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What is peer tutoring?

Tutor = Tutee

More expectations
My project: How to support peer tutoring?

Tutor-tutee pairs
- Selecting suitable peer tutors
- Selection criteria

Helping tutors
- Instructions/handbooks/manuals
- Tutor training
Tutor training

Content knowledge
  communication skills
  domain-specific knowledge
  prior knowledge
  subject knowledge

Tutoring skills
  asking thinking questions
  pedagogical skills
  task-processing skills
  higher cognitive skills
  knowledge telling

Process-facilitation skills
  factual knowledge
But why is tutor training necessary?
True peer tutoring

Before the training
- Tutor: 2
- Tutee: 2

Content knowledge: 2
Tutoring skills: 2

After the training
- Tutor: 5
- Tutee: 2

Content knowledge: 5
Tutoring skills: 2
Task complexities

• Complex tasks \(\rightarrow\) simultaneously deal with several interactive information elements \(\rightarrow\) higher cognitive skills \(\rightarrow\) a high cognitive load

• So, what kind of peer tutors can better alleviate tutees’ high cognitive load when working on complex tasks? A peer tutor with more content knowledge or a tutor with more tutoring skills?
Research question

• What are the effects of enhancing peer tutors with two competences on *tutees’* and *tutors’* cognitive load and task performance?
Participants

• Four classes of secondary school students, aged 16-17, $n = 88$
• Two classes were randomly assigned for each treatment
• Within each class, half of the pupils acted as tutors and the other half acted as tutees
• Tutor-tutee pairs were created randomly within each class
Subject: Civics
Topic: Replacing student grants with a student loan
Tutee task

• Statement: *The student grant should be replaced by a student loan.*

• Read the election programs from diverse political parties. Choose a **standpoint** pro or con the statement and make three **arguments** to support the standpoint, in which **two** are from the election programs and **one** is your own argument.
Background information of the task topic
Why is this task complex?
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Tutor training: Content knowledge (CK)

Factual knowledge of the task topic
Two government brochures about student grants and loans

Examples of arguments
• Two news articles about the debates on replacing the grant with a loan

http://www.duo.nl/particulieren/studiefinanciering/studiefinanciering.asp

http://www.volkskrant.nl/
Tutor training: Tutoring skills (TS)

Task-processing skills

• A worked example about *how* to make arguments on another topic
  - Statement, Standpoint, Arguments
  - Relationship between a standpoint and arguments
  - Sentence patterns of expressing arguments

Pedagogical skills

Rules and exercises of asking questions effectively

- Make sure that others understand your questions
- Ask others to clarify their answers
- Continue with asking questions
- Summarize answers from others
Pre-measures

- Prior knowledge test
- Tutoring skills questionnaire
Post-measures

- Cognitive load on the task: NASA Task Load Index with six 20-point sub-scales

- Post-test (tot: 16)
  - One open question: Summary of tutee task (tot: 10)
  - Three multiple choice questions (tot: 6)

- Questionnaire of evaluating the tutoring process with eleven 5-point Likert scales (tot: 55)
This study: Each session 50 mins

Session 1: Introduction, pre-measures and tutor training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tutees read “Types of questions”</th>
<th>Tutors received training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Session 2: F2F Peer tutoring on the task and post-measures

| Tutees first read standpoints pro or con the statement from diverse political parties. And then tutees worked on the task. | Tutors first read standpoints pro or con the statement from diverse political parties. And then tutors helped tutees by using instructions based on the training materials. |
Tutee results Cognitive load
each subscale: 20, total: 120 (n.s.)
Tutee results Post-test, total: 16

\[ t(21) = 2.87, \ p = .01 \]
Tutee results Evaluation of tutoring process, total: 55 (n.s.)
Tutor results Cognitive load
each subscale: 20, total: 120
t(23)= 2.87, p = .01
Tutor results Post-test, total: 16 (n.s.)
Tutor results Evaluation of tutoring process, total: 55 (n.s.)
Conclusion

• TS tutors contributed to better tutee task performance than CK tutors.
• TS tutors experienced lower cognitive load than CK tutors during the tutoring process.
• Both groups of tutors and tutees did not evaluate the tutoring process at a satisfactory level.
Discussion

• Knowledge versus skills: Did TS tutors really have skills? Or they just started to transform procedural knowledge into skills?
Limitations

• No processing data to trace tutoring interactions
• No control group
• Missing values
• Very limited time for each session