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- Methodology
- Results
- Tools for Implementation

http://sarcomaalliance.org/peer-to-peer/
“to teach
is to learn twice over”

- Joseph Joubert
Overview of ELC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELC Level</th>
<th>ACTFL</th>
<th>Grammar Class</th>
<th>Writing Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundations Prep</td>
<td>NL-NM</td>
<td>(All Skills)</td>
<td>(All Skills)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations A</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>Oral Communication Acc</td>
<td>Writing &amp; Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations B</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Oral Communication Acc</td>
<td>Writing &amp; Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations C</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Writing &amp; Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Prep</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>(Writing &amp; Grammar)</td>
<td>(Writing &amp; Grammar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic A</td>
<td>IH</td>
<td>Linguistic Accuracy</td>
<td>Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic B</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>Linguistic Accuracy</td>
<td>Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Prep</td>
<td>AM-AH</td>
<td>Linguistic Accuracy</td>
<td>Writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rationale

● Motivation
  o Student Environment
  o Service Learning
  o Authentic Application

● Mentoring
  o Upper and Lower Level Student Pairing
Methodology

- Four (4) Semesters of Action Research
  - One (1) upper-level grammar class & one (1) lower-level writing class paired per semester

- Two (2) Workshops per Semester
  - 65 minutes total workshop time
    - 5-7 minute training
    - Two (2) 25-minute partnerships
    - 3-5 minute follow-up survey for student feedback
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oct 2013</th>
<th>Dec 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>gym</td>
<td>computer lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>track changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pairing</td>
<td>deliberate (proficiency; personality; language)</td>
<td>deliberate (proficiency; personality; language)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trial 1a. Survey Results

Question: Would you like to do this activity again?

- Yes 93%
- Maybe 3.5%
- No 3.5%
Trial 1b. Survey Results

Question: Did you find the track changes training helpful?

- Yes 91%
- Kind of 9%
- No 0%
Trial 1. Advantages & Disadvantages

- Student Comments: Themes
  - Mentoring (ME)
    - Training
  - Motivation (MO)
    - Location: Gym vs. Computer Lab
    - Time
## Trial 2. University Prep & Foundations C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Feb 2014</th>
<th>Apr 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>computer lab</td>
<td>computer lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training</strong></td>
<td>track changes</td>
<td>feedback skit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pairing</strong></td>
<td>deliberate (proficiency; personality; language)</td>
<td>deliberate (proficiency; personality; language)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trial 2a. Survey Results

Question: Did you find the track changes training helpful?

- Yes, definitely: 47.4%
- Yes, somewhat: 52.6%
- Not really: 0%
- Not at all: 0%
Trial 2. Advantages & Disadvantages

- Second trial; learned from experience
- Failed to gather quantitative data for Trial 2b
## Trial 3. Academic A & Academic A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>July 1, 2014</th>
<th>July 29, 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>computer lab</td>
<td>computer lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training</strong></td>
<td>feedback skit</td>
<td>track changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pairing</strong></td>
<td>deliberate <em>(proficiency; personality; language)</em></td>
<td>deliberate <em>(proficiency; personality; language)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trial 3b. Survey Results

Question: Did you find the track changes training helpful?

- Yes, definitely 53.8%
- Yes, somewhat 38.5%
- No 7.7%
Trial 3. Advantages & Disadvantages

- Same proficiency peer relationship; second pair of eyes
- Incorrect feedback; lack of reciprocation
## Trial 4. University Prep & Academic A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>October 2014</th>
<th>November 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>computer lab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>tutoring styles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pairing</td>
<td>deliberate (proficiency; personality)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trial 4a. Survey Results

Question: Would you like to do this activity again?

- Yes 96.80%
- No 3.20%
Trends

● Passive vs. Active
● Mentoring & Motivation
● Benefits of Trainings
Possible Trainings

1. How to give constructive feedback
   - Script + skit
2. How to use track changes
   - Projector + demonstration
3. Tutoring styles
   - Powerpoint + discussion
Good tutor? Bad tutor?

What do you think?
What type of parent-tutor are you?

• **Neglectful**—neither responsive nor demanding

• **Indulging**—responsive, but not demanding

• **Authoritarian**—demanding, but not responsive (totalitarian)

• **Authoritative**—demanding and responsive (measured and consistent)
**What type of parent-tutor are you?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsive</th>
<th>Indulging</th>
<th>Authoritative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Responsive</td>
<td>Neglectful</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Demanding</td>
<td>Demanding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation

- Handout
- Group discussion
Verratti, R., & Hutchison, N. Students as Teachers: Exploring Peer-to-Peer Teaching. (TESOL International Convention, March 2014)
Questions?
Contact Information

Candice Snow  candice.snow@byu.edu
Brooke Eddington  brooke.e.eddington@byu.edu
Alisha Chugg  achugg@byu.edu