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Tutoring is an important form of academic support for developmental education students. A comparison study was conducted to investigate the benefits of tutoring on the final grades for developmental English students who participated in tutoring versus those students who did not. The final grades for three consecutive semesters were analyzed to determine tutoring efficacy at a community college in northeastern North Carolina. Results indicated that students who received tutoring were more successful than students who did not receive tutoring. Success was noted in a higher percentage of As and Bs, lower withdrawal rates, and higher persistence rates in developmental English courses. Implications were noted for students regarding tutoring, administrators considering the merits of tutoring programs, and instructors who teach developmental English courses. Keywords: tutoring, developmental education, English, grades, efficacy

Tutoring is a common form of learning support and academic assistance available to college students. Arendale et al. (2007) described tutoring as one-to-one or small group learning assistance sessions with the finalizing goal of fostering independent learning. Historically, tutoring has existed since ancient Greece and even during the Colonial Era Harvard students received tutoring in Latin (Lasiewicz, 2008). Since the earliest days of tutoring in higher education, many other tutoring models have emerged to assist student learning with most of the tutoring programs employing either peer or professional tutors. In essence, the programs are designed to positively impact student learning outcomes in both curriculum and developmental coursework.
Statement of the Problem and Significance

According to Boylan (2002), “At a minimum, successful developmental programs provide tutoring in English, reading, study strategies, and mathematics. It is not atypical, however, for developmental programs to provide tutoring in other subjects such as the social, behavioral, or biological sciences” (p. 49). This study analyzed the perceived benefits of tutoring for developmental English courses at a community college in northeastern North Carolina.

Despite the implication from research that successful students will utilize tutorial services, the usage rates of the community college being examined in this study were too low, especially in developmental English courses. There is little research that examines the efficacy of tutoring for developmental education students in North Carolina. In addition, there is no formal research concerning tutoring for the specific community college in this study; thus, research was conducted to fill in this gap. If the results show a correlation between high student grades and frequent tutoring visits, this study may contribute to the body of literature regarding the benefits of tutoring and how to improve efficacy for a tutoring program. On the other hand, if the results do not show a significant impact on student learning outcomes, that information can be used to make more strategic decisions at the administrative level for the college moving forward.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to examine the differences between final grades for students in developmental English who received tutoring versus those who did not receive tutoring at a community college in northeastern North Carolina over three semesters. The research questions follow:

1. What are the differences between students who received tutoring versus students who did not receive tutoring on final grades in developmental English courses for the Spring semester of 2011 at a two-year community college?

2. What are the differences between students who received tutoring versus students who did not receive tutoring on final grades in developmental English courses for the Fall semester of 2011 at a two-year community college?

3. What are the differences between students who received tutoring versus students who did not receive tutoring on final grades in developmental English courses for the Spring semester of 2012 at a two-year community college?

Literature Review

An examination of the tutoring models indicated that they are varied and the research is inconclusive as to which ones are most effective. However, one com-
monality is that greater exposure to tutoring results in improved learning. Some of the most popular tutoring models and their effectiveness are discussed below.

**Reciprocal**

Reciprocal tutoring involves a shared responsibility for learning and tutoring between peers of the same or a similar class (Pariser, 2012). This model lends itself to relationship building because students learn to work together and trust each other. The ASK to THINK — TEL WHY (sic) transactive model is a subcomponent of reciprocal tutoring. In this framework, students are trained in questioning skills and share tutor responsibilities (King, 1998).

A study of reciprocal tutoring was conducted by Dioso-Hensen (2012) for 68 engineering students enrolled in college physics. Thirty-eight students were placed into a reciprocal peer tutoring group. The remaining 30 students received a more traditional tutoring approach where one of the students in each pairing assumed the role of tutor. In the reciprocal group, students were provided instructional materials and support from peer mentors. Students in both the reciprocal and traditional tutoring groups showed academic gains. However, the posttest mean scores of the reciprocal peer tutoring group was 27.66 compared with 24.63 for the nonreciprocal group.

In order to be successful, reciprocal peer tutoring requires ongoing evaluation and training. According to Pariser (2012), “Reciprocal peer tutoring is an ongoing process in student development that helps students to achieve their goals by providing information, opportunities, guidance, mutual support, and suggestions in problem solving and learning techniques” (p. 19). Therefore, reciprocal peer tutoring is similar to other models because it requires a systematic and ongoing evaluation of effectiveness.

**Appointments and Drop-In Tutoring**

Learning and academic support centers at colleges and universities may use peer or professional tutors. Depending on the administrative configuration, students may sign up for tutorial services and receive assistance on an appointment basis, or students may simply “drop-in” whenever they need help. Learning centers ordinarily employ tutors who can work in a variety of academic subjects for scheduling flexibility. Also, learning centers may include a computer lab and present academic workshops to students (Boylan, 2002; Boylan & Saxon, 2012; Pariser, 2012).

There are numerous studies that document the benefits of appointments and drop-in tutoring. Hendriksen, Yang, Love, and Hall (2005) found that tutored students had a 2.78 average semester GPA compared with a 2.64 average semester GPA for nontutored students. Overall, tutored students had a 75% pass rate versus a 71% pass rate for nontutored students. Qualitative findings indicated that students were satisfied with the learning center.
Tutoring impacts long-term success as well. In a longitudinal study, Rheinheimer, Beverlyn, Francois, and Kusorgbor (2010) noted the frequency of tutoring requests affected graduation rates. In fact, students who graduated made three times more requests for tutoring compared with students who withdrew. This evidence speaks partly to the motivation of students who are concerned with their academic progression. Frequency of visits can also have a positive effect on student learning outcomes. For example, Cooper (2010) discovered that 113 students who visited a learning center more than 10 times had 10% higher rates of persistence and .2 average higher GPA than students who infrequently visited.

**Online**

There are a plethora of online tutoring companies designed to serve college students. Some online companies include NetTutor (2013), Smarthinking Inc. (2013), Tutor.com (2013), and TutorVista (2013). At this point, there is no evidence that suggests one company is more efficient than another. Most online tutoring utilizes an interactive whiteboard where the tutor and student will interact synchronously. Osman (2010) wrote that a “Web-based online learning environment gives support to the students in various ways, such as tools for both asynchronous and synchronous knowledge and experience sharing opportunities which may, in turn, deepen their understanding and promote their metacognitive problem solving expertise” (p. 10). Online tutoring is a relatively new phenomenon, and more research is needed concerning its efficacy for college students.

**Embedded**

The embedded tutoring model is a hybrid of traditional tutoring arrangements with elements of Supplemental Instruction (SI). This model is currently being implemented at East Carolina University (Coghill, 2013). Tutors in this model are typically peer tutors who perform the following weekly tasks:

- 2 hours of class lecture time in the course the individual will tutor (tutors work in pairs or larger groups, so that at least one of the tutors is present in each class session)
- 1 hour meeting with faculty mentor(s) who teach the course
- 1 hour of preparation/planning time
- 1 hour-long evening workshop
- 5 additional office hours available for one-one-one tutoring appointments (Coghill, 2013, p. 6)

Appalachian State University (2013) utilizes a similar model called Lead Tutoring which also incorporates elements of SI. Both models are adapted from Muhlenberg College, one of the pioneers of the embedded tutoring approach.
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(Coghill, 2013). Although there is a great deal of research related to course-based learning assistance, there is no current or extant literature focused on the efficacy of an embedded tutor model for developmental education courses.

Furthermore, since the embedded tutor model is a relatively new intervention, there is a limited amount of scholarly research that specifically addresses its benefits. A study conducted by Golsan (2012) assessed the benefits of an embedded peer tutor model in a basic communications course. Golsan examined 417 students using a quasiexperimental design. The results indicated there were no significant differences between affective learning and perceptions of classroom climate between embedded peer tutor sections and nonembedded peer tutor sections. However, the peer tutors developed a greater level of content mastery and reported an improvement in communication skills as a result of participating.

On the other hand, some programs identify academic gains related to this model. Hendriksen et al. (2005) found that students in their course-embedded tutoring programs routinely outperformed their nontutored peers but did not provide specific measures. In another study, Chester et al. (n.d.) analyzed the effect of the embedded peer tutor model on three different course types using experimental and control groups for each section. The mean grade total was significantly higher in embedded peer tutor sections for psychology and civil engineering courses but not for industrial design. In an Introduction to Psychology course at East Carolina, 88% of students in the peer-embedded course who took advantage of tutoring passed the class compared with a 76% pass rate for nontutored students (Coghill, 2013).

**Tutoring in Developmental Education**

Tutoring also benefits developmental education students. Perin (2002) claimed tutoring and other support services are necessary for developmental education students “to increase the persistence and performance of academically low functioning students” (p. 34) who often arrive underprepared to college. Kaplan (2004) found that with a group of 211 developmental students, those who utilized both tutoring and computer-based instruction maintained a 70% pass rate compared with a 54.63% pass rate for developmental students who did not utilize both services. Perin (2004) conducted a qualitative study of 15 community colleges across six states and found positive outcomes in retention for curriculum-level English courses and increases in GPA for students who used tutorial services. Academic gains were identified for 408 developmental students at Lincoln University Learning Center in reading, writing, and math classes (Fullmer, 2012).

Fowler and Boylan (2010) found tutoring to be an integral component of a Pathways to Success Program for developmental students. In this program, students were required to attend tutoring if a grade below a C was received on a major assessment. Academic assistance was provided through a SI configuration or through one-on-one tutoring with a faculty member. Other noncognitive factors and support systems were addressed in the Pathways to Success Program as well.
In Spring 2009, 70% of 324 students were in good standing (GPA 2.0 or greater) after completing the program. In Spring 2004, before the program’s creation and the tutoring mandate, only 46% of 344 students were considered to be in good standing. Clearly, there are advantages to requiring tutoring for developmental education students.

**Administrative Considerations**

Regardless of the tutoring model used, the administrative organization is critical in order for a tutoring center to maximize its effectiveness. Boylan (2002) found that training was the most critical component in building and maintaining a successful tutoring program. Training topics often focus on questioning techniques, communication skills, learning theories, and how to handle nonresponsive students. Several associations such as the College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA), the Association of Tutoring Professionals (ATP), and the National Tutoring Association (NTA) offer tutor training certification for individuals or programs.

Reichert and Hunter (2006) present a four-tier approach for hiring prospective tutors that includes reviewing minimum academic requirements, testing skills, demonstration of tutoring capabilities, and an interview process. Pariser (2012) found that centralization of tutoring services enabled greater student access. Boylan and Saxon (2012) wrote that centralization “provides a ‘one-stop shopping’ center for students seeking services” (p. 37). Thus, the level of accessibility is much greater for centralized support services. The literature also supports an integration of developmental curriculum with learning laboratories (Boylan & Saxon, 2012). In order for this arrangement to be beneficial, both laboratory staff and instructors must communicate expectations and objectives. Continual communication between support services and academic affairs is another important administrative consideration (Pariser, 2012). The above administrative considerations may contribute to a tutoring program’s overall effectiveness.

**Summary of Literature**

The aforementioned scholarly research contains five dissertations, one resource handbook, 11 peer-reviewed journal articles, and two published books. The major findings from the literature indicate that tutoring is one of the best practices to support student learning. Moreover, tutoring is most effective when students are invested in the learning process and make the necessary efforts to attend tutoring regularly. The literature also asserts that one of the inherent difficulties in researching tutoring programs is how to prove efficacy. Typically though, researchers found that students who attended tutoring more often generated positive results than students who did not participate in tutoring (cf. Hendriksen et al., 2005; Kaplan, 2004; Rheinheimen et al., 2010). While research does not favor one tutoring model over another, the literature does suggest that certain
administrative considerations such as a focus on tutor training will enhance an institution’s tutoring program and ultimately help students succeed.

**Method**

The following method section discusses the participant selection process and provides information on the number of participants during the three semesters being analyzed in this study. Next, the instruments used to evaluate participants and tutoring efficacy on those participants are discussed. In addition, the design and procedure are briefly addressed. Finally, the data extracted from this study are analyzed. IRB permission was sought and granted for this study.

**Participants**

All of the participants ($n=2488$) were developmental English students enrolled in ENG 070, ENG 085, or ENG 095. However, the majority of students ($n=2235$) in developmental English courses chose not to participate in tutoring. Participants all had similar abilities as evidenced by their placement into developmental English through scores on a placement test. The participants were enrolled during the Spring 2011, Fall 2011, or Spring 2012. Participants were placed into two distinct categories: those who received tutoring services versus those who did not receive tutoring services.

None of the students were required to receive tutorial services. Therefore, students chose to attend of their own volition. Students were made aware of tutorial services through class visits, information on syllabi, other students, campus-wide marketing strategies, and instructor recommendations. The students who elected to receive tutoring visited the college’s learning center and received tutoring through either weekly scheduled appointment with the same tutor or by utilizing the drop-in option where an appointment is not necessary. Most tutoring sessions occurred with a tutor and a single student. However, other sessions occurred in small groups of no more than three students with a single tutor. The sessions typically focused on grammar concerns, organization of ideas, and thesis construction.

The final grades of students ($n=253$) who received tutoring were compared with the final grades of students who did not receive tutoring ($n=2235$). In Spring 2011, 57 students received tutoring and 809 students did not receive tutoring. In Fall 2011, 44 students received tutoring and 755 students did not receive tutoring. In Spring 2012, 152 students received tutoring and 671 students did not receive tutoring.

**Design**

The design used was survey design. The institutional researcher and authors collaborated to ensure appropriate variables of interest were identified before research was conducted. For this study, the independent variable was whether or
not a student received tutoring. The dependent variable was the students’ final grades in developmental courses for which they were enrolled. The study was designed to determine whether there were any benefits for students who received tutoring on final grades in developmental English courses.

**Procedure**

Researchers followed all standard protocol to ensure accurate gathering of data. Although student names were part of the data collection process, student ID numbers were used to compare and contrast data. Thus, student identities remained anonymous during the final stage of data collection. After compiling the data, descriptive statistics were analyzed through frequencies and percentages.

**Instrumentation**

To determine the number of students who received tutoring during each individual semester, historical data from Tutortrac (Redrock Software Corporation, 2013) were analyzed and reports were given to the institutional researcher. Next, the Informer System from Datatel Student Management Software identified student cohorts. Then, researchers used Microsoft Excel to organize student information. Finally, researchers utilized Microsoft Access to cross-check the final grades of students who received tutoring compared with the final grades of those student participants who did not receive tutoring.

**Results**

The results section was analyzed in two phases. First, hypothesis tests were conducted to account for statistical significance and effect sizes. Second, analyses were conducted using percentages to examine the number of letter grades and other conditions for each condition.

An independent samples t-test for unequal variances was calculated comparing the mean scores of tutored (n=57) versus nontutored students (n=809) on Academic Success in Developmental English courses (total As, Bs, and Cs) for Spring 2011. Results are displayed in Table 1. A statistically significant difference was found (t (65)=-3.29, p=.00). The mean for tutored students (m=1.60, sd=1.06) was statistically significantly different from the mean scores for nontutored students (m=1.13, sd=1.19). An r of .30 was calculated as the effect size, (if there was a difference and how big was the difference), and indicated a medium effect size as indicated by Cohen (1992).

An independent samples t-test for unequal variances was calculated comparing the mean scores of tutored (n=44) versus nontutored students (n=755) on Academic Success in Developmental English courses (total As, Bs, and Cs) for Fall 2011 (see Table 1). A statistically significant difference was found (t (48)=-1.78, p=.04). The mean for tutored students (m=1.57, sd=0.99) was statistically significantly different from the mean scores for nontutored students (m=1.29,
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An r of .25 was calculated as the effect size, (if there was a difference and how big was the difference), and indicated a small to medium effect size as indicated by Cohen (1992).

In summary, when testing the null hypothesis for each of the three semesters, students who received tutoring performed academically better than students who did not receive tutoring in Developmental English courses, ENG 070, ENG 085, and ENG 095. For a more thorough account of the academic performance by letter grades, an analysis using percentages was conducted and the description follows.

To analyze the data by percentages, graphs were created to depict the final grade outcomes of developmental English students who received tutoring versus those students who did not receive tutoring. The bar graphs indicate whether a student received an A, B, or C as a final letter grade for the course. In addition, students may have received an Incomplete (I), In Progress (IP), Withdrawal (W), Official Withdrawal (OW), or Never Attended (NA). Developmental English students who received a D or F would have been given an IP for a final course grade. The bar graph was divided by tutored and nontutored students, and three separate graphs were created for Spring 2011, Fall 2011, and Spring 2012. Success rates in developmental English courses are defined as final averages of A, B, or C. All courses used a 10-point grading scale to determine averages. For example, an A average equals a final score of 90–100. Charts were also used to show the total number of student participants and outcomes for each individual semester.

Table 1. Comparison of Mean Differences Between Tutored and Nontutored Students on Final Grades in Developmental English Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Tutored (N)</th>
<th>Nontutored (N)</th>
<th>Significance/Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>57 1.60 (1.06)</td>
<td>809 1.13 (1.19)</td>
<td>.00/.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>44 1.57 (0.99)</td>
<td>755 1.29 (1.04)</td>
<td>.04/.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>152 1.49 (1.31)</td>
<td>671 1.08 (1.18)</td>
<td>.00/.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All were statistically significant at <.05; with low to medium effect sizes.

sd =1.04). An r of .25 was calculated as the effect size, (if there was a difference and how big was the difference), and indicated a small to medium effect size as indicated by Cohen (1992).

An independent samples t-test for unequal variances was calculated comparing the mean scores of tutored (n=152) versus nontutored students (n=671) on Academic Success in Developmental English courses (total As, Bs, and Cs) for Spring 2012 (see Table 1). A statistically significant difference was not found (t (217)=-3.77, p=.00). The mean for tutored students (m=1.49, sd=1.31) was statistically significantly different from the mean scores for nontutored students (m=1.08, sd=1.18). An r of .25 was calculated as the effect size, (if there was a difference and how big was the difference), and indicated a small to medium effect size as indicated by Cohen (1992).
In Spring 2011, the success rates of students who received tutoring was 57% compared with 43% for students who did not receive tutoring. In Fall 2011, the success rates of students who received tutoring was 53% compared with 47% for students who did not receive tutoring. Finally, in Spring 2012, the success rates of students who received tutoring was 55% compared with 45% for students who did not receive tutoring. The overall success rate average over three semesters was 55% for students who received tutoring compared with 45% for students who did not receive tutoring. Therefore, developmental English students who attended tutoring had a 10% higher rate of success.

There was also a noticeable difference between final letter grades for students who received tutoring versus those who did not receive tutoring. In Spring 2011, 19% of tutored students finished with A averages while 14% of nontutored students finished with A averages (see Figure 1). That same semester, 42% of tutored students finished with B averages compared with 25% of nontutored students (see Figure 1). Also, only 3% of tutored students officially withdrew from courses while 10% of nontutored students officially withdrew (see Figure 1). In Fall 2011, 18% of tutored students finished with A averages compared with 14% of nontutored students (see Figure 2). During the same semester, 38% of tutored students finished with B averages compared with 31% of nontutored students (see Figure 2). In addition, no tutored students officially withdrew from developmental English courses while 6% of nontutored students officially withdrew (see Figure 2). In Spring 2012, 24% of tutored students finished with A averages

![Figure 1. Comparison of Tutored and Nontutored Students in Spring 2011](image)

A Excellent (Grade of 90–100)
B Above average (Grade of 80–89)
C Average (Grade of 70–79)
I Incomplete
IP In progress (Grade 69 and below given for students who attended the entire class)
NA Never attended
OW Official withdraw during the course
OW. Official withdraw after the course has ended
**Figure 2. Comparison of Tutored and Nontutored Students in Fall 2011**

- A  Excellent (Grade of 90–100)
- B  Above average (Grade of 80–89)
- C  Average (Grade of 70–79)
- D  Below average (Grade of 60–69 used only for college-level courses)
- F  Failure (Grade of 59 and below used only for college-level courses)
- IP  In progress (Grade 69 and below given for students who attended the entire class)
- NA  Never attended
- OW  Official withdraw during the course

**Figure 3. Comparison of Tutored and Nontutored Students in Spring 2012**

- A  Excellent (Grade of 90–100)
- B  Above average (Grade of 80–89)
- C  Average (Grade of 70–79)
- IP  In progress (Grade 69 and below given for students who attended the entire class)
- NA  Never attended
- OW  Official withdraw during the course
- OW.  Official withdraw after the course has ended
- W  Withdraw initiated by the instructor
compared with 12% of nontutored students (see Figure 3). The B averages during Spring 2012 only showed a slight difference with tutored students at 29% and nontutored students at 28% (see Figure 3). Moreover, the withdrawal rate showed that 20% of nontutored students withdrew while only 10% of tutored students withdrew (see Figure 3).

In summary, tutored students had higher statistically significant mean scores than nontutored scores with effect sizes ranging from low to medium and medium. Analysis by percentages also indicated that tutored students outperformed nontutored students in all areas with a few exceptions. For example, tutored students received IP grades at higher rates than nontutored students and nontutored students also finished with higher percentages of C averages for all semesters. However, on the whole though, tutored students achieved greater levels of success.

Discussion
The following section summarizes key findings and discusses limitations related to this study. Also, findings are briefly discussed in terms of how they are supported by existing literature. Finally, the implications of tutoring related to developmental education are addressed.

Summary Statement of Findings
The findings indicated that tutored students performed statistically significantly better in developmental English courses than nontutored students and support literature that tutoring is a best practice to assist students. Tutored students achieved higher overall success rates than nontutored students. Additionally, tutored students scored higher percentages of As and Bs. Tutored students also withdrew from courses at lower rates. Thus, the findings from this study confirm that tutoring positively affects final grades in developmental English. The results also imply that tutored students are more likely to persist in coursework and be successful in future courses if they continue to utilize tutoring services. Tutoring, then, contributes to improving retention if utilized properly. The dynamics of the session varied between a tutor and a single student and small group sessions of no more than three students with a single tutor.

Conclusions and Implications for Practice
The findings of this study support literature that tutoring is a best practice to enhance academic development and contribute to student success (cf. Kaplan, 2004; Perin, 2004). As in many studies that analyze tutoring efficacy, this particular study confirmed that students who seek and receive tutoring services outperformed their nontutored peers in terms of final grades.

The research in this study supports the use of tutoring for developmental English courses. Although this study did not focus on other developmental
courses such as math or study skills, it is reasonable to assume that students in those subjects would benefit from tutoring as well. Due to the many benefits of tutoring, developmental education programs should seriously consider integrating tutoring into coursework. At the very least, developmental instructors should promote tutoring services to students; it is not enough to simply include an announcement concerning tutoring on a syllabus or mention tutoring on the first day of class and never again afterward. Instructors might take their classes to the tutoring center on campus for a tour and allow students to ask questions about receiving tutoring services. Likewise, tutoring personnel should strive to visit every developmental education course at the beginning of each semester to make students aware of hours of operation, location, and procedures. More importantly, developmental students, who often have multiple responsibilities, must be made aware that tutoring is beneficial for them and will help to improve their grades. It is more likely that these students will make use of tutoring services, if they were aware of the benefits.

Perhaps, tutorial services would become important on an institutional level when funding is connected to student outcomes and improving retention rates because most institutions spend a significant amount of money to recruit new students (Noel-Levitz, 2011). Investing resources on students who are already in college will more likely have a positive impact, not only on retention rates but also on graduation rates. Therefore, it is important to advocate for tutoring services and make sure that it is a priority for student services.

Administrators of tutoring programs should also consider the type of tutoring model most beneficial for developmental students at their respective institutions. Traditionally, developmental students require supplementary academic support, but some students are unwilling to seek academic assistance. Students may also not have additional time to spend for tutoring due to various responsibilities. Nevertheless, a large majority of the students in this study did not seek tutorial services despite its benefits. For this reason, it is essential to bridge the gap between the developmental classroom and tutoring services. An embedded tutor model could help to demystify negative connotations associated with tutoring by making tutoring more accessible to students. Exposure to academic support could encourage students to utilize tutorial assistance in current developmental classes but also in future curriculum courses as well. As a result, more developmental students might benefit from tutoring and ultimately be more successful in their courses.

**Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research**

This study was limited to one institution. Its findings can only be generalized for the participant institution’s student population in developmental English classes. It is recommended that future research should be done to explore the effects of tutoring in developmental English courses in different colleges; both in the same state and in different states. The results could be then generalized for
student population in developmental English courses and perhaps, better policy decisions could be made at institutional and state levels.

A combination of drop-in and appointment-based tutoring was used in this research, so the effectiveness of these types of tutoring was not analyzed. This study did not focus on the efficacy of tutoring related to each individual level of developmental English coursework. Rather, the goal was to examine a more comprehensive view of the benefits of tutoring. It would also be useful to investigate the effect of various tutoring models on a similar population of students, as well as the effects of tutoring on different levels of developmental English coursework. Furthermore, it is difficult to ascertain if tutoring is the sole predictor for student success because there are so many variables involved in a student’s coursework during any given semester. Future studies might examine tutoring along with other noncognitive factors such as motivation and resilience. Still, other future research may focus on whether the number of tutoring hours for an individual student contributes to a higher final course grade. Additionally, it would be valuable to conduct further research to find out the reasons behind developmental English students’ choices of using or not using the tutoring services available to them. This could be done using a qualitative approach, which might provide an opportunity to better understand complex individual issues associated with student success in developmental English courses.
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