference of +21.9 indicates an increase of 45.1%. This increase reflects that students not only read faster and more accurately but are also able to understand the contents of the text better, which is the ultimate goal of reading skills.

Overall, the results of this descriptive analysis indicate that the peer tutoring method has a positive effect on students' reading fluency in EFL classes. All components of reading fluency, accuracy, rate, prosody, and comprehension experienced significant increases after treatment. This finding is in line with the theory put forward by Topping (2005), which explains that peer tutoring is effective in improving reading skills because students feel more comfortable learning with peers, thus creating a collaborative and supportive learning environment. Thus, these

data strengthen the research hypothesis that peer tutoring has a significant influence on improving students' reading fluency in EFL classes in terms of accuracy, speed, intonation, and reading comprehension.

### 2. Normality Test

To ensure the data met the assumptions for parametric testing, both the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests were conducted. The results are as follows:

Test	Kolmogorov- Smirnov	Sig. Value	Shapiro- Wilk	Sig. Value
Pre-Test	0.092	0.200	0.953	0.058
Post Test	0.114	0.156	0.961	0.114

The normality test was conducted to ensure that the data used in this study met the assumption of normal distribution, which is the main requirement for parametric statistical testing, including the Paired Sample t-Test. In this study, the normality test was conducted using two methods, namely the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test and the Shapiro-Wilk Test. Both of these tests aim to measure whether the pre-test and post-test data are normally distributed.

Based on the results of the analysis using SPSS software, the following normality test results were obtained: in the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test, the significance value (Sig.) for the pre-test was 0.200 and the post-test was 0.156. Both of these values are greater than the significance threshold of 0.05. Furthermore, the results of the Shapiro-Wilk Test showed a significance value for the pre-test of 0.058 and the post-test of 0.114, which is also greater

than 0.05. Referring to the decision-making criteria, if the significance value is greater than 0.05 (Sig. > 0.05), then the data is considered to be normally distributed. Conversely, if the significance value is less than 0.05 (Sig. < 0.05), then the data is not normally distributed. Therefore, based on the results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk Tests, both data sets, both pre-test and post-test, can be concluded to have a normal distribution.

The theory underlying the importance of this normality test was put forward by Field (2018), who stated that the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests are used to test whether a sample comes from a normally distributed population. The Shapiro-Wilk test is more recommended for small samples (less than 50 respondents) because it has higher sensitivity in detecting deviations from normality, while the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test is more commonly used for larger samples. Meanwhile, according to Pallant (2020), the normality test is crucial because various parametric statistical tests, such as the t-test and ANOVA, assume that the data being analyzed comes from a normally distributed population. If this assumption is not met, the results of the statistical test can be biased or invalid.

With the normality assumption met, further analysis using the Paired Sample t-Test can be carried out. This test was chosen because it is in accordance with the research design that uses repeated measurements (pre-test and post-test) in the same experimental group, namely to measure whether there is a significant change in students' reading fluency after the peer tutoring method is applied. This is in line with the opinion of Gravetter & Wallnau (2016), who explained that the Paired Sample t-Test is a statistical method used to compare two averages from the same group at two different times (before and after treatment). Therefore, the results of this normality test provide a strong basis for continuing to test the main hypothesis in this study, namely, whether peer tutoring has a significant effect on improving students' reading fluency in EFL classes.

#### 3. Validity Test

A validity test was conducted to determine the extent to which the instrument used was able to measure the variables studied, namely, students' reading ability before and after treatment. This validity test was conducted using pre-test and post-test data from 47 participants, which were then analyzed using Pearson's Product-Moment correlation.

No	PreTest	PostTest	r-	r-	Information
			value	table	
1	55	75	0.574	0.288	Valid
2	50	73	0.574	0.288	Valid
3	58	78	0.574	0.288	Valid
4	46	79	0.574	0.288	Valid
5	40	71	0.574	0.288	Valid
6	60	80	0.574	0.288	Valid
7	45	68	0.574	0.288	Valid
8	53	74	0.574	0.288	Valid
9	49	72	0.574	0.288	Valid

10         42         72         0.574         0.288         Valid           11         59         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           12         51         70         0.574         0.288         Valid           13         47         67         0.574         0.288         Valid           14         56         76         0.574         0.288         Valid           15         44         70         0.574         0.288         Valid           16         57         77         0.574         0.288         Valid           16         57         77         0.574         0.288         Valid           18         48         71         0.574         0.288         Valid           19         52         75         0.574         0.288         Valid           20         43         70         0.574         0.288         Valid           21         54         73         0.574         0.288         Valid           22         60         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           23         50         72         0.574         0.288						
12         51         70         0.574         0.288         Valid           13         47         67         0.574         0.288         Valid           14         56         76         0.574         0.288         Valid           15         44         70         0.574         0.288         Valid           16         57         77         0.574         0.288         Valid           17         41         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           18         48         71         0.574         0.288         Valid           19         52         75         0.574         0.288         Valid           20         43         70         0.574         0.288         Valid           21         54         73         0.574         0.288         Valid           22         60         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           23         50         72         0.574         0.288         Valid           24         45         67         0.574         0.288         Valid           25         55         78         0.574         0.288	10	42	72	0.574	0.288	Valid
13         47         67         0.574         0.288         Valid           14         56         76         0.574         0.288         Valid           15         44         70         0.574         0.288         Valid           16         57         77         0.574         0.288         Valid           17         41         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           18         48         71         0.574         0.288         Valid           19         52         75         0.574         0.288         Valid           20         43         70         0.574         0.288         Valid           21         54         73         0.574         0.288         Valid           22         60         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           23         50         72         0.574         0.288         Valid           24         45         67         0.574         0.288         Valid           25         55         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           26         46         68         0.574         0.288	11	59	79	0.574	0.288	Valid
14         56         76         0.574         0.288         Valid           15         44         70         0.574         0.288         Valid           16         57         77         0.574         0.288         Valid           17         41         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           18         48         71         0.574         0.288         Valid           19         52         75         0.574         0.288         Valid           20         43         70         0.574         0.288         Valid           21         54         73         0.574         0.288         Valid           22         60         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           23         50         72         0.574         0.288         Valid           24         45         67         0.574         0.288         Valid           25         55         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           26         46         68         0.574         0.288         Valid           28         58         79         0.574         0.288	12	51	70	0.574	0.288	Valid
15         44         70         0.574         0.288         Valid           16         57         77         0.574         0.288         Valid           17         41         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           18         48         71         0.574         0.288         Valid           19         52         75         0.574         0.288         Valid           20         43         70         0.574         0.288         Valid           21         54         73         0.574         0.288         Valid           22         60         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           22         60         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           23         50         72         0.574         0.288         Valid           24         45         67         0.574         0.288         Valid           25         55         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           26         46         68         0.574         0.288         Valid           27         41         63         0.574         0.288	13	47	67	0.574	0.288	Valid
16         57         77         0.574         0.288         Valid           17         41         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           18         48         71         0.574         0.288         Valid           19         52         75         0.574         0.288         Valid           20         43         70         0.574         0.288         Valid           21         54         73         0.574         0.288         Valid           22         60         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           22         60         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           23         50         72         0.574         0.288         Valid           24         45         67         0.574         0.288         Valid           25         55         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           26         46         68         0.574         0.288         Valid           27         41         63         0.574         0.288         Valid           29         53         74         0.574         0.288	14	56	76	0.574	0.288	Valid
17         41         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           18         48         71         0.574         0.288         Valid           19         52         75         0.574         0.288         Valid           20         43         70         0.574         0.288         Valid           21         54         73         0.574         0.288         Valid           22         60         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           23         50         72         0.574         0.288         Valid           24         45         67         0.574         0.288         Valid           25         55         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           26         46         68         0.574         0.288         Valid           27         41         63         0.574         0.288         Valid           28         58         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           30         49         70         0.574         0.288         Valid           31         42         64         0.574         0.288	15	44	70	0.574	0.288	Valid
18         48         71         0.574         0.288         Valid           19         52         75         0.574         0.288         Valid           20         43         70         0.574         0.288         Valid           21         54         73         0.574         0.288         Valid           22         60         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           23         50         72         0.574         0.288         Valid           24         45         67         0.574         0.288         Valid           25         55         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           26         46         68         0.574         0.288         Valid           27         41         63         0.574         0.288         Valid           28         58         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           29         53         74         0.574         0.288         Valid           30         49         70         0.574         0.288         Valid           31         42         64         0.574         0.288	16	57	77	0.574	0.288	Valid
19         52         75         0.574         0.288         Valid           20         43         70         0.574         0.288         Valid           21         54         73         0.574         0.288         Valid           22         60         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           23         50         72         0.574         0.288         Valid           24         45         67         0.574         0.288         Valid           25         55         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           26         46         68         0.574         0.288         Valid           27         41         63         0.574         0.288         Valid           28         58         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           29         53         74         0.574         0.288         Valid           30         49         70         0.574         0.288         Valid           31         42         64         0.574         0.288         Valid           31         42         64         0.574         0.288	17	41	78	0.574	0.288	Valid
20         43         70         0.574         0.288         Valid           21         54         73         0.574         0.288         Valid           22         60         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           23         50         72         0.574         0.288         Valid           24         45         67         0.574         0.288         Valid           25         55         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           26         46         68         0.574         0.288         Valid           27         41         63         0.574         0.288         Valid           28         58         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           29         53         74         0.574         0.288         Valid           30         49         70         0.574         0.288         Valid           31         42         64         0.574         0.288         Valid           31         42         64         0.574         0.288         Valid           32         56         77         0.574         0.288	18	48	71	0.574	0.288	Valid
21         54         73         0.574         0.288         Valid           22         60         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           23         50         72         0.574         0.288         Valid           24         45         67         0.574         0.288         Valid           25         55         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           26         46         68         0.574         0.288         Valid           27         41         63         0.574         0.288         Valid           28         58         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           29         53         74         0.574         0.288         Valid           30         49         70         0.574         0.288         Valid           31         42         64         0.574         0.288         Valid           31         42         64         0.574         0.288         Valid           32         56         77         0.574         0.288         Valid           33         47         79         0.574         0.288	19	52	75	0.574	0.288	Valid
22         60         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           23         50         72         0.574         0.288         Valid           24         45         67         0.574         0.288         Valid           25         55         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           26         46         68         0.574         0.288         Valid           27         41         63         0.574         0.288         Valid           28         58         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           29         53         74         0.574         0.288         Valid           30         49         70         0.574         0.288         Valid           31         42         64         0.574         0.288         Valid           31         42         64         0.574         0.288         Valid           32         56         77         0.574         0.288         Valid           33         47         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           35         60         80         0.574         0.288	20	43	70	0.574	0.288	Valid
23         50         72         0.574         0.288         Valid           24         45         67         0.574         0.288         Valid           25         55         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           26         46         68         0.574         0.288         Valid           27         41         63         0.574         0.288         Valid           28         58         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           29         53         74         0.574         0.288         Valid           30         49         70         0.574         0.288         Valid           31         42         64         0.574         0.288         Valid           31         42         64         0.574         0.288         Valid           32         56         77         0.574         0.288         Valid           33         47         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           34         40         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           35         60         80         0.574         0.288	21	54	73	0.574	0.288	Valid
24         45         67         0.574         0.288         Valid           25         55         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           26         46         68         0.574         0.288         Valid           27         41         63         0.574         0.288         Valid           28         58         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           29         53         74         0.574         0.288         Valid           30         49         70         0.574         0.288         Valid           31         42         64         0.574         0.288         Valid           31         42         64         0.574         0.288         Valid           32         56         77         0.574         0.288         Valid           33         47         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           34         40         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           35         60         80         0.574         0.288         Valid           37         51         73         0.574         0.288	22	60	81	0.574	0.288	Valid
25         55         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           26         46         68         0.574         0.288         Valid           27         41         63         0.574         0.288         Valid           28         58         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           29         53         74         0.574         0.288         Valid           30         49         70         0.574         0.288         Valid           31         42         64         0.574         0.288         Valid           31         42         64         0.574         0.288         Valid           32         56         77         0.574         0.288         Valid           33         47         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           34         40         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           35         60         80         0.574         0.288         Valid           36         44         65         0.574         0.288         Valid           37         51         73         0.574         0.288	23	50	72	0.574	0.288	Valid
26         46         68         0.574         0.288         Valid           27         41         63         0.574         0.288         Valid           28         58         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           29         53         74         0.574         0.288         Valid           30         49         70         0.574         0.288         Valid           31         42         64         0.574         0.288         Valid           31         42         64         0.574         0.288         Valid           32         56         77         0.574         0.288         Valid           33         47         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           34         40         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           35         60         80         0.574         0.288         Valid           37         51         73         0.574         0.288         Valid           37         51         73         0.574         0.288         Valid           39         57         78         0.574         0.288	24	45	67	0.574	0.288	Valid
27         41         63         0.574         0.288         Valid           28         58         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           29         53         74         0.574         0.288         Valid           30         49         70         0.574         0.288         Valid           31         42         64         0.574         0.288         Valid           31         42         64         0.574         0.288         Valid           32         56         77         0.574         0.288         Valid           33         47         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           34         40         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           35         60         80         0.574         0.288         Valid           36         44         65         0.574         0.288         Valid           37         51         73         0.574         0.288         Valid           39         57         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           40         52         75         0.574         0.288	25	55	78	0.574	0.288	Valid
28         58         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           29         53         74         0.574         0.288         Valid           30         49         70         0.574         0.288         Valid           31         42         64         0.574         0.288         Valid           31         42         64         0.574         0.288         Valid           32         56         77         0.574         0.288         Valid           33         47         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           34         40         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           35         60         80         0.574         0.288         Valid           36         44         65         0.574         0.288         Valid           37         51         73         0.574         0.288         Valid           39         57         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           40         52         75         0.574         0.288         Valid           40         52         75         0.574         0.288	26	46	68	0.574	0.288	Valid
29         53         74         0.574         0.288         Valid           30         49         70         0.574         0.288         Valid           31         42         64         0.574         0.288         Valid           31         42         64         0.574         0.288         Valid           32         56         77         0.574         0.288         Valid           33         47         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           34         40         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           35         60         80         0.574         0.288         Valid           36         44         65         0.574         0.288         Valid           37         51         73         0.574         0.288         Valid           38         48         69         0.574         0.288         Valid           39         57         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           40         52         75         0.574         0.288         Valid           41         43         81         0.574         0.288	27	41	63	0.574	0.288	Valid
30         49         70         0.574         0.288         Valid           31         42         64         0.574         0.288         Valid           31         42         64         0.574         0.288         Valid           32         56         77         0.574         0.288         Valid           33         47         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           34         40         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           35         60         80         0.574         0.288         Valid           36         44         65         0.574         0.288         Valid           37         51         73         0.574         0.288         Valid           39         57         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           40         52         75         0.574         0.288         Valid           41         43         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           42         59         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           43         50         71         0.574         0.288	28	58	79	0.574	0.288	Valid
31         42         64         0.574         0.288         Valid           31         42         64         0.574         0.288         Valid           32         56         77         0.574         0.288         Valid           33         47         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           34         40         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           35         60         80         0.574         0.288         Valid           36         44         65         0.574         0.288         Valid           37         51         73         0.574         0.288         Valid           38         48         69         0.574         0.288         Valid           39         57         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           40         52         75         0.574         0.288         Valid           41         43         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           42         59         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           43         50         71         0.574         0.288	29	53	74	0.574	0.288	Valid
31         42         64         0.574         0.288         Valid           32         56         77         0.574         0.288         Valid           33         47         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           34         40         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           35         60         80         0.574         0.288         Valid           36         44         65         0.574         0.288         Valid           37         51         73         0.574         0.288         Valid           38         48         69         0.574         0.288         Valid           39         57         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           40         52         75         0.574         0.288         Valid           41         43         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           42         59         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           43         50         71         0.574         0.288         Valid	30	49	70	0.574	0.288	Valid
32         56         77         0.574         0.288         Valid           33         47         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           34         40         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           35         60         80         0.574         0.288         Valid           36         44         65         0.574         0.288         Valid           37         51         73         0.574         0.288         Valid           38         48         69         0.574         0.288         Valid           39         57         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           40         52         75         0.574         0.288         Valid           41         43         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           42         59         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           43         50         71         0.574         0.288         Valid	31	42	64	0.574	0.288	Valid
33         47         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           34         40         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           35         60         80         0.574         0.288         Valid           36         44         65         0.574         0.288         Valid           37         51         73         0.574         0.288         Valid           38         48         69         0.574         0.288         Valid           39         57         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           40         52         75         0.574         0.288         Valid           41         43         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           42         59         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           43         50         71         0.574         0.288         Valid	31	42	64	0.574	0.288	Valid
34         40         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           35         60         80         0.574         0.288         Valid           36         44         65         0.574         0.288         Valid           37         51         73         0.574         0.288         Valid           38         48         69         0.574         0.288         Valid           39         57         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           40         52         75         0.574         0.288         Valid           41         43         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           42         59         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           43         50         71         0.574         0.288         Valid	32	56	77	0.574	0.288	Valid
35         60         80         0.574         0.288         Valid           36         44         65         0.574         0.288         Valid           37         51         73         0.574         0.288         Valid           38         48         69         0.574         0.288         Valid           39         57         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           40         52         75         0.574         0.288         Valid           41         43         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           42         59         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           43         50         71         0.574         0.288         Valid	33	47	79	0.574	0.288	Valid
36         44         65         0.574         0.288         Valid           37         51         73         0.574         0.288         Valid           38         48         69         0.574         0.288         Valid           39         57         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           40         52         75         0.574         0.288         Valid           41         43         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           42         59         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           43         50         71         0.574         0.288         Valid	34	40	81	0.574	0.288	Valid
37         51         73         0.574         0.288         Valid           38         48         69         0.574         0.288         Valid           39         57         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           40         52         75         0.574         0.288         Valid           41         43         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           42         59         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           43         50         71         0.574         0.288         Valid	35	60	80	0.574	0.288	Valid
38         48         69         0.574         0.288         Valid           39         57         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           40         52         75         0.574         0.288         Valid           41         43         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           42         59         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           43         50         71         0.574         0.288         Valid	36		65	0.574	0.288	Valid
39         57         78         0.574         0.288         Valid           40         52         75         0.574         0.288         Valid           41         43         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           42         59         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           43         50         71         0.574         0.288         Valid	37	51	73	0.574	0.288	Valid
40         52         75         0.574         0.288         Valid           41         43         81         0.574         0.288         Valid           42         59         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           43         50         71         0.574         0.288         Valid	38	48	69	0.574	0.288	Valid
41     43     81     0.574     0.288     Valid       42     59     79     0.574     0.288     Valid       43     50     71     0.574     0.288     Valid	39	57	78	0.574	0.288	Valid
42         59         79         0.574         0.288         Valid           43         50         71         0.574         0.288         Valid	40	52	75	0.574	0.288	Valid
43 50 71 0.574 0.288 Valid	41	43	81	0.574	0.288	Valid
	42	59	79	0.574	0.288	Valid
44 55 76 0.574 0.288 Valid	43				0.288	Valid
	44	55	76	0.574	0.288	Valid

45	46	68	0.574	0.288	Valid
46	54	74	0.574	0.288	Valid
47	45	70	0.574	0.288	Valid

# Description:

- a. r-value = correlation result between PreTest and PostTest scores.
- b. r-table = critical value of r table up to n = 47 and df = 45 at  $\alpha = 0.05$ .
- c. If r-value > r-table, then the instrument is said to be valid.

Based on the calculation results, the r-value obtained is 0.574 which is greater than the r-table of 0.288. This shows that there is a significant positive correlation between the pre-test and post-test scores. Thus, the instrument used in this study has good validity because it is able to measure what should be measured, namely students' reading ability before and after treatment.

According to Arikunto (2010), an instrument is said to be valid if it is able to measure what is to be measured and produces data that is in accordance with reality. In addition, Sugiyono (2017) also explains that the validity of an instrument shows the extent to which the instrument is able to reveal data from the variables studied accurately. The use of pre-test and post-test data to test validity in this study is based on the theory put forward by Heale and Twycross (2015). They explain that in pre-experimental research, pre-tests and post-tests are valid methods for testing validity because they allow researchers to compare results before

and after intervention or treatment. Thus, if there is a consistent and significant change in scores, this indicates that the instrument used really measures the effect of the variables studied. In the context of this study, the validity of the instrument is seen from the significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores, which reflect students' reading ability before and after the implementation of the peer tutoring method. With an r-value that exceeds the r-table, this instrument is proven to have adequate construct validity.

### 4. Reliability Test

Reliability testing aims to determine the internal consistency of the instrument and whether the questions used provide stable and consistent results if used repeatedly. Reliability is tested using Cronbach's Alpha with the following interpretation:

a. 
$$\alpha \ge 0.9$$
  $\rightarrow$  Very Reliable

b. 
$$0.7 \le \alpha < 0.9 \rightarrow \text{Reliable}$$

c. 
$$0.6 \le \alpha < 0.7$$
  $\rightarrow$  Quite Reliable

d. 
$$\alpha < 0.6$$
  $\rightarrow$  Not Reliable

The following are the results of the instrument reliability test:

No	Test Type	Cronbach's	Description
		Alpha	
1	PreTest	0.717	Reliable
2	PostTest	0.717	Reliable

Based on the calculation results, the Cronbach's Alpha value was obtained as 0.717. This value is in the range of  $0.7 \le \alpha < 0.9$ , which

indicates that the pre-test and post-test instruments have good reliability. This means that the questions used in this instrument are consistent in measuring students' reading ability. This consistency is important because it ensures that the results obtained are not caused by chance factors but truly reflect students' abilities.

According to Sugiyono (2017), reliability shows the extent to which an instrument can provide consistent results if measurements are carried out repeatedly. Thus, these results strengthen the fact that the instruments used in this study are not only valid but also reliable, providing a strong basis for data collection and further analysis.

#### 5. Paired Sample t-Test

A Paired Sample t-test was conducted to determine whether the difference in students' reading fluency scores before and after the peer tutoring intervention was statistically significant. The results are as follows:

Component	t-value	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Accuracy	-10.453	46	< .001
Rate (WPM)	-12.892	46	< .001
Prosody	-9.761	46	< .001
Comprehension	-11.329	46	<.001

To determine whether there is a statistically significant difference in students' reading fluency scores before and after the implementation of the peer tutoring method, a Paired Sample t-Test was conducted. This test aims to compare two sets of data from the same group, namely the pre-test and post-test results, in order to identify the effect of the intervention given.

Based on the results of the Paired Sample t-Test conducted, it can be seen that there is a statistically significant difference between students' reading fluency scores before (pre-test) and after (post-test) the implementation of the peer tutoring method. This test aims to determine whether changes in scores in each component of reading fluency - namely accuracy, rate (WPM), prosody, and comprehension - occur significantly or are just coincidence.

#### 1. Accuracy

The results of the t-test for accuracy show a t-value = -10.453 with df (degree of freedom) = 46 and Sig. (2-tailed) < .001. The significance value that is far below 0.05 indicates that there is a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test results in the aspect of reading accuracy. This means that the implementation of peer tutoring significantly contributes to improving students' ability to recognize and pronounce words accurately. The negative t-value indicates that the post-test score is consistently higher than the pre-test score, which supports the hypothesis that peer tutoring intervention has a positive impact on students' accuracy.

### 2. Rate (WPM)

The rate component or reading speed shows the highest t-test result, with a t-value = -12.892 and Sig. < .001. This large t-value shows a very significant difference between the pre-test and post-test in terms of reading speed (in words per minute). These results strengthen Topping's theory (2005), which states that peer tutoring helps students become more fluent and faster readers because they feel more comfortable and confident when practicing with peers compared to when reading under teacher pressure. Thus, the increase in students' reading speed after the intervention shows that peer tutoring has a strong impact on the aspect of reading fluency.

#### 3. Prosody

In the prosody component, the t-value = -9.761 was obtained with Sig. < .001. This value is also smaller than 0.05, so it can be concluded that there is a significant increase in the use of intonation, expression, and pauses when students read. This increase proves that peer tutoring not only helps students read quickly but also more expressively and communicatively. This is in line with Rasinski's opinion (2014), which emphasizes that prosody is an important element of reading fluency because fluent reading involves the ability to combine speed, accuracy, and expression simultaneously.

#### 4. Comprehension

Finally, the t-test results for comprehension showed a t-value = -11.329 and Sig. < .001. These results indicate a significant increase in students' ability to understand text after peer tutoring intervention. This difference reflects that the peer tutoring method not only improves the technical aspects of reading (such as speed and accuracy) but also strengthens students' ability to understand the contents of the reading. According to Vygotsky (1978), social interaction, such as that which occurs in peer tutoring, plays an important role in the development of cognitive skills, including reading comprehension. Students discuss and provide feedback to each other, which helps them to better understand the meaning of the text in depth.

Overall, the results of the Paired Sample t-Test showed that all components of reading fluency accuracy, rate, prosody, and comprehension experienced significant improvements after the peer tutoring method was implemented. The consistent significance values of less than 0.05~(p < 0.05) for all components prove that the improvements did not occur by chance but rather due to the real influence of the peer tutoring intervention. Thus, this finding strengthens the research hypothesis that peer tutoring has a positive and significant effect on improving students' reading fluency in EFL classes.

#### C. Discussion

The findings of this study provide strong evidence that peer tutoring significantly enhances reading fluency in EFL classrooms, particularly in terms of accuracy, rate, prosody, and comprehension. This section discusses how these results relate to existing theories and previous research, offering a comprehensive understanding of the role of peer tutoring in improving reading fluency.

## 1. Accuracy

The results showed a 38.4% increase in accuracy after the implementation of peer tutoring, as reflected in the post-test scores. This improvement suggests that peer tutoring provides an effective platform for immediate corrective feedback, helping students recognize and pronounce words correctly. These findings align with Fuchs et al. (1997), who argued that peer feedback allows for real-time correction, reinforcing proper pronunciation and reducing word-recognition errors. According to Vygotsky's (1978) Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), students learn best when they receive support from more knowledgeable peers. In this study, tutors acted as 'more capable peers,' guiding tutees through challenging words and helping them develop word recognition strategies. The improvement in accuracy also aligns with Topping's (2005) assertion that peer tutoring fosters a supportive environment, allowing students to feel comfortable making mistakes and learning from them. This is crucial in EFL contexts,

where fear of embarrassment often hinders active participation. Comparing these results with those of Rahmasari (2017), who found significant accuracy gains through peer tutoring in university students, this study confirms that peer tutoring is equally effective at the secondary level, reinforcing its adaptability across educational contexts.

# 2. Rate (Automaticity)

The most notable finding was the 45.8% increase in reading rate, with students' average reading speed rising from 72 to 105 words per minute. This improvement supports the theory of automaticity by LaBerge & Samuels (1974), which explains that repeated practice reduces cognitive effort in word recognition, allowing students to read faster and focus more on comprehension. In the peer tutoring sessions, timed reading exercises encouraged students to read at a steady pace while their tutors monitored progress. This collaborative practice not only boosted reading speed but also fostered a sense of responsibility among tutors to help their peers succeed. The findings are consistent with Blanch et al. (2020), who observed that peer tutoring significantly improved reading rates, especially when combined with structured practice. However, unlike Blanch's online peer tutoring model, this study highlights the advantage of face-to-face interactions, which appeared more effective in maintaining students' reading tempo and motivation.

#### 3. Prosody

Prosody also saw a substantial improvement of 46.4% in the post-test. This progress reflects better intonation, rhythm, and expression during reading, key indicators of reading fluency. According to Rasinski (2004), prosody is closely linked to comprehension, as proper intonation helps convey meaning and structure. Peer tutoring provided a platform for tutors to model expressive reading, giving tutees a clear example of how fluent reading sounds. The reciprocal tutoring method used in this study allowed students to observe and mimic their peers' intonation patterns, reinforcing Roscoe & Chi's (2007) theory that peer interaction enhances both linguistic and cognitive skills. Interestingly, this study aligns with Supramaniam (2022), who found that peer tutoring coupled with metacognitive strategies boosted prosody among EFL learners. Both studies highlight the importance of pairing fluency practice with reflection and feedback, ensuring students don't just read faster but also more meaningfully.

# 4. Comprehension

Finally, comprehension scores improved by 45.1%, indicating that fluency gains translated into a better understanding of text content. This supports Kuhn & Stahl's (2003) theory that fluency and comprehension are interconnected: as reading becomes more automatic, cognitive resources are freed up for deeper text analysis. In this study, peer tutors played a crucial role

by asking follow-up questions after reading sessions, prompting tutees to explain the meaning of texts. This interactive approach aligns with Goodlad & Hirst's (1989) emphasis on peer dialogue as a tool for developing critical thinking skills. Comparing these results to those of Kholifuddin Roma et al. (2020), who found that peer tutoring significantly enhanced reading comprehension among eighth graders, this study reaffirms the broader benefits of peer tutoring, improving fluency and reinforcing text understanding.

## **D.** Comparison with Previous Studies

When comparing the findings of this study with previous research, several parallels and differences emerge.

Swan (2014) found mixed results in reading fluency, with some students showing little to no improvement. This inconsistency was attributed to the lack of structured interaction between peers, as the tutoring sessions were loosely organized and often relied solely on student initiative. In contrast, this study implemented a structured, face-to-face peer tutoring program with clear guidelines and monitoring, resulting in consistent gains across all components of fluency—accuracy, rate, and prosody. The direct interaction and immediate feedback provided by peer tutors seemed to play a crucial role in maintaining student engagement and motivation, ultimately contributing to their reading progress. This suggests that the level of structure and the mode of interaction significantly influence the effectiveness of peer tutoring.

Blanch et al. (2020) emphasized the benefits of online peer tutoring, particularly in its flexibility and accessibility, allowing students to connect and collaborate regardless of location. However, the current study highlights that in-person collaboration fosters stronger interpersonal bonds between students. The face-to-face setting created a more dynamic learning environment where non-verbal cues, such as gestures and facial expressions, enhanced communication and understanding. Moreover, the immediacy of feedback in physical interactions appeared to be more impactful, as students could promptly clarify misconceptions and adjust their reading strategies. These findings suggest that while online peer tutoring offers convenience, in-person peer tutoring strengthens relational ties and supports real-time, responsive learning processes.

Additionally, Rahmasari (2017) and Roma et al. (2020) reported significant improvements in reading comprehension through peer tutoring, which closely aligns with the current study's results. Both previous studies underscored the importance of peer discussion in reinforcing reading comprehension, as collaborative dialogue encouraged students to verbalize their thoughts, ask questions, and negotiate meanings. Similarly, this study found that peer discussion played a vital role in solidifying reading understanding, with students actively engaging in back-and-forth explanations and joint problem-solving. The combination of peer feedback and collective reasoning helped students process texts

more deeply, moving beyond surface-level decoding to critical interpretation. These consistent findings across studies affirm that peer tutoring, particularly when structured and interactive, not only boosts reading fluency but also strengthens comprehension by fostering a supportive, communicative learning atmosphere.

Overall, while previous studies have highlighted both the potential and challenges of peer tutoring in reading fluency and comprehension, this study contributes to the discourse by emphasizing the importance of structure and direct interaction. The data suggest that a well-organized, face-to-face peer tutoring model can produce measurable improvements in both fluency and comprehension, reinforcing the notion that collaborative learning thrives on active participation, real-time feedback, and strong peer relationships.

Furthermore, the present study strengthens the body of evidence supporting peer tutoring as a dynamic strategy for enhancing reading fluency in EFL contexts. It not only confirms established theories like the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) and automaticity but also underscores the value of face-to-face, reciprocal tutoring for fostering linguistic, cognitive, and social development.

The results of this study clearly illustrate that peer tutoring positively impacts all four components of reading fluency: accuracy, rate, prosody, and comprehension. These findings offer practical implications for EFL classrooms, providing educators

with an effective method to foster collaborative learning and enhance students' reading skills. Moreover, the comparison with previous research highlights the importance of direct, structured interaction, reinforcing the notion that peer tutoring is a powerful tool for language development.

#### CHAPTER V

#### CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

#### A. Conclusion

Based on the findings and discussion presented in the previous chapter, this study concludes that peer tutoring has a significant and positive impact on reading fluency in EFL classrooms, specifically in the areas of accuracy, rate, prosody, and comprehension.

#### 1. Accuracy

The study revealed a 38.4% increase in accuracy after the peer tutoring intervention. This improvement indicates that real-time feedback from peer tutors played a crucial role in helping tutees correct their pronunciation and word recognition errors. The constant interaction between tutors and tutees provided opportunities for immediate correction and clarification, reinforcing proper reading techniques. These findings align with Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), which emphasizes that learning happens most effectively when students receive support from more knowledgeable peers.

## 2. Rate (Reading Speed)

The 45.8% increase in reading rate suggests that peer tutoring enhanced students' reading automaticity. The timed reading exercises, monitored by tutors, encouraged students to read more quickly without compromising comprehension. This result

supports LaBerge & Samuels' (1974) automaticity theory, which explains that repeated reading practice reduces cognitive load, allowing students to recognize words effortlessly and focus on meaning.

#### 3. Prosody

The study recorded a 46.4% improvement in prosody, highlighting the effectiveness of peer tutoring in developing students' intonation, stress, and rhythm while reading aloud. The reciprocal tutoring method allowed students to observe fluent reading modeled by their peers, then practice expressive reading themselves. This outcome is consistent with Rasinski's (2004) theory that prosody is an essential component of reading fluency as it reflects deeper comprehension and adds meaning to spoken text.

# 4. Comprehension

The 45.1% increase in reading comprehension scores demonstrates that fluency gains positively influenced students' ability to understand texts. Peer tutors facilitated comprehension by asking follow-up questions and encouraging discussions about the reading materials. This approach aligns with Kuhn & Stahl's (2003) theory that fluent readers have more cognitive capacity to focus on interpreting texts rather than decoding words.

Overall, the study supports the notion that peer tutoring is not only beneficial for improving reading fluency but also fosters collaboration, boosts confidence, and strengthens the social bonds among students. It confirms previous research findings, such as those by Rahmasari (2017) and Roma et al. (2020), while highlighting the importance of face-to-face peer interaction, as emphasized by Blanch et al. (2020).

#### B. Limitation

### 1. Research Design Limited to Pre-Experiment

This study used a pre-experimental design with a one-group pretest-posttest model without a control group. Therefore, the results of the improvement in students' reading ability cannot be fully claimed as a direct result of the peer tutoring intervention, because it cannot be compared with the group that did not receive treatment.

#### 2. Relatively Short Duration of Intervention

The peer tutoring program was implemented for only three weeks. This limited time may not be enough to measure the long-term impact of this method on students' reading fluency as a whole, especially in terms of the formation of reading habits or long-term motivation.

## 3. Scope: Limited to One School and Certain Classes

This study was only conducted at SMP Islam Al Azhar 14 Banyumanik on grade VIII students. The results may not be generalizable to other schools, other levels of education, or different EFL contexts.

## 4. Individual Factors Not Considered in Depth

Variables such as students' motivation levels, personality, or anxiety are not specifically explained, even though these factors can influence the success of a peer tutoring program.

## C. Implications

#### 1. Theoretical Implications

This study contributes to the development of theories in the field of language learning, especially in the context of EFL (English as a Foreign Language). The results of this study support Vygotsky's theory of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), where social interaction through peer assistance can improve students' academic competence. These findings also strengthen the constructivist and peer-assisted learning approaches, which emphasize the importance of students' active role in the learning process. Thus, this study enriches the literature on the effectiveness of peer tutoring in improving reading fluency components such as accuracy, reading speed, prosody, and comprehension.

## 2. Practical Implications

Practically, the results of this study indicate that the peer tutoring strategy is feasible to be applied in the English learning process, especially in improving students' reading fluency. Teachers can use this method as an alternative learning strategy that is collaborative and participatory. Peer tutoring allows teachers to overcome the limitations of time and individual attention to

students, especially in classes with a large number of students. In addition, teachers can develop a systematic peer tutoring module or implementation guide so that it can be applied sustainably and consistently.

## 3. Social Implications

From a social perspective, the implementation of peer tutoring has the potential to foster positive social values among students, such as caring, cooperation, a sense of responsibility, and empathy for friends. Students who are involved as tutors or tutees both benefit not only academically, but also in terms of character building. The classroom environment becomes more inclusive, where students feel supported and motivated to learn without fear or shame. This is in line with the school's efforts to build a humanistic and student-centered learning climate.

### **D.** Suggestions

Based on the conclusions drawn from this study, several suggestions are provided for teachers, students, and future researchers to further enhance the implementation of peer tutoring strategies in EFL classrooms.

For teachers, it is strongly recommended to integrate peer tutoring strategies into their reading instruction. Peer tutoring has proven to be a powerful tool to address the diverse learning needs of students by fostering collaborative learning environments. Through structured peer tutoring sessions, students can support one another in developing their reading fluency, particularly in the

areas of accuracy, rate, prosody, and comprehension. To maximize its effectiveness, teachers should offer clear guidelines and training for both tutors and tutees, ensuring that feedback remains constructive, specific, and focused. Additionally, teachers should regularly monitor the peer tutoring process, providing support when necessary to maintain the quality of interactions and learning outcomes.

For students, active participation in peer tutoring sessions is highly encouraged, both as tutors and tutees. Serving as a tutor not only reinforces the tutor's own understanding but also strengthens their communication and leadership skills. On the other hand, tutees benefit from receiving immediate feedback and personalized support from their peers. This reciprocal learning process not only improves reading fluency but also cultivates a sense of responsibility, cooperation, and mutual respect among students. Furthermore, peer tutoring can boost students' confidence in reading aloud and discussing texts, which is particularly valuable in EFL contexts where language anxiety often poses a challenge.

For future researchers, there are several potential avenues to explore that build upon the findings of this study. First, future studies could investigate the long-term effects of peer tutoring on reading fluency to determine whether the improvements observed in this study are sustained over time. It would be valuable to understand whether consistent peer tutoring leads to lasting gains

in fluency and overall reading skills. Second, exploring cross-age peer tutoring, where older students mentor younger ones, could provide insight into how age differences influence the effectiveness of this strategy compared to same-age tutoring. Third, examining the impact of online peer tutoring platforms would be highly relevant in today's digital era, particularly in assessing how technology can support reading fluency in remote or hybrid learning environments. Lastly, incorporating qualitative research methods such as in-depth interviews, classroom observations, and reflective journals could offer a more nuanced understanding of students' experiences, attitudes, and challenges during peer tutoring sessions. This qualitative data would complement quantitative findings, providing a holistic view of peer tutoring's impact.

By continually exploring and refining peer tutoring strategies, educators and researchers can unlock their full potential as an effective approach to fostering reading fluency and overall language proficiency in EFL classrooms. The collaboration between teachers, students, and researchers is crucial in creating dynamic, supportive learning environments where all students have the opportunity to thrive and succeed.

#### REFERENCES

- Blanch, et al. (2020). *Title of the Study*. Journal Name, Volume(Issue), Page range. DOI/Publisher.
- Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education* (8th ed.). Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W. (2018). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Dona. (Year). Title of the Study. Publisher.
- Ehri, L. C. (1998). Grapheme-phoneme knowledge is essential for learning to read words in English. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 33(1), 12-26.
- Falchikov, N. (2001). Learning together: Peer tutoring in higher education. Routledge.
- Fantuzzo, J. W., et al. (1992). *Peer-assisted learning: A practical guide to classroom intervention*. Guilford Press.
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2009). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Fuchs, L. S., et al. (1997). Peer-assisted learning strategies: Making classrooms more responsive to diversity. *American Educational Research Journal*, *34*(1), 174-206.

- Fuchs, L. S., et al. (2001). Oral reading fluency as an indicator of reading competence: A theoretical, empirical, and historical analysis. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 5(3), 239-256.
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2011). *Educational* research: Competencies for analysis and applications (10th ed.). Pearson.
- Ghasemi, A., & Zahediasl, S. (2012). Normality tests for statistical analysis: A guide for non-statisticians. *International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism*, 10(2), 486-489.
- Ghozali, I. (2018). *Multivariate analysis application* with IBM SPSS 25 program. Diponegoro University Publishing Board.
- Ginsburg-Block, M. D., Rohrbeck, C. A., & Fantuzzo, J. W. (2006). A meta-analytic review of social, self-concept, and behavioral outcomes of peer-assisted learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98(4), 732-749.
- Goodlad, S., & Hirst, B. (1989). *Peer tutoring: A guide to learning by teaching*. Nichols Publishing.
- Gough, P. B., & Tunmer, W. E. (1986). Decoding, reading, and reading disability. *Remedial and Special Education*, 7(1), 6-10.
- Grabe, W. (2009). Reading in a second language: Moving from theory to practice. Cambridge University Press.
- Guthrie, J. T., & Wigfield, A. (2000). Engagement and motivation in reading. *Handbook of Reading Research*, *3*, 403-422.

- Harmer, J. (2007). *How to teach English* (2nd ed.). Pearson Longman.
- Jones, J., Ostojic, S., Menard, N., Picard, A., & Miller, J. (2017). Primary prevention of reading failure: Effects of universal peer tutoring in the early grades. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 40(1), 1-25.
- Kuhn, M. R., & Schwanenflugel, P. J. (2010). Teaching children to become fluent and automatic readers. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 42(2), 129-152.
- Kuhn, M. R., & Stahl, S. A. (2003). Fluency: A review of developmental and remedial practices. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95(1), 3-21.
- LaBerge, D., & Samuels, S. J. (1974). Toward a theory of automatic information processing in reading. *Cognitive Psychology*, 6(2), 293-323.
- Martin Luther King Jr. (Year). Title of the Source. Publisher.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL reading and writing*. Routledge.
- Pallant, J. (2020). SPSS survival manual (7th ed.). Routledge.
- Piaget, J. (1964). Part I: Cognitive development in children: Piaget's development and learning. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 2(3), 176-186.
- Pikulski, J. J., & Chard, D. J. (2005). Fluency: Bridge between decoding and reading comprehension. *The Reading Teacher*, 58(6), 510-519.

- Rahmasari, D. (2017). *Title of the Study*. Journal Name, Volume(Issue), Page range. DOI/Publisher.
- Rasinski, T. (2004). Assessing reading fluency. *Pacific Resources* for Education and Learning.
- Rasinski, T., et al. (2011). Fluency instruction: Research-based best practices. Guilford Press.
- Riduwan. (2015). Measurement scale of research variables. Alfabeta.
- Roscoe, R. D., & Chi, M. T. H. (2007). Understanding tutor learning: Knowledge-building and knowledge-telling in peer tutors' explanations and questions. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(4), 534-574.
- Salarvand, H., Guimaraes, L., & Balagholi, A. (2022). *Title of the Study*. Journal Name, Volume(Issue), Page range. DOI/Publisher.
- Samuels, S. J. (1979). The method of repeated readings. *The Reading Teacher*, 32(4), 403-408.
- Slavin, R. E. (1995). *Cooperative learning: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). Allyn & Bacon.
- Sugiyono. (2016). Educational research methods. Alfabeta.
- Sugiyono. (2017).. Alfabeta.
- Sugiyono. (2019). Quantitative, qualitative, and R&D research methods. Alfabeta.
- Supramaniam, K. (2022). *Title of the Study*. Journal Name, Volume(Issue), Page range. DOI/Publisher.

- Swan, M. O. (2020). *Title of the Study*. Journal Name, Volume(Issue), Page range. DOI/Publisher.
- Topping, K. J. (2005). Peer assisted learning: A practical guide for teachers. Brookline Books.
- Topping, K. J., & Ehly, S. (1998). *Peer-assisted learning*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Topping, K. J., & Ehly, S. (2001). Peer-assisted learning: A framework for consultation. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 12(2), 113-132.
- Van Keer, H., & Verhaeghe, J. P. (2005). Effects of explicit reading strategies instruction and peer tutoring on second and fifth graders' reading comprehension and self-efficacy perceptions. *The Journal of Educational Psychology*, 97(4), 491-503.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

# DOCUMENTATION

# a. Document of the Pre-Test







# b. Document of the Peer Tutoring (Treatment)







# c. Document of the Post-Test





