CHARACTERISTICS OF TUTORS IN THE MANHATTAN, KANSAS,
FRIENDSHIP TUTORING PROGRAM

by /264

LINDA JOAN DICKERSON FUNK

B. S., Kansas State University, 1964

—————————————

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Family and Child Development

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1969

Approved by:

Sheldon K. Calluvan

Major Professor

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Tutorial programs, such as the Friendship Tutoring Program of Manhattan, Kansas, have gained momentum during the past decade. A tutorial program can be defined as a program in which one or more persons assists another person in some aspect of his development. Presently, tutorial programs include over 200,000 tutors in more than 1,000 tutorial projects (Noce, 1967). Seven million hours are spent yearly in helping over 350,000 children benefit from homework help, recreation, field trips and vocational counseling (Isgar, 1967). A general belief among lay people is that tutorials represent a potentially great force for positive change in American education.

The Manhattan Friendship Tutoring Program is a voluntary community program operating under the auspices of the Human Relation Board of the city. The program, now in its fifth year of operation, was begun as an unofficial community project by a handful of citizens and a dozen university students who volunteered to help as friends and tutors. During the years, it has grown to include over 225 volunteers serving as tutors, grade-level coordinators, co-directors, an advisory board, bus drivers and others. In addition, interested individuals have donated books, supplies, money, transportation, and space for the program's weekly tutoring sessions, which are held in three downtown churches.

In 1965, the Manhattan Human Relations Board adopted the Friendship Tutoring Program under its official city auspices and made provision for financial and clerical support. It also established a seven person advisory board made up of parents, tutors, and interested citizens to insure the continuity of the program. In January, 1968, the city of Manhattan officially made provisions for the financial support of the program. An amount of $2,575.00 was budgeted with $1,375.00 being allocated for an executive coordinator. The Department of Family and Child Development at Kansas State University provided matching funds for the executive coordinator; a graduate assistant has been employed annually to serve in the capacity of executive coordinator.

The Friendship Tutoring Program serves over 200 children on a one-to-one, "tutor-friend" basis. Tutors are selected primarily on the basis of their willingness to participate in a volunteer helping program and their commitment to stay with the program for at least one full semester. Orientation sessions and guidebooks are provided for new tutors, but most of their "training" is of an in-service nature through conferences with coordinators and with the executive coordinator.

Most of the children come to the program with friends or are brought by their parents. As the program has gained the awareness and acceptance of the public schools, additional numbers of children have come as referrals from school officials, counselors, and teachers. About one-half of the children are from minority groups, mostly Negroes, while the majority of

nominated for the Lane Bryant Community Service Program Award in a nation-wide competition of community service volunteer programs, the Friendship Tutoring Program received citations of honorable mention.

Noce (1967) has set forth valid reasons for studying tutorial projects:

Very little careful and responsible research and evaluation has been performed anywhere nationally, to date...

It is unfair to expect the children being tutored, the tutors, and professional personnel involved in referring children for tutoring to remain committed to a program which is essentially unproven...

The future growth and expansion of the tutorial movement will depend in large part on favorable publicity and good public relations fostered by the positive findings of sound research and evaluation.

Thus, research and evaluation is a necessity for any tutorial project. However, several problems, not unique to any one program, exist which greatly retard such activity. First, the largely unstructured ever-changing nature of tutorial projects prevents well-organized, long-ranged, sophisticated studies. Tutors may object to giving personal time to become involved in a study. Parents of tutees may object to having their children scrutinized by an "outsider." Secondly, gaining access to valuable school records, test scores, or interviewing school personnel may be an impossible task, depending on the individual school district. Thirdly, there appears to be an absence of a universally accepted statement of objectives for the various programs. This is due in large part to a lack of agreement among those who formulate tutorial philosophy. One can sympathize with the problems of creating a philosophy for a movement which is very large and very new, but the fact

remains it is very difficult to perform research and evaluation in an area where the purpose, direction and outcome remain very diverse and frequently ill-defined.

Thus, due to lack of any formal evaluation about the Friendship Tutoring Program, this study evolved as an attempt to describe the tutors in the Friendship Tutoring Program in terms of tutor background, tutor's use of consultation and time devoted to tutoring, tutor's reasons for becoming involved and tutor's personal perception of his success, of tutee's improvements in relationships with others and improvements in school activities, tutor's ease and whether tutoring was worth the time and effort involved.

Origination of Tutoring Programs

The social revolution of the past decade brought a new phenomenon
to the scene of American education. Organized tutorials initially developed
out of the Northern students' involvement in the civil rights movement. In
the late fifties, as Southern students were pledging their minds and bodies
to fight for human freedom, Northern college students sought a part they
could play in this revolution for human rights. Out of the individual search
for meaningful acts; out of the frustrating and limbo roles of college students
in a vibrant time; and out of the desperate need for new forms of education
to meet the needs of the disadvantaged minorities, tutoring programs devel-
oped (Chesler, 1965).

Purposes of Tutoring Programs

Each tutorial develops according to the needs of the community and
the ideals and enthusiasm of the college student involved (Hamilton, 1965).
Chesler (1965) sets forth some of the general purposes of tutorials: to
increase the intellectual skills, school performance and creative expres-
sion of the tutee; improve the social consciousness of the tutors; foster
community development. Tutorials attempt to correct the more obvious ills

of a segregated society and the ills of an educational system that inadequately corrects for societal mistakes.

The basic idea of the Columbia Educational Enrichment Program is to establish a relationship with the tutees, bring about their observation and creativity and to serve as a trusted friend (Missouri Alumnus, 1968).

Parham (1966) stated the objectives of the Athens, Georgia, tutorial: to improve ability to read and study, to help create a desire to learn and remain in school, to overcome discouragement by enabling tutees to keep up, to help develop or restore a child's confidence, to aid slow learners, to make available beneficial stimulation and experiences and to provide associations with other young people with whom the tutees might identify and from whom they might gain attention and love.

The Newark Tutorial Project goal is twofold: to motivate high school students to finish secondary school and to consider the possibility of college, and to afford a personal cultural interchange between tutor and tutee which a classroom situation within the school system often makes difficult (Metzger, 1964).

The purpose of the University of Washington tutorial is to offer individual help in basic skills, particularly to students who come from backgrounds low on the socio-economic scale and who lack motivation because they know no one who has succeeded (Student N.E.A. News, 1966).

The Cache-Logan Tutorial Center for underachievers in reading and writing bases their program on the critical points in a student's schooling.

Tutorial leaders believe the fourth, seventh, and tenth grades are the critical grade-levels and all tutoring is directed toward these areas (Shaver and Nuhn, 1968).

Tutors at Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri, hope to raise academic achievement of tutees while realizing that IQ scores alone may not indicate true potential of disadvantaged students, to discover and develop latent talents of tutees, to build strong ties of human understanding between tutor and tutee, and to help tutees develop respect for themselves, confidence in their abilities and pride in their attainments (Baun, 1965).

Seventy Lycoming College students tutor disadvantaged high school students in Williamsport, Pennsylvania. The program, sponsored by Students for Human Rights and Equality (SHARE), attempts to improve tutee's reading skills and to encourage tutees to prepare for future job training (Pennsylvania School Journal, 1966).

Different Types of Programs

Tutoring in the Cache-Logan Tutorial Center occurs during the regular school day. Tutors are members of the community who receive an hourly pay for services rendered. Some tutor on a one-to-one ratio while others work with a three-to-one ratio. At the junior and senior high school levels, tutoring substitutes for regular English classes (Shaver and Nuhn, 1968).

University of Southern Florida college students tutor in Jennings Elementary School during the regular school day. Children in segregated

Jennings are tutored in hopes that they will be more prepared for moving into integrated schools during the following year (Fuentes, 1969).

College students at the University of Washington tutor at elementary, junior and senior high schools during the regular school day. Tutors work with tutee's regular teachers, thus allowing the teacher more time for other students (Student N.E.A. News, 1966).

University of Missouri and Stephens College students meet twice a week with Negro children in one of the local schools. The Columbia Educational Enrichment Program, which includes four afternoon and evening sessions, is structured so that it requires a tutor to spend at least two hours a week with his child. Beyond this requirement there are no rules as long as the tutoring works in the best interest of the individual and does not hinder the other children. The program operates mainly for 160 elementary age school children. According to Bill Elder, a student coordinator, 80 per cent of the tutors volunteer for another year of tutoring (Missouri Alumnus, 1968).

Elementary age children in the Athens, Georgia, tutorial are selected by recommendations of principals and teachers, while the college tutors are screened by the sponsoring organization, Wesley Foundation. Conferences among principals, teachers and tutors are held and a running evaluation is provided in a meeting of tutors every two weeks. Tutoring sessions are held in the schools, during or immediately after regular school hours. According to Russell Edwards, program director, a primary objective is to

keep the school aims in mind. "We're lost if we try to work outside the school structure." (Parham, 1966).

The Kinloch Tutoring Project in St. Louis, Missouri, relies on Washington University students as volunteer tutors. Under the sponsorship of the Student YWCA-YMCA, tutors and tutees meet in "Y" buildings and "store-front" classrooms. Tutees, who come from disadvantaged areas, are tutored on a three-to-one ratio (Baun, 1965).

Myths of Tutoring

Shaevitz (1969) discussed some of the myths of tutoring. He labeled these myths as: "the relationship," "know-nothing," "independence equals creativity," and "it's good to be an ostrich," and described each:

"The Relationship." While some programs see their goals as primarily educational in nature, others believe that the most important product of a tutoring endeavor is to form a relationship. There is an implicit assumption that if this relationship is not quickly formed, something is wrong with the volunteer. This confusion in direction with the primary emphasis being placed upon "the relationship" not as a means to an end, but as an end to itself, appears to be one widely held myth of volunteers in various programs. How a relationship is formed, what is the quality of this relationship, and what is the effect of such a union on the child being tutored has rarely been discussed or demonstrated.

"Know-Nothing." Some project officials believe that school systems have failed due to the inability of teachers to be spontaneous, creative and to approach the child as an individual. Therefore, in order not to block the basic spontaneity and creative potential of the tutor, it is necessary that he know nothing about methods of instruction, factors responsible for learning or anything else that the professionally trained teachers know.

"Independence Equals Creativity." The equating of independence with creativity has led to most programs having no structure, believing any modification of this controlled chaos would be detrimental. On the

other side of independence is loneliness. A student who has been sent out to tutor with the implicit task of being creative feels isolated and cut off. He is prevented from recontacting more central people in the program because they are difficult to locate and because asking for help is seen as a sign of weakness.

"It's Good to be an Ostrich." Tutors neglect use of school informa-tion believing that the information will be detrimental rather than facili-tating and that the more information one has about the child, the less capable one is in helping him. However, by knowing where a tutee is having difficulty, the tutor is less likely to be duped and more likely to direct his efforts in areas that could be beneficial.

Aspects of Helping Relationships

It is possible that the quality of the interpersonal relationship in a teaching or tutoring situation is more important for the progress of some students than for others. In a study of college tutorials, Little (1968) discovered that a "good" relationship between tutor and tutee was indepen-dent of the tutee's feelings of satisfaction with academic progress.

Barrett-Lennard (1963) viewed the helping relationship as any re-lationship in which one person facilitates the personal development or growth of another. The helping person understands the other, from the other's own frame of reference. Respect and caring for the other person is unqualified, unconditional. A helping person is ready to communicate meanings that do originate in him, in response to the other's actual desire for this kind of communication. Study of the helping relationship reveals that a helping person is deeply caring, understanding, accepting and available and is able to perceive the other as basically self-directing and responsible.

Why Volunteers Participate

According to Metzger (1964), students who took part in the Newark, New Jersey Tutorial Project were motivated by the wish to put into practical application the theoretical knowledge gained from college study. They all wished to express their interest in motivating students from less fortunate backgrounds.

Athens, Georgia, college students who tutored became better informed about a segment of people which had been separated from them previously, broadened the scope of their college education by spending a few hours a week outside the intellectual ghetto of the college, and had the opportunity to receive personal satisfaction through application of skills gained from their education (Parham, 1966). Director Russell Edwards hypothesized that tutors are searching for a handle to their world and some find it in a tutorial project.

Members of the Student National Education Association in the University of Washington tutorial received practical experience to complement the theory learned in the college class room (Student N.E.A. News, 1966).

Most university students in the Columbia Educational Enrichment Program became involved because they liked what they had heard about the program. Others, who were sociology and education majors, entered the program because it was related to their studies (Missouri Alumnus, 1968).

Dr. David Gottlieb, director of program development of Job Corps, stated: "College students are rarely invited to participate in anything

worthwhile. Tutoring represents a kind of meaningful activity that attracts young people. Rewards are as great for them as for the children they tutor" (Hamilton, 1965).

Relationship and Effect on Community

If a tutorial project is to have any lasting and real value to the community it serves, it must be a basic activity of that community. The children and their parents must be involved in the administration and policy making of the program. No matter how hard tutors try, they cannot know all that the people need. The tutorial project is one of the means by which people are enabled to determine their own futures. It may be very difficult, however, for tutors to relinquish their own autonomy to involve parents and others in the decision making process (Isgar, 1966).

According to Hamilton (1965) the impetus for tutorial projects usually originates outside the school system. No standard pattern exists for college tutorial projects. Each develops according to the needs of the community and the ideals and enthusiasm of the college students involved.

The associate superintendent for curriculum and education in the Clarke County, Georgia, school system indicated the Athens Tutorial had caused some deep thinking in local public school circles and that the project had made school officials look more closely at the importance of individual attention. Teacher-pupil ratio in one Negro school where college students tutored decreased from 1-to-38 to 1-to-22 (Parham, 1966).

Success of Tutoring Programs

Over 96 per cent of tutors in the Kinloch Tutoring Project, St. Louis,
Missouri, felt that the tutoring experience was very worthwhile (Baun, 1965).
A follow-up study of one of the first tutorial projects in North Philadelphia
showed that 41 per cent of the tutees were doing "much better" and another
50 per cent were doing "a little better" in academic endeavors (Hamilton,
1965).

Dunbarton College tutors in Washington, D. C., found their biggest
problem was in establishing rapport with the children. Tutors felt some
measure of success in the fact that tutees seemed eager to come to tutoring
sessions. Tutors admitted that it was difficult to discern any clear improve-
ment in their tutees (Horan, 1965).

Glasser (1968) discussed the legitimacy of tutorial programs, especially
the programs which use college students as prime resources for tutoring. He
questioned the tutor's reasons for becoming involved in tutorials, the kind of
training necessary for college students to become adequate tutors, and if
the commitment of time and energy that might be demanded for tutorials is
unrealistic to ask of a student. Glasser claimed that the hopes once held
for tutorials have not been validated in that very few have been able to
catalyze any change in school systems or have a marked effect on the academic
achievement of the children involved.

Summary

Tutorials developing out of the social revolution of the past decade tend to rely upon college students as volunteer tutors. Although most tutorials develop according to the needs of individual communities, the primary purpose appears to be increasing intellectual skills. The methods for accomplishing this vary from highly structured tutorials which include tutoring within the regular school day to semi-structured tutorials meeting outside the school system for tutoring. Some tutorials include the development of tutee's creative and social awareness while also encouraging development of intellectual skills.

Formation of a helping relationship between tutor and tutee is encouraged in most tutorials; however, some questions may arise as to the importance or purpose of this relationship. It has been suggested that tutors receive supportive assistance from tutorial officials and that tutors make better use of school information when made available.

Most college students volunteer as tutors because they have a desire to help other people and they sense a need to put into practical use those theories learned in the college classroom.

Existing tutorials are usually considered as successful by those people working within the program. Little, if any, research appears to have investigated actual successes or failures of tutoring programs. Also, there seems to be little knowledge about how tutors, tutees, parents, or the community feel about existing tutorials.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

Subjects

The Friendship Tutoring Program was studied in order to further the understanding of the volunteers participating in the program. Although the program had been in existence for four years, no formal attempt had been made to review or describe the program. Since the program is dependent upon the efforts of volunteers, in particular college students, the tutors were the major focus of this study. The subjects for the study were the 123 volunteer tutors involved in the program in the Spring, 1968. Further description of subjects will be presented in the results section.

Instrument

The questionnaire (Appendix) for this study was developed after reading sources describing research techniques and studies done on similar populations (Good and Hatt, 1952).

The primary objective of the questionnaire was to obtain a description of the tutors in the Manhattan, Kansas, Friendship Tutoring Program. Information was obtained which included the background and experience of tutors and tutees, tutor's use of consultation and time devoted to tutoring, tutor's reasons for becoming involved, tutor's perception of tutee's improvement in

terms of relationships with others and scholastic endeavors, tutor's degree of ease with tutee, and tutor's rating of his overall success and of the value of the time and effort which he expended.

A pretest was conducted by administering the questionnaire to nine subjects who were former tutors in the FTP, but who were not tutoring during the Spring, 1968. The purpose of the pretest was to determine if any questions were not clearly stated and to establish the average length of time required to complete the questionnaire. Minor changes were made in the questionnaire after the pretest.

Collection of Data

The questionnaire was administered to the 123 tutors present at the tutoring session on May 7, 1968. At the preceding tutoring session, tutors were asked to arrive 30 minutes early on May 7, 1968, so they could complete the questionnaire before the tutees arrived. Room coordinators received copies of the questionnaire for each tutor in his room. A face sheet, accompanying the questionnaire, explained the purpose of the study. Room coordinators were instructed to distribute the questionnaires, but to answer no questions concerning the questionnaire. Since former tutors taking the pretest had raised no concerns about wordings or comprehension of questions, it was felt that the subjects could complete the questionnaire without additional help.

Analysis of Data

Responses to the questionnaire were coded numerically and recorded on

flow sheets. The Computer Center of Kansas State University computed frequencies and percentages on each variable for the total group. Hypotheses were tested utilizing the chi square statistical method.

Hypotheses Tested

Hypothesis 1. No significant relationship will be found between tutor's perceived overall success and the following:

1 - 1. Age

1 - 2. Sex

1 - 3. Major

1 - 4. Previous tutoring experience

1 - 5. Previous teaching experience

1 - 6. Previous FTP experience

1 - 7. Number months spent in program

1 - 8. Number months tutee in program

1 - 9. Age of tutee

1 - 10. Sex of tutee

1 - 11. Whether tutor had met parents

1 - 12. If tutor had discussed tutee with parents

1 - 13. If tutor had discussed tutee with teachers

1 - 14. If tutor had consulted others

1 - 15. Amount of preparation time

1 - 16. Time spent in extra-curricular activities

1 - 17. Whether tutoring class requirement

1 - 18. Reason for becoming tutor

1 - 19. Improvement of tutee's relationship with tutor

1 - 20. Improvement of tutee's relationship with peers

1 - 21. Improvement of tutee's relationship with parents

1 - 22. Improvement of tutee's relationship with teachers

1 - 23. Improvement of tutee's relationship with other authority figures

1 - 24. Improvement of tutee's grades

1 - 25. Improvement of tutee's school attitudes

1 - 26. Improvement of tutee's school attendance

1 - 27. Improvement of tutee's educational aspirations

1 - 28. Tutor's ease at end of program

1 - 29. Whether tutoring worth time and effort

Hypothesis 2. No significant relationship will be found between tutor's perception of tutoring as worth the time and effort and the following:

2 - 1. Age

2 - 2. Sex

2 - 3. Major

2 - 4. Number of months spent in program

2 - 5. Age of tutee

2 - 6. Sex of tutee

2 - 7. Amount of preparation time

2 - 8. Time spent in extra-curricular activities

2 - 9. Whether tutoring class requirement

2 – 10. Reason for becoming tutor

2 – 11. Improvement of tutee's relationship with tutor

2 – 12. Improvement of tutee's relationship with peers

2 – 13. Improvement of tutee's relationship with parents

2 – 14. Improvement of tutee's relationship with teachers

2 – 15. Improvement of tutee's relationship with other authority figures

2 – 16. Improvement of tutee's grades

2 – 17. Improvement of tutee's school attitudes

2 – 18. Improvement of tutee's school attendance

2 – 19. Improvement of tutee's educational aspirations.

Hypothesis 3. No significant relationship will be found between whether tutoring was class requirement and the following:

3 – 1. Whether tutor had met parents of tutee

3 – 2. If tutor had discussed tutee with parents

3 – 3. If tutor had discussed tutee with teachers

3 – 4. If tutor had consulted others

3 – 5. Amount of preparation time

3 – 6. Time spent in extra-curricular activities.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Description of Subjects

The subjects for this study were the 123 tutors participating in the
Manhattan, Kansas, Friendship Tutoring Program (FTP) during the Spring
of 1968. Of this number, 110 were students at Kansas State University,
Manhattan, Kansas. Approximately one-fourth of the subjects were male.

Classification and Major

Freshmen and seniors comprised 32 per cent of the total number of
tutors. Fifty-one per cent were sophomores and juniors, five per cent were
graduate students and twelve per cent were not enrolled in the university.
Of these twelve per cent, some were special students, some were high school
seniors and a few were members of the Manhattan community. One-fourth of
the college students were majoring in Education, approximately one-fifth
were in Family and Child Development and one-fifth were Arts and Science
majors. The remaining students were enrolled in other curricula of the uni-
versity.

Marital Status and Family Composition

A large percentage (89 per cent) of the subjects were single. Questions

concerning the number of older and younger siblings in the family indicated

that most of the tutors came from relatively small families as shown in

Table 1.

Home Community

Almost one-half of the subjects had a rural background. One-fourth

were from towns with a population of 15,000 to 50,000 and about one-fourth

from towns with a population of over 100,000. A detailed description of

subjects is indicated in Table 1.

TABLE 1

DESCRIPTION OF TUTORS

Variable	Number (123)	Percentage
Age of Tutor		
16 to 17 years	5	4
18 years	13	11
19 to 20 years	62	50
21 to 22 years	31	25
23 to 26 years	9	7
27 to 41 years	3	3
Mean 20.4 years		
Sex of Tutor		
Male	29	24
Female	94	76
Classification of Tutors		
Freshman	22	18
Sophomore	32	26
Junior	31	25
Senior	17	14
Graduate student	6	5
Other	14	12

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Variable	Number	Percentage
Tutor's Major		
Education	31	25
Family and Child Development	21	17
Arts and Science	21	17
Non-students	13	11
Home Economics	11	9
Sociology	7	6
Agriculture	6	5
Engineering	4	3
Architecture	2	2
Commerce	3	2
Psychology	1	1
Vet Medicine	1	1
No response	2	2
Tutor's Marital Status		
Single	110	89
Married	12	10
Separated	1	1
Number of Children		
One	1	1
Two	2	1
None	120	98
Number of Older Brothers		
One	36	29
More than one	8	7
None	79	64
Number of Younger Brothers		
One	37	30
More than one	19	16
None	67	54

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Variable	Number	Percentage
Number of Older Sisters		
One	24	20
More than one	16	13
None	83	67
Number of Younger Sisters		
One	32	26
More than one	20	16
None	71	58
Size of Home Community		
Farm	32	26
15,000 to 50,000	30	24
Over 100,000	23	19
5,000 to 15,000	13	11
Under 5,000	12	10
50,000 to 100,000	8	6
Rural, non farm	5	4

Tutor Role

This study attempted to look at several aspects of the Friendship Tutoring Program. Some of the aspects studied were past experiences of tutors, backgrounds of tutees, tutor's use of consultation, advance preparation and additional time devoted to tutoring, number and types of activities shared by tutor and tutee and why the tutor became involved in the FTP.

Tutoring Experience

Only one out of eight tutors had previous tutoring experience and most of

this experience had been through participation in summer projects in metro-
politan areas. One-third of the subjects had previous teaching experience,
and although a few of the subjects had taught or were presently teaching
school, most of the experience was through student teaching or Sunday school
teaching. Forty-one per cent of the tutors had done previous tutoring with
the FTP, with 32 per cent having had the experience in the semester pre-
ceding the one in which the questionnaire was administered. Most of these
tutors had entered the program because they were interested and wanted to
help others.

The largest number of subjects (37 per cent) heard about the program
through friends, 17 per cent had read articles in local newspapers, 16 per
cent had been told about the program in psychology classes and 30 per cent
had been informed through other people, child development and sociology
classes and through organizations on campus.

The number of months that the subjects had been tutoring ranged from
four to thirteen months with a mean of 5.3 months. See Table 2.

TABLE 2

TUTORING EXPERIENCE

Variable	Number (123)	Percentage
Previous Tutoring Experience		
Yes	16	13
No	107	87
Previous Teaching Experience		

TABLE 2 (Continued)

Variable	Number	Percentage
Previous Teaching Experience (Continued)		
Yes	38	31
No	85	69
Previous FTP Experience		
Yes	50	41
No	73	59
Number of Months of FTP Experience		
3 months or less	6	5
3 – 6 months	39	32
6 – 12 months	3	2
Over 12 months	2	2
No experience	73	59
Reasons for Previous FTP Experience		
Interested and wanted to help	23	19
Class requirement	9	7
Other	18	15
No previous experience	73	59
Method of Hearing about FTP		
Friend of tutor	45	37
Newspaper	21	17
Psychology class	20	16
Other people	10	8
Middle Child class	10	8
School activity	6	5
Related organizations	6	5
Adolescent class	4	3
Sociology	1	1

TABLE 2 (Continued)

Variable	Number	Percentage

Number of Months Spent Tutoring Child

Four	41	33
Eight	21	17
Three	20	16
Nine	15	12
Seven	7	6
One	5	4
Two	5	4
Five	4	3
Six	2	2
Twelve	2	2
Thirteen	1	1

Mean = 5.3 Months

Background of Tutees

Tutees, the children being tutored, had participated in the Friendship Tutoring Program from two to thirty-six months, with a mean of 11.8 months. This is more than twice the average tutor's length of participation. Tutees ranged in age from seven to twenty years, with a mean age of 10.5 years. The number of male and female tutees was evenly divided with 50 per cent male and 50 per cent female. See Table 3.

TABLE 3

BACKGROUND OF TUTEES

Variable	Number (123)	Percentage
Number of Months of Tutee Participation In FTP		
6 months or less	32	26
7 - 12 months	45	37
13 - 17 months	8	7
18 months	24	20
19 - 36 months	14	10
	Mean 11.8 Months	
Age of Tutee		
7 years	11	9
8 - 11 years	64	60
12 years	10	8
13 years	14	11
14 - 20 years	14	11
	Mean 10.8 Months	
Sex of Tutee		
Male	61	49.6
Female	62	50.4

Tutor Contact with Tutee's Family

Three-fourths of the tutors had met the parents of the child they were tutoring. Thirty-eight per cent of the tutors had met the tutee's parents within the last three months, 15 per cent had met the parents three to six months before the administration of the questionnaire and 22 per cent had met the parents more than six to twelve months previous.

Although 75 per cent of the tutors had met the parents, only 56 per cent had been inside the child's home. Some of the contacts with parents were made at tutoring sessions, special meetings called by program leaders or at the car when the tutor was returning the tutee to his home. While 56 per cent of the tutors had been inside the home, only 28 per cent had interacted with the tutee's family while visiting at his home. Almost half of the tutors had discussed the tutee with the parents or guardian at some time during the year. See Table 4.

TABLE 4

TUTOR CONTACT WITH TUTEE'S FAMILY

Variable	Number (123)	Percentage
Tutor Met Child's Parents		
Yes	92	75
No	31	25
Approximate Date of Meeting		
Less than 3 months ago	47	38
3 - 6 months ago	18	15
6 - 12 months ago	26	21
Over 12 months ago	1	1
Never met	31	25
Tutor Inside Tutee's Home		
Yes	69	56
No	54	44
Number of Times Inside Tutee's Home		
One	26	21
Two	15	12

TABLE 4 (Continued)

Variable	Number	Percentage
Number of Times Inside Tutee's Home (Con't)		
Three – five	22	18
Six – nine	6	5
None	54	44
Tutor Interact with Tutee's Family		
Yes	36	29
No	87	71
Tutor Discuss Tutee with Child's Parents or Guardian		
Yes	60	48.8
No	63	51.2

Tutor Use of Consultation

Approximately one-third of the tutors had discussed the tutee with the child's classroom teacher or teachers and one-tenth had discussed the child with other school personnel such as a counselor or principal. Three-fourths had consulted persons other than school personnel. Among those persons consulted were freinds of the tutor (17 per cent), a coordinator of the FTP (17 per cent), program consultants for the FTP (17 per cent), the tutor's instructor in one of his college classes (13 per cent), other tutors (8 per cent), and others (3 per cent). See Table 5.

TABLE 5

TUTOR USE OF CONSULTATION

Variable	Number (123)	Percentage
Tutor Discussed Tutee with Tutee's School Teacher or Teachers		
Yes	36	29
No	87	71
Number of Teachers Consulted		
One	32	26
Two	4	3
None	87	71
Tutor Discussed Tutee with Other School Personnel		
Yes	13	11
No	110	89
Other School Personnel Consulted		
Counselor	8	7
Principal	2	2
Other	3	2
None	110	89
Were Others Consulted		
Yes	93	76
No	30	24
Who Was Consulted		
Friends of tutor	21	17
Room Coordinator	21	17
Program consultants	21	17
Instructor of tutor	16	13
Other tutors	10	8
Other consultants	4	3
None	30	24

Preparation for Tutoring

Responses to the question concerning the amount of time devoted to preparation for each tutoring session indicated that almost one-fourth of the tutors did no advance preparation for the tutoring sessions, three-fourths spent less than one hour in preparation while more than one-tenth devoted one to three hours to this effort. Although program consultants had encouraged each tutor to spend additional time with the tutee outside of the regular tutoring sessions, 35 per cent usually spent no extra time each week, 29 per cent under one hour, 17 per cent from one to two hours and 9 per cent from two to three hours. For 10 per cent of the sample the additional time varied from week to week. See Table 6.

TABLE 6

ADVANCE PREPARATION AND EXTRA-CURRICULAR TIME

Variable	Number (123)	Percentage
Amount of Time Devoted to Preparation for Tutoring Session		
Under one hour	80	65
One to two hours	12	10
Three hours	3	2
None	28	23
Amount of Time Devoted to Tutee Outside of Tutoring Session		
Under one hour	36	29
One to two hours	21	17
Two to three hours	11	9
Varies each week	12	10
None	43	35

Joint Activities of Tutor and Tutee

The number of different activities in which tutor and tutee had partici-
pated ranged from zero to twelve. These activities were in addition to the
Tuesday evening sessions in which all participated. Forty-two per cent
had participated in two to four different types of activities and 45 per cent
had participated in five to twelve different activities with the tutee. Seven
per cent had participated in one joint activity.

The types of activities in which tutors and tutees had participated are
indicated in Table 7.

TABLE 7

JOINT ACTIVITIES OF TUTORS AND TUTEES

Variable	Number	Percentage
Number of Activities Participated in by Tutor and Tutee		
One	9	7
Two – four	52	42
Five – six	24	20
Seven – nine	24	20
Ten – twelve	7	5
None	7	6
Type of Activities Participated in by Tutor and Tutee (More than 1 response possible)		
Going to library	76	
Visiting tutor's KSU home	63	
Visiting KSU campus	53	
Shopping	53	
Going to city park	44	
Eating out	44	
Sightseeing	32	
Going on picnic	26	
Going to cat track	25	

TABLE 7 (Continued)

Variable	Number	Percentage
Type of Activities Participated in by Tutor and Tutee (Continued)		
Visiting tutee's home	23	
Going to ball games	21	
Going to Tuttle Creek facilities	15	
Going to Douglas Center activities	10	
Going to museums	8	

Why Tutor Became Involved in FTP

Although the Friendship Tutoring Program was used as an observation laboratory for some Kansas State University classes, only 15 per cent of the tutors entered the program because of a class requirement. Program consultants were eager to learn why college students were attracted to FTP. When asked their reasons for becoming tutors, over one-half of the college students indicated they were interested in helping others. Other reasons given for participating were: to gain experience helpful in vocational field, to gain a better understanding of youth, to gain a better understanding of underprivileged persons, a desire to work with member of minority group, to gain a better understanding of my self and curiosity. See Table 8.

The subjects were asked to indicate to what degree the tutee had improved in his relationships with others during the months the tutor had known the tutee. A continuum from "not at all" to "very much" was used. Over one-half the tutors believed the tutee and tutor relationship had improved "very much." Most tutors indicated that the tutee's relationships with peers

parents, teachers and other authority figures showed some improvements.

Table 9 presents this data.

TABLE 8

WHY TUTOR BECAME INVOLVED IN FTP

Variable	Number (123)	Percentage
Was Tutoring a Class Requirement?		
Yes	19	15
No	104	85
For Which Class?		
Middle Child	11	9
Adolescent	7	5
Educational Psychology	1	1
None	104	85
Major Reason for Becoming a Tutor		
Interested in helping others	68	55
To gain experience helpful in vocational field	16	13
Class requirement	12	10
To gain a better understanding of youth	9	7
To gain a better understanding of underprivileged persons	9	6
Had desire to work with member of minority group	5	4
To gain better understanding of myself	3	2
Curiosity	3	2

TABLE 9

DEGREE TUTOR BELIEVED TUTEE IMPROVED IN HIS RELATIONSHIPS

Variable	1 (Not at all)	2	3	4	5 (very much)	6 (can't evaluate)	0 (no response)
You (tutor)	1%	5%	23%	36%	32%	2%	1%
Peers	11%	24%	36%	17%	0%	9%	3%
Parents	15%	21%	24%	7%	2%	29%	2%
Teachers	13%	24%	24%	11%	3%	23%	2%
Authority figures	13%	24%	33%	8%	1%	18%	3%

In rating tutee's improvement in scholastic endeavors, over one-half the tutors indicated the tutee had shown some improvement in grades, school attitude and educational aspirations; however, tutors indicated improvement in school attendance had been minimal. One-fifth of the tutors were unable to evaluate the tutee's improvement in school attendance. Table 10 presents this data.

Eighty per cent of the tutors experienced a feeling of overall success in their efforts with the tutee. One-half indicated feeling uneasy with the tutee during the first tutoring sessions, but most tutors agreed to feeling at ease with the tutee at the time of this study. Approximately 85 per cent of the tutors believed that their participation in the Friendship Tutoring Program was worth the time and effort expended. Table 11 presents this data.

TABLE 10

DEGREE TUTOR BELIEVED TUTEE IMPROVED IN HIS SCHOLASTIC ENDEAVORS

Variable	1 (Not at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very much)	6 (Can't evaluate)	0 (No response)
Grades	6%	30%	30%	18%	7%	7%	2%
Attitude	11%	32%	30%	19%	1%	5%	2%
Attendance	38%	16%	15%	7%	3%	18%	3%
Educational aspirations	17%	26%	30%	11%	7%	6%	3%

TABLE 11

DEGREE TUTOR FELT SUCCESSFUL, AT EASE, AND WORTH TIME AND EFFORT

Variable	1 (Not at all)	2	3	4	5 (Very much)	6 (Can't evaluate)	0 (No response)
Overall success	0%	14%	41%	33%	7%	2%	3%
At ease, beginning	17%	34%	19%	18%	10%	1%	1%
At ease, now	0%	3%	7%	29%	59%	1%	1%
Worth time and effort expended	0%	4%	13%	27%	55%	1%	0%

Relationships Among Variables

Relationships were hypothesized between perceived overall success and 29 other variables, between perception of worth of tutoring and 19 variables, and between tutoring as a class requirement and 6 variables. Hypotheses

tested are listed in the Procedure (pp. 18-20); Table 12 presents the results of the chi square analysis to test for a significant relationship between each of the pairs of variables. Because of the large number of hypotheses tested, only those in which significant relationships were observed are discussed.

TABLE 12

RESULTS OF STATISTICAL ANALYSIS UTILIZING CHI SQUARE

Hypothesis	x^2	df	Level of Significance
1 - 1	4.39	8	NS
1 - 2	0.71	2	NS
1 - 3	6.03	8	NS
1 - 4	4.58	2	NS
1 - 5	1.75	2	NS
1 - 6	1.80	2	NS
1 - 7	7.40	8	NS
1 - 8	8.83	10	NS
1 - 9	11.25	14	NS
1 - 10	0.12	2	NS
1 - 11	3.68	2	NS
1 - 12	5.63	2	.10
1 - 13	3.54	2	NS
1 - 14	1.18	2	NS
1 - 15	3.47	4	NS
1 - 16	3.62	6	NS
1 - 17	4.84	2	.10
1 - 18	5.22	4	NS
1 - 19	34.58	6	.005
1 - 20	15.19	6	.025
1 - 21	14.14	6	.05
1 - 22	16.61	6	.025
1 - 23	14.55	6	.025
1 - 24	21.51	4	.005
1 - 25	29.65	6	.005
1 - 26	3.42	6	NS
1 - 27	24.30	6	.005
1 - 28	37.43	4	.005
1 - 29	21.97	6	.005

TABLE 12 (Continued)

Hypothesis	x^2	df	Level of Significance
2 - 1	9.53	12	NS
2 - 2	1.90	3	NS
2 - 3	8.09	12	NS
2 - 4	9.27	12	NS
2 - 5	20.09	21	NS
2 - 6	0.50	3	NS
2 - 7	13.63	6	.05
2 - 8	10.19	9	NS
2 - 9	0.24	3	NS
2 - 10	7.68	6	NS
2 - 11	19.75	9	.025
2 - 12	18.96	9	.05
2 - 13	18.15	9	.05
2 - 14	16.50	9	.10
2 - 15	18.87	9	.05
2 - 16	18.62	6	.005
2 - 17	34.42	9	.005
2 - 18	6.70	9	NS
2 - 19	11.96	9	NS
3 - 1	0.02	1	NS
3 - 2	0.77	1	NS
3 - 3	1.27	1	NS
3 - 4	1.53	1	NS
3 - 5	4.34	2	NS
3 - 6	2.17	3	NS

Hypothesis 1 - 12. There was no significant relationship between tutor's perceived overall success and whether tutor had met parents.

Tutor's perception of overall success was significantly related to whether or not the tutor had discussed the tutee with the child's parents at the .10 level of significance. Tutors who perceived themselves as successful tended to have held such discussions. Of those tutors with high perceived success, 60.4 per cent had held discussions, in contrast to only

35.3 per cent of tutors with low perceived success and 39.2 per cent of those tutors who perceived themselves as having moderate success. The majority of tutors who had held discussions (52.5%) perceived themselves as having been highly successful, while the majority of tutors who had not held discussions (50.8%) perceived themselves as having moderate success. Hypothesis 1 - 12 was rejected.

Hypothesis 1 - 17.   There was no significant relationship between tutor's perceived overall success and whether the tutor was tutoring because of a class requirement.

The relationship between overall success and whether or not the tutor was involved because of a class requirement was significant at the .10 level. The relationship between the two variables appeared to be curvilinear with greater than expected frequencies appearing for both low perceived and high perceived success among those who did have the requirement and for moderate success among those who did not have the requirement. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 - 17 was rejected.

Hypothesis 1 - 19.   There was no significant relationship between tutor's perceived overall success and tutee's improvement in relationship with tutor.

The relationship between perceived overall success and tutee's improvement in relationship with the tutor (as perceived by the tutor) was significant at the .005 level. The relationship seemed to be roughly linear in that those scoring low on one variable scored similarly on the other. Of those tutors who perceived little improvement in the relationship with their

tutee, 60 per cent also perceived a low level of success. Of those tutors who perceived much improvement in the relationship 64.9 per cent also perceived very high overall success. Ninety-one per cent of those who perceived themselves as highly successful perceived either moderate or much improvement in their relationship with the tutee. On the basis of these findings, Hypothesis 1 - 19 was rejected.

Hypothesis 1 - 20. There was no significant relationship between the tutor's perceived overall success and perceived improvement of tutee's relationships with peers.

Significant at the .025 level was the relationship between overall success and tutee's improvement in relationships with his peers. Tutors perceiving much improvement of tutee's relationship with peers perceived high overall success. Tutors who see moderate improvement in the relationship also perceive high overall success. Hypothesis 1 - 20 was rejected.

Hypothesis 1 - 21. There was no significant relationship between the tutor's perceived overall success and perceived improvement in tutee's relationships with parents.

Significant at the .05 level was the relationship between overall success and tutee's improvement in relationships with his parents. Seventy per cent of those tutors perceiving high improvement in tutee's relationships perceived high overall success, while 55 per cent of those tutors perceiving moderate improvement in tutee's relationships with parents perceived high overall success. Fifty-two per cent of those tutors perceiving moderately low improvement in tutee's relationships with his parents perceived moderate

overall success. Fifty-three per cent of tutors perceiving low success also perceived low improvement in tutee's relationship and 44 per cent of those tutors perceiving high overall success perceived a moderate improvement in tutee's relationships with his parents. Hypothesis 1 - 21 was rejected.

Hypothesis 1 - 22. There was no significant relationship between tutor's perceived overall success and perceived improvement in tutee's relationships with his teachers.

Significant at the .025 level was the relationship between overall success and perceived tutee's improvement in relations with his teachers. When a tutor perceived himself as high in overall success, he tended to see improvement in relationships of the tutee. Eighty-two per cent of those tutors perceiving high improvement in tutee's relationships with teachers also perceived themselves as highly successful, while 50 per cent of those tutors who perceived themselves as low in success perceived the tutee's improvement in relationships with his teachers as moderately low. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 - 22 was rejected.

Hypothesis 1 - 23. There was no significant relationship between tutor's perceived overall success and perceived improvement in tutee's relationships with authority figures.

The relationship between perceived overall success and the tutor's perception of tutee's improvement in relationships with authority figures was significant at the .025 level. As with the previous relationship, tutors who perceived themselves as successful perceived a greater improvement in tutee's relationships with authority figures, while tutors who did not feel

successful perceived little or no improvement in the tutee's relationships with authority figures. Hypothesis 1 - 23 was rejected.

Hypothesis 1 - 24. There was no significant relationship between tutor's perceived overall success and perceived improvement in tutee's grades.

The relationship between perceived overall success and perceived tutee improvement in grades was significant at the .005 level. When tutors perceived themselves as successful they also perceived improvement in tutee's grades. Eighty-one per cent of those tutors who saw themselves as unsuccessful perceived little or no improvement in tutee's grades. Of those tutors who thought they were highly successful, 40 per cent perceived much improvement in tutee's grades. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 - 24 was rejected.

Hypothesis 1 - 25. There was no significant relationship between tutor's perceived overall success and perceived improvement in tutee's school attitudes.

Significant at the .005 level was the relationship between the tutor's perceived overall success and perceived tutee's improvement in school attitudes. Tutors who perceived an improvement in tutee's school attitudes tended to perceive themselves as successful. Eighty-one per cent of those tutors who perceived much improvement in tutee's school attitudes indicated they were highly successful and 46 per cent of those tutors who perceived little or no improvement in tutee's school attitude thought of themselves as unsuccessful. Hypothesis 1 - 25 was rejected.

Hypothesis 1 - 27. There was no significant relationship between tutor's
perceived overall success and perceived improvement
in tutee's educational aspirations.

There was a relationship between perceived overall success and the
tutor's perception of improvement in the tutee's educational aspirations,
significant at the .005 level. Sixty-eight per cent of those tutors who per-
ceived an improvement in tutee's educational aspirations rated themselves
high in overall success. Fifty-three per cent of those tutors who perceived
little improvement in tutee's educational aspirations thought of themselves
as moderately successful and 52.9 per cent of the tutors who perceived
moderate improvement in tutee's educational aspirations perceived their
overall success as low. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 - 27 was rejected.

Hypothesis 1 - 28. There was no significant relationship between tutor's
perceived overall success and perceived ease with tutee
at end of semester.

There was a relationship between perceived overall success and tutor's
ease with tutee at end of the semester which was significant at the .005 level.
The distribution is skewed with most tutors reporting that they felt at ease.
Sixty-one per cent of those tutors who felt highly at ease with tutee perceived
themselves as being high in overall success, 63.0 per cent of those tutors
who felt highly at ease with tutee perceived themselves as moderate in
overall success and 54.5 per cent of those tutors who felt moderately low in
ease perceived themselves as being low in overall success. Eighty-eight
per cent of tutors perceiving themselves as successful also indicated they
were highly at ease with the tutee. Hypothesis 1 - 28 was rejected.

Hypothesis 1 – 29. There was no significant relationship between tutor's perceived overall success and whether the tutor felt tutoring was worth the time and effort expended.

Significant at the .005 level was the relationship between perceived overall success and whether the tutor felt tutoring was worth the time and effort. There was a skewed distribution with most tutors regarding tutoring as worth the time and effort. Ninety-two per cent of those tutors who thought tutoring was worth the time and effort perceived themselves as being highly successful. Sixty-three per cent of those tutors who thought tutoring was moderately worth the time and effort perceived themselves as moderate in overall success. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 – 29 was rejected.

Hypothesis 2 – 7. There was no significant relationship between whether tutor thought tutoring was worth the time and effort and the amount of advance preparation time.

The relationship between whether tutoring was worth the time and effort and the amount of advance preparation time was significant at the .05 level. Fifteen of the tutors devoted more than two hours per week to preparing for the tutoring sessions and all of these perceived tutoring as being well worth the time and effort. Two-thirds of the subjects spent one hour or less per week in preparation. Of these, 78 per cent thought tutoring was worth the time and effort. Hypothesis 2 – 7 was rejected.

Hypothesis 2 – 11. There was no significant relationship between whether tutor thought tutoring was worth the time and effort and perceived improvement in tutee's relationship with tutor.

The relationship between whether tutoring was worth the time and effort and the tutor's perception of improvement in his relationship with the tutee was significant at the .025 level. Of those tutors who thought tutoring was well worth the time and effort, 46 per cent perceived much improvement in tutee's relationships with the tutor and 34 per cent perceived moderate improvement in the tutee's relationship. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 - 11 was rejected.

Hypothesis 2 - 12. There was no significant relationship between whether tutoring was worth the time and effort and perceived improvement in tutee's relationships with peers.

Significant at the .05 level was the relationship between whether tutoring was worth the time and effort and the improvement in tutee's relationship with his peers. Tutors who thought tutoring was worth the time and effort did not appear to perceive much improvement in tutee's relationships with peers. Forty-nine per cent of those tutors who thought tutoring was worth the time and effort perceived moderate improvement in tutee's relationships with his peers, while 43 per cent of those tutors who thought tutoring was worth the time and effort perceived only moderately low improvement in tutee's relationships with his peers. Hypothesis 2 - 12 was rejected.

Hypothesis 2 - 13. There was no significant relationship between whether tutoring was worth the time and effort and perceived improvement in tutee's relationships with his parents.

Tutor's perception of whether tutoring was worth the time and effort was significantly related to the tutee's improvement in relationships with

his parents at the .05 level. Tutors who thought tutoring was worth the time and effort did not appear to perceive much improvement in tutee's relationships with parents; however, 60 per cent of those tutors who perceived much improvement in tutee's relationships with parents thought tutoring was worth the time and effort. Forty-six per cent of those tutors who perceived moderately low improvement in tutee's relationships with parents thought tutoring was worth the time and effort. Thirty-seven per cent of those tutors who perceived no improvement in tutee's relationships thought tutoring was moderately worth the time and effort. Eleven per cent of those tutors who saw no improvement in the tutee's relationships with his parents did not perceive tutoring as worth the time and effort. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 - 13 was rejected.

Hypothesis 2 - 14. There was no significant relationship between whether tutoring was worth the time and effort and perceived improvement in tutee's relationships with his teachers.

The relationship between whether tutoring was worth the time and effort and the tutee's improvement in relationships with his teachers was significant at the .10 level. Forty-eight per cent of those tutors who thought tutoring was worth the time and effort perceived moderately low improvement in tutee's relationships with his teachers. Thirty-seven per cent of those tutors who thought tutoring was well worth the time and effort perceived moderate improvement in tutee's relationships with his teachers. Hypothesis 2 - 14 was rejected.

Hypothesis 2 - 15. There was no significant relationship between whether
tutoring was worth the time and effort and perceived
improvement in tutee's relationships with authority
figures.

Significant at the .05 level was the relationship between whether

tutoring was worth the time and effort and perceived improvement of tutee's

relationships with authority figures. Ninety per cent of those tutors who

thought tutoring was worth the time and effort perceived much improvement

in tutee's relationships with authority figures, while 35 per cent of those

tutors who thought tutoring was worth the time and effort perceived moderate

improvement in tutee's relationships with authority figures. Therefore,

Hypothesis 2 - 15 was rejected.

Hypothesis 2 - 16. There was no significant relationship between whether
tutoring was worth the time and effort and perceived
improvement in tutee's grades.

There was a relationship between whether tutoring was worth the

time and effort and improvement in tutee's grades, significant at the .005

level. Eighty per cent of those tutors who perceived improvement in tutee's

grades thought tutoring was worth the time and effort while 37 per cent of

those tutors who perceived moderate improvement in tutee's grades thought

tutoring was worth the time and effort. Hypothesis 2 - 16 was rejected.

Hypothesis 2 - 17. There was no significant relationship between whether
tutoring was worth the time and effort and perceived
improvement of tutee's school attitudes.

There was a relationship between whether tutoring was worth the time

and effort and improvement in the tutee's school attitudes, significant at the .005 level. Of those tutors who perceived much improvement in tutee's school attitudes, 83 per cent thought tutoring was well worth the time and effort. Of those tutors who perceived moderate improvement in tutee's school attitudes, 35 per cent thought tutoring was worth the time and effort. Of those tutors who perceived no improvement in school attitudes, 50 per cent thought tutoring was moderately worth the time and effort. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 - 17 was rejected.

In summary, some of the relationships between tutor's perception of overall success and 29 other variables were significant on application of the chi square test. Tutors who had discussed the tutee with the child's parents tended to rate themselves as successful as did those tutors who were involved in tutoring because of a class requirement. Most tutors who perceived themselves as successful tended to perceive improvements in the tutee's relationships with others and improvements in his scholastic endeavors. Tutors who thought of themselves as successful appeared to feel at ease with the tutee and thought tutoring was worth the time and effort expended.

Examination of the relationship between tutor's perception of whether tutoring was worth the time and effort and 19 variables indicated that tutors who did some advance preparation for tutoring sessions rated tutoring as being worth the time and effort. Tutors who thought tutoring was worth the time and effort tended to perceive some improvement in tutee's relationships with others and improvement in tutee's grades and school attitudes.

DISCUSSION

Approximately one-fourth the tutors were male with three-fourths female, while about one-half the tutees were male and one-half female. Thus, it appears that at least one-fourth the male tutees were tutored by females. Since a same sex role model is often deemed desirable, program officials should actively recruit male tutors. It is probable that male tutees have many contacts with female role models via their mothers, school teachers, and other female authority figures. Some tutees may prefer male tutors since there could be a mutual interest in activities such as ball games or model car racing.

Tutees had been enrolled in the FTP almost twice as long as the tutors. This may have placed the tutors at a disadvantage since the tutee was more knowledgable about the overall program, was able to refer to the previous years' experiences and former tutors concerning general rules of the program. In general, tutees greater length of time in the program may have made it easier for the tutee to manipulate the tutor if necessary. This may have made the tutor uncomfortable and less able to discipline the tutee.

Tutors were highly encouraged to meet the parents or guardians of the tutee, and while three-fourths of the tutors had met the parents, only

one-half had been inside the tutee's home and had discussed the child with his parents. However, those tutors who rated themselves high in overall success tended to have held discussions with the parents. It is possible that tutors who felt successful were more highly motivated to become involved with the child's family.

Tutors involved in the program because of class requirement indicated higher feelings of success than those tutors who did not have the class requirement. This may have been due to follow-up discussions and supportive guidance which occurred within the college classroom. Certainly these tutors had more opportunities for assistance and support than those tutors who were not required to participate. Although informal discussion groups were a part of the FTP, attendance was not required and not all tutors were able or desired to take advantage of these sessions. It is possible that program officials would want to make attendance of such discussion groups a requirement for the tutor.

Those tutors who perceived themselves as successful noted improvement in tutee's relationships with the tutor, peers, parents, teachers and other authority figures. In general, more tutors seemed to note improvement in tutee's relationships with the tutor and peers than with parents, teachers and other authority figures. This may be due to the tutor's first-hand knowledge of the tutor-tutee and the tutee-peer relationships. Tutee's interaction with peers would have been easily observed at weekly tutoring sessions. Observations of tutee's interactions with parents, teachers and other authority figures

may have been more difficult for some tutors.

Tutors who thought of themselves as successful perceived an improvement in tutee's grades, school attitudes and educational aspirations. However, even successful tutors did not rate high improvement in tutee's school attendance. This could be because the tutee did not have poor school attendance. Another possibility is that children with poor school attendance may not be attracted to a tutorial program which involves a weekly commitment of time. Tutor's knowledge of tutee's grades, school attitudes and educational aspirations may have been achieved through discussion with the tutee, since only a small percentage of tutors had consulted teachers or other school personnel. Tutors who noted improvement in tutee's grades, school attitudes and educational aspirations may have felt directly responsible for the improvement and thus perceived themselves as successful.

All tutors, regardless of perception of success, felt somewhat at ease with the tutee at the time of this study, although those tutors who felt most successful also felt more at ease with the tutee. Most tutors had been tutoring for several months which was probably an adequate length of time in which to develop feelings of ease and comfort.

Almost all the tutors believed tutoring was worth the time and effort expended, regardless of their perceived overall success. Over 90 per cent of the tutors considered tutoring as worthwhile, which is in agreement with tutors in the Kinloch Tutorial who also felt tutoring was worthwhile (Baun, 1965).

Approximately three-fourths of the tutors became involved with the program for reasons such as a desire to help others or to seek a better understanding of people. This kind of motivation for attraction to the program may have resulted in the positive feelings toward time and effort expended. Most tutors who sought out the program probably felt that they had a skill worth offering a tutee. A feeling of having something to offer could have been another positive perception of the time and effort expended.

Over three-fourths of the tutors had done some advance preparation for tutoring sessions which is similar to tutors in the Kinloch Tutorial (Baun, 1965). Those tutors who had done advance preparation for tutoring tended to believe tutoring was worth the time and effort expended. This may mean that those who put more of themselves into the program felt or received a higher return for their efforts. Most tutors devoted one hour or less per week in preparing for a tutoring session. Since most tutors were enrolled as full-time college students, program officials did not expect them to devote much time to preparation. The commitment of two hours per week for the actual tutoring session was looked upon as a worthwhile contribution. This finding indicated in planning activities and preparing materials program directors must assume some responsibility.

Those tutors who thought tutoring was worth the time and effort tended to note some improvement in tutee's relationships with tutors, peers, parents, teachers and other authority figures. Tutors appeared to note the most improvement in the tutor-tutee relationship. This may be because tutors were more

concerned about their personal relationship with the tutee than with tutee's relationships with other people.

Tutors who thought tutoring was worth the time and effort expended also perceived an improvement in tutee's grades and school attitudes. It is possible that these tutors regarded the tutee's improvements as evidence of the tutor's contribution and therefore felt proof that time and effort expended directly resulted in the improvements.

It is evident that tutors who thought of themselves as successful and who thought tutoring was worth the time and effort expended tended to note more improvement in tutee's relationships and scholastic endeavors. Perhaps tutors who rated themselves as successful felt a need to substantiate this by also indicating high improvement in the tutee. Also, those tutors who had a high self concept may have been more effective than tutors who did not perceive themselves as successful.

Further Implications of Findings

Further implications of these findings are that those tutors who did not feel successful or believe tutoring was worth the time and effort did not stay with the program and, therefore, were probably not represented in the sample. The feeling of success among tutors may indicate that tutors either have low expectations or are not aware of ways in which they can improve relationships with others. The findings suggest that tutors may place higher priority on the tutee's academic development rather than on his total development. Other areas of concern for tutor emphasis might be social,

emotional or creative development.

A person volunteering as a tutor probably has some belief in helping programs and would want to see them as successful. Since students do find this kind of helping activity to be a meaningful experience, perhaps this type of participatory experience should be made a part of the college curriculum.

If one goal of a program is to work for coordinated effort between the program, school, and home, then there needs to be a restructuring in order to facilitate this kind of interaction.

Further research is indicated in the areas of how successful a program is in achieving its goals, the difference between a successful and unsuccessful tutor, how the tutee perceives the success of the tutor and the program, increased knowledge of what can and cannot be achieved within a limited tutorial program, research in expectations of parents, school and community for the tutoring program and whether participation in a tutorial increases the tutors' ability to relate to children or develop an appreciation of minority group children.

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to examine and describe characteristics of tutors in the Manhattan, Kansas, Friendship Tutoring Program in terms of tutor background, use of consultation, expenditure of time, reasons for becoming involved and comfort in tutoring. In addition, the tutor's perception of tutee's improvement in relationships with others and in school activities, and whether tutors felt tutoring was worth the time and effort and they were successful were studied.

The subjects for this study were the 123 volunteer tutors involved in the Friendship Tutoring Program in the Spring, 1968. A questionnaire was developed and administered to the tutors, most of whom were students at Kansas State University. Responses to the questionnaire were coded and various comparisons were tested utilizing the chi square statistic.

Findings indicated that more females than males were participating as tutors although male and female children were equally represented. The average tutee had been in the program almost twice as long as the average tutor. Interaction between tutor and tutee's parents was limited. Tutors spent on the average less than one hour per week preparing for tutoring sessions. Most tutors felt that participation in the program was worth the time

and effort and perceived themselves as successful.

Findings indicated significant relationships between these variables.

(1) Tutor's perceived overall success and perceived improvement of tutee's relationship with parents.

(2) Whether tutoring was worth the time and effort of tutor and amount of preparation time for tutoring sessions.

(3) Whether tutoring was worth the time and effort of tutor and perceived improvement of tutee's relationships with peers.

(4) Whether tutoring was worth the time and effort of tutor and perceived improvement of tutee's relationships with parents.

(5) Whether tutoring was worth the time and effort of tutor and perceived improvement of tutee's relationships with other authority figures.

(6) Tutor's perceived overall success and perceived improvement of tutee's relationships with peers.

(7) Tutor's perceived overall success and perceived improvement of tutee's relationships with teachers.

(8) Tutor's perceived overall success and perceived improvement of tutee's relationships with other authority figures.

(9) Whether tutoring was worth the time and effort of tutor and perceived improvement of tutee's relationship with tutor.

(10) Tutor's perceived overall success and perceived improvement of tutee's relationship with tutor.

(11) Tutor's perceived overall success and perceived improvement of tutee's grades.

(12) Tutor's perceived overall success and perceived improvement of tutee's school attitudes.

(13) Tutor's perceived overall success and improvement of tutee's educational aspirations.

(14) Tutor's perceived overall success and tutor's ease with tutee at end of semester.

(15) Tutor's perceived overall success and whether tutoring was worth time and effort of tutor.

(16) Whether tutoring was worth time and effort of tutor and perceived improvement in tutee's grades.

(17) Whether tutoring was worth time and effort of tutor and perceived improvement in tutee's school attitudes.

Generally, those tutors who perceived themselves as successful and who thought tutoring was worth the time and effort tended to perceive improvement in tutee's relationships with others and improvement in tutee's scholastic endeavors.

Further research is indicated to determine the success of the program in achieving its goals, the difference between a successful and unsuccessful tutor, what constitutes "success" versus "nonsuccess," and whether the tutorial program is meeting the expectations of the parents, school, and community.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Barrett-Lennard, G. T. Significant aspects of a helping relationship.
    Mental Hygiene, 1963, 47, 223-227.

Baun, Eugene L. Washington University campus "Y" tutoring project.
    Peabody Journal of Education, 1965, 43, 161-168.

Chesler, Mark A. Tutors for disadvantaged youth. Educational Leadership,
    1965, 22, 559-563, 605, 607.

Collegians tutor disadvantaged high schoolers. Pennsylvania School Journal,
    1966, 114, 379.

Friendship is a student tutor. Missouri Alumnus, 1968, 57, 24-27.

Fuentes, Martha A. Reading, writing, rithmetic . . . and love. School
    Activities, 1969, 40, 5.

Glasser, Doug. Tac's third year. Tac Tic, Sept.-Oct., 1968, 2-4.

Goode, William, and Paul Hatt. Methods in social research. New York:
    McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1952.

Hamilton, Andrew. Here come the tutors. P.T.A. Magazine, 1965, 60, 7-9.

Horan, Janet. Project: literacy. National Catholic Educational Association,
    1965, 62, 505-508.

Isgar, Hazel-Ann. The tutorial phenomenon. Student N.E.A. News, 1966,
    9, 8-10, 15.

Little, D. F., and B. S. Walker. Tutor-pupil relationships and academic
    progress. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1968, 47, 324-328.

Manhattan Friendship Tutoring Program, Annual Report, 1966-67 and 1967-68.

Metzger, Barbara. A tutorial project for poor students. Journal of Marriage
    and the Family, 1964, 26, 440-442.

Noce, James S. _Research and evaluation in tutorial programs._ Tutorial Assistance Center, Washington D.C., 1967.

Parham, Joseph B. In search of a handle. _Southern Education Report_, 1966, 42, 8-10.

Shaevitz, Morton H. Myths of tutoring. _Tailorbird,_ 1969, 2, 1-3.

Shaver, James P. and Dee Nuhn. Underachievers in reading and writing respond to a tutoring program. _The Clearing House_, 1968, 43, 236-239.

UW students and STAY. _Student N.E.A. News,_ 1966, 9, 10-11.

APPENDIX

KANSAS·STATE UNIVERSITY *Manhattan, Kansas 66502*

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT, JUSTIN HALL

May 7, 1968

Dear Tutor,

    To fulfill a requirement for the Master's degree, I have chosen to describe the tutors in the Friendship Tutoring Program. In order to assist me, I would like for you to complete the attached questionnaire. Keep in mind that your answers will be annonymous. Please complete *every* question. Do not leave any blank. When you are finished with the questionnaire, return it to your room coordinator.

    I realize that you are a vital part of the Friendship Tutoring Program and I thank you for the interest and cooperation you have shown throughout the year.

                Sincerely,

                Linda J. Funk

                Linda J. Funk
                Executive Coordinator
                Friendship Tutoring
                Program

Approved:

Marjorie Stith

Marjorie Stith, Ph. D., Head
Department of Family and
Child Development

Enclosure

TUTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Age_____

2. Sex_____

3. Classification_____

4. Major_____

5. Marital Status_____

6. Number of children_____

7. Number of older brothers_____

8. Number of younger brothers_____

9. Number of older sisters_____

10. Number of younger sisters_____

11. Size of home community (Check one)

    1. _____Farm
    2. _____Rural, non-farm
    3. _____Under 5,000
    4. _____5,000 - 15,000
    5. _____15,000 - 50,000
    6. _____50,000 - 100,000
    7. _____Over 100,000

12. Have you had previous tutoring experience?_____

13. If so, where?_____

14. Have you had previous teaching experience?_____

15. If so, where?_____

16. Have you tutored with Friendship Tutoring before the Spring semester, 1968?_____

17. If so, give the approximate dates when you began and terminated_____

18. What was your reason for becoming a tutor during the above stated time?_____

19. How did you first hear about Friendship Tutoring? (Check one)

    1. _____ Newspaper article
    2. _____ Class. Indicate which class_____
    3. _____ Friend who was a tutor
    4. _____ Other. Indicate_____

20. How many MONTHS have you been tutoring the student?_____

21. To your knowledge, how many MONTHS has the student spent in this program?_____

22. Age of student that you are tutoring?_____

23. Sex of student that you are tutoring?_____

24. Have you met your student's parents or guardian?_____

25. If so, give the approximate date_____

26. Have you been inside the student's home?_____

27. If so, approximately how many times?_____

28. Have you interacted with the family at the student's home?_____

29. Have you discussed the student with his parents or guardian?_____

30. Have you discussed the student with any of his school teachers?_____

31. If so, how many?_____

32. Have you discussed the student with other school personnel?_____

33. If so, whom?_____(counselor, principal, etc.)

34. Have you consulted others about the student and your relationship with him?_____

35. If so, whom?_____

36. If you devote time to preparation for Tuesday evening tutoring sessions, approximately how much time do you expend? (Check one)

    1. _____ None
    2. _____ Under 1 hour
    3. _____ 1 to 2 hours
    4. _____ Other. Indicate_____

37. If you spend time with the student outside of Tuesday evening,
indicate the average amount of time spent per week. (Check one)

    1. _____None
    2. _____Under 1 hour
    3. _____1 to 2 hours
    4. _____2 to 3 hours
    5. _____Other. Indicate_____

38. Indicate the types of activities you and your student have
done together.

    1. _____Ball games. Where?_____
    2. _____Activities at Douglas Center. Specify_____
    3. _____Library
    4. _____Cat Track
    5. _____Shopping
    6. _____Visiting KSU Campus. Where?_____
    7. _____Visiting your college home
    8. _____Visiting student's home
    9. _____Eating out
   10. _____Sightseeing
   11. _____Sunset Zoo
   12. _____Tuttle Creek facilities
   13. _____Picnics
   14. _____Museum
   15. _____City Park
   16. _____Other. Specify. _____ _____

                            _____ _____

39. Are you fulfilling a class requirement through involvement
with the tutoring program?_____

40. If so, indicate which class_____

41. Rank in order of importance (8 through 1) your reasons for
becoming a tutor. Use the HIGHEST number (8) for your MAJOR
reason.

    1. _____Interested in helping others
    2. _____Desire to work with member of a minority group
    3. _____Gain experience helpful in vocational field
    4. _____Gain a better understanding of youth
    5. _____Gain a better understanding of underprivileged persons
    6. _____Gain a better understanding of myself
    7. _____Curiosity
    8. _____Class requirement

If you have other reasons for becoming a tutor, please
indicate_____

The following questions are to be answered in terms of the <u>DEGREE</u> to which they affect YOU. Circle the number which corresponds to YOUR belief. If you cannot rate a particular item, state your reason.

DURING THE TIME THAT YOU HAVE BEEN TUTORING THE STUDENT, TO WHAT DEGREE DO YOU <u>BELIEVE</u> THE STUDENT IMPROVED IN HIS RELATIONSHIPS WITH:

42. YOU

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all				Very much

43. PEERS

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all				Very much

44. PARENTS

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all				Very much

45. TEACHERS

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all				Very much

46. OTHER AUTHORITY FIGURES

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all				Very much

DURING THE TIME THAT YOU HAVE BEEN TUTORING THE STUDENT, TO WHAT DEGREE DO YOU <u>BELIEVE</u> HE HAS IMPROVED IN HIS SCHOLASTIC ENDEAVORS:

47. GRADES

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all				Very much

48. ATTITUDE TOWARD SCHOOL

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all				Very much

(Scholastic endeavors continued)

49. SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all				Very much

50. EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATIONS

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all				Very much

51. OVERALL, TO WHAT DEGREE TO YOU BELIEVE YOU HAVE BEEN
     SUCCESSFUL WITH THE STUDENT?

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all				Very much

52. TO WHAT DEGREE DID YOU FEEL AT EASE WITH THE STUDENT
     WHEN YOU FIRST BEGAN TUTORING HIM?

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all				Very much

53. TO WHAT DEGREE DO YOU FEEL AT EASE WITH THE STUDENT NOW?

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all				Very much

54. CIRCLE THE NUMBER WHICH REFLECTS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOUR
     PARTICIPATION IN THIS PROGRAM WAS WORTH THE TIME AND EFFORT
     WHICH YOU EXPENDED.

1	2	3	4	5
Waste of time				Absolutely worth all effort

CHARACTERISTICS OF TUTORS IN THE MANHATTAN, KANSAS,
FRIENDSHIP TUTORING PROGRAM

by

LINDA JOAN DICKERSON FUNK

B. S., Kansas State University, 1964

———————————————

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Family and Child Development

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1969

The purpose of this research was to study tutors in the Manhattan, Kansas, Friendship Tutoring Program in terms of tutor's background and experience, degree of involvement, motivation for tutoring and perception of success.

A questionnaire was developed and administered to the 123 volunteer tutors during Spring, 1968. Most of the tutors were college students at Kansas State University. Data were analyzed by means of a chi square test.

More females than males were participating as tutors in the program although male and female children were equally represented. The average tutee had been in the program almost twice as long as the average tutor. Interaction between tutor and tutee's parents was limited. Tutors spent on the average less than one hour per week preparing for tutoring sessions. Most tutors felt that participation in the program was worth the time and effort and perceived themselves as successful.

Significant findings indicated that tutors who perceived themselves as successful noted improvement in tutee's relationships with tutor, peers, parents, teachers and other authority figures; noted improvement in tutee's grades, school attitudes and educational aspirations; felt at ease with tutee and thought tutoring was worth the time and effort expended. Tutors who thought tutoring was worth the time and effort expended did some advance preparation for tutoring sessions; noted improvement in tutee's relationships with tutor, peers, parents, and other authority figures; and noted improvement in tutee's grades and school attitudes.

Further study of this and other tutorial programs should be undertaken to increase their effectiveness in relationship to parents, school and community expectations.