What Works Clearinghouse

ies INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION SCIENCES

ClassWide Peer Tutoring

Effectiveness[1]

No studies of *ClassWide Peer Tutoring* that fall within the scope of the English Language Learners review protocol meet What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) evidence standards. The lack of studies meeting WWC evidence standards means that, at this time, the WWC is unable to draw any conclusions based on research about the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of *ClassWide Peer Tutoring* on English language learners.

Program Description[2]

ClassWide Peer Tutoring is a teaching strategy that involves the entire class in tutoring using a game format. *ClassWide Peer Tutoring* typically uses existing curriculum materials and can be adapted across different grade levels and content areas. The class is divided into two competing teams, and pairs of students are formed within each team. The tutor presents the content stimulus (e.g., a word to be spelled, a math problem) to the tutee. The tutee responds both orally and in writing. The tutor evaluates the tutee's performance, provides corrective feedback, and awards points for the performance. Tutor and tutee roles are exchanged within each session. Points for each student are pub-

licly posted and added to determine the winning team of the day. The procedure requires 30 minutes per session; each student in the dyad receives 10 minutes of tutoring, and 5 to 10 minutes are used to add and post individual points. Content to be learned, teams, and tutoring pairs are normally changed on a weekly basis. Teachers organize the academic content to be tutored into daily and weekly units and prepare materials to be used within the *ClassWide Peer Tutoring* format. Teachers develop tests and administer them in a pretest-posttest sequence based on the unit of study. The results serve as feedback for the student and for monitoring learning.

1. The studies in this report were reviewed using WWC Evidence Standards, Version 2.0 (see the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Chapter III), as described in protocol Version 2.0.
2. The descriptive information for this program was obtained from a publicly available source: the developer's website (http://www.specialconnections. ku.edu/cgi-bin/cgiwrap/specconn/main.php?cat=instruction&section=cwpt/main, downloaded June 2010). The WWC requests developers to review the program description sections for accuracy from their perspective. Further verification of the accuracy of the descriptive information for this program is beyond the scope of this review. The literature search reflects documents publicly available by February 2009.

Program Description
(continued)

The WWC identified eight studies of *ClassWide Peer Tutoring* for English language learners that were published or released between 1983 and 2009.

One study is out of the scope of the English Language Learners review protocol because it has an ineligible study design.

Three studies are out of the scope of the English Language Learners review protocol because they are not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention.

Two studies are out of the scope of the English Language Learners review protocol because the outcomes are not within the domains specified in the protocol.

Two studies are out of the scope of the English Language Learners review protocol because the intervention examined is not implemented in a way that falls within the scope of the review; the intervention is bundled with other components.

References

Studies that fall outside the English Language Learners review protocol or do not meet evidence standards

Arreaga-Mayer, C. (1998). Increasing active student responding and improving academic performance through *ClassWide Peer Tutoring. Intervention in School and Clinic*, *34*(2), 89–94. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.

Greenwood, C. R. (1996). Research on the practices and behavior of effective teachers at the Juniper Gardens Children's Project: Implications for diverse learners. In D. L. Speece & B. K. Keogh (Eds.), *Research on classroom ecologies: Implications for inclusion of children with learning disabilities* (pp. 39–68). New York: Routledge. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.

Greenwood, C. R., Arreaga-Mayer, C., Utley, C. A., Gavin, K. M., & Terry, B. J. (2001). *ClassWide Peer Tutoring* learning management system: Applications within elementary-level English language learners. *Remedial & Special Education,* *22*(1), 34–47. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine an intervention implemented in a way that falls within the scope of the review—the intervention is bundled with other components.

Madrid, L. D., Canas, M., & Ortega-Medina, M. (2007). Effects of team competition versus team cooperation in *ClassWide Peer Tutoring. Journal of Educational Research, 100*(3), 155–160. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.

Perdomo-Rivera, C. (2002). The effects of *ClassWide Peer Tutoring* on the literacy achievement and language production of English language learners in an elementary school setting. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 63*(10A), 153–3455. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.

Utley, C. A. (1997). Peer-mediated instruction and interventions. *Focus on Exceptional Children, 29*(5), 1–23. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.

Vaughn, S., Martinez, L. R., Linan-Thompson, S., Reutebuch, C. K., Carlson, C. D., & Francis, D. J. (2009). Enhancing social

References *(continued)*

studies vocabulary and comprehension for seventh-grade English language learners: Findings from two experimental studies. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness, 2*(4), 297. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine an intervention implemented in a way that falls within the scope of the review—the intervention is bundled with other components.

Xu, Y., Gelfer, J., & Perkins, P. (2005). Using peer tutoring to increase social interactions in early schooling. *TESOL Quarterly, 39*(1;1), 83–106. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.

Additional sources

Xu, Y. (2003). Effects of *ClassWide Peer Tutoring* (CWPT) on social interactions of children with and without English proficiency. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 64*(05A), 248–1523.

Xu, Y., Gelfer, J. I., Sileo, N., Filler, J., & Perkins, P. G. (2008). Effects of peer tutoring on young children's social interactions. *Early Child Development and Care, 178*(6), 617–635.