

Technical Appendix

Definition

One to one tuition involves a teacher, teaching assistant or other adult giving a pupil intensive tuition on a one to one basis. It is often used as catch up or remedial support for learners who are falling behind their peers with important skills or concepts. It may also be offered to other learners such as high attainers, or in subjects like music when teaching an instrument.

Tuition may be during normal lessons (withdrawal) or it may be undertaken outside of the pupil's normal lessons, for example as part of after school programmes or **Summer schools**.

Such tuition is usually undertaken by trained teachers or **Teaching assistants** or other adults, such as volunteers, and not by fellow students (see **Peer tutoring**).

It is distinguished from **Mentoring** which is often undertaken by volunteers who focus on building confidence, or developing resilience and character, rather than directly or only focusing on teaching or tutoring specific academic skills.

Search terms: one to one tuition/tutoring; volunteer tutoring programs; reading recovery; early literacy tutoring programs

Evidence Rating

There are seven meta-analyses of one to one tuition, mainly using well-controlled experiments or trials which were undertaken in schools using pupil attainment data. Six of these were published in the last ten years. The pooled effect sizes vary from 0.05 to 0.70 (nearly two-thirds of a standard deviation). The causes of variation were explored in these studies; the experience and training of tutors and the structure and intensity of the tutoring were identified as important influences. Overall the evidence is rated as extensive.

Some reviews published since the effect size for this strand was calculated have concluded that one to one tuition by teachers does not, on average, have a greater impact than one to one tuition by paraprofessionals. In contrast, this analysis suggests that it does. We will assess the reason for the difference in these conclusions when this strand is next updated, but for now have retained the conclusions suggested by the Toolkit analysis, in line with the Toolkit methodology.

References

- 1 *Chappell, S., Nunnery, J., Pribesh, S., & Hager, J.*
Supplemental educational services (SES) provision of no child left behind: A synthesis of provider effects (Research Brief) [↗](#)
Norfolk, VA: The Center for Educational Partnerships at Old Dominion University
(2010)
- 2 *D'Agostino, J. V., & Harmey, S. J. (Abstract ↓)*
An international meta-analysis of Reading Recovery [↗](#)
Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR), 21(1), 29-46
(2016)
- 3 *Elbaum, B., Vaughn, S.M., Hughes, M.T. & Moody, S.M. (Abstract ↓)*
How Effective Are One-to-One Tutoring Programs in Reading for Elementary Students at Risk for Reading Failure? A MetaAnalysis of the Intervention Research [↗](#)
Journal of Educational Psychology 92.4: 605-619
(2000)
- 4 *Gorard, S., See, B.H. & Siddiqui, N.*
Switch-on Reading Evaluation Report and Executive Summary [↗](#)
EEF, London
(2014)
- 5 *Jun, S.W., Ramirez, G., & Cumming, A. (Abstract ↓)*
Tutoring Adolescents in Literacy: A MetaAnalysis [↗](#)
Journal of Education, 45 (2), 219-238
(2010)
- 6 *Maxwell, B., Connolly, P., Demack, S., O'Hare, L., Stevens, A. & Clague, L.*
TextNow Transition Programme Evaluation Report and Executive Summary [↗](#)
EEF, London
(2014)
- 7 *NFER*
Catch Up® Literacy: Evaluation Report and Executive Summary [↗](#)
EEF, London
(2015)
- 8 *NFER*
Catch Up® Numeracy: Evaluation Report and Executive Summary [↗](#)
EEF, London
(2014)
- 9 *Ritter, G.W., Barnett, J.H., Genny, C.S., & Albin, G.R. (Abstract ↓)*
The Effectiveness of Volunteer Tutoring Programs for Elementary and Middle School Students: A Meta-Analysis [↗](#)
Review of Educational Research, 79 (3), 3-38
(2009)
- 10 *Sibieta, L.*
REACH Evaluation report and executive summary [↗](#)
London: EEF
(2016)
- 11 *Slavin, R. E., Lake, C., Davis, S., & Madden, N. A. (Abstract ↓)*
Effective programs for struggling readers: A best-evidence synthesis [↗](#)
Educational Research Review, 6(1), 1-26
(2011)
- 12 *Tanner, E., Brown, A., & Day, N. Kotecha, M., Low, N., Morrell, G., Turczuk, O., Brown, V. Collingwood, A.*
Evaluation of Every Child a Reader (ECaR) Research report [↗](#)
DfE, London
(2011)
- 13 *Torgerson, C.J., Wiggins, A., Torgerson, D.J., Ainsworth, H., Barmby, P., Hewitt, C., Jones, K., Hendry, V., Askew, M., Bland, M. Coe, R., Higgins, S., Hodgson, J., Hulme, C. & Tymms, P.*
Every Child Counts: The Independent evaluation [↗](#)
DfE, London
(2011)
- 14 *Washington State Institute for Public Policy (Abstract ↓)*
Tutoring: By adults, one-on-one, structured [↗](#)
Washington State Institute for Public Policy, Seattle Wa.
(2014a)
- 15 *Washington State Institute for Public Policy (Abstract ↓)*
Tutoring: By adults, one-on-one, nonstructured [↗](#)
Washington State Institute for Public Policy, Seattle Wa.
(2014b)
- 16 *Wasik, B. A., & Slavin, R. E. (Abstract ↓)*
Preventing Early Reading Failure with One-to-One Tutoring: A Review of Five Programs [↗](#)
Reading Research Quarterly, 28(2), 179-200
(1993)

Summary of effects

Meta-analyses	Effect size	FSM effect size	
D'Agostino, J. V., & Harmeey, S. J., (2016)	0.59	-	(Reading recovery)
Elbaum, B., Vaughn, S.M., Hughes, M.T. & Moody, S.M., (2000)	0.41	-	(Elementary reading)
Jun, S.W., Ramirez, G., & Cumming, A., (2010)	0.70	-	(by adults)
Ritter, G.W., Barnett, J.H., Genny, C.S., & Albin, G.R., (2009)	0.30	-	(volunteer tutoring)
Slavin, R. E., Lake, C., Davis, S., & Madden, N. A., (2011)	0.39	-	(by teachers and paraprofessionals)
Washington State Institute for Public Policy, (2014a)	0.53	-	(structured tutoring)
Washington State Institute for Public Policy, (2014b)	0.05	-	(non-structured tutoring)
Single Studies	Effect size	FSM effect size	
Gorard, S., See, B.H. & Siddiqui, N. (2014)	0.24	0.36	
Maxwell, B., Connolly, P., Demack, S., O'Hare, L., Stevens, A. & Clague, L. (2014)	-0.06	0.18	
NFER (2015)	0.12	0.00	
NFER (2014)	0.21	-	(intervention vs control)
	0.27	-	(time equivalent one to one vs control)
Sibieta, L. (2016)	0.33	-	(EEF REACH)
	0.51	-	(REACH + Language comprehension)
Tanner, E., Brown, A., & Day, N. Kotecha, M., Low, N., Morrell, G., Turczuk, O., Brown, V. Collingwood, A. (2011)	0.14	-	
Torgerson, C.J., Wiggins, A., Torgerson, D.J., Ainsworth, H., Barmby, P., Hewitt, C., Jones, K., Hendry, V., Askew, M., Bland, M. Coe, R., Higgins, S., Hodgen, J., Hulme, C. & Tymms, P. (2011)	0.33	-	
Weighted mean	0.37		

The right hand column provides detail on the specific outcome measures or, if in brackets, details of the intervention or control group.

Meta-analyses abstracts

2 D'Agostino, J. V., & Harmeey, S. J. (2016)

Reading Recovery is one of the most researched literacy programs worldwide. Although there have been at least 4 quantitative reviews of its effectiveness, none have considered all rigorous group-comparison studies from all implementing nations from the late 1970s to 2015. Using a hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) v-known analysis, we examined if effects differed in the United States versus other nations, if experiments yielded larger effects than quasi-experiments, if the effects changed over time, and if the type of outcome mediated the impact estimates. We also considered the sustained effects of the intervention. After reviewing 203 primary studies, we identified 16 that met our criteria, such as treatment fidelity and experimental or high-quality quasi-experimental design. Based on a random effects model, the estimated overall effect was .59, with larger effects for outcomes based on the Observation Survey (Clay, 2013), and stronger effects in certain literacy domains, such as text reading, print knowledge, and general literacy. Although United States studies produced a larger point estimate (.61) compared to other countries (.52), and experiments (.69) yielded a larger estimate than quasi-experiments (.43), neither difference was statistically significant. Overall, effects did not change over time, but effects based on the Observation Survey did improve significantly from earlier to later studies. We also found that the long-term effect may diminish, but there were too few studies to estimate the sustained impact with confidence. The .59 overall effect places Reading Recovery in the top 10% in terms of impact of early literacy programs reviewed by the What Works Clearinghouse.

3 *Elbaum, B., Vaughn, S.M., Hughes, M.T. & Moody, S.M. (2000)*

A meta-analysis of supplemental, adult-instructed one-to-one reading interventions for elementary students at risk for reading failure was conducted. Reading outcomes for 42 samples of students (N = 1,539) investigated in 29 studies reported between 1975 and 1998 had a mean weighted effect size of 0.41 when compared with controls. Interventions that used trained volunteers or college students were highly effective. For Reading Recovery interventions, effects for students identified as discontinued were substantial, whereas effects for students identified as not discontinued were not significantly different from zero. Two studies comparing one-to-one with small-group supplemental instruction showed no advantage for the one-to-one programs.

5 *Jun, S.W., Ramirez, G., & Cumming, A. (2010)*

What does research reveal about tutoring adolescents in literacy? We conducted a meta-analysis, identifying 152 published studies, of which 12 met rigorous inclusion criteria. We analysed the 12 studies for the effects of tutoring according to the type, focus, and amount of tutoring; the number, age, and language background of students; and the quality of the research. Despite variability, these studies suggest benefits, notably for cross-age tutoring, reading, and small tutoring programs of lengthy duration.

9 *Ritter, G.W., Barnett, J.H., Genny, C.S., & Albin, G.R. (2009)*

This meta-analysis assesses the effectiveness of volunteer tutoring programs for improving the academic skills of students enrolled in public schools Grades K–8 in the United States and further investigates for whom and under what conditions tutoring can be effective. The authors found 21 studies (with 28 different study cohorts in those studies) reporting on randomized field trials to guide them in assessing the effectiveness of volunteer tutoring programs. Overall, the authors found volunteer tutoring has a positive effect on student achievement. With respect to particular subskills, students who work with volunteer tutors are likely to earn higher scores on assessments related to letters and words, oral fluency, and writing as compared to their peers who are not tutored.

11 *Slavin, R. E., Lake, C., Davis, S., & Madden, N. A. (2011)*

This article reviews research on the achievement outcomes of alternative approaches for struggling readers ages 5–10 (US grades K-5): One-to-one tutoring, small-group tutorials, classroom instructional process approaches, and computer-assisted instruction. Study inclusion criteria included use of randomized or well-matched control groups, study duration of at least 12 weeks, and use of valid measures independent of treatments. A total of 97 studies met these criteria. The review concludes that one-to-one tutoring is very effective in improving reading performance. Tutoring models that focus on phonics obtain much better outcomes than others. Teachers are more effective than paraprofessionals and volunteers as tutors. Small-group, phonetic tutorials can be effective, but are not as effective as one-to-one phonetically focused tutoring. Classroom instructional process programs, especially cooperative learning, can have very positive effects for struggling readers. Computer-assisted instruction had few effects on reading. Taken together, the findings support a strong focus on improving classroom instruction and then providing one-to-one, phonetic tutoring to students who continue to experience difficulties.

14 *Washington State Institute for Public Policy (2014a)*

The tutoring programs included in this meta-analysis are structured, systematic approaches to tutoring struggling students in specific English language arts and/or mathematics skills. The evaluated programs include a variety of specific programs and curricula such as (in no particular order) Reading Recovery, Mathematics Recovery, Edmark Reading Program, Howard Street Tutoring, and Early Intervention Program. The programs provide, on average, about 30 hours of tutoring time to an individual student each year. Tutors are typically certificated teachers or specially trained adults (e.g. instructional aides and community volunteers). Tutors receive approximately ten hours of training per year with a focus on the specific content and general tutoring strategies.

15 *Washington State Institute for Public Policy (2014b)*

The tutoring programs included in this analysis provide one-on-one assistance to struggling students in English language arts and/or mathematics. The evaluated programs typically allow tutors to exercise their own discretion when selecting and implementing tutoring strategies. The programs provide, on average, about 30 hours of tutoring time to an individual student each year. The tutors are non-certificated adults (e.g. instructional aides and community volunteers) who receive approximately two hours of training per year.

16 *Wasik, B. A., & Slavin, R. E. (1993)*

The tutoring programs included in this analysis provide one-on-one assistance to struggling students in English language arts and/or mathematics. The evaluated programs typically allow tutors to exercise their own discretion when selecting and implementing tutoring strategies. The programs provide, on average, about 30 hours of tutoring time to an individual student each year. The tutors are non-certificated adults (e.g. instructional aides and community volunteers) who receive approximately two hours of training per year.