



Students' Use of Tutoring Services, by Adequate Yearly Progress Status of School

U.S. Department of Education
NCES 2010-023

Authors

Siri Warkentien
Education Statistics Services
Institute – American Insti-
tutes for Research

Sarah Grady
Education Statistics Services
Institute – American Insti-
tutes for Research

Contents

Introduction.....	1
Background.....	1
Research Questions.....	2
Data Source.....	3
Student Characteristics.....	5
Free Tutoring and Information About Free Tutoring.....	5
Other Tutoring.....	7
Satisfaction With Tutoring.....	9
Summary.....	11
Methodology and Technical Notes.....	11
References.....	14
Appendix A: Standard Error Tables.....	16

For more information,
contact Lisa Hudson,
National Center for
Education Statistics,
(202) 502-7358,
lisa.hudson@ed.gov

Introduction

Tutoring has a history as a tool to improve students' academic achievement in the United States (Cohen, Kulik, and Kulik 1982; Wasik and Slavin 1993; Invernizzi 2002). Children can receive tutoring from a variety of sources, both at school and outside of school. Parents who can tutor their children often first try to intervene themselves and then, given economic means, hire private tutoring services for their children. Children of parents who cannot help, either educationally or financially, rely upon tutoring services provided at school (Farkas and Durham 2008). The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB)—which mandated that Title I schools not meeting yearly assessment targets offer free tutoring as part of the supplemental education services (SES) in the legislation—brought new attention to tutoring. Recent research on Title I has investigated the implementation of and participation in SES (U.S. Government Accountability Office 2006; Stullich, Eisner, and McCrary 2007; U.S. Department of Education 2007; U.S. Department of Education 2009).

This Statistics in Brief contributes to current research by investigating the use of tutoring services among a nationally representative group of public school students enrolled in grades K–12.¹ The report compares students in schools that have not made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for 3 or more years, and were thereby enrolled in schools that may have been required to provide SES (such as tutoring), to students who attended other public schools. Comparisons include parents' reports of receipt of information on free tutoring; their child receiving free tutoring; their child receiving other tutoring; paying, in whole or in part, for other tutoring; and parent satisfaction with free and other tutoring.

Background

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) reauthorized Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which provides federal funds to help elementary and secondary schools establish and maintain programs to meet the

¹ The 2007 National Household Education Survey (NHES) questionnaire did not use the term “supplemental educational services” but instead asked parents, “Some schools and districts help students get free tutoring or extra academic help outside of regular school hours. This extra help can be offered after school, on weekends, or during the summer. Have you received information from (CHILD)’s current school or district about opportunities for free tutoring? During this school year, has (CHILD) received free tutoring outside of regular school hours by a provider approved by your state or district?” Although these questions were intended to measure the use of free tutoring under supplemental educational services, parents may not have been aware of their child’s eligibility or whether their child’s school offered free tutoring as a provision of supplemental educational services under Title I.

educational needs of low-achieving students in high-poverty schools.² NCLB requires states to establish yearly assessment targets for districts and schools. Schools that receive Title I funds and do not make AYP for 2 consecutive years are identified for improvement. If a Title I school does not make AYP for a 3rd year, the district must offer SES to low-income students in that school.³

Supplemental educational services are defined as “additional academic instruction designed to increase the academic achievement of students in schools in need of improvement” (U.S. Department of Education 2005). They can include tutoring and other supplemental academic enrichment services, as long as they occur outside of the regular school day. SES providers can be from the public or private sector; however, all providers must be approved by the state. States have the option of requiring all schools that did not make AYP for a 3rd year, regardless of Title I status, to provide SES to students. For example, 6 of the 48 responding states and the District of Columbia required that non-Title I schools offer SES to low-income students in the 2003–04 school year (U.S. Department of Education 2006). Additionally, some schools may offer SES to students who are not low income (U.S. Department of Education 2009). Therefore, the only consistent determinant of a student’s potential eligibility for receiving SES (such as tutoring services) is whether or not the child attends a school which has not made AYP for 3 years or more.

Recent findings from research on Title I and SES indicate that students with certain characteristics receive SES at higher rates than do other students. For example, a study of nine large, urban school districts in the 2004–05 school year found that among eligible students, those in grades 2–5, Black and Hispanic students, limited English proficiency students, and students with disabilities received SES at higher rates than did other students (U.S. Department of Education 2007).

² Title I funds can either be administered in a schoolwide program or a targeted assistance program. Schoolwide programs operate in schools in which 40 percent or more of the children are from low-income families and that use their Title I funds to improve instruction throughout the entire school. Targeted assistance programs operate in schools that use Title I funds to provide services only to children who have been identified as most at risk of failing to achieve academic targets (No Child Left Behind Act, sections 1114 and 1115).

³ Readers should note that the regulations as outlined here are those that were in place at the time of the 2007 NHES survey.

Research Questions

This Statistics in Brief investigates the use of tutoring services by a nationally representative group of public school students enrolled in grades K–12 and attending schools that did not make AYP for 3 or more years. The report seeks to answer the following research questions: What percentage of students attends schools not making AYP for 3 or more years and how does this vary by student background characteristics? What percentage of students had parents who reported that they received information about free tutoring from the student’s school or district, and what percentage of students received free tutoring or other tutoring? Among those who received other tutoring, what percentage bore any cost for the tutoring services? Finally, what percentage of parents reported being very satisfied with the free or other tutoring that their child received? Within each of these research questions, the brief compares tutoring usage among students attending schools that did not make AYP for 3 or more years to the use of tutoring services among students attending other public schools.⁴ In addition, the report examines background characteristics of students for each research question.⁵

Because each state has developed its own standards, assessments, definitions of student proficiency, and AYP targets, the definition of a “school that did not make AYP” is not consistent across states. A school that misses AYP targets in one state may in fact have higher achievement than a school that meets AYP targets in another state. However, this designation determines whether a school must offer SES to low-income students, and so this analysis focuses on examining students in schools that did not make AYP for 3 years and the extent to which their parents report that such services were offered in these schools (regardless of family income) in addition to comparing the use of tutoring services of students in these schools to students attending other public schools.

⁴ In this brief, “other public schools” include schools that have not made AYP for 1 or 2 years (and, therefore, are not required under NCLB legislation to provide SES) as well as schools meeting AYP targets. The data included on the NHES file do not support a finer breakout of “other public schools.”

⁵ The characteristics examined may be related to each other and therefore differences in one variable may explain some or all of the results shown. Although beyond the scope of this report, the variables are worthy of further consideration in multivariate modeling.

All differences discussed in the text were tested for statistical significance at the .05 level using *t*-tests without adjustments for multiple comparisons.

Data Source

The report uses data from the Parent and Family Involvement in Education (PFI) Survey of the 2007 National Household Education Surveys Program (NHES:2007) to analyze the characteristics of students by their school’s AYP status and their use of tutoring services. The AYP status of the school was merged from the National Adequate Yearly Progress and Identification (NAYPI) database.⁶

NHES is a random-digit-dial telephone survey of U.S. households conducted for the U.S. Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). In 2007, the NHES PFI Survey completed 10,681 interviews with parents or guardians of a nationally representative sample of children enrolled in grades K–12, including homeschoolers. These data, when properly weighted, represent a population of 53.2 million students. The PFI Survey asks the person in the household who is most knowledgeable about the child’s education to provide information about family involvement in the child’s school, school efforts to involve the family in school activities, parental involvement with the child’s homework, school choice, and homeschooling. In 2007, the PFI Survey also included a series of questions about tutoring.

In NHES:2007 parents were asked to report the name of the school attended by each child. The school names were coded using established school ID numbers from the Common Core of Data for public schools.⁷ NHES:2007 also included a list of NCES school ID numbers in the restricted-use file that identify schools not making AYP for 3 or more years in the 2006–07 school year. The list was created from the NAYPI database of all schools that did not make AYP for 3 or more years in the 2006–07 school year and includes only those schools attended by students sampled in NHES.

⁶ The NAYPI database was created by the American Institutes for Research for the State Study of the Implementation of Accountability and Teacher Quality under No Child Left Behind (SSI NCLB) for the U.S. Department of Education. For additional information on the NAYPI database, visit <http://www.air.org/publications/naypi.data.download.aspx>.

⁷ U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data (CCD) (<http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/ccddata.asp>).

For this analysis, the list was used to create the two analytic samples of students—those attending schools that did not make AYP for 3 or more years and those attending other public schools. Schools not making AYP for 3 or more years that receive Title I funds are required to offer free SES to low-income students (exhibit 1). The particular practices of each school, district, and state are not addressed in this analysis (e.g., some states require that SES be offered to students at non-Title I schools; some states have demand for SES that exceeds their funding and can offer SES only to the lowest achieving students). It is not possible to determine in the NHES data whether the sampled student received or was eligible for free tutoring as part of SES under Title I. Therefore, this analysis focuses on tutoring among students who attended schools that did not make AYP for 3 or more years compared to tutoring among students who attended other public schools. The NHES sample used for the analyses presented in this report includes 9,003 students representing almost 45.6 million students in grades K–12.

Exhibit 1. Adequate yearly progress status and Title I mandates

Adequate yearly progress (AYP) status ¹	Provision of supplemental educational services (SES) under Title I reauthorization
Make AYP	†
Failure to make AYP—1st year	†
Failure to make AYP—2nd year (identified for improvement) ²	School choice
Failure to make AYP—3rd year or more (identified for improvement) ²	School choice and SES to low-income students in Title I schools ³

† Not applicable.

¹ Adequate yearly progress is the measure of the extent to which students in a school meet annual achievement targets in reading and mathematics. Each state develops its own definition of AYP; these definitions must reflect the objective of all students demonstrating proficiency by the 2013–14 school year.

² Schools that are labeled as “identified for improvement” have not made AYP for 2 or more years.

³ States and schools may offer SES to students who are not low income and/or may offer SES to students attending schools that are not receiving Title I funds. SES can include tutoring and other supplemental academic enrichment services, as long as they occur outside of the regular school day. Readers should note that the regulations as outlined here are those that were in place at the time of the NHES survey.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education. (2005). *Supplemental Educational Services Non-Regulatory Guidance*. Washington, DC.

Table 1. Percentage distribution of public school students in grades K–12, by whether their school made adequate yearly progress targets and selected characteristics: 2006–07

Selected characteristics	Percent attending schools that did not make AYP for 3 or more years	Percent attending other public schools
Total	10.1	89.9
Student characteristics		
Race/ethnicity ¹		
White	4.5	95.5
Black	18.9	81.1
Hispanic	18.2	81.8
Other	11.4	88.6
Grade level		
K–5	8.8	91.2
6–8	15.9	84.1
9–12	7.7	92.3
Poverty level ²		
Poor	19.6	80.4
Near-poor	13.3	86.7
Nonpoor	5.6	94.4
English spoken in household		
Both parents/only parent	8.2	91.8
One of two parents	14.2	85.8
No parent(s)	24.2	75.8
Family structure		
Two-parent household	8.4	91.6
One-parent household	13.5	86.5
Nonparent guardians	17.9	82.1
Student's school characteristics		
School status		
Schoolwide Title I-eligible	23.0	77.0
Title I-eligible, not schoolwide	6.5	93.5
Not Title I-eligible	2.0	98.0
Missing	2.1 !	97.9
Students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch		
25 percent or fewer	1.9	98.1
26 to 50 percent	3.9	96.1
Greater than 50 percent	24.4	75.6
Missing	7.2 !	92.8

! Interpret data with caution; standard error is more than one-third of the estimate.

¹ Race categories exclude Hispanic origin. Black includes African American and Hispanic includes Latino. The "other" race/ethnicity category includes Asian, Pacific Islander, American Indian, Alaska Native, and multiracial children not of Hispanic ethnicity.

² "Poor" includes those students living in households below the poverty threshold; "near-poor" is defined as those at 100–199 percent of the poverty threshold; and "nonpoor" is defined as those at 200 percent or more of the poverty threshold. The poverty threshold is determined by the federal government based on the household's size and composition. For more information, see U.S. Census Bureau, Poverty Thresholds for 2006 by Size of Family and Number of Related Children Under 18 Years at <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/threshld/thresh06.html>.

NOTE: Estimates exclude homeschooled and ungraded students. AYP is adequate yearly progress. "Other public schools" include schools that have not made AYP for 1 or 2 years (and, therefore, are not required under NCLB legislation to provide SES) as well as schools meeting AYP targets.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Parent and Family Involvement in Education Survey of the National Household Education Surveys Program (NHES), 2007 and Common Core of Data (CCD), "Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey," 2006–07, Version 1c.

Student Characteristics

During the 2006–07 school year, approximately 10 percent of public school students in grades K–12 attended a school that did not make AYP for 3 or more years (table 1). The percentage of students attending these schools varied by several background characteristics. For example, 19 percent of Black students and 18 percent of Hispanic students in grades K–12 attended such schools compared to 5 percent of White students.

In terms of grade level, a higher percentage of students in grades 6–8 than in grades K–5 or 9–12 were in schools that missed AYP targets for 3 or more years (16 vs. 9 and 8 percent, respectively).

Approximately one-fifth (20 percent) of all poor K–12 students attended a school not making AYP for 3 or more years compared to 13 percent of near-poor students.⁸ Nonpoor students (6 percent) had the smallest percentage attending these schools.

A higher percentage of students living in households where no parent spoke English than in households in which one out of two parents spoke English attended schools not making AYP for 3 or more years (24 vs. 14 percent). Students living in households where either both parents or the only parent spoke English had the smallest percentage attending such schools (8 percent).⁹

Thirteen percent of students from one-parent households attended schools that missed AYP targets for 3 or more years compared to 8 percent of students from two-parent households.

⁸ “Poor” includes those students living in households below the poverty threshold, “near poor” is defined as those at 100 percent to 199 percent of the poverty threshold, and “nonpoor” is defined as those at 200 percent or more of the poverty threshold. The poverty threshold is determined by the federal government based on a household’s size and composition. For this report, a household with four people would be considered poor with an income of \$20,000 or less, near poor with an income between \$20,001 and \$40,000, and nonpoor with an income greater than \$40,000. For more information see U.S. Census Bureau, Poverty Thresholds for 2006 by Size of Family and Number of Related Children Under 18 Years, <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/threshld/thresh06.html>.

⁹ The student’s household language indicates the knowledge and/or use of English by the parent(s)/guardian(s) in the household. The variable has three values which represent whether the student’s parent(s) speak(s) English, regardless of other languages known or spoken: both or only parent speaks English at home, one of two parents speaks English at home, and no parent speaks English at home.

About one out of four students (23 percent) who attended schools with schoolwide Title I programs were in schools that also did not make AYP targets for 3 or more years.¹⁰ Higher percentages of students at schools with schoolwide Title I programs than at Title I-eligible schools not operating schoolwide programs attended a school not making AYP for 3 or more years (23 vs. 7 percent). Students at schools not eligible for Title I (2 percent) were the least likely to attend a school not meeting the necessary AYP targets.

Twenty-four percent of students attending schools in which greater than 50 percent of the students were eligible for free or reduced-price lunch were at schools that did not make AYP for 3 or more years. This percentage is higher than the percentage of students at schools in which 26 to 50 percent of students were eligible (4 percent), which is in turn higher than the percentage of students at schools in which fewer than 25 percent of students were eligible (2 percent).

Compared to the overall percentage (10 percent), higher percentages of the following groups of students attended schools not making AYP for 3 or more years: Black and Hispanic students, students in grades 6–8, poor and near-poor students, students from households in which no parent spoke English, students from one-parent households, students attending schools with schoolwide Title I programs, and students attending schools in which greater than 50 percent of students were eligible for free or reduced-price lunch.

Free Tutoring and Information About Free Tutoring

During the 2006–07 school year, approximately 60 percent of the public school students in grades K–12 who attended a school that did not make AYP for 3 or more years (approximately 10 percent of public school students in grades K–12) had parents who reported that they received information about free tutoring from their child’s school or district (table 2). Twenty-two percent of students attending such schools received free tutoring, according to

¹⁰ Any given school may be either Title I, or may have failed to meet AYP for 3 or more years, or may meet both of these conditions, or neither.

Table 2. Percentage of public school students in grades K–12 whose parents reported receiving information about free tutoring and who received free tutoring, by whether their school made adequate yearly progress and selected characteristics: 2006–07

Selected characteristics	Free tutoring, among students attending schools not making AYP for 3 or more years		Free tutoring, among students attending other public schools	
	Percent receiving information ¹	Percent receiving free tutoring ¹	Percent receiving information ¹	Percent receiving free tutoring ¹
Total	59.9	21.7	43.3	13.0
Student characteristics				
Race/ethnicity ²				
White	48.6	11.3	40.2	9.7
Black	64.6	29.6	48.0	20.2
Hispanic	67.8	22.3	52.4	19.5
Other	44.5	21.8	38.2	9.6
Grade level				
K–5	59.8	24.4	37.2	9.3
6–8	58.7	21.7	45.5	15.5
9–12	61.6	17.3	50.3	16.3
Poverty level ³				
Poor	62.1	23.7	43.2	15.5
Near-poor	62.2	22.4	45.3	15.4
Nonpoor	55.0	18.5	42.8	11.5
English spoken in household				
Both parents/only parent	56.8	19.9	41.8	12.0
One of two parents	71.7	21.6 !	59.4	20.4
No parent(s)	66.8	26.2	54.9	21.0
Family structure				
Two-parent household	56.6	19.8	43.5	11.7
One-parent household	66.9	26.0	43.8	16.8
Nonparent guardians	55.3	17.5 !	37.2	13.2
Student's school characteristics				
School status				
Schoolwide Title I-eligible	62.2	23.2	46.6	15.0
Title I-eligible, not schoolwide	56.2	17.6	38.0	8.7
Not Title I-eligible	46.8	14.4	42.5	12.4
Missing	‡	‡	55.2	26.4
Students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch				
25 percent or fewer	67.0	12.0 !	42.2	11.0
26 to 50 percent	46.4	13.2	41.4	12.0
Greater than 50 percent	60.5	24.1	45.1	14.9
Missing	73.4 !	11.4 !	53.1	22.1

! Interpret data with caution; standard error is more than one-third of the estimate.

‡ Reporting standards not met.

¹ Parents were asked whether they had received information from their child's school about opportunities for free tutoring and whether their child received tutoring outside regular school hours by a provider approved by their school district or state.

² Race categories exclude Hispanic origin. Black includes African American and Hispanic includes Latino. The "other" race/ethnicity category includes Asian, Pacific Islander, American Indian, Alaska Native, and multiracial children not of Hispanic ethnicity.

³ "Poor" includes those students living in households below the poverty threshold; "near-poor" is defined as those at 100–199 percent of the poverty threshold; and "nonpoor" is defined as those at 200 percent or more of the poverty threshold. The poverty threshold is determined by the federal government based on the household's size and composition. For more information, see U.S. Census Bureau, Poverty Thresholds for 2006 by Size of Family and Number of Related Children Under 18 Years at <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/threshld/thresh06.html>.

NOTE: Estimates exclude homeschooled and ungraded students. AYP is adequate yearly progress. "Other public schools" include schools that have not made AYP for 2 or fewer years (and, therefore, are not required under NCLB legislation to provide SES) as well as schools meeting AYP targets.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Parent and Family Involvement in Education Survey of the National Household Education Surveys Program (NHES), 2007 and Common Core of Data (CCD), "Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey," 2006–07, Version 1c.

their parents.¹¹ Lower percentages of students who did not attend such schools had parents who reported receiving information about free tutoring (43 percent) or receiving free tutoring (13 percent).

Students in Schools Not Making AYP

Among students in schools not making AYP for 3 or more years, race/ethnicity was the only characteristic by which parents reported differences in both receipt of information about free tutoring *and* receipt of free tutoring. A smaller percentage of White students had parents who reported receiving information about free tutoring—and a smaller percentage of White students received free tutoring—than did Black or Hispanic students. About half (49 percent) of White students had parents who received information about free tutoring, compared to about two-thirds of Black and Hispanic students (65 and 68 percent, respectively). Eleven percent of White students received free tutoring, compared to 30 percent of Black students and 22 percent of Hispanic students.

Receipt of information about tutoring services varied by students' family structure for students who attended schools that did not make AYP for 3 or more years. Fifty-seven percent of students living in two-parent households had parents who reported receiving information about free tutoring, compared to 67 percent of students living in one-parent households.

Comparisons by School Status

In general, higher percentages of students attending schools that did not make AYP for 3 or more years than other public schools had parents who reported receiving information about free tutoring. This was true for Black and Hispanic students; students in grades K–5, 6–8, and 9–12; poor, near-poor, and nonpoor students; students in households in which both parents, or the only parent, spoke English and students in households in which no parent spoke English; students living in one- or two-parent households; students attending schools with schoolwide Title I programs as well as students attending Title I-eligible schools not operating schoolwide programs; and those

attending schools in which 25 percent or fewer students were eligible for free or reduced-price lunch and in which greater than 50 percent of the students were eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. Differences for those receiving information about free tutoring ranged from 11 percent for students in grades 9–12 (62 vs. 50 percent) to 25 percent for students attending schools where 25 percent or fewer students were eligible for free or reduced-price lunch (67 vs. 42 percent).

In addition, students attending schools that did not meet AYP targets for 3 or more years had parents who reported higher levels of free tutoring compared to parents of their peers who attended other public schools. This was also true for students in grades K–5; poor and nonpoor students; students in households in which both parents, or the only parent, spoke English; students living in one- and two-parent households; students attending schools operating schoolwide Title I programs; and students attending schools in which greater than 50 percent of the students were eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. Differences by school status for those receiving free tutoring, according to their parents, ranged from 7 percent for nonpoor students (19 vs. 12 percent) to 15 percent for students in grades K–5 (24 vs. 9 percent).

Other Tutoring

In addition to being asked about free tutoring, parents of school-age children were asked if their child received “any other tutoring services.” Parents may have used broad and diverse interpretations of “tutoring services” in their responses. For example, parents may have considered free tutoring from a source other than the school or district, tutoring from a family member, or tutoring services for which they paid a provider. In total, about 12 percent of students attending schools that did not make AYP for 3 or more years received some other form of tutoring (table 3). Of these students, 27 percent received other tutoring services that were paid for, in whole or in part, by their household. Overall, 11 percent of students attending other schools received other tutoring; among these students, 67 percent received services for which their household paid.

¹¹ Although supplemental education services can be offered in the summer according to the NCLB legislation, the data presented here are limited to tutoring received during the school year, and thus may be an underestimate.

Table 3. Percentage of public school students in grades K-12 who received tutoring other than free tutoring and whose household paid for tutoring, by whether their school made adequate yearly progress and selected characteristics: 2006-07

Selected characteristics	Other tutoring, among students attending schools not making AYP for 3 or more years		Other tutoring, among students attending other public schools	
	Received other tutoring ¹	Household paid for other tutoring ²	Received other tutoring ¹	Household paid for other tutoring ²
Total	11.8	27.1	11.2	67.2
Student characteristics				
Race/ethnicity ³				
White	12.0	46.6	11.1	64.1
Black	15.0	22.6	10.6	75.1
Hispanic	9.0	11.4 !	11.7	78.8
Other	11.6 !	‡	11.5	49.7
Grade level				
K-5	14.4	36.6	9.5	72.8
6-8	9.3	14.4 !	9.7	68.0
9-12	11.5	24.1 !	14.5	61.9
Poverty level ⁴				
Poor	7.8	‡	8.5	81.5
Near-poor	16.5	‡	12.6	84.8
Nonpoor	12.9	53.6	11.6	57.9
English spoken in household				
Both parents/only parent	13.6	30.7	11.3	65.8
One of two parents	17.3 !	‡	12.4	‡
No parent(s)	6.4	‡	9.9	77.9
Family structure				
Two-parent household	11.9	22.6	11.4	64.8
One-parent household	9.9	30.1 !	10.4	75.4
Nonparent guardians	18.6 !	‡	12.5	66.1
Student's school characteristics				
School status				
Schoolwide Title I-eligible	11.2	27.3	8.8	75.6
Title I-eligible, not schoolwide	18.7	‡	11.1	63.4
Not Title I-eligible	8.5 !	‡	12.8	64.5
Missing	#	#	10.7	72.7
Students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch				
25 percent or fewer	16.6 !	‡	13.5	57.9
26 to 50 percent	10.1 !	‡	10.4	69.4
Greater than 50 percent	11.9	22.3	9.2	82.2
Missing	‡	#	10.7	67.9

Rounds to zero.

! Interpret data with caution; standard error is more than one-third of the estimate.

‡ Reporting standards not met.

¹ Parents were asked whether their child received "other tutoring" outside of free tutoring from a provider approved by the state or district.

² Tutoring services were paid for, in whole or in part, by the student's household.

³ Race categories exclude Hispanic origin. Black includes African American and Hispanic includes Latino. The "other" race/ethnicity category includes Asian, Pacific Islander, American Indian, Alaska Native, and multiracial children not of Hispanic ethnicity.

⁴ "Poor" includes those students living in households below the poverty threshold; "near-poor" is defined as those at 100-199 percent of the poverty threshold; and "nonpoor" is defined as those at 200 percent or more of the poverty threshold. The poverty threshold is determined by the federal government based on the household's size and composition. For more information, see U.S. Census Bureau, Poverty Thresholds for 2006 by Size of Family and Number of Related Children Under 18 Years at <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/threshld/thresh06.html>.

NOTE: Estimates exclude homeschooled and ungraded students. AYP is adequate yearly progress. "Other public schools" include schools that have not made AYP for 2 or fewer years (and, therefore, are not required under NCLB legislation to provide SES) as well as schools meeting AYP targets.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Parent and Family Involvement in Education Survey of the National Household Education Surveys Program (NHES), 2007 and Common Core of Data (CCD), "Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey," 2006-07, Version 1c.

Students in Schools Not Making AYP

The receipt of other tutoring services varied by the student's poverty level and by whether English was spoken at home by the child's parents. A smaller percentage of poor students had parents who reported that their children received other tutoring than did parents of near-poor students (8 vs. 17 percent), and a larger percentage of students from homes in which both parents, or the single parent, spoke English received other tutoring than students from homes in which no parent spoke English (14 vs. 6 percent).

Overall, higher percentages of students attending schools that did not make AYP for 3 or more years had parents who reported that their students received free tutoring (22 percent) than other tutoring (12 percent) (tables 2 and 3). The following groups also had higher percentages receiving free tutoring than other tutoring: Black and Hispanic students; students in grades K–5 and 6–8; poor students; students from households in which no parent spoke English; students from one- and two-parent households; students attending schools with schoolwide Title I programs, and students attending schools in which greater than 50 percent of students were eligible for free or reduced-price lunch.

Comparisons by School Status

There were no measurable differences in the overall percentage of students attending schools not making AYP for 3 or more years who received other tutoring and the percentage of students attending other public schools (12 vs. 11 percent) (table 3). Furthermore, there were no measurable differences by any selected background characteristics. In contrast, the percentage of students whose household paid for other tutoring, in whole or in part, varied by the student's school's AYP status. In general, lower percentages of students attending schools that did not make AYP for 3 or more years had parents who reported that they paid for tutoring services. Among students who received other tutoring, 27 percent of students attending schools not making AYP targets for 3 or more years received tutoring services that were paid for by their household, compared to 67 percent of students attending other public schools. This was also true for Black and Hispanic students; students in grades K–5, 6–8, and 9–12; students living in

households in which both parents, or the only parent, spoke English; students living in one- and two-parent households; students attending schoolwide Title I schools; and those attending schools in which greater than 50 percent of students were eligible for free or reduced-price lunch.

Satisfaction With Tutoring

Parents of students were also asked how satisfied they were with the tutoring services that their child received. Parents could respond "very satisfied," "somewhat satisfied," "somewhat dissatisfied," or "very dissatisfied." Of the students attending schools that did not make AYP for 3 or more years, about 63 percent of students who received free tutoring and 54 percent of students who received other tutoring had parents who were very satisfied with the services that their child received (table 4). Among students at other public schools, 62 percent of students who received free tutoring and 59 percent of students who received other tutoring had parents who reported being very satisfied with the services their child received.

Students in Schools Not Making AYP

Parent satisfaction varied by poverty level and family structure among students attending schools that did not make AYP for 3 or more years. Specifically, a greater percentage of poor students who received free tutoring had parents who were very satisfied with the services than did their near-poor or nonpoor peers (80 percent vs. 57 and 41 percent, respectively). In addition, 50 percent of all students living in two-parent households had parents who were very satisfied, compared to 75 percent of students living in one-parent households.

Parent satisfaction with other tutoring varied by students' grade level. A greater percentage of students enrolled in grades K–5 in schools that missed AYP targets for 3 or more years and who received other tutoring had parents who were very satisfied with the services (66 percent) than did the comparable group of students enrolled in grades 6–8 (38 percent).

Comparisons by School Status

There were no measurable differences in parent satisfaction with tutoring services by the AYP status of the student's school.

Table 4. Percentage of public school students in grades K–12 who received free or other tutoring whose parents reported being very satisfied with tutoring services, by whether their school made adequate yearly progress, type of tutoring, and selected characteristics: 2006–07

Selected characteristics	Parental satisfaction, among students attending schools not making AYP for 3 or more years who received tutoring		Parental satisfaction, among students attending other public schools who received tutoring	
	Free tutoring ¹	Other tutoring ²	Free tutoring ¹	Other tutoring ²
Total	62.9	54.2	61.9	58.7
Student characteristics				
Race/ethnicity ³				
White	71.0	‡	58.7	61.3
Black	61.4	53.0	65.5	62.1
Hispanic	59.9	52.2	65.6	51.7
Other	‡	‡	55.5	50.4
Grade level				
K–5	68.0	66.1	68.4	64.0
6–8	55.3	38.2	60.9	58.9
9–12	66.2	50.5	57.5	53.8
Poverty level ⁴				
Poor	80.3	‡	65.7	59.2
Near-poor	56.9	53.6	61.7	58.4
Nonpoor	40.9	53.8	60.4	58.7
English spoken in household				
Both parents/only parent	63.9	52.8	61.7	58.7
One of two parents	‡	‡	62.6	‡
No parent(s)	62.7	‡	62.9	57.3
Family structure				
Two-parent household	50.5	50.7	61.5	57.9
One-parent household	74.6	63.2	63.4	60.8
Nonparent guardians	‡	‡	56.5	61.9
Student's school characteristics				
School status				
Schoolwide Title I-eligible	67.0	54.8	64.1	59.9
Title I-eligible, not schoolwide	‡	‡	61.0	60.9
Not Title I-eligible	‡	‡	59.9	57.2
Missing	‡	#	65.4	61.3
Students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch				
25 percent or fewer	‡	‡	57.7	54.5
26 to 50 percent	‡	‡	63.6	61.7
Greater than 50 percent	64.8	51.5	63.3	62.1
Missing	‡	‡	65.6	62.1

‡ Reporting standards not met.

¹ Parents were asked whether they had received information from their child's school about opportunities for free tutoring and whether their child received tutoring outside regular school hours by a provider approved by their school district or state.

² Parents were asked whether their child received "other tutoring" outside of free tutoring from a provider approved by the state or district.

³ Race categories exclude Hispanic origin. Black includes African American and Hispanic includes Latino. The "other" race/ethnicity category includes Asian, Pacific Islander, American Indian, Alaska Native, and multiracial children not of Hispanic ethnicity.

⁴ "Poor" includes those students living in households below the poverty threshold; "near poor" is defined as those at 100–199 percent of the poverty threshold; and "nonpoor" is defined as those at 200 percent or more of the poverty threshold. The poverty threshold is determined by the federal government based on the household's size and composition. For more information, see U.S. Census Bureau, Poverty Thresholds for 2006 by Size of Family and Number of Related Children Under 18 Years at <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/threshld/thresh06.html>.

NOTE: Estimates exclude homeschooled and ungraded students. AYP is adequate yearly progress. "Other public schools" include schools that have not made AYP for 2 or fewer years (and, therefore, are not required under NCLB legislation to provide SES) as well as schools meeting AYP targets.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Parent and Family Involvement in Education Survey of the National Household Education Surveys Program (NHES), 2007 and Common Core of Data (CCD), "Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey," 2006–07, Version 1c.

Summary

During the 2006–07 school year, approximately 10 percent of all public school students in grades K–12 attended a school that did not make AYP for 3 or more years. Higher percentages of certain student groups attended such schools compared to the overall percentage—Black and Hispanic students; poor and near-poor students; students living in households in which no parent spoke English; students attending schools in which greater than 50 percent of students were eligible for free or reduced-price lunch or attending schools that had schoolwide Title I programs.

In general, greater percentages of students attending schools that did not make AYP for 3 or more years than other public schools received information about free tutoring and received free tutoring, according to their parents (60 vs. 43 percent and 22 vs. 13 percent, respectively, for students overall).

Among all students in schools that missed AYP targets for 3 or more years, about 60 percent had parents who reported having received information about free tutoring from the student’s school. Twenty-two percent of students received free tutoring services, according to their parents. Receipt of information about free tutoring from the student’s school varied by race/ethnicity and family structure among students who attended such schools. Receipt of free tutoring also varied by race/ethnicity. Larger percentages of Black and Hispanic students received information about free tutoring and received free tutoring than White students.

About 12 percent of students attending schools that did not make AYP for 3 or more years received tutoring services other than free tutoring from their school. Among these students, 27 percent received tutoring that was paid for, in whole or in part, by their household. Receipt of other tutoring varied by poverty level and by the language most spoken in the child’s home. For example, a smaller percentage of poor than near-poor students received other tutoring.

There were no measurable differences between the percentage of students attending schools not making AYP for 3 or more years and those in other public schools who received other tutoring

(12 vs. 11 percent). However, among students who received other tutoring, higher percentages of students attending other public schools had the services paid for, in whole or in part, by their household than did their peers attending schools not making AYP targets (67 vs. 27 percent).

Overall, among students in schools that missed AYP targets for 3 or more years and who received free tutoring, approximately 63 percent had parents who reported being very satisfied with the free tutoring their child received. Fifty-four percent reported being very satisfied with other tutoring services. The percentage of students whose parents reported that they were very satisfied with free tutoring varied by poverty level and family structure. For example, larger percentages of poor students than near-poor or nonpoor students and larger percentages of students in one-parent households than in two-parent households had parents who were very satisfied with free tutoring. The percentage of students whose parents were very satisfied with other tutoring services varied by grade level, with a larger percentage of students in grades K–5 than in grades 6–8 having parents who were very satisfied with other tutoring services.

Parent satisfaction with free tutoring did not vary based on the AYP status of their child’s school. In addition, there were no measurable differences by AYP status of the child’s school for parent satisfaction with other tutoring.

Methodology and Technical Notes

Overview of NHES

The 2007 National Household Education Survey (NHES) was a telephone survey conducted for the U.S. Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Data collection occurred from January through May 2007. When appropriately weighted, the sample used in this analysis is nationally representative of public school students in grades K–12 in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The sample was selected using random-digit-dial methods, and the data were collected using computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) technology. A screening questionnaire administered to a member of the household age 18 or older was used to determine

whether any children enrolled in grades K–12 lived in the household, to collect age and grade information on each child, and to identify the appropriate parent or guardian to respond for the sampled child. More detailed, extended interviews were conducted about each sampled child. Each interview was conducted with the parent or guardian most knowledgeable about the care and education of the sampled child.

In 2007, parents were asked to provide the name of their child’s school during the interview. NHES matched the NCES identification number of the child’s school to data from one of two NCES surveys—the Common Core of Data (CCD) for public schools or the Private School Universe Survey (PSS) for private schools. All NHES variables pertain to the student, but CCD and PSS variables pertain to the student’s school. At the time that the data from the CCD file were merged with the NHES data, CCD data from the 2004–05 academic school year were the most recent data available. However, for this analysis, CCD data from the 2006–07 academic year were merged to the NHES file in order to better align with the timing of the NHES data collection. The variable SCHLID, available in the PFI restricted-use data file, was used to merge the NHES data with data from the 2006–07 CCD data file, to recreate some of the school-level derived variables included in the data files. The CCD variables used for this analysis include schoolwide Title I status (STITLI06) and percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch (calculated by dividing TOTFRL06 by MEMBER06).

The restricted data file for NHES:2007 also includes a list of NCES school identification numbers that identify schools that did not make adequate yearly progress (AYP) for 3 or more years in the 2006–07 school year. This list was created from the National Adequate Yearly Progress and Identification (NAYPI) database which combines data collected from state education agency officials and consolidated state performance reports and data from the Department of Education’s EDFacts/ Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) system. The list was used to identify which students attended a school that may have been required to provide supplemental educational services (SES) under the No Child Left Behind legislation. Readers

should note that individual states are always the most authoritative, detailed, and current source for their own AYP status and identification for improvement status.

For complete information on NHES:2007 methodology, please see Hagedorn et al. (2008).

Response Rates

Screening interviews were completed with 54,034 households in 2007, with a unit response rate of 53 percent. The second-stage response rate, or the percentage of eligible sampled children for whom interviews were completed, was 74 percent for the Parent and Family Involvement in Education (PFI) extended interviews. Thus, the overall unit response rate for the PFI Survey was 39 percent in 2007. Response bias analyses showed no evidence of substantial bias in estimates. Statistical adjustments used in weighting corrected, at least partially, for any biases resulting from differential nonresponse (Van de Kerckhove et al. 2008).

In 2007, item nonresponse (the failure to complete some items in an otherwise completed interview) was very low (less than 2 percent for most variables in this report). For information about specific item response rates, see Hagedorn et al. (2008). All items with missing responses, except those derived from the CCD and the PSS, were imputed using a hot-deck imputation procedure (Kalton and Kasprzyk 1986).

Quality of Estimates: Reliability of NHES:2007 Data

Estimates produced using data from NHES are subject to two types of errors: nonsampling and sampling errors. Nonsampling errors are errors made in the collection and processing of data. Sampling errors occur because the data are collected from a sample, rather than a census, of the population.

Nonsampling Errors

“Nonsampling error” is the term used to describe variations in the estimates that may be caused by population coverage limitations and data collection, processing, and reporting procedures. The sources of nonsampling errors are typically problems

such as unit and item nonresponse, differences in respondents' interpretations of the meaning of survey questions, response differences related to the particular time the survey was conducted, the tendency for respondents to give socially desirable responses, and mistakes in data preparation.

In general, it is difficult to identify and estimate either the amount of nonsampling error or the bias caused by this error. For each NHES survey, efforts were made to prevent such errors from occurring and to compensate for them where possible. For instance, during the survey design phase, cognitive interviews were conducted to assess respondents' knowledge of the topics, respondents' comprehension of questions and terms, and item sensitivity. The design phase also entailed extensive staff testing of the CATI instrument and a pretest in which several hundred interviews were conducted to identify problems with the initial questionnaire.

An important nonsampling error for a telephone survey is the failure to include persons who do not live in households with telephones. Weighting adjustments using characteristics related to telephone coverage were used to reduce the bias in the estimates associated with children who do not live in households with telephones.

Sampling Errors

The sample of households with telephones selected for an NHES survey is just one of many possible samples that could have been selected from all households with telephones. Therefore, estimates produced from each NHES survey may differ from estimates that would have been produced from other samples. This type of variability is called sampling error because it arises from using a sample of households with telephones rather than all households with telephones.

Survey Standard Errors

The standard error is a measure of the variability due to sampling when estimating a statistic; standard errors for estimates presented in this report were computed using a jackknife replication method. Standard errors can be used as a measure of the precision expected from a particular sample.

Standard errors for all of the estimates are presented in tables found in appendix A. These standard errors can be used to produce confidence intervals, which indicate the accuracy of an estimate. For example, an estimated 10.1 percent of students were reported to have attended a school that did not make AYP for 3 or more years during the 2006–07 school year. This figure has an estimated standard error of 0.48. Therefore, the estimated 95 percent confidence interval for this statistic is approximately 9.16 to 11.04 percent [10.1 percent \pm (1.96 \times 0.48)]. That is, if samples from the same population are taken numerous times and confidence intervals constructed using each possible sample, 95 percent of the intervals will include the true value of the population parameter.

Statistical Tests

Comparisons made in this report have been tested for statistical significance at the .05 level using the student's *t* statistic to ensure that the differences are larger than those that might be expected because of sampling variation. The following formula was used to compute the *t* statistic, without adjustments for multiple comparisons:

$$t = \frac{E_1 - E_2}{\sqrt{se_1^2 + se_2^2}}$$

where E_1 and E_2 are the estimates being compared and se_1 and se_2 are the corresponding standard errors of these averages.

Several points should be considered when interpreting *t* statistics. First, comparisons based on large *t* statistics may appear to merit special attention. This can be misleading since the magnitude of the *t* statistic is related not only to the observed differences in means or proportions but also to the number of respondents in the specific categories used for comparison. Hence, a small difference compared across a large number of respondents would produce a large *t* statistic.

Second, there is a possibility that one can report a "false positive" or type I error. In the case of a *t* statistic, this false positive would result when a difference measured with a particular sample showed a statistically significant difference

when there was no difference in the underlying population. Statistical tests are designed to control this type of error. These tests are set to different levels of tolerance or risk known as alphas. The alpha level of .05 selected for findings in this report indicates that a difference of a certain magnitude or larger would be produced no more than 1 time out of 20 when there was no actual difference in the quantities in the underlying population. When p values are smaller than the .05 level, the null hypothesis that there is no difference between the two quantities is rejected. Finding no difference, however, does not necessarily imply that the values are the same or equivalent.

Third, the probability of a type I error increases with the number of comparisons being made. Bonferroni adjustments are sometimes used to correct for this problem. Bonferroni adjustments do this by reducing the alpha level for each individual test in proportion to the number of tests being done. However, while Bonferroni adjustments help avoid type I errors, they increase the chance of making type II errors. Type II errors occur when there actually is a difference present in a population, but a statistical test applied to estimates from a sample indicates that no difference exists. Bonferroni adjustments are not employed in this report.

References

- Cohen, P.A., Kulik, J.A., and Kulik, C.L.C. (1982). Educational Outcomes of Tutoring: A Meta-analysis of Findings. *American Educational Research Journal*, 19, 237–248.
- Farkas, G., and Durham, R. (2007). The Role of Tutoring in Standards Based Reform. In A. Gamoran (Ed.), *Standards-Based Reform and the Poverty Gap: Lessons for No Child Left Behind* (pp. 201–228). Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Hagedorn, M., Roth, S.B., O'Donnell, K., Smith, S., and Mulligan, G. (2008). *National Household Education Surveys of 2007: Data File User's Manual, Volume I and Volume III: Parent and Family Involvement in Education Surveys* (NCES 2009-024). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC.
- Invernizzi, M. (2002). The Complex World of One-on-One Tutoring. In S. Neuman and D. Dickinson (Eds.), *Handbook of Early Literacy Research*. (pp. 459–470). New York: Guildford Press.
- Kalton, G., and Kasprzyk, D. (1986). *The Treatment of Missing Data. Survey Methodology*, 12: 1–16.
- Stullich, S., Eisner, E., and McCrary, J. (2007). *National Assessment of Title I, Final Report: Volume I: Implementation* (NCEE 2008-4012). National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education: Washington, DC. Retrieved October 10, 2008, from www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/37/0f/30.pdf.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2005). *Supplemental Educational Services Non-Regulatory Guidance*. Washington, DC. Retrieved September 29, 2008, from www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/suppsvcsguid.doc.
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, Policy and Program Studies Service. (2006). *Title I Accountability and School Improvement From 2001 to 2004*. Washington, DC. Retrieved October 10, 2008, from www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/disadv/tassie3/tassie3.pdf.
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, Policy and Program Studies Service. (2007). *State and Local Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act, Volume I—Title I School Choice, Supplemental Educational Services, and Student Achievement*. Washington, DC. Retrieved October 10, 2008, from www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/2a/57/54.pdf.
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, Policy and Program Studies Service. (2009). *State and Local Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act, Volume VII—Title I School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services: Final Report*. Washington, DC. Retrieved April 17, 2009, from <http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/choice/nclb-choice-ses-final/choice-ses-final.pdf>.

- U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2006). *Education Actions Needed to Improve Local Implementation and State Evaluation of Supplemental Educational Services* (GAO-06-758). Washington, DC. Retrieved October 8, 2008, from www.gao.gov/new.items/d06758.pdf.
- Van de Kerckhove, W., Montaquila, J.M., Carver, P.R., and Brick, J.M. (2008). *Evaluation of Bias in the 2007 National Household Education Surveys Program: Results From a Special Data Collection Effort* (NCES 2008-065). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC.
- Wasik, B.A., and Slavin, R.E. (1993). Preventing Early Reading Failure With One-to-One Tutoring: A Review of Five Programs. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 28, 179–200.

For more information on the National Household Education Surveys Program, visit <http://nces.ed.gov/nhes>. To order additional copies of this Statistics in Brief or other NCES publications, call 1-877-4ED-PUBS or visit <http://www.edpubs.org>. NCES publications are also available on the Internet at <http://nces.ed.gov>.

Appendix A. Standard Error Tables

Table A-1. Standard errors for table 1: Percentage distribution of public school students in grades K-12, by whether their school made adequate yearly progress targets and selected characteristics: 2006-07

Selected characteristics	Percent attending schools that did not make AYP for 3 or more years	Percent attending other public schools
Total	0.48	0.48
Student characteristics		
Race/ethnicity		
White	0.35	0.35
Black	1.93	1.93
Hispanic	1.26	1.26
Other	2.57	2.57
Grade level		
K-5	0.72	0.72
6-8	1.25	1.25
9-12	0.65	0.65
Poverty level		
Poor	1.55	1.55
Near-poor	1.10	1.10
Nonpoor	0.39	0.39
English spoken in household		
Both parents/only parent	0.50	0.50
One of two parents	2.96	2.96
No parent(s)	1.87	1.87
Family structure		
Two-parent household	0.54	0.54
One-parent household	1.16	1.16
Nonparent guardians	5.02	5.02
Student's school characteristics		
School status		
Schoolwide Title I-eligible	1.24	1.24
Title I-eligible, not schoolwide	0.77	0.77
Not Title I-eligible	0.28	0.28
Missing	0.91	0.91
Students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch		
25 percent or fewer	0.37	0.37
26 to 50 percent	0.48	0.48
Greater than 50 percent	1.23	1.23
Missing	3.34	3.34

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Parent and Family Involvement in Education Survey of the National Household Education Surveys Program (NHES), 2007 and Common Core of Data (CCD), "Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey," 2006-07, Version 1c.

Table A-2. Standard errors for table 2: Percentage of public school students in grades K-12 whose parents reported receiving information about free tutoring and who received free tutoring, by whether their school made adequate yearly progress and selected characteristics: 2006-07

Selected characteristics	Free tutoring, among students attending schools not making AYP for 3 or more years		Free tutoring, among students attending other public schools	
	Percent receiving information	Percent receiving free tutoring	Percent receiving information	Percent receiving free tutoring
Total	2.76	2.06	0.72	0.50
Student characteristics				
Race/ethnicity				
White	4.71	3.02	0.89	0.59
Black	6.03	5.96	2.62	1.83
Hispanic	3.93	2.61	1.85	1.66
Other	10.34	6.02	2.97	1.33
Grade level				
K-5	5.01	3.63	1.20	0.65
6-8	4.24	3.71	1.71	1.16
9-12	4.36	3.62	1.32	0.95
Poverty level				
Poor	5.25	3.83	2.31	1.35
Near-poor	4.24	3.45	1.97	1.53
Nonpoor	3.99	3.15	0.77	0.57
English spoken in household				
Both parents/only parent	3.36	2.71	0.74	0.57
One of two parents	11.52	8.68	4.50	3.39
No parent(s)	5.44	3.84	2.52	2.15
Family structure				
Two-parent household	3.37	2.28	0.77	0.56
One-parent household	3.94	4.04	1.96	1.16
Nonparent guardians	15.64	9.21	5.22	2.62
Student's school characteristics				
School status				
Schoolwide Title I-eligible	3.29	2.41	1.40	1.00
Title I-eligible, not schoolwide	6.84	5.10	1.50	0.83
Not Title I-eligible	7.53	4.25	1.06	0.70
Missing	†	†	4.24	4.47
Students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch				
25 percent or fewer	8.84	5.49	1.26	0.81
26 to 50 percent	7.15	4.07	1.50	1.03
Greater than 50 percent	3.16	2.58	1.68	0.91
Missing	25.50	10.32	3.56	3.46

† Not applicable.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Parent and Family Involvement in Education Survey of the National Household Education Surveys Program (NHES), 2007 and Common Core of Data (CCD), "Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey," 2006-07, Version 1c.

Table A-3. Standard errors for table 3: Percentage of public school students in grades K-12 who received tutoring other than free tutoring and whose household paid for tutoring, by whether their school made adequate yearly progress and selected characteristics: 2006-07

Selected characteristics	Other tutoring, among students attending schools not making AYP for 3 or more years		Other tutoring, among students attending other public schools	
	Received other tutoring	Household paid for other tutoring	Received other tutoring	Household paid for other tutoring
Total	1.41	5.98	0.43	1.88
Student characteristics				
Race/ethnicity				
White	2.67	14.56	0.53	2.70
Black	3.31	7.27	1.59	5.53
Hispanic	1.76	6.78	1.19	4.10
Other	5.88	†	1.42	7.19
Grade level				
K-5	2.44	10.21	0.69	2.93
6-8	2.09	7.94	0.74	4.47
9-12	2.48	10.35	0.89	3.00
Poverty level				
Poor	1.68	†	1.13	5.87
Near-poor	3.80	†	1.25	3.16
Nonpoor	2.20	10.41	0.47	2.60
English spoken in household				
Both parents/only parent	1.79	6.96	0.49	2.10
One of two parents	10.32	†	2.97	†
No parent(s)	1.61	†	1.53	6.15
Family structure				
Two-parent household	1.83	6.64	0.46	2.41
One-parent household	2.16	13.86	0.86	3.36
Nonparent guardians	10.03	†	2.32	11.54
Student's school characteristics				
School status				
Schoolwide Title I-eligible	1.54	7.17	0.84	3.97
Title I-eligible, not schoolwide	4.88	†	1.10	5.05
Not Title I-eligible	2.99	†	0.67	2.65
Missing	†	†	2.15	8.52
Students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch				
25 percent or fewer	5.88	†	0.81	3.32
26 to 50 percent	3.42	†	0.75	3.82
Greater than 50 percent	1.58	6.55	0.83	3.07
Missing	†	†	1.82	7.87

† Not applicable.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Parent and Family Involvement in Education Survey of the National Household Education Surveys Program (NHES), 2007 and Common Core of Data (CCD), "Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey," 2006-07, Version 1c.

Table A-4. Standard errors for table 4: Percentage of public school students in grades K-12 who received free or other tutoring whose parents reported being very satisfied with tutoring services, by whether their school made adequate yearly progress, type of tutoring, and selected characteristics: 2006-07

Selected characteristics	Parental satisfaction, among students attending schools not making AYP for 3 or more years who received tutoring		Parental satisfaction, among students attending other public schools who received tutoring	
	Free tutoring	Other tutoring	Free tutoring	Other tutoring
Total	5.07	5.84	2.10	2.14
Student characteristics				
Race/ethnicity				
White	11.62	†	2.82	2.38
Black	9.29	10.55	4.53	7.40
Hispanic	7.47	10.41	3.90	5.38
Other	†	†	7.99	7.73
Grade level				
K-5	7.50	9.41	3.35	4.13
6-8	10.37	10.42	4.61	4.78
9-12	10.31	13.42	3.33	3.07
Poverty level				
Poor	6.44	†	4.99	7.54
Near-poor	9.57	13.53	5.37	5.48
Nonpoor	10.56	10.76	2.69	2.23
English spoken in household				
Both parents/only parent	6.26	7.28	2.41	2.18
One of two parents	†	†	8.48	†
No parent(s)	8.18	†	5.43	9.52
Family structure				
Two-parent household	7.48	8.16	2.44	2.57
One-parent household	7.10	11.51	3.88	4.70
Nonparent guardians	†	†	8.87	9.92
Student's school characteristics				
School status				
Schoolwide Title I-eligible	5.96	7.47	3.07	5.69
Title I-eligible, not schoolwide	†	†	5.55	4.91
Not Title I-eligible	†	†	3.23	2.82
Missing	†	†	8.44	9.43
Students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch				
25 percent or fewer	†	†	4.13	3.46
26 to 50 percent	†	†	3.49	4.08
Greater than 50 percent	5.52	7.33	3.01	4.88
Missing	†	†	7.70	7.56

† Not applicable.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Parent and Family Involvement in Education Survey of the National Household Education Surveys Program (NHES), 2007 and Common Core of Data (CCD), "Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey," 2006-07, Version 1c.

www.ed.gov



ies.ed.gov