Anatomy of process-based writing center tutorials with NNES writers: what writers take away

Jason C. Vickers
*University at Albany, State University of New York, jvickers2001@hotmail.com*

The University at Albany community has made this article openly available. Please share how this access benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarsarchive.library.albany.edu/legacy-etd](https://scholarsarchive.library.albany.edu/legacy-etd)

Part of the [Higher Education Commons](https://scholarsarchive.library.albany.edu/higher-education-commons), and the [Language and Literacy Education Commons](https://scholarsarchive.library.albany.edu/language-literacy-education-commons)

**Recommended Citation**


This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the The Graduate School at Scholars Archive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Legacy Theses & Dissertations (2009 - 2024) by an authorized administrator of Scholars Archive. Please see [Terms of Use](https://scholarsarchive.library.albany.edu/terms-of-use). For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@albany.edu.
ANATOMY OF PROCESS-BASED WRITING CENTER TUTORIALS WITH NNES

WRITERS: WHAT WRITERS TAKE AWAY

by

Jason C. Vickers

A Dissertation

Submitted to the University at Albany, State University of New York

in Partial Fulfillment of

the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

College of Education

Department of Educational Theory and Practice

2012
ANATOMY OF PROCESS-BASED WRITING CENTER TUTORIALS WITH NNES
WRITERS: WHAT WRITERS TAKE AWAY

by

Jason C. Vickers

Copyright 2012
ABSTRACT

Non-native English speaking (NNES) students in higher educational settings face difficulties writing academic papers and, in response to these difficulties, often seek assistance in understanding cultural, rhetorical, linguistic aspect of writing in English (Harris & Silva, 1993; Powers & Nelson, 1995). One resource available to them is writing centers, which Leki (2009) believes may be “ideal learning environments whose first or strongest language is not English” (p. 1). Writing centers in higher education contexts are places, usually operated by English departments, where students can go to receive assistance at all stages of writing their academic papers. Tutorials are typically collaborative in nature. Given the disparate cultural thought patterns influencing how Confucian heritage culture (CHC) NNES writers compose and limited research investigating how process-based tutorials assist this population in becoming “better writers”

In light of this population’s needs, this dissertation used a case-study design to explore what occurs in process-based tutorials between native English speaking tutors and CHC NNES undergraduate writers. With the following questions in mind: (1) What do NES tutor / NNES writer tutorials look like? (2) What are NNES writer perceptions of these writing tutorials? (3) What are NES tutor perceptions of these writing tutorials?

The study was guided by the theoretical framework of social constructionism. It also drew upon social views of writing, Agar’s institutional framework, and contrastive rhetoric. Data include transcripts of tutorials, tutor and writer interviews, and artifacts used during the tutorials. This data triangulation allowed me to extrapolate more detailed conclusions on what occurs in writing tutorials, how various discursive features reflect
varying writer and tutor understanding, and, ultimately, what these CHC NNES writers take away from the tutorials.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Academic writing is a process not naturally developed; it is acquired through a complex process of cultural transmission (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996). Having learned to write in their home culture, Non-native English speaking (NNES) international students attending U.S. universities are expected to write under a variety of circumstances. NNES students frequently encounter challenges and obstacles including understanding rhetorical situations or linguistic differences with which they have limited or no prior experience (Braxley, 2005; Harris & Silva, 1993; Huang, 2010; Powers & Nelson, 1995b; Thonus, 1993) due to cultural influences different than those acquired though Anglo-European cultural patterns (Kaplan, 2001). Also factoring into writing challenges are language difficulties NNES students may have and meeting instructor expectations. These problems are significant given the increase of international student enrollment in post-secondary settings in the past few years. In the 2008-2009 academic year, U.S. post-secondary institutions saw some 671,616 international students attending classes full time (Fischer, 2009), almost double that of international students attending U.S. post-secondary institutions in 1984 (Hinkel, 2002). Approximately 62% of these students came from Asian countries, with the majority coming from China, and include a 16% increase of first-year students (Fischer, 2009).

Despite meeting English proficiency requirements as measured by the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) or the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) to enter universities, and despite their past academic successes in their home countries, NNES students may “suffer from… intense frustration of having
‘knowledge trapped inside’ because that knowledge may be beyond their linguistic ability to express it” (Friedrich, 2006, p. 23). In order for them to be academically successful, NNES students need be able to express their knowledge through writing (Leki & Carson, 1994).

Cultural Obstacles

Separating writing from culture is an almost impossible task. What one knows, how one knows something, and how one conveys this knowledge is intimately tied to beliefs instilled by one’s home culture (Green, 2007; Ha, 2001; Kostouli, 2005; Orr, 2005; Ramanathan & Atkinson, 1999; Salili, 1996; Swales, 1987). Depending on their culture, NNES writers bring with them writing styles specific to their first language (L1) (Blau, Hall, & Sparks, 2002; Grabe, 1989; Kaplan, 2001; Kobayashi, 1984). One of the issues students encounter is the differences between rhetorical structures used in their home culture (C1) versus the rhetorical structure used by the target culture (C2), and these differences may lead readers to be confused or fail to understand the text (Grabe, 1989; Grabe & Kaplan, 1996; Hinds, 1987, 1990; K. Kim, 1996; Swales, 1987).

In Western academic writing, writers are often asked to produce reader-based prose versus writer-based prose, where writer-based prose is associative, uses language specific to the writer, and appears to lack organization (Flower, 1979; Flower & Hayes, 1977). Reader-based prose, then, is a linear, “deliberate attempt to communicate something to a reader… [using] shared language and shared context between writer and reader… [and offering] the reader an issue-centered rhetorical structure rather than a replay of the writer’s discovery process” (Flower, 1979, p. 20). While this model of reader-based and writer-based prose is contested (i.e., Bartholomae, 1986), research on
students from Confucian Heritage Cultures (Japan, Korea, China, and Viet Nam) reveals that these writers’ C1 rhetorical structures are frequently indirect and appear disorganized (Bliss, 2001; K. Kim, 1996; Okabe, 1987). In fact, this C1 rhetorical strategy is rooted to ideas of reader-responsible structures (Hinds, 1987), where the reader is responsible for making connections in the text. Another obstacle students might encounter that would affect the logical order of their written work is differences in topic sentence placement leading to specific-to-general paragraph structure versus the oft-employed general-to-specific structure favored by Western rhetorical conventions (Hinds, 1990; Kobayashi, 1984).

**Language Obstacles/Linguistic Fluency**

Students also enter Western post-secondary settings with different language obstacles that negatively affect the comprehensibility of written text. Language obstacles can relate to grammar and mechanics, word choice and sophistication of word choice, and other structural issues related to writing. Linguistic fluency has been shown to be an additional stumbling block for NNES writers (Bitchener & Basturkmen, 2006). West (as cited by Carlson & Bridgeman, 1986) lists correctness of punctuation, quality of sentence structure, vocabulary size, and correctness of vocabulary usage as some of the issues NNES students have when writing. NNES writers also have issues with use of pronouns (Santos, 2001) as cohesive reference elements and pragmatic word order (Bardovi-Harlig, 1990); both are issues that can cause readers confusion. The list here is not exhaustive. Rather, these items illustrate ongoing language difficulties NNES students have when entering post-secondary institutions.
It is difficult to know if language errors are purely a result of deficits in a student’s knowledge about the target language, if the language error is created because of the student’s C1, or if it is a combination of both. Regardless of the causes, it is clear that many NNES students face difficulties with writing, and looking only at the cultural and linguistic issues associated with the difficulties reveals a limited understanding of surrounding issues. To better understand the problem, we need to look at the types of writing students encounter, instructor expectations, and areas instructors and students identify as being necessary for writing.

**Writing Expected of NNES Students in Coursework**

NNES students face different types of writing tasks depending on the courses they are taking. Although Leki’s (2007) investigation with four NNES students led her to conclude that NNES students may not face a wide array of writing tasks, her findings conflict with larger-scale research investigating the types of writing NNES students are expected to produce. In a survey about types of writing across academic disciplines in undergraduate and graduate courses, researchers (Canseco & Byrd, 1989; Carlson & Bridgeman, 1986; Horowitz, 1986; Lunsford & Lunsford, 2008) have classified a variety of writing tasks at both undergraduate and graduate levels: summary of or reaction to a reading, annotated bibliography, reports on specific experience and personal narratives, tasks requiring the connection of theory and data, case studies, tasks requiring arguments synthesizing multiple sources, and close readings and analyses. In graduate business courses, students are expected to produce writing in examinations, case studies, papers and reports, and in response to short assignments and problems assigned. When looking

---

1 This is a partial list of tasks required of writers in post-secondary settings. Lunsford and Lunsford (2008) provide one of the most up-to-date lists of the type of writing assigned by post-secondary instructors.
at the differences in the type and amount of writing required across different areas, graduate students are required to focus more on extended writing in their academic area more than undergraduate students (Atkinson & Ramanathan, 1995).

**Instructor Perception of What Students Need for Content-Specific Writing**

Regardless of the writing task, instructors have general expectations of NNES student writing, elements in the writing they consider most important in order for students to produce effective writing, and areas in which the students need to improve in order for them to produce appropriate written products. A review of research over the past twenty-five years reveals that instructor expectations of NNES students writing has changed, perhaps unsurprisingly, very little, with the overarching theme being a primary concern for students to be able to write effectively in their academic areas (Canseco & Byrd, 1989; Huang, 2010; Jenkins, Jordan, & Weiland, 1993; Santos, 1988; Zhu, 2004; Zhu & Flaitz, 2005). ‘Effectively’ may be defined differently depending on the instructor. Santos (1988) identifies, in the different types of writing required by both undergraduate and graduate instructors, that comprehensibility of language and content of student texts are valued over grammatical accuracy, provided the lack of accuracy does not detract from the comprehensibility of the written product. How professors rated acceptability of language used varied, with acceptability being lower for physics professors than professors in humanities/social sciences. Huang (2010) lists organization in order to convey major and supporting ideas, use of a wide array of appropriate topic-related vocabulary, ability to write on a topic while maintaining organization and cohesion, and demonstration of a command of standard written English as being the writing tasks both undergraduate and graduate professors expect of science students. Zhu and Flaitz (2005), in interviewing
instructors from business, physics, and engineering, found that “productive skills, particularly writing, to be most challenging for NNES students, and hence an area in need of improvement” (p. 7). Organization, grammar, and vocabulary were issues in writing ranging from short essay responses to theses and dissertations. The overall picture here is that instructors by and large value discourse-level aspects such as organization, content, support, clarity, and cohesion more than sentence-level features such as punctuation and sentence structure (Carlson & Bridgeman, 1986).

**Student Perceptions of What They Need for Content-Specific Writing**

When looking at what NNES writers report as important to earn a “good grade” on content-course writing tasks, students list content and rhetorical skills as the two most important factors (Leki & Carson, 1994). In terms of skills necessary to succeed in their course-content writing, they listed task management strategies and rhetorical skill, with task management strategies including managing writing (i.e. aspects of the writing process), sources (i.e., summarizing, synthesizing, and using sources), and managing research. NNES students also identified the need to understand and learn appropriate editing strategies in order to produce “good writing” (Zhu & Flaitz, 2005).

NNES graduate students primarily perceive linguistic fluency (i.e., grammatical accuracy and word choice) as a major stumbling block for successful thesis writing (Bitchener & Basturkmen, 2006). NNES writers also express having difficulties expressing relationships between their ideas, citing articles, organizing paragraphs, developing ideas, presenting logically connected ideas, and drawing conclusions (Dong, 1998). Last, graduate NNES students identify needing more experience in writing longer essays using appropriate formats (Zhu & Flaitz, 2005). This corresponds with the
expectation that graduate students produce longer written assignments in the their content areas (Atkinson & Ramanathan, 1995).

**Existing Issues with Courses and Student Preparation**

One issue in teaching writing to NNES students in general and discipline-specific classes is a lack of instructor ability to teach the types of genres students may need to master in order to be successful in disciplinary writing. Even were courses to successfully meet the needs of all students in addressing the wide variety of genres necessary to ensure that enter regular academic adequately equipped to write in discipline-specific areas, time constraints often prevent students from mastering the particular type of disciplinary writing (Harris & Silva, 1993). Writing within a specific area, after all, is a lengthy, ongoing process that can take years to master (Casanave, 2004). When students have access to first-year composition courses offered through English departments, they may become familiar with genres in general but still not acquire the skills to write within the genre of their discipline (Christison & Krahnke, 1986; Wardle, 2009).

In essence, writing courses cannot equip NNES students with all of the things necessary to become proficient writers. To assist them in becoming proficient writers, students have two forms of support available: courses designed to assist NNES acquire skills necessary to be successful in their university courses and writing centers. In the next section, I discuss these two resources in more detail and discuss limitations each may have.

**Preparation Course Support for NNESs**

In order to prepare themselves to grapple with difficult writing tasks, NNES students may draw on a variety of resources to assist them such as enrolling in writing
programs designed to teach them how to write for U.S. and academic audiences. These courses may be general language courses or English for Academic or Specific purposes. Despite often targeting academic writing, programs designed for NNES writers tend to address basic skills of writing or academic writing in a general sense and not more complex writing skills associated with writing discipline-specific academic papers at the post-secondary level (J. Williams, 1995), especially the longer expository type of writing expected of graduate students (Reid, 2001). In general, courses targeting NNES student improvement in speaking, listening, reading, and writing, writing, while ranked by a majority of students as the hardest of language skills to acquire, only receives approximately 10% of instructional time (Christison & Krahnke, 1986). Alternatively, another resource to facilitate NNES initiation into academic discourse and writing is L2 writing programs (Spack, 1988). Students completing both general NNES preparation courses and more specific writing courses may continue to experience difficulties in their university coursework.

**Student Perceptions of What Is Still Needed After Taking These Courses**

Research on how NNES students perceive courses designed to prepare them to fully participate in general and discipline-specific courses reveals both strengths and limitations. Leki and Carson’s (1994) survey of 77 NNES students who completed at least one course in intensive English training (in this case, English for Academic Purposes course) and were enrolled in one at least one regular or English as a Second Language section of a first-year composition course revealed that 17% of the students felt that their English for Academic Purposes (EAP) course did not prepare them with skills necessary to complete writing tasks in academic courses. When asked what things NNES
students wished they could have learned better, writers indicated language skills, task management strategies, and rhetorical skills as most important. Students also consistently “expressed a desire for more college-level, more sophisticated vocabulary” (Leki & Carson, 1997, p. 93).

**Writing Centers**

An alternative to courses targeting writing development is university writing centers. As Leki (2009) notes, “Writing centers may be the ideal learning environment for students whose first or strongest language is not English” (p. 1). Braxley (2005) shares this notion by maintaining that writing centers may be the one place NNES students who lack support in academic writing can go to receive assistance with composing. Harris (1995a) reinforced these ideas in saying that “writers gain kinds of knowledge about their writing and about themselves that are not possible in other institutional settings” (p. 27). Writing center practices and the way tutorials are conducted may not be ideal for NNES students.

Writing centers have seen a change over the years in the way tutorials are conducted, and these changes are largely rooted in the theoretical assumptions informing composition practice. The notion of a writing center has been around since the 1930s (Kelly, 1995; Murphy & Sherwood, 2008), beginning with writing clinics and labs and eventually transforming to writing centers as we know them today. Writing clinics and labs focus on assisting students learning “self-help” strategies, but labs provide more direct guidance to students (Moore, 1995). These labs and clinics focused on writer text and grammatical correctness (Murphy & Sherwood, 2008; Wallace, 1991).
With Emig’s (1971) work, L1 writing theory shifted from traditional rhetoric to process-based theories focusing more on the processes writers use in constructing texts. The process theory of writing was further informed by authors from expressivist (also expressive) camps (see Elbow, 1968; McNabb, 1998; Murray, 1968, 1978) where writing was seen as an act of expression and largely a process with writers drawing upon personal experience and experiences of others vis-à-vis peer feedback. Also in the process-based movement are cognitive process theorists (Flower, 1979, 1984, 1989; Flower & Hayes, 1977; Flower & Hayes, 1980, 1981; Hayes & Flower, 1986), who discuss the cognitive processes individuals go through when writing. Flower and Haye’s (1981) model includes three operations in the process: planning, translating, and reviewing. The social view of writing focuses on dialogic interactions between the writer and others about writing and the knowledge necessary to writing within different discourse communities (i.e., Bartholomae, 1986; Bizzell, 1986a; Bruffee, 1973, 1984, 1986; Faigley, 1986; Lantolf, 2000; Swales, 1988).

One of the most influential pieces in shaping current writing centers, guided by process-based theories of composition, is North’s (1984) article targeting university instructors and outlining his vision for writing centers. In it, North argues that the job of the writing center (and the tutor) “is to produce better writers, not better writing” (p. 438), and his vision is realized by utilizing a student-centered, collaborative approach focusing on the writer and the writing process versus a product. North’s idea of developing the writer and the process and not the product resounds throughout popular tutor training manuals (Reigstad & McAndrew, 1984; Ryan & Zimmerelli, 2010) and other writing center literature (i.e., Brooks, 1991; Harris, 1995b; Harris & Silva, 1993).
In one of the popular guides for tutor training, McAndrew and Reigstad (2001) outline three options for writing tutorials: teacher-centered, student-centered, and collaborative. *Teacher-centered tutoring* positions the tutor as an authority who is more likely to issue directives as he or she instructs the writer, who is more a passive recipient in the tutorial, on how to revise both higher-order concerns (HOCs) and lower-order concerns (LOCs). In *student-centered tutoring*, the writer is encouraged to determine the direction of the tutorial session and do most of the talking. The tutor will listen, ask open-ended (Socratic) questions to encourage the writer to talk about the process and suggests strategies for improving not only the piece of work the writer brought to the tutorial but strategies to assist the writer with future writing. In this model, the student is responsible for the majority of the conversation. *Collaborative tutoring* positions the tutor and writer on more equal footing with both participants sharing equally in the conversation. Conversations in these tutorials “moves from talk focused on the paper to off-the-paper talk, then brings the conversation back to the draft by encouraging the students to include ideas from the conversation in the piece” (McAndrew & Reigstad, 2001, p. 26). Although the tutor and writer share equally in the conversation, problem-solving, and decision making, it is the tutor who ultimately controls diagnosis and moves in the conversation from one topic to another.

Murphy and Sherwood (2008) present the overarching principles guiding these three tutoring styles and writing centers in general as contextual, collaborative, interpersonal, and individualized. It is contextual in that there are cultural and interpersonal aspects that both the writer and tutor bring to the table. Moreover, the cultural context may be bound to a specific culture (in this instance, U.S. academic
culture). Non-native speakers studying in this different cultural setting may have limited understanding of the target culture and its writing systems and, as a result, produce writing that appears to be illogical or disorganized (Chapel & Wang, 1998; Hinds, 1990).

Tutoring is collaborative in that the tutor and writer work (collaborate) towards a common goal: the improvement of the writer. It is interpersonal because tutors “must draw upon extensive interpersonal skills to work effectively with students who bring a range of educational and cultural backgrounds and a variety of learning styles” (Murphy & Sherwood, 2008, p. 1). It is individualized as each tutor develops his or her own style of tutoring and because each tutorial session is unique. While these tenets of tutoring appear simple, the act of tutoring is far more complex.

**Tutors and Tutor Behaviors**

Popular training manuals on tutor training all discuss similar behaviors tutors should follow during a tutorial session. Gillespie and Learner (2000, 2008) provide the following ‘rules’ for tutors: 1) focus on writer development and establish a rapport with the writer; 2) have the writer take ownership of the tutorial; 3) start with higher-order concerns; 4) ask questions; 5) have writers read their papers aloud; 6) comment on things that are working in the paper; 7) trust the writer’s ideas of the text; 8) have writers identify and make corrections (i.e., do not correct or be directive); 8) ask about the writer’s plans for revision. Ryan and Zimmerelli (2010), in clarifying “ask questions,” indicate that tutors should listen and ask questions as a reader, not instructor. When writers go into the writing center without a text, tutors can work with writers in understanding the assignment, brain storming ideas, free writing, or simply talk to writers about the writing.
Higher-order and Lower-order Concerns

Of specific interest in the tutorial process is addressing higher-order concerns (HOCs) prior to lower-order concerns (LOCs), and many writing center tutors are instructed by tutor training manuals (i.e., Gillespie & Lerner, 2008; McAndrew & Reigstad, 2001; Ryan & Zimmerelli, 2010) to address HOCs first and then move to LOCs as time permits. HOCs deal with items such as theses and focus, appropriate tone or voice, development, and organization; LOCs deal primarily with sentence structure, clarifying sentences, word usage, grammar, punctuation, mechanics, and spelling (Gillespie & Lerner, 2008; McAndrew & Reigstad, 2001; Reigstad & McAndrew, 1984). Editing deals more with grammar and punctuation but is included in LOCs. Focus on HOCs versus LOCs, however, may be difficult the less experienced the tutor is (Kiedaisch & Dinitz, 1993; Waldo, 1993).

While one goal of many writing center tutorials is to help improve the writer, tutors cannot ignore that the artifact most likely bringing writers into the writing center is a specific product. This is something North (1994) recognized in his “Revisiting ‘The idea of a writing center’.” In it he recognizes that his initial claim that writers go to the writing center motivated out of genuine engagement with their writing and desire to improve as writers (North, 1984) was somewhat naïve; he recognized that writers, while obviously motivated, are more likely motivated to improve the specific product they bring. Ideally, there would be, when a writer enters the writing center with a paper, discussion revolving around the process of writing as well as addressing issues in a specific product. It is important to recognize that North did not explicitly state that this

---

2 Higher-order concerns refers to global aspects of a paper while lower-order concerns refers to local aspects of a paper.
should be the case. North’s ultimate point in tutorials is that “[e]xpertise…. means knowing how to talk about writing” (North, 1982, p. 440). It is also important to mention that tutors cannot address HOCs or LOCs without there being a paper or if the tutorial focuses on abstract ideas of a paper without ever referring to the product.

**Issues with Using Native English Speaking (NES) Tutorial Techniques with NNES Writers**

Researchers investigating NNES writing tutorials have consistently argued that some techniques used in tutorials with native English speakers (NES) may be ineffective in dealing with NNES writers and/or techniques that have proven “effective” with NES writers appear to be abandoned by tutors when encountering NNES writers. Having the writer take charge of the tutorial translates into having the student talk more than the tutor, and this reflects the idea of student-centered tutorials. When tutors deal with NNES writers, there is more tutor talk than writer talk (Ritter, 2002; Thonus, 1999b, 2002, 2004; J. Williams, 2004, 2005; Young, 1992).

Tutors are instructed to ask questions, often Socratic questions, in order to promote conversational exchange; however, Blau, Hall and Sparks (2002) point out that attempts at Socratic questioning techniques by tutors are often close-ended questions when dealing with NNES writers. These techniques tend to promote more directiveness in tutorials, a technique tutors are frequently advised to avoid, especially those in centers adopting a process-based approach espoused by North. This directiveness, however, may not be poor practice with NNES writers; researchers (Blau, et al., 2002; Powers, 1993; Thonus, 1998a, 1998b; Young, 1992) argue that NNES students tend to prefer and benefit more from tutor directives. Still, in discussing directiveness with NNES students, Staben
and Nordhaus (2009) draw a distinction between being direct and giving directives. Being direct, for them, means providing writers information they don’t have, while giving a directive means telling writers what to do. Overall, there is agreement in NNES writing center research that what’s effective with NES writers may not be effective with NNES writers.

**Statement of the Problem**

Overall, students are required to write both in and out of their chosen discipline, with graduate students being required to produce more in their discipline in terms of frequency and length (Zhu & Flaitz, 2005). In Zhu and Flaitz’s research, instructors and students agreed, overall, about the skills necessary to succeed in academic writing. While students may take courses to help them improve their writing, we see that these courses may not provide students with the agreed upon skills necessary to meet both instructor and self-expectations. Both writing courses offered to both NES and NNES populations and writing-intensive courses offered to NNES students may provide insufficient support to students in teaching them to be better writers. The writing center as a resource to assist students in acquiring competency in writing for both general and discipline-specific courses is a viable alternative. However, research suggests that tutorials with NNES writers may need to be conducted differently than tutorials with NES writers. Moreover, extant research on NNES writers in writing center tutorials has been limited to these NES/NNES tutorial differences (Harris & Silva, 1993; Powers, 1993; Thonus, 2004; J. Williams & Severino, 2004), dominance in tutorials (Ritter, 2002; Thonus, 1998b, 2002, 2004; J. Williams, 2002, 2005; Young, 1992), interactions between NES tutors and NNES writers (Bawarshi & Pelkowski, 1999; Gage, 1986; Ritter, 2002; Thonus, 1999b; J. Williams & Severino, 2004).
Williams, 2002), and perceived success of NES tutor/NNES writer tutorials (Ritter, 2002; Thonus, 1998b, 2001, 2002; Weigle & Nelson, 2004; J. Williams, 2004). Research to date has not investigated what NNES writers are taking out of the writing center tutorials in terms of how they develop into “better writers”.

**Research Questions**

In light of the lack of research on what students are taking out of writing tutorials, I investigated the phenomenon using the following questions as a guide:

1. What do NES tutor/NNES writer tutorials look like?
2. What are NNES writer perceptions of these writing tutorials?
3. What are NES tutor perceptions of these writing tutorials?
Definition of Terms

Collaboration/ Collaborative tutoring: View positioning tutor and writer on equal footing where both share equally in the conversation. Conversation includes talk-on-paper to talk-off-paper. The tutor then encourages the writer to include ideas from “talk-off-paper” portion of the tutorial. Collaboration here refers to talk about writing versus co-authorship.

Confucian Heritage Culture (CHC): Students originating from Japan, Korea, Viet Nam, Singapore, and Taiwan. CHC individuals share communication style, rhetorical patterns in writing, and similar exposure to lock-step, teacher-centered instruction (see Green, 2007; Hinds, 1987; Hinds, 1990; Phuong-Mai, Terlouw, & Pilot, 2005, 2006; Volet, 1999; Watkins & Biggs, 1996; Wong, 2008).

Culture 1(C1): refers to the writer’s home culture

Culture 2(C2): refers to the target culture

First language (L1): First language

Higher-order concerns (HOCS): Items such as theses and focus, appropriate tone or voice, development, and organization. Also Global Issues.

Lower-order concerns (LOCS): primarily with sentence structure, punctuation, usage, and spelling. Also Local Issues.

Editing: Attention and changes with grammar-related issues

Native English Speaker (NES): Individuals whose first language is English

Non-native English Speaker (NNES): Individuals whose first language is not English. For this study, my use of this term refers to non-native English speakers who are also international students and have come from abroad to study in U.S. post-secondary
institutions. I will not use the term NNES to refer to Generation 1.5 students, or students who are originally from a NNES country but have lived in the U.S. and completed any schooling K-12 schooling.

*Process-based approach (writing process):* I draw upon Ryan and Zimmerelli’s\(^3\) (2010) definition of writing process: prewriting, writing, and revising and editing. I use this definition because it is the definition students learn in the tutor training course and in the writing center. Prewriting involves freewriting, brainstorming, outlining, and researching. Writing involves creating an initial draft. Revising and editing entails global revision, sentence-level revision, and editing. In global revision, focus is on changes in content, focus, organization, point of view, voice, and tone. Sentence-level revision means improving individual sentences by eliminating unnecessary words, clarifying confusing or incorrectly structured sentences, and clarifying language and words to better convey the writer’s intended thought. Editing refers to identifying and correcting errors in spelling, grammar, and punctuation. This is recursive, non-linear process. It will typically begin with prewriting, but writers may return to this stage as the need for additional information in order to complete a writing task is identified.

*Second language (L2):* While this has traditionally referred to second language, I use this to refer to any language beyond their first language employed by a speaker.

*Student-centered tutorial:* View of writing tutorial where the writer decides what to work on and does most of the talking. The tutor will often ask open-ended, Socratic questions to encourage the writer to talk about the process. The tutor will offer

\(^3\) I use Ryan and Zimmerelli’s (2010) definition of the writing process because this is the definition presented to students in the tutor training course offered at University at Albany and the definition used in the UAWC.
suggestions on how to improve the writing product and how the writer may improve him/herself as a writer.

*Teacher-centered tutorial:* View positioning tutor as an authority who will diagnose and issue directive or offer suggestions on how to review HOCs and LOCs accordingly. Writer is more passive in this view.

*Tutor:* An undergraduate or graduate student working at the university writing center whose primary task is to assist students in improving their writing process.

*Writer/student:* An individual visiting the writing center to work on a writing assignment at any stage of the writing process.

*Writing center (WC):* For this study, writing center refers to a physical location staffed with peer undergraduate and graduate tutors where students from all disciplines can go in order to work on their writing and, more specifically, writing process. The writing center where this research takes place is the University at Albany Writing Center (UAWC). The UAWC strives to be a collaborative, student-centered environment that utilizes discourse (talking) as the primary method to address student writing concerns at all stages of the writing process.

*Writing Center Manuals:* Writing Center manuals referred to in this research are: The Bedford Guide for Writing Tutors (Ryan & Zimmerelli, 2010); The St. Martin’s Sourcebook for Writing Tutors (Murphy & Sherwood, 2008); Tutoring Writing: A Practical Guide for Conferences (McAndrew & Reigstad, 2001); The Allyn and Bacon Guide to Peer Tutoring (Gillespie & Lerner, 2000); and The Longman Guide to Peer Tutoring (Gillespie & Lerner, 2008). The first two manuals are used in the University at
Albany Writing Center training and in the course that prepares undergraduates to become
peer tutors.

Summary

This chapter has dealt with various issues NNES writers encounter in their writing
including language obstacles, expectations by instructors, writer-perceived needs in their
writing, and issues of NNES support. It also introduced writing centers as resources
where NNES writers can receive assistance in their writing and described tutor behaviors,
concerns with HOCs and LOCs and issues inherent in tutoring NNES writers. The next
chapter provides a more detailed view of research on writing, writing centers, and
tutorials between NES tutors and NNES writers.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RESEARCH

In this chapter, I will review research on NES/NNES tutorials in order to establish the foundation for my study’s research questions. Given that my research and the writing center where my research takes place draw from process approaches to writing, I first discuss the process approach to writing and the different views of the process approach. I then review extant literature that researches NES/NNES tutorials. In this review, I discuss NNES writer expectations in terms of what these writers expect tutorials to focus on and these writers’ expectations for tutor and writer roles in a tutorial. After looking at NNES writer expectations, I review literature arguing writing centers tutorials as instances of institutional discourse, dominance in tutorials, and the use of suggestions and questions by NES tutors in NES/NNES tutorials. Last, I review research regarding what writers appear to be taking out of the tutorials and discuss how this research does not extend beyond revision on specific writing products.

Process Approach to Writing

The process approach to writing consists of three views: expressive/expressivist view, cognitive process view, and social view. The expressivist view of writing ultimately frames writing as a highly personal act where writers draw upon their own experience and the experience of others vis-à-vis peer feedback (Berlin, 1982; Elbow, 2000; McKay, 2006; Murray, 1968). The cognitive view as described by Flower and
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4 This is intended as a brief overview to contextualize writing and is not a comprehensive discussion of the process approach to writing. This task is far beyond the scope of my work.

5 The view of the process approach to writing I use here was initially presented by Berlin (1982). This is one vision of the process approach to writing; the views described here have been challenged by other scholars (Bizzell, 1982; Emig, 1977, 1982) and depending on culture (i.e., Connor, Nagelhout, & Rozycki, 2008; Hyland, 2003).
Hayes (1977; 1981) and Hayes and Flower (1986) describe the writing process as the cognitive act of problem-solving and contains four key points: writing is a distinct thinking process, processes are hierarchical and embedded, the composing act is a thinking process guided by the writer’s goals, and writers create both high-level and supporting sub-goals that reflect the writer’s sense of purpose (Flower & Hayes, 1981). Students move through different stages: planning, translating, and reviewing. Berlin (1988) cautions that the expressivist and cognitive views of writing are geared more towards individual writers, how they express themselves, writing as a means of political mobilization, and their private cognition in the composing processes. With the social view, what Berlin refers to as “social-epistemic,” writing is acquired through dialogic interaction with members of a discourse community. Because this dialogue encapsulates North’s ideas that the goal of a tutorial is to result in a better writer through conversation, I next elaborate slightly more the social view of writing.

**Social View.** Grounded in Social Constructivism, the social view of writing, which includes the discourse community view (see Killingsworth, 1993), is a more complex view of writing, as Faigley (1986) notes. Faigley distills this view to one assumption: “human language (including writing) can be understood only from the perspective of a society rather than a single individual” (p. 535). This ‘society’ often alludes to a culture of writing that is more commonly known as discourse communities (Bizzell, 1986b; Swales, 1988). Researchers and academes argue that students need to be indoctrinated into and master the academic language and writing style of university writing culture (Bartholomae, 1986; Bizzell, 1982, 1986b; Lantolf, 2000). With Berkenkotter and Huckin’s (1995) work, we see an excellent example of how one
doctoral student appropriates the writing necessary to succeed within his discourse community through collaborative discussions with his advisor and recursive revision of his writing.

At the heart of the social view of writing is the idea of individuals entering a discourse community (Bruffee, 1984; Goody, 1978; Krashen, 1981), and writing does not begin with a process but is a process that includes (or should) an understanding of “inquiry strategies and techniques that will enable students to search beyond their own limited present experience and knowledge” (Reither, 1994, p. 149). Bruffee (1984, 2008) argues that peer tutoring provides writers opportunities to construct and reconstruct how they engage in composition tasks by engaging in extended, constructive conversations with capable peers in order to assist the writers to “internalize conversation about writing and carry [this understanding] away with them so that they can continue to be good writers on their own” (Bruffee, 1984, p. 58). When students engage in these conversations with others, the goal is to improve themselves as writers. Focus of the social view of writing is “not on how the social situation influences the individual, but on how the individual is a constituent of a culture” (Faigley, 1984, p. 157)

**Connections to Writing Center UAWC**

Writing centers may draw upon any one, a combination of, or all three views of the writing process I have briefly discussed (Kinkead & Harris, 1993). First, tutorials focus on the writer’s process with attention being paid to prewriting, drafting and revising. Tutorials where students have no product may engage in free writing activities espoused by Murray and Elbow, and this activity falls in the prewriting stage. The core of many ‘ideal’ tutorials is a student-centered, collaborative approach, with tutors and writers
discussing and negotiating not only the academic discourse community to which the
student is writing for but, as explicated by views of contrastive rhetoric, Western
rhetorical structures. Tutorials are not designed to make the writers a carbon-copy of one
another; they are designed to address the needs of the individual writer and his or her
process, not the writing process, as the writer-unique situations and tasks demand (North,
1984, 1994). Additionally, it is important to recognize that “different tasks will pose
different problems and require in turn somewhat different writing processes” (Gilbert &
Dabbagh, 2005, p. 102). The UAWC prescribes to North’s view of writing centers and
writing as being socially constructed (J. Hanifan, personal communication, April 20,
2011).

Writing Centers and NNES Writers

Because the views of the writing process I have just presented are grounded in
research on NES writers, there may be concern that these views do not apply to writers
from different cultures. Research, however, has analyzed the writing processes of NNES
and NES writers and found the process is similar. Specifically, Zamel (1982, 1983)
qualitatively investigated the writing process of advanced NNES writers and found that
these students engage in a similar process as NES writers. Prior to writing, students
appear to collect facts and organize their ideas. Once their ideas are organized, most
students in her study engaged in prewriting activities which included free-writing,
brainstorming, and outlining and then drafted their paper. Writers in her study discussed
how they engaged in internal dialogue and thought about how they might restructure and
add to their papers. During first drafts, writers attended to higher-order concerns.
Attention to lower-order concerns (i.e. surface-level features such as editing) typically
occurred during later drafts. Cummings (1989) reached similar conclusions in his research investigating language proficiency and writing processes. In his study, effective NNES writers planned prior to writing, used heuristics to locate and solve problems, simultaneously made decisions while attending to more complex aspects of writing, produced content and discourse suited to the writing task, and made planned selection of appropriate words and phrases throughout the process.

The question, then, may not be about differences in writing process; the question becomes one of looking at how the process is influenced by tutorials and the interactions between NES tutors and NNES writers. Since my research ultimately seeks to understand what NNES students are taking out of the tutorials by looking at what tutorials between NES tutors and NNES writers look like and writer perceptions and tutor perceptions, I will review the literature investigating NNES writers in writing centers.

Recall that the specific context of my research takes place in a writing center informed by North’s (1984, 1994) view that the writing center’s purpose is to improve the writer and not a specific product. Writing center tutors’ roles range from offering reader response, aiding students in understanding the assignment, diagnosing and offering necessary support for potential struggles a writer might have with the composing process, suggesting strategies, and assisting the student to find his or her own answers (Brooks, 1991; Harris, 1992, 1995a; Harris & Silva, 1993; J. Williams, 2005). The entire tutorial process is aimed at improving the writer in their writing process, not improving a specific product (North, 1984, 1994). Conversations serve as a medium through which the writers come to understand writing (Bruffee, 1984; Goody, 1978; Harris, 1995a; Krashen, 1981).
Review of Literature Investigating NES/NNES Tutorials

To date, the majority of research has focused on interaction between NES tutors and NNES writers (Bawarshi & Pelkowski, 1999; Gage, 1986; Ritter, 2002; Thonus, 1999b; J. Williams, 2002), what NNES writers expect out of tutorials (Carter-Tod, 1995; Harris, 1995a; Powers, 1993; J. Williams, 2004, 2005; J. Williams & Severino, 2004), perceptions of NES tutor and NNES writer roles (Thonus, 2002), tutorials as instances of institutional discourse (Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 2005; Thonus, 1999a, 2002; J. Williams, 2005), dominance in tutorials (Thonus, 1999a), and use of mitigation and questions (Ritter, 2002; Thonus, 1998b, 2002, 2004; J. Williams, 2002, 2005; Young, 1992). Most of the research has also compared NES tutorial styles with NES writers and NNES writers (Harris & Silva, 1993; Powers, 1993; Thonus, 2004; J. Williams & Severino, 2004). Findings from research comparing NES/NES with NES/NNES tutorials will be discussed throughout each section. A smaller point of investigation deals with writer revision from draft to draft as a result of a tutorial (Conrad & Goldstein, 1999; J. Williams, 2004). Research investigating how tutorials might result in changes in writers’ processes are limited to survey research investigating NES writers (Bell, 2000, 2002; Carino & Enders, 2001; Niiler, 2003, 2005). To reiterate, no research has investigated how NNES writers’ writing processes may be affected as a result of tutorial sessions.

NNES Writer Expectations

One issue investigated is the disparity between what writing centers do and what NNES writers expect when they attend a writing tutorial. Two issues emerge here with writer expectations: focus of the tutorial and role of the tutor and writer. As I will show,
these two issues contribute to some of the ways tutors and writers interact in writing center tutorials.

**Tutorial Focus.** Writing center training manuals frequently recommend that tutors work on the writing process by addressing higher-order concerns before lower-order concerns and editing with editing typically being delayed until the end of the tutorial if addressed at all (Blau, et al., 2002; Bruce & Rafoth, 2009; Gillespie & Lerner, 2000; McAndrew & Reigstad, 2001; Murphy & Sherwood, 2008; Reigstad & McAndrew, 1984; Ryan & Zimmerelli, 2010). NNES writers, however, often visit the writing center in order to work on local issues such as language use and grammar (Blau, et al., 2002; Carter-Tod, 1995; Harris, 1995a; Powers, 1993; Ritter, 2002; J. Williams, 2004, 2005; J. Williams & Severino, 2004). Tutors are faced with a choice when writers insist on dealing with grammar: work on grammar, which violates the ‘rules’ tutors should follow, or negotiate away from working on grammar, which may be considered as ignoring the request (Ritter, 2002; Thonus, 1998b). Unmet expectations can lead to writers abandoning services (Carter-Tod, 1995) and be perceived by the writer as an unsuccessful tutorial (Ritter, 2002).

Carter-Tod (1995) discusses how one of her participants stopped visiting the writing center after realizing that he/she would not receive the type of service sought: assistance on grammar. Clark (1988b) maintains that resistance to working on surface features is a response to a fear of potential charges of plagiarism. She argues this fear limits how well a tutor can assist students in improving their writing and advocates assisting students with proofreading and editing by modeling the process. Clark also insists that “[t]rue collaborators respond to one another honestly and do not withhold
from one another about trivial aspects of a paper (spelling, typos, missing commas, for example) because they fear providing too much assistance” (p. 95). Issues such as these are what ostensibly led Blau, Hall, and Sparks (2002) to conclude that tutors should balance focusing on higher-order concerns with lower-order concerns and editing. They assert that the benefit of “dealing with global [HOCs] and local [LOCS] concerns simultaneously is that tutors can show NNES writers the larger issues that arise while addressing the language concerns that many of them bring to the writing center” (p. 42).

**Tutor/Writer Role.** A second concern addressed in the literature is the differing expectations of what a tutor ‘should be.’ On the one hand, writing center literature argues that tutors should behave one way; on the other hand, NNES writers bring with them culturally formed beliefs of how tutors should be and their (writers’) relation to tutors. Tutors are expected to be peer collaborators in order to guide the writers and assist them in becoming better writers (Blau, et al., 2002; Harris, 2008; North, 1984, 1994). This view aligns with student-centered models of instruction where the writer presents issues he or she wants to address in writing center tutorials (Bruce & Rafoth, 2009; McAndrew & Reigstad, 2001; Murphy & Sherwood, 2008; Reigstad & McAndrew, 1984; Ryan & Zimmerelli, 2010).

Studies have found, however, that expectations NNES writers bring into writing center conferences are different from the role tutors are expected to assume. These writers tend to position tutors in very different ways; NNES writers typically position tutors as experts closer to a teacher versus peers and prefer this position to tutors-as-peers (Carter-Tod, 1995; Harris, 2008; Thonus, 1998a, 2001; Young, 1992). Young (1992) and Harris and Silva (1993) reveal that NNES writers overwhelmingly prefer the tutor as
occupying a higher status than the writer. Young’s research, specific to Taiwanese students, emphasized that these NNES writers preferred tutorials to be more in line with the tutorial as interaction marked by a separation of teacher as authority in writing and writer as a more passive recipient of the other’s knowledge. Thonus’s (1999a, 1999b, 2001, 2002, 2004) research also supports the tutor-as-teacher preference of NNES writers.

Overall, the student-centered or collaborative models of writing centers are dispreferred by many NNES writers coming from CHC countries (Carter-Tod, 1995; Young, 1992). These writer expectations of having tutors positioned as authority are essentially realized according to the research based on tutorials framed as service encounters, high levels of tutor dominance, and more frequent use of directives versus questions that lead to open conversations. I will discuss what research has suggested about these three aspects next.

**Scaffolding in Writing Center**

Research has looked at the effects of scaffolded feedback on NNES writing (Donato, 1994; Ewert, 2009; Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Thompson, 2009; Weissberg, 2006; J. Williams, 2002, 2004). Scaffolding, first presented by Wood, Bruner, and Ross (1976), is a process that “enables a... novice to solve a problem, carry out a task or achieve a goal which would be beyond his unassisted efforts” (p. 90). A crucial point Wood, Bruner and Ross make is that the learner must comprehend the solution in order for scaffolded instruction to work and for the student to be able to successfully complete the task on his or her own. They outline six features of scaffolding:

1. Recruitment – the tutor must enlist the learner’s interest and aligned with the task
2. Reduction in the degrees of freedom – simplifying the task by breaking it down into manageable parts
3. Direction maintenance – maintaining pursuit of a goal/focus

4. Marking critical features – the tutor marks relevant features of the task or points out discrepancies between what the learner producing and what the correct product is

5. Frustration control – this is identified as being of minor importance by Wood et at., but it is instrumental in reducing stress

6. Demonstration – tutor models how the task is to be performed

Puntambekar and Hübscher (2005) discuss what they view to be four essential features of scaffolding. They reinforce that a crucial feature is intersubjectivity – that there is a shared understanding of the task between tutor and learner. Ongoing diagnosis of the learner’s current level of understanding is the second feature and entails diagnosing the learner’s current level and supporting instruction accordingly. Third is the dialogic and interactive component of scaffolding. This feature is essential because the learner is also active – “scaffolded interactions are a function of participation” (p. 3) by both the tutor and learner. The last feature, fading, was not discussed in Wood, Bruner and Ross’s initial model. Puntambekar and Hübscher feel this is a necessary component and refer back to Vygotsky’s (1978) discussions of how learners must internalize the act. As this is done, the support, or scaffold, is removed allowing the learner to perform the task independently.

The collaborative nature of writing has been discussed by a number of researchers both in and out of writing center contexts. Donato (1994) described the metaphor of scaffolding saying that that, in social interaction, "a knowledgeable participant can create, by means of speech, supportive conditions in which the novice can participate in, and extend, current skills and knowledge to higher levels of competence" (p. 40). He found that "when learners are actively assisted in dialogic events on topics of mutual interest
and value, individual and conceptual development occurs" [p.42]. His research on collective scaffolding in L2 contexts revealed that peers can serve as more knowledgeable others and assist one another in acquiring more complex and advanced linguistic skills.

Williams’s (2004) research investigated tutorials between NES tutors and NNES writers where scaffolding was employed by the tutor. She found that there are six features associated with this type of successful:

1. Negotiation episodes
2. Active writer participation in these episodes
3. Clarification of critical features by tutor
4. Sustained emphasis on goals by tutor
5. Organization of task by tutor
6. Modeling by tutor

(p. 190)

She concluded that the first two features are associated with acquisition and the last three with scaffolding and that tutorials using scaffolding resulted in more writer text-based revision. In tutorials where the tutor was more conversationally dominant, there was little to no revision. Although her research does not directly investigate scaffolding, she does state that the dialogic environment of a writing center is an ideal place for scaffolding to occur.

Weissberg (2006) directly investigated scaffolding in writing center contexts and agreed with Williams that tutorials are “unique opportunit[ies] to address the needs of individual L2 writers through [dialogue]” (p. 262). In this research, scaffolding was more likely to occur when the tutor took time to dialogically assist the writer solve a particular
problem with either content or process. Weissberg is explicit in pointing out that he does not make a claim that tutorials using scaffolding assist writers in becoming better writers of academic English. Instead, his research was to look at how discussions occurred and whether these scaffolded dialogues “played a role in finding solutions to the writing problems associated with them” (p. 260)

Last, Thompson (2009) looked at scaffolding in writing centers drawing upon Cromley and Azevedo’s (2005) discussion of cognitive and motivational scaffolding. Cognitive scaffolding consists of asking open-ended questions, breaking the problem into smaller tasks, and prompting; motivational scaffolding serves to maintain or improve motivational state through reinforcement. Thompson also looked at the use of gestures as scaffolding mechanisms. Both forms of scaffolding were found to “motivate a student to increase her knowledge about how to revise her draft” (p. 447).

**Tutorial as a Service Encounter**

Writing center tutorials have been fit within Agar’s (1985) institutional discourse frame by various researchers (Ritter, 2002; Thonus, 1998b, 1999b, 2001, 2004; J. Williams, 2002, 2004, 2005; J. Williams & Severino, 2004). This institutional discourse frame positions one individual, the tutor in this case, as an institutional representative, or service provider, and the other individual, the writer in this case, as a client. The frame consists of three phases: diagnosis, directive, and report. During diagnosis, the representative attempts to fit the client’s problem into the institution’s frame, usually through a series of questions aimed at understanding the primary reason for the visit. The directive phase entails the service provider instructing or suggesting to the client what to
do. The report phase is typically where the service provider files a report of the encounter (Agar, 1985).

Ritter (2002), Thonus (1998a, 1998b, 1999a, 2001, 2004), and Williams (2002, 2004, 2005) have found that institutional discourse is an appropriate frame to use in writing center tutorials in describing the patterns of interaction, how discursive techniques are utilized in order for the to control tutorial, and who appears to control the tutorial. Fitting it into Agar’s framework, tutorials are encounters of institutional discourse where the institutional representative typically controls the flow and direction of the encounter. Williams (2002, 2004, 2005) found that the diagnosis is the longest phase in tutorials; Ritter (2002) and Thonus (1998b, 1999a), the directive phase. The difference in which phase is longest appears to depend on how the phases are defined. Williams classifies each new item identified in a tutorial as a diagnosis of a problem. Ritter and Thonus consider the initial reason the writer attends a tutorial session as being the diagnosis for the general visit and classify identifying these emergent issues in writer text as being a series of evaluation-suggestion pairs and subsequent negotiation of suggestions (i.e. the writer accepts or rejects the suggestion). This use of evaluation-suggestion pairs falls, for Ritter and Thonus, in the directive phase.

With the tutorial being viewed as a service encounter where tutors are service providers and writers are clients, I look at the impact this view may have on how tutors and writers interact. Agar (1985) indicates that the service provider will dominate the session and offer more directives, and the literature appears to support these behaviors in interactions between tutors and writers.
Tutor Dominance. Who dominates interaction in NNES tutorials has been the focus of much research and relates to both NNES writer expectations and the tutorial as a service encounter. Writing center manuals indicate that tutors should not dominate the tutorial session (Bruce & Rafoth, 2009; Murphy & Sherwood, 2008; Ryan & Zimmerelli, 2010). Studies have consistently shown that NES tutors dominate NNES tutorials, and that this dominance occurs more in tutorials with NNES writers than with NES writers. Thonus (1993, 1998b, 2004), Ritter (2002), Williams (J. Williams, 2004, 2005), Williams and Severino (2004), and Young (1992) all found that NES tutors dominate NNES writers in tutorial sessions.

Williams (2005) and Thonus (1999b, 2002, 2004) found that tutors exhibit greater volubility (talk time) and turn length and produce more leading moves to control the flow of the session. This means that the tutor talked more, occupied more conversational turns, and controlled the flow of conversation through discursive techniques. One method to dominate discussion is through the use of directives/suggestions and questions. I will address this in more detail when I discuss tutor use of mitigated suggestions and questions during tutorials.

Evaluating this dominance from a ‘best practice’ standpoint, we might conclude that this is a bad practice. Viewed from writers’ perceptions, though, seems to indicate that this is what many NNES writers expect. For example, Young (1992) found that the Taiwanese participants preferred tutors to be dominant as a result of the writers’ experiences with lock-step instructional strategies used in their home country. Thonus (2001) similarly found that writers accord tutors higher status and, as a result, expect tutors to be dominant in the discussion. Viewed from an institutional discourse
perspective, the tutor would naturally be the dominant party in the interaction (Ritter, 2002).

*Mitigated Suggestions and Questions.* In North’s (1982) view, a successful tutor talks about the writing and offer suggestions to the writer on how to improve as a writer; a successful tutor does not tell the writer what to do by being directive. In order to avoid being directive, tutors are told to mitigate their suggestions to writers. Mitigated suggestions contain politeness markers while unmitigated suggestions lack politeness markers (Levinson, 1983). Directives express a desire for the speaker to get the hearer to do something specific (Searle, 1976) and are similar in structure, yet bound to the relative status of the speaker and hearer, to suggestives (Searle, 1979). In other words, a person occupying a superordinate position may be afforded telling a subordinate what to do whereas the subordinate would need to mitigate a similar utterance in order to present it in a more polite manner to a superordinate. Individuals of equal status would choose various suggestive structures in order to avoid face threatening acts. Since tutors are expected to be peers in writing center tutorials, it is expected that more suggestives would appear in tutorials versus directives. On the other hand, since research has indicated that tutors take a dominant position with NNES writers, there exists the likelihood for increased directives.

Research indicates that NES tutors are more directive and use less mitigation and questions when dealing with NNES writers compared to tutorials between NES tutors and NES writers (Ritter, 2002; Thonus, 1998b, 2002, 2004; J. Williams, 2002, 2005; Young, 1992). While polite suggestions have been shown to occur in NES/NNES tutorials, imperatives occurred more frequently than mitigated suggestions using downgraders such
as hedging, conditionals, and downtoners (Thonus, 1998b, 2002). While directiveness may be viewed unfavorably by writing centers, Young (1992) indicates that her Taiwanese participants reported feeling uncomfortable when the tutor offered indirect, mitigated comments and greatly preferred “bald-on-record” comments. Thonus (1998b) conjectures that more tutor directives is a result of less conversational involvement on the NNES writer’s part. However, increased tutor volubility and subsequent dominance may equally explain the lack of NNES writer conversational involvement.

When questions are used in tutorials between NES tutors and NNES writers, the questions tend to be close-ended, leading questions (Conrad & Goldstein, 1999; Thonus, 1998a; J. Williams & Severino, 2004) or a series of clarification questions and comprehension checks (Ritter, 2002; Thonus, 1998a) versus the Wh- questions recommended by tutor training manuals. The choice to use more directives and suggestions over Socratic questions may not be detrimental to tutorials, though. Research on CHC cultures suggests that these students are resistant to Socratic questions based on cultural influences (Tweed & Lehman, 2002). Student revision tends to be less successful when Wh- questions are used to facilitate change (Conrad & Goldstein, 1999; Thonus, 1998b); using tight question-answer adjacency pairs appears to result in more revision (Ritter, 2002; J. Williams, 2005).

NNES Perceptions of Writing Tutorials

The majority of research investigating whether writing center conferences make students ‘better writers’ focuses on NES writers. Qualitatively, Taylor-Escoffery (1992) found that basic writers who attend university writing conferences typically underwent a change in their perception of writing and how writing can be used to “get things done” (p.
14) with respect to informing, advising, persuading, or instructing. Bell (1986) and Carino and Enders (2001) administered Likert scales and found that students visiting writing centers improved from draft to draft and that they felt they would use what they learned during tutorials in their future writing. Niiler (2003, 2005) found statistically significant correlations between NES writers’ pre-drafts and their post-drafts. Both Bell and Carino and Enders recognize the need for more research in order to understand connections between tutorials and improved writing process.

In looking at writing center research on NNES writers and the changes they make, we see the same focus on measuring writer growth by looking at how a particular product changed from draft-to-draft. There is also concern that tutor dominance can negatively affect what writers learn and how much revision results out of a tutorial. Goldstein and Conrad (1990) suggest that revisions “seem to occur when they [have] been negotiated in the conference” (1990, p. 71). Williams (2004) supports this in saying that active writer participation in the conversation is an essential element for successful revision. Again, both Goldstein and Conrad and Williams looked at draft-to-draft, not how the tutorial affects the writer long-term. Williams (2004) recognizes this limitation by saying that “one cannot directly extrapolate from short-term draft-to-draft change to long-term development” (p. 174). Nonetheless, Powers (1993) is optimistic about writing tutorials by saying that the act of writers verbalizing their ideas and discussing their writing with tutors may allow them to better understand audience awareness, begin recognizing organization patterns, and acquire new vocabulary and sentence structures.

While research has made important progress in unpacking the interactions that occur in tutorials between NES tutors and NNES writers, they shed no light on the
intricacies of the tutorials, what interactions and techniques influence NNES writers’ awareness of these issues, or how types of suggestions made or items discussed in the tutorials appear to result in writer changes. The majority of research, while indicating that tutorials took place in writing centers that use a process-based approach to writing, look more closely at revision that is occurring on a specific product and the interactions between the tutor and writer and do not investigate writers’ processes. Young (1992) exclusively looks at the interactions between teacher-as-tutor and writers to better understand preferences different cultures have for politeness acts; her research did not seek to understand what changes were occurring in student writing or changes in the writers.

Thonus’s, Williams’s, and Ritter’s research all frame writing center tutorials as instances of institutional discourse and focus on interaction and, namely, dominance in the interaction and looked at how directives/suggestions may influence individual student product worked on in the tutorials but do not extend beyond that to look at how the encounter may result in long-term writer changes. My interest in utilizing Agar’s institutional discourse is not in how directive or nondirective a tutorial is; my interest is in utilizing this frame in order to establish structure of tutorial through topic initiations. I do not look at the use of discourse as a dominating agent because to do so would presume that NNESs have sufficient linguistic knowledge to be cognitively effected by use of mitigation strategies in a language that is their L2. Using discourse markers and mitigation strategies and discussing the effects of said markers and strategies assumes that the NNES possesses sufficient grasp of the linguistic and communicative competences in the L2 to be influenced (van Dijk). These subtleties in language, while
performing specific acts, are not necessarily interpreted as “dominance” by an NNES. In fact, Young (1992) discusses how hedges used to upgrade and control conversation were viewed as a sign of the teacher as being knowledgeable and appeared to comfort the NNES student rather than discomfort or dominate the student.

Hoon (2009) also recognizes the lack of research investigating how writing tutorials change NNES writers’ processes and calls for additional research in this area – a call that has yet to be answered. My proposed research seeks to investigate this by looking at tutorials and writer and tutor perception of the tutorials. My research goes beyond looking at the structure of tutorials and interactions in writing center tutorials and beyond writer and tutor perceptions by investigating what the NES tutors believe NNES take out of the tutorials and what NNES writers actually report as being things in the tutorial that changed their writing.

**Summary**

In this chapter, I reviewed different views describing process-approaches to writing and how these may be used in writing centers. I then reviewed literature specific to NNES writers in writing centers. In the next chapter, I describe my theoretical frames, research approach, the educational setting, data sources, and methods for analyzing the data. I also discuss ethical issues of the research, issues with validity, and my role in the research.
CHAPTER THREE

THEORETICAL FRAMES & METHODOLOGY

Theoretical Frames

Influenced by my experiences with living and teaching abroad and working closely with NNES students in the writing center for nearly five years, I come into this research drawing on four theories. Each one represents a change in my understanding, through my experiences as the English as a Second Language consultant at the University Writing Center, of what it means to become a writer. Social constructionism is the primary theory I draw upon in this research. Contained within social constructionism are theories of the social view of writing; Agar’s (1985) institutional discourse; and contrastive rhetoric. Combining my experiences and driven by these theories, I asked the overarching question of, “What are NNES writers taking out of WC tutorial?” In order to get at this question and understand not only what these writers reported taking out of the tutorial but what the tutorials looked like and what may have contributed to writer take-away, I asked the following research questions:

1. What do NES tutor/NNES writer tutorials look like?
2. What are NNES writer perceptions of these writing tutorials?
3. What are NES tutor perceptions of these writing tutorials?

Social Constructionism

Thought and knowledge is social in origin (Geertz, 1973), and it is through active communication, negotiation, conflict, and rhetoric that assumptions and knowledge within a specific social arena are developed. Social constructionism views all knowledge, reality, emotion, and behavior as being socially constructed through social interaction and,
more specifically, constructed through the discourse resulting from those social interactions (Bell, 2002; Blau, et al., 2002; Gergen, 1985, 1999, 2001; Gergen & Gergen, 2008; Hinds, 1990; Jones, 2001). Social constructionism “assumes that entities we normally call reality, knowledge, thought, facts, texts, selves, and so on are constructs generated by communities of like-minded peers” (Bruffee, 1986, p. 487). As Gergen (1985) argues, “the process of understanding… is the result of an active, cooperative enterprise of persons in relationship” (p. 267). To say that knowledge is socially constructed through interactions does not mean that individuals have a specific hand in constructing knowledge; rather, the focus is on the collective generation of knowledge (Crotty, 1998).

**Social View of Writing**

The social view of the writing process informs my research as it elaborates on writers needing to understand the different discourse communities in which they write and that this understanding is acquired through conversation with those situated within a specific discourse community (Bartholomae, 1986; Bizzell, 1986b; Bruffee, 1984; Faigley, 1986; Goody, 1978; Killingsworth, 1993; Krashen, 1981; Lantolf, 2000; Li, 2009; Swales, 1988). As Nystrand (1989) has asserted, “[w]riting is informed by the larger community” (p. 71). Harris (1992) cautions that there has been confusion with the term “collaboration” because it has been used to refer to collaborative writing as in joint authorship versus collaborative learning about writing. In my research, I refer to Harris’s second meaning of collaboration - collaboration about writing “where one writer claims ownership and makes all final decisions” (p. 390).
Given this, I draw on Bruffee (1984, 1986, 2008) and his ideas of the collaborative nature of writing as constitutive of social constructionism with the conversation that occurs around writing and the writing process and knowledge necessary to write in the context of writing center tutorials. Bruffee (2008) asserts that “[p]eer tutoring provides a social context in which students can experience and practice the kinds of conversation that academics most value” (p. 210). Learning to write in this social situation exposes writers to knowledgeable peers who are capable of converse about writing, the assignment, and the subject (Bruffee, 1984). Writing is, then, a “result of a process involving the interaction of writer, audience, language, texts, and context” (Farris, 1987, p. 32). This social interaction and dialogue is what allows writers to become part of specific discourse communities, membership that is critical to the construction of written meaning. As Ede (1995) concludes, “as long as thinking and writing are regarded as inherently individual, solitary activities, writing centers can never be more than pedagogical fix-it shops to help those who... are unable to think and write on their own” (p. 102).

Furthermore, “[s]peech and writing are seen as social constructs, the users of which are members of discourse communities in which form and function are understood and valued, with newcomers to the community needing to be initiated into the particular discourse prevailing within it” (Santos, 2001, p. 162). Individuals who are not part of that discourse community, especially NNESs, must appropriate knowledge and ways of discussing that knowledge specific to that community through interacting with other members of those communities. CHC NNESs come from a different culture that have a
different set of beliefs, values, expectation and norms where knowledge may be directly transmitted by an instructor and memorized by students (Salili, 1996).

**Agar’s Institutional Discourse**

Agar (1985) researched how service encounters between an institutional representative (IR) and a client typically follow a set pattern: diagnosis, directive, and report. During diagnosis in service encounters, the IR typically holds the floor by controlling the flow of the conversation and asking questions in order to fit the problem into the institution’s frame. The directive phase entails the institutional representative explicitly telling the client what he or she needs to do. The report phase involves the institutional representative interpreting the session, writing up a summary (report) and filing it into the archive. Agar explains that in service encounters the diagnosis and report phases are essential. Past research investigating this phenomenon in educational contexts, both in counseling sessions (Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1993a, 1993b, 1996; Hartford & Bardovi-Harlig, 1992) and in writing center encounters (Thonus, 1998a, 1998b, 1999a, 2004; J. Williams, 2002, 2005; J. Williams & Severino, 2004), has shown that Agar’s frame applies. It will assist me in making sense of the writing tutorial by adding a structural framework that will facilitate coding, analyzing, and interpreting the data.

**Contrastive Rhetoric**

Contrastive rhetoric is beneficial to use because it emphasizes that different cultures produce different thoughts, and these thoughts, in turn, are often represented using differing rhetorical structures (Blau, et al., 2002; Grabe, 1989; Hinds, 1987, 1990; Kaplan, 1966, 1987, 2001). Entering into the research with these potential differences in mind allows me to analyze the interactions and, perhaps, unpack areas in the writing not
addressed by the tutor or writer that might have been missed. Potentially missed elements may suggest that global concerns are being addressed less often than what the tutor may perceive themselves as addressing them.

Summary

Social constructionism is the overarching theory with knowledge and what we know as being constructed by communities of like-minded peers. The social view of writing as I have outlined presents writing as being situated within social constructionism with for my research as tutorials are social interaction assisting writers to being acquiring the discourse associated with a specific community (in this case, academic writing). This implies either a change in prior writing behaviors or acquisition of new writing behaviors as a result of these social interactions. Institutional discourse also allows me see how writing tutorials develop and what types of focus occur. Contrastive rhetoric represents a view of a socially constructed view of writing the CHC NNES writers may be coming from. The discursive strategies used in tutorial interactions may reveal what tutorials look like, potential breakdowns in communication and writer understanding. While tutors do not have specific training in contrastive rhetoric, tutors will typically address rhetorical structure and indirectly draw attention to cultural differences in writing. Using this lens also facilitates data analysis when looking for areas in which tutors may need additional training in order for tutors to conduct effective tutorials.

In the remainder of this chapter, I discuss the context, setting, data used, methods I employed, ethical considerations, potential issues with validity, and researcher subjectivity.
Research Approach

In line with postmodern philosophy, the world is “complex and chaotic and reality [is] multiply constructed and transitional” (Grbich, 2007, p. 9). To capture a more comprehensive picture of CHC NNES student writing, it is important not only to understand the phenomenon from the perspective of the student, it is important to understand the phenomenon as perceived from multiple stances (Patton, 2002). A naturalistic qualitative approach is an appropriate method to use for research of this type as it reveals a rich, detailed description of processes and experiences in participants’ own words (McMillan, 2008; Patton, 2002).

Using case study design, this study investigated the phenomenon from a variety of angles. The naturalistic approach is promoted by various writing researchers (Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995; Herrington, 1985; Lee & Schallert, 2008) who indicate the need for qualitative methods in order to better understand the intricate, often unobserved, details of a phenomenon as it occurs in a natural setting which might not otherwise be observed by using quantitative methods (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Naturalistic research is ideal as it allows me to understand not only the complexity of a phenomenon as it occurs, but also to study the process of writing tutorials in situ without manipulating it (Seckendorf, 1986). The writing tutorials in my study were naturalistic in that they would occur regardless of my research. Because I recorded the tutorial using a small digital recorder and was not present, observer effect on the tutorial session was minimized (Patton, 2002).

The research design I used was an embedded single-case design (Yin, 2009). Case studies are instrumental for understanding phenomena within a bounded system/context.
through in-depth analysis of multiple data sources (Creswell, 2007; McKay, 2006; Patton, 2002; Yin, 2009). The context, or bounded system, for my case study was the University at Albany Writing Center (UAWC) framed by North’s views of writing centers. Each tutorial represented a specific case, and the embedded units of analysis were the NES tutor and NNES writer. See Figure 1 for the case design.

Figure 1. *Embedded single-case design*

In the remainder of this chapter, I describe the larger setting and specific research context, participants and participant selection, data sources, methods used to analyze data, and my data collection time-table. I also address ethical considerations, generalizability and validity issues, my role in the research, and management of my subjectivity.
Educational Setting

Courses Requiring Writing & Limited Courses to Assist NNES

Both general and discipline-specific courses require a multitude of writing tasks in both undergraduate and graduate courses and, depending on the school or college, each level may have different writing requirements. To contextualize writing tasks expected of students a little better, I’ll briefly discuss the university in which this study takes place, the courses targeting writing undergraduate students must take, the type of writing support they are offered outside of the required writing courses, and issues with these courses as identified in the literature.

The university where this study takes place, the University at Albany, does not have a sequence of undergraduate writing courses offered through the English department. Instead, the university adheres to the Writing Across the Curriculum model (Conrad & Goldstein, 1999) in which students typically complete two to three writing-intensive courses: a minimum of one course taken in written discourse to satisfy the general education requirement and at least one writing-intensive course in their major to satisfy requirements of various disciplines throughout the schools (University at Albany, 2010a, 2010b). These writing intensive courses are typically identified by adding Z, W, V, or T at the end of the course number. Whether the writing intensive course required is a lower-level course (100- to 200) or upper-level course (300- to 400- ) depends on the specific school or college within the university. For example, students in Nano-technology (L&P Media, 2010) can take either a lower- or upper-level writing intensive course, while students in Criminal Justice (University at Albany, 2010d) must take a 400-level writing intensive course in the major. Not all departments require students to take a writing-
intensive course within their discipline, however. Students pursuing a Bachelor of Science in Public Health (University at Albany, 2010c), for instance, are not required to complete a writing-intensive course in their major. This variability of specific majors requiring writing-intensive courses is in line with Leki’s (2007) findings that academic majors require different amounts of writing of their students for undergraduate students.

Contrary to the trend observed by Williams (1995) that more universities are offering writing courses targeting undergraduate NNES students and counting towards their core curriculum, the university where this study is conducted offers few writing courses targeting both undergraduate and graduate NNES students counting towards their core curriculum. It does, however, offer credit-bearing courses through the Intensive English Language Program. The courses cost extra and only carry credits in order to ensure that NNES students carry the required number of credits to meet the requirements for their student visas; the course does not count towards their degrees. It is a mandatory course for students who have not met the university requirements on the TOEFL or IELSTS exams; otherwise, it is an option for NNES students. Additionally, the School of Education offers a three-credit graduate-level course in academic writing designed for NNES graduate students. Aside from these two services, there are no other writing courses available to assist NNES students in developing their writing.

University Writing Center

This research takes place at the University at Albany Writing Center (UAWC). In terms of philosophy, the writing center uses a student-centered, process-based approach as can be inferred from the statement on the writing center webpage:
Writers work with tutors in one-to-one sessions, typically 30-60 minutes in length. A tutor will attempt to best understand the writer’s context and how the writer sees him/herself in relation to the project or assignment. Tutors are trained to use tutorial time efficiently and to make decisions about which issues can and should be addressed within the framework of a given session, usually working with "global" issues (organization, logic, structure) first, then moving to "local" issues (sentence and word level problems).

Please note: tutors do not proofread or simply correct grammatical errors; instead they engage the whole writer and his/her writing process.

(University at Albany, 2010e)

The writing center is located on the first floor of the Humanities building, the building in which the English department is located. There are three main areas where tutorials take place: the main tutorial room, the writers’ computer room, and the ESL consultant room (see Figure 3). There are three additional rooms, but tutorials do not occur in these areas. The majority of the tutorials occur with regular writing center tutors (i.e. not the ESL consultant) and take place in the main tutorial room. There are two computers available for student use in the writers’ computer room. As can be seen, the writing center has limited space. There are no more than 6 tutorials occurring simultaneously due, in most part, to only 4-6 tutors working throughout the day at any given time. Reference materials for writers are located on various bookshelves and on the wall next to the entrance. The atmosphere is relaxed and informal and can be quite loud when tutorials are running.
Staff consist of one director, two assistant-directors, one ESL consultant (the researcher), and a mixture of undergraduate and graduate tutors. Undergraduate tutors are drawn from a pool of students completing an upper-level course entitled “Tutoring & Writing” offered through the English department. Upon completion of the course and being recommended by the course instructor, students can apply for a writing center position. Based on student writing samples and a series of interviews with the assistant-directors, potential candidates are hired. On occasion, the writing center employs one or two Master-level students as tutors; these individuals are previous undergraduate writing tutors.

Each semester, there are four PhD-level tutors. As part of their assistantship, these students work in the writing center for one semester and are either in their first or second semester of their program. In order to prepare them, the PhD tutors receive three days of training prior to the beginning of the semester. PhD tutors spend one semester in the writing center, and undergraduate tutors spend as many as 4 semesters. The implications here are that the undergraduate tutor population may be better trained and more
experienced while the PhD tutors arguably have more knowledge in the English discipline given their advanced educational status.

In order to better understand how undergraduate tutors are prepared to deal with NNES writers in general, I informally audited the undergraduate tutor preparation course every Monday for the majority of a semester. This tutor training course utilized two texts targeting tutor training (Murphy & Sherwood, 2008; Ryan & Zimmerelli, 2010) and one text on stylistic choices in writing (J. M. Williams & Colomb, 2010). Select articles were also introduced, but no articles dealt with NNES writers. The only material this class was exposed to was an article by Harris (2008) on cultural conflicts in the writing center and an article by Myers (2008) on ways to avoid direct editing of NNES writer papers. I also attended the three-day PhD tutor training session the semester prior to this research. Tutors there were provided the same two articles the undergraduate tutor training course used as well as an article by Blau, Hall, and Sparks (2002) on rethinking writing center tutorials with NNES writers.

Participants and Selection

In my research, I employed purposeful selection using criterion sampling (Creswell, 2007; Patton, 2002; Yin, 2009) to focus on tutorials between undergraduate and graduate NES tutors and undergraduate CHC NNES writers. I chose CHC NNES students as the focus of my study for several reasons. First, the university writing center sees a large number of students from China, Korea, and Japan; this population makes up approximately 63% of all international students on a national level (Fischer, 2009). Creswell (2007) discusses how criterion sampling is beneficial in that it allows for homogenous sampling of participants who have experienced the phenomenon being
studied, and membership in CHC increases chances of homogeneity in the writer population. This is significant as writers from CHC will likely possess similar histories in terms of how they were educated, how they view knowledge, commonly shared communication styles, and commonly shared written rhetorical strategies they employ.

For my research, I initially sought to capture four to six tutorial sessions to analyze. With purposeful sampling, quantity of participants depends on the rationale of the study, representativeness of the samples, and depth of analysis (Patton, 2002). Although the sample may be considered small, the level of detail in my analysis allowed me to draw conclusions that inform tutorial practice involving CHC NNES writers. The aim of my research was not to generalize findings but to investigate my questions deeply, which was facilitated by using a manageable number of cases.

**Data Sources**

In order to gain a fuller picture of the phenomenon, data triangulation, or “extensive, drawing on multiple sources of information, such as observations, interviews, [and] documents” (Creswell, 2007, p. 75), is recommended (Creswell, 2007; McKay, 2006; McMillan, 2008; Patton, 2002; Yin, 2009). To achieve data triangulation, I collected the following data for my research: digital audio recordings of four to six tutorials between NES tutors and NNES writers; transcriptions of tutorials; a clean copy of the writing the student brings to the tutorial and, if possible, a copy of the writing with writer or tutor notes; tutor shift reports; writer check-in/out forms; semi-structured, focused interviews with tutors and writers; transcripts of the interviews; additional post-tutorial written product from the writer if possible.
Digital audio recordings of tutorials and resulting transcriptions allowed me to have a better understanding of what tutorials look like. Clean copies of student writing and a copy of tutor/writer notes during the tutorial session paired with the digital audio recordings enabled me to have a better understanding of the tutorial. These three data pieces also allowed me to formulate interview questions. Tutor shift reports and writer check-in/out forms were instrumental in both formulating interview questions and allowing me to achieve a baseline of what writers take out of the tutorial as well as what the tutors believe writers took away. Semi-structured, open-ended interviews are essential to investigating what writers might take away from the tutorial on a more long-term basis, writer and tutor perceptions of the tutorials, and what tutors report as ‘high-quality tutorials.’ Transcriptions of the interviews enabled me to discover common themes and differences between writers, between tutors, and between tutors and writers.

Methods for Analysis

To investigate my research questions, I also utilized methodological triangulation, or “the use of multiple methods to study a single problem or program” (Patton, 2002, p. 247). In order to achieve methodological triangulation, I recorded and transcribed tutorials, conducted interviews with tutors and writers, transcribed and analyzed interviews, and used writer and tutor artifacts to facilitate overall analysis.

Timeline and Steps for Data Collection and Analysis

Methodologically, I followed this basic procedure:

1) Solicit writers who met my participant criteria of being undergraduate, CHC NNES writers to participate in my study. I reviewed upcoming appointments and looked for undergraduate writers whose names identify them as potential
members of CHC countries. I either contacted them in advance or approached them just prior to their writing tutorial. I also solicited participation from writers who walk into the writing center without an appointment. Prior to the tutorial I reviewed the specifics of the research and had the participants sign the consent form at that time. I asked all tutors ahead of time if they were willing to participate in my research and reviewed the consent form. I also had them sign the consent form at that time. It was possible for tutors to participate more than once. In the case that a tutor participated more than once, I had them sign a consent form each time to ensure participant rights were addressed. However, only one tutor participated more than once, and this was with the same writer (Case 4).

2) I either gave the tutor the digital audio recorder to capture the tutorial session or started the digital audio recorder and then left. After the tutorial session, I collected the recorder.

3) Either before or after the session, I made a copy of the student’s writing. At the end of the tutorial, I asked if the tutor or writer made notes during the session and made copies of those documents provided both tutor and writer consented.

4) Also during this time, I asked the writer if he or she was willing to participate in the second stage of the research: the interview. If the writer assented, I obtained their contact information to arrange an interview. Interviews took place approximately one to two weeks after the tutorial session. I chose this time schedule to allow myself sufficient time to transcribe the tutorial and
analyze it on a preliminary basis. I scheduled interviews as close to the tutorial in hopes that the tutorial would be fresh in both the writer’s and tutor’s minds.

5) Once I had made this arrangement, I transferred the digital recording to a password-protected laptop and assigned it identifiers (i.e., “W#” or “T#”). I recorded the tutor or writer information and identifies in a password-protected spreadsheet.

6) I obtained and copied the writer’s ‘Writer Check-in/out Form” (see Appendix A). At the end of the day, I obtained and copied the tutor’s shift report (see Appendix B), and took care to cover the tutor’s name when copying the shift report to maintain confidentiality. I wrote the corresponding identifier on each artifact.

7) Next, I transcribed the tutorial using Express Scribe (NCH, 2010) transcription software.

8) Once data was transcribed, I transferred the plain text transcript (i.e., no discourse analysis will have been done) into NVivo 8 (QSR, 2008) and coded tutorials as described in more detail below. This preliminary coding was used to guide both writer and tutor interviews. I also began identifying areas of interest for discourse analysis at this time and coded using the protocol found in Appendix C.

9) I reviewed the writer check-in/out sheet and tutor shift report to assist in focusing the interviews.

10) I scheduled and conducted interviews with the tutors and writers.
11) Once interviews were completed, I transcribed the interviews using Express Scribe and coded the interviews using NVivo 8 and following the steps outlined in the Coding Interviews section found below.

12) I repeated these steps for each tutorial.

13) Once all data was collected and analyzed as outlined above and described in more detail below, I looked across the data for patterns and similarities in tutorials and common themes. In order to ensure systematic cross-case analysis, I recoded the data using NVivo 8 grouping statements into themes. I will elaborate more on this stage in Chapter 4 under Findings, Tutorial Analysis.

Data collection and analysis was ongoing and overlapping. See Table 1 for my research timeline.

Table 1. *Research timeline*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Timeline</th>
<th>Research Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March - April 2011</td>
<td>Complete IRB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2011 - November 2011</td>
<td>Recruit participants, Record Tutorial, Analyze tutorial – meta-structure, Conduct interview, Analyze interviews, Member check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2011 - March 2012</td>
<td>Macro-analysis of data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-April 2012</td>
<td>Defend dissertation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-April through May 1, 2012</td>
<td>Revise dissertation as directed by committee (if necessary)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Data

In analyzing the data, I utilized multiple tools including transcription and coding of tutorial sessions at both the meta-structure and discourse level, interviews and transcriptions of the interviews, and artifacts including but not limited to the writer’s original paper, notes and/or markups made on the writer’s paper during the tutorial, writer check-in/out forms, and tutor shift reports. Following are descriptions of how each question was analyzed and tools used to conduct the analysis.

Analyzing RQ1: What do NES tutor/NNES writer tutorials look like?

To investigate this question, I used transcripts of the tutorials that I transcribed into Microsoft WordPad (Microsoft, 2009) using Express Scribe (NCH, 2010) as the transcription software. Using WordPad allowed me to create unformatted transcripts I could use with other analytic software such as NVivo 8 (QSR, 2008). In total, I analyzed five tutorials for a total of 102 pages of tutorial transcripts. Once I completed transcribing each tutorial, I listened to the tutorial again and reviewed the transcription to ensure accuracy. I analyzed the data for meta-structure and discourse-level structure. Looking at meta-structure allowed me to understand the basic form focus of each tutorial. Discourse-level structure allowed me to obtain a more detailed picture of what occurred in the tutorial sessions. In this next portion, I describe both meta-structure analysis and discourse-level structure analysis in more detail.

Meta-structure Analysis

In looking at tutorial meta-structure, I used NVivo 8 and the block-and-file coding approach (Grbich, 2007) with these areas in mind: statement types (questions, focus statements), Agar’s (1985) institutional discourse phases, global versus local foci, process

---

6 A sample transcript can be found at the end of the dissertation (Appendix J).
focus, and scaffolding. See Table 2 for how data will be used to understand meta-
structure. Following Table 2 is a more detailed discussion of how each occurred.

Table 2. Data Analysis for RQ1: What do NES tutor/NNES writer tutorials look like? (Meta-
structure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transcripts</td>
<td>Analyzed using NVivo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Block-and file coding approach in order to determine focus as well as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>similarities and differences in focus across tutorials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Questions/ statement types to focus writer attention on specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>areas which serve to diagnose a problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Agar’s institutional discourse framework (diagnosis, directive, &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>report + openings and closings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Global focus (HOCs) and local focus (LOCs) (suggests alignment with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>best practices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Process (what stage of the writing process the tutor addressed and/or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>what suggestions for process were made)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Scaffolding (cognitive and motivational scaffolding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artifacts</td>
<td>• Original student paper and copy of paper with student or tutor notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(if possible) to be used as a guide to tutorial transcript.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement type coding. During the initial coding, I coded questions, questions or statements which appeared to focus writer attention on a specific section of the paper. This was a tentative coding sheet. As I went through the data and looked for topic initiations, initial focus on HOCs or LOCs, statement to focus attention on a certain aspect of the writing in terms of process, and/or occurrences of scaffolding (cognitive or motivational) I revised the codes. Coding first for statement type allowed me to more quickly code for overall focus and specific structure and isolate topic initiations.

Agar’s Institutional Discourse. In order to look for relative structure of tutorials, I coded based on Agar’s (1985) three phases of instructional discourse – diagnosis, directive, and report – as utilized in writing center research. This was done by looking at
topical initiations (i.e., changes in topic in the tutorial) and parsing them into one of the phases described below.

The diagnosis phase is where the institutional representative (the tutor in this case) “fits the client’s problem to the institution’s frames” (Agar, 1985, p. 150). In writing center contexts, diagnosis is viewed as “a statement of the problem, of what… brought the writer to the center” (J. Williams, 2005, p. 41) and occurs through conversation with the writer about the writer and about their assignment. To better diagnose issues, tutors may question writers in addition to either the tutor or writer reading the writer’s paper, and it is during this phase that the tutor and writer negotiate the goals of the tutorial (Ritter, 2002; Thonus, 2002; J. Williams, 2005). The goals that are set, while directing the direction of the tutorial, are also fit within the writing center’s pedagogical frame; goals outside of the center’s pedagogy, such as grammar instruction, are typically negotiated away from (Thonus, 1999a, 1999b; J. Williams, 2005). Tutors also may ask questions to diagnose a problem.

In the directive phase, the client is either told what to do at that moment, told what needs to be done after the meeting, or offered suggestions (Agar, 1985; Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1990; Thonus, 1998b; J. Williams, 2005). Agar indicates that of the three phases, this phase is the one least likely to be addressed. This may not hold true when the institutional frame is a writing center; Thonus (1998b), for instance, suggests that the majority of a tutorial is situated within this phase.

Agar’s (1985) last identified phase in institutional discourse is the report phase. This is unlikely to be evident in the tutorial transcripts as it typically refers to the physical report writing and will likely appear in tutor shift reports and on writer check-in/out
forms. However, Ritter (2002) suggests that the report phase and the tutorial closing typically co-occur with the tutor asking writers to complete writer report forms, repeating suggestions for the writer to work on, or reiterating what appeared to be successful in the tutorial session.

To the three phases of institutional discourse I adopted Thonus’s (Thonus, 1998a, 1999a) addition of Openings and Closing. The openings phase includes introductions of the tutor and writer as well as small talk where the two might attempt to establish on one or the other’s part affiliation. Tutor training manuals recommend that tutors ‘chat’ or break-the-ice with the writers in an effort to establish rapport (Gillespie & Lerner, 2008; Ryan & Zimmerelli, 2010). Once rapport has been established, the tutor then moves on to asking the writer what specifically brought the writer to the writing center. For all intents and purposes, these initial queries typically serve as the beginning of the initial diagnosis phase as the writer self-diagnoses. This latter view aligns to Thonus’s (Thonus, 1998b, 2002) view of openings and is the one I used. The closings phase is the end of the tutorial session and includes summarizing what the writer will do after the tutorial, small talk, appreciation, arranging the next tutorial, and leave taking (Ritter, 2002; Thonus, 1998b). Table 3 summarizes the phases and phase order.
Table 3. Institutional Phase Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>To begin interaction</td>
<td>Greeting, Introduction, Small talk, Establishing rapport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis</td>
<td>to clarify reason or understanding, to align writer goals with WC’s goals</td>
<td>Statement of problem/topic identification, Establishment of goals, Questions about writing (non-clarification), Statements to focus on text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>to direct, regulate, and instruct</td>
<td>Direct statements telling writer what to do during session, Direct statements directing writer to do something after tutorial, Suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report*</td>
<td>Report of what occurred in session</td>
<td>Verbally summarizing what was covered in tutorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing</td>
<td>To end interaction</td>
<td>Summarizing writer’s next step, Small talk, Showing appreciation, Arranging next tutorial, Leave taking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Report phase may also be found within the closing
(adapted from Reinhardt, 2007)

In this portion of coding, I first coded the opening, report, and closing phases to reduce the coding boundary. I then used sentence-level coding to identify potential areas where diagnosis occurred and looked at the discourse that followed looking for a directive or suggestion and code that. If the directive matched (pairs with) the diagnostic sentence, I identified the block as a diagnosis/directive pair. If there was no diagnosis/directive pair, it may be that the block of discourse immediately following a diagnosis served a different purpose other than as a directive. These instances were marked for reviewed and, when necessary, I created in vivo codes to assist in categorizing them. Once I finished coding the tutorial, I moved onto the discourse-level structure phase.
Establishing Foci

*HOCS/LOCs.* Once statement types were coded and segments for institutional discourse, I used a block-and-file approach to code broadly for global focus (e.g., HOCS) and local (sentence-level) focus (e.g., LOCS) by looking at each segment in the tutorial breakdown. In coding for global focus, I looked for places in the transcript where the tutor or writer discussed content and focused of the paper, rhetorical organization, point of view, voice, and tone. For local or sentence-level focus, I coded for instances where the tutor or writer discussed improving individual sentences by eliminating unnecessary words, clarifying confusing or incorrectly structured sentences, and clarifying language and words to better convey the writer’s intended thought. Coding for editing entailed looking for instances where the tutor or writer addressed correcting errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation. Coding for these aspects allowed me to establish an initial idea of the general focus and rough sequence of the tutorial. I was able to ascertain whether the tutorial conforms to writing center literature suggestions of focusing on global aspects of revision first, then local revision (Gillespie & Lerner, 2000, 2008; Ryan & Zimmerelli, 2010).

*Process.* I coded each segment based on what part of the writing process based on Ryan and Zimmerman’s (2010) stages to the writing process. See Table 4. I used this version of the process because it is the one used in the tutor training course at the university and in the UAWC.
Table 4. Writing Process Stages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prewriting</td>
<td>Consists of planning and generating ideas, freewriting, brainstorming, outlining, and researching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Creating an initial draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revising and Editing</td>
<td>Global revision (focus is on changes in content, focus, organization, point of view, voice, and tone), sentence-level revision (improving individual sentences by eliminating unnecessary words, clarifying confusing or incorrectly structured sentences, and clarifying language), and editing (identifying and correcting errors in spelling, grammar, and punctuation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In coding for this, I looked for where the writer reported being in the process, what stage of the process the tutor appeared to focus on, and what suggestions for changes in process the tutor provided the writer.

Scaffolding. Last, I analyzed the discourse for instances of scaffolding. I used Thompson’s (2009) modified coding scheme for scaffolding. This included cognitive scaffolding and motivational scaffolding. Cognitive scaffolding consists of verbal techniques such as modeling, open-ended questions, breaking the problem into smaller tasks, and prompting. Motivational scaffolding is statements that serve to maintain or improve motivational state through reinforcement. Both cognitive and motivational scaffolding are episodes where there is active writer participation, clarification of critical features, sustained emphasis on a specific goal as organized by the tutor, and modeling. Modeling by itself would not constitute cognitive scaffolding unless it was within the fit the above episode. Similarly, reinforcing a piece of writing outside of the episode would not qualify as motivational scaffolding.

---

7 Thompson modified the scaffolding from Cromley and Azevedo’s (2005), who researched scaffolding techniques used in reading.
**Discourse-level Structure Analysis**

Discourse analysis (DA) has been used by numerous researchers (Ewert, 2009; Gage, 1986; Ritter, 2002; Thonus, 1998b, 1999a, 1999b, 2001, 2002, 2004; J. Williams, 2002, 2004, 2005; Young, 1992) to investigate the interactions between NES tutors and NNES writers. This research is in addition to research looking at interactional patterns between NES and NNES interlocutors in writing conferences between NES teachers and NNES students (Goldstein & Conrad, 1990).

My current research continues my previous work by looking at conversational and discourse aspects. I use an adapted version of Jefferson’s transcript notation model (see Appendix C) to mark the different discursive features I observe in the tutorials. I notated each captured tutorial in their entirety. During notation, I coded for tutor and writer volubility, prosodic elements, discourse markers, filled and unfilled pauses, suggestion types, and mitigation strategies. See Table 5 for data source and features coded for.

Table 5. *Data Analysis for RQ1: What do NES tutor/NNES writer tutorials look like? (Discourse-level structure)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transcripts</td>
<td>Analyzed using Jefferson’s transcript notation model (see Appendix C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Volubility (# of words uttered including backchannels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prosody (e.g., rising and falling tones &amp; pronunciation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discourse markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Backchannels (mm, m-hm, ng., alright, uh., yeah, so)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Filled and unfilled pauses (ex. time before, after &amp; around utterances)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I describe each of these aspects in more detail below.

*Volubility.* Volubility refers to the “time at talk” (Thonus, 2002); research shows that more tutor talk suggests less collaboration, with more tutor-talk signaling tutor dominance (Y.-K. Kim, 2000; Thonus, 2004). In order to establish volubility, I counted
the number of utterances uttered by each participant. Establishing and understanding volubility allows me to form a more specific picture of what these tutorials look like. Higher levels of tutor volubility may suggest teacher-centered tutorials, higher levels of writer volubility may suggest student-centered models, and relatively equal amounts of volubility may suggest collaborative models. Volubility was measured in total number of words, average words per turn, the percentage tutor and writer spoke, and tutor-to-writer word ratio.

*Filled and unfilled pauses.* Closely related to both prosody and marker use are occurrences of filled pauses and unfilled pauses. Unfilled pauses occur when there is absence of any utterance (i.e. word→pause→continuation) and suggest the speaker is searching for information (Dornyei & Kormos, 1998), while filled pauses contain markers such as uh, um, and oh and contain pauses either before the marker, after the maker, or both (i.e. word→potential pause→marker→potential pause→continuation). Although pauses are part of naturally occurring speech, filled and unfilled pauses are prosodically different than regular speech activities (Swerts, 1998). Clark and Fox Tree (2002) suggest that these signals of delay occur in patterns and that, generally speaking, filled pauses with uh and um may have shorter pauses before and after the utterance than do u:h and u:m. Clark and Fox Tree also suggest that variations of uh signal shorter delays than variations of um. Ultimately, frequent filled and unfilled pauses in speech acts may indicate a lack of NNES English fluency (Derwing, Munro, & Thomson, 2008; Dornyei & Kormos, 1998; Munro & Derwing, 2001; Riggenbach, 1991), and correlations have been established between NNES English fluency of English and how comprehensible their speech is (Derwing, et al., 2008). Therefore, relationships between
filled and unfilled pauses and fluency and correlations between fluency and comprehensibility may have direct impact on establishing goals and maintaining flow of a tutorial because tutors carrying on conversations with less fluent NNES writers may be forced to grapple more with understanding the utterances in discursive exchanges and be less able to focus on the message.

**Prosody.** Focusing on prosodic qualities (prosody) may shed light on how prosodic patterns acquired in the writer’s first language may interfere with the understanding of an utterance and message (Guion, 2005; Lindfield, Wingfield, & Goodglass, 1999). I coded for rising and falling tones, speech rate, and, when it seems to impact communication, pronunciation and analyzed these more closely for each writer depending on whether tutors reported prosodic issues.

**Discourse Markers.** Discourse markers are used to initiate conversational repair (H. H. Clark, 1994; H. H. Clark & Fox Tree, 2002), signal understanding or lack of understanding (Condon, 2001; Schiffrin, 2001a, 2001b), or indicate receipt of new information (Byron & Heeman, 1997). Discourse markers include oh, ok, alright, yeah, uh, um, mm, and you know. Each can serve a different purpose in a speech act.

Schiffrin’s (2001b) research on oh reveals that its use may function as self-initiated repair, serve to fill gaps in utterances resulting from speakers searching for information, indicate repair completion, and may be used in conjunction with information elaborations and amendments. Oh is also used to indicate receipt of new information (Byron & Heeman, 1997) or that information received is recognized as fitting in with prior knowledge. Last, oh can indicates sudden recall and sudden realization of what previously misunderstood information may mean (Schiffrin, 2001b). Interlocutors may
also use ok and alright to signal “success achievement of understanding” (Condon, 2001, p. 493) as well as to orient suggestions, signal upcoming elaboration, or indicate continued attention to the dialogic exchange.

Discourse markers uh and um are used to signal when foreseen problems such as delays or interruptions in speech activity may occur (H. H. Clark, 1994; H. H. Clark & Fox Tree, 2002). These interruptions may indicate that the speaker is searching for information to include in an utterance or searching for correct lexical items.

**Backchannels.** Backchannels often consist of discourse markers and show that the listener is attending to the conversation (Heinz, 2003; Schiffrin, 2001a). Discourse markers are considered backchannels when “they follow the other speaker’s turn with little or no pause, and there is no subsequent speech from that speaker” (J. Williams, 2005, pp. 54-55). Research (see Cathcart, Carletta, & Klein, 2003; Gardner, 1998) have identified right, okay, mm-hmm, uh, yeah, mm, and variations as frequently used backchanneling markers. These backchannels were taken from research on NES interlocutors and may not represent type of backchannels NNES speakers employ.

Karpiński, Kleśta, & Szalkowska (2006) researched backchanneling in Korean and Thai speakers and found more frequent use of mm (also ng) as a backchannel than NES with interlocutors (see Gardner, 1998).

In terms of tutorial exchange, writers may tend to backchannel more because of a tutor’s domination of the tutorial. NNES backchanneling may not reflect listener engagement with dialogue, however. Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford (2005) found that, in conferences between NES teachers and NNES students, backchannels that appeared to indicate listener attention to the conversation were, in fact, politeness strategies. These
‘faux’ backchannels often necessitated subsequent tutor negotiation of meaning for statements believed to be initially understood by the student (Goldstein & Conrad, 1990).

**Meta-structure Analysis Summary**

To review, in looking at what tutorial sessions look like, I coded on two levels: meta-structure and discourse-level structure. During meta-structure coding, I first coded questions/statements that appeared to draw writer attention to specific areas of the text and topic initiations. Once these were coded, I went back through the transcripts and coded for statements or blocks of discourse which indicated the focus of the tutorial (global vs. local). Last, I reviewed the tutorial transcripts again and, using the statements I coded in the first stage as a guide, code using the institutional discourse frame. From this data, I was able to establish a comprehensive picture of what the overall structure of each tutorial looked like by using the topic initiations and how they aligned to Agar’s institutional discourse frame.

To delve more deeply into what the tutorials looked like, I analyzed the interaction between the tutors and writers on a discourse level. Looking at volubility allowed me to see who talked more. This suggests both dominance and style of the tutorial. Prosody, discourse markers, backchannels, and pauses may suggest understanding or lack of understanding.

**Interviews**

Interviews are useful to understand “the lived experiences of other people and the meaning they make of the experience” (Seidman, 2006, p. 9). This phase of the research was designed to obtain a deeper understanding of both the writer and tutor in terms of what they each brought into the tutorial experientially, their perceptions of the tutorial,
what they took out of the tutorial (writer focused), and how the tutorial compared to an ideal (tutor focused).

I utilized open-ended questions, more structured in vivo questions created from my analysis of the tutorial transcripts, and probing questions to elicit more detailed information. Open-ended questions enabled me to better explore both the writer’s and tutor’s impressions of the tutorial (McKay, 2006; Patton, 2002; Seidman, 2006). This open-ended format also allowed me to listen more and talk less and follow up on what the participant said (Seidman, 2006). My structured questions came directly from the tutorial transcripts and were designed to investigate in more detail what occurs based on the writer’s and tutor’s perception. For example, suggestions specific to the tutorial were explored in the interview. If the tutor suggested that the writer needed to restructure the paper, for instance, I asked the writer how beneficial this suggestion was and how they (the writer) would use this in future writing. Throughout the entire process, probing questions allowed me to better understand the details of the tutorial from the participants’ perspectives, allowed the participants to compare and contrast expectations and experiences, and enabled me to clarify things I didn’t understand.

During interviews, I used the transcript as a point of reference. I also asked specific questions about items written in the writer check-in/out form and tutor shift report. By analyzing what occurred in tutorials and combining it with interview data I was able to obtain a much richer description of NES/NNES tutorial sessions. What participants said about the transcripts during the interview also allowed me to better interpret the target conversations under analysis (Thonus, 1999b). I conducted ten interviews for a total of approximately 144 pages of interview data.
RQ2: What are NNES writer perceptions of these writing tutorials?

During writer interviews, I asked questions to establish a picture of the writer including his/her country of origin, length in the U.S., educational background (time studying English, major, academic level), perceptions of themselves as writers in both their L1 and in English, and number of tutorials they attended before. I investigated the reason the writer went to the writing center, whether they ended up working on that reason, and had them describe the tutorial in general terms. Next, I focused on specific aspects of the tutorial such as suggestions and difficulties. I used the transcript to facilitate this portion of the discussion. I also asked about specific areas I previously identified during the first phase of my research (i.e. “Tell me what you thought about this suggestion”). I concluded by asking what the writer learned from the tutorial session and what they might have liked to have seen done differently in order to increase what they might take out. See Table 6 for data sources and analysis to answer my second research question.
Table 6. Data Analysis for RQ2: What are NNES writer perceptions of these writing tutorials?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Interviews  | Coded and analyzed using NVivo  
• Background questions to understand writer’s history and what brought the writer into the tutorial  
• Open-ended interview questions derived from transcripts (see Appendix D)  
• Probing questions  
  Detail-oriented probes – ask for specific information in order to obtain a ‘full picture’  
  Elaboration probes – used to maintain participant contribution to interview through backchannels and direct solicitation  
  Clarification probes – used when research does not understand something said or what the participant is referring to  
  Contrast probes – used to elicit information on similarities and differences of past and current experiences  
• Coded using both a prior and in vivo codes |
| Artifacts   | • Writer check-in/out form used to obtain immediate perception of confidence resulting from tutorial (form)  
• Writer check-in/out form used to obtain perception of volubility (form) |

RQ3: What are NES tutor perceptions of these writing tutorials?

As with writer interviews, during tutor interviews I asked questions to establish a picture of the tutor including his/her educational background (major, academic level), experience and training in tutoring, and experience with NNESs. I moved on to questions regarding the tutor’s view of what an ideal tutorial was and how the tutorial they conducted compared. Next, I focused on specific aspects of the tutorial. Using the writer check-in/out form as a launching point, I asked about how they negotiated what they worked on during the tutorial, how this differed to or aligned with the writer’s expectations, and the reason why this was the focus. See Table 7 for data sources and analysis to answer my second research question.
Table 7. Data Analysis for RQ3: What are NES tutor perceptions of these writing tutorials?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Interviews  | Coded and analyzed using NVivo  
• Background questions to understand writer’s history and what brought the writer into the tutorial  
• Open-ended interview questions derived from transcript (see Appendix E)  
• Probing questions  
  Detail-oriented probes – ask for specific information in order to obtain a ‘full picture’  
  Elaboration probes – used to maintain participant contribution to interview through backchannels and direct solicitation  
  Clarification probes – used when research does not understand something said or what the participant is referring to  
  Contrast probes – used to elicit information on similarities and differences of past and current experiences  
• Coded using both a prior and in vivo codes |
| Artifacts   | • Writer check-in/out form used to obtain what tutor perceived writer as doing ‘different’ in future assignments  
• Tutor shift report to better understand tutor perception of tutorial and shape interview questions and probes |

**Coding Interviews**

After each interview, I used Express Scribe and transcribe the interviews into WordPad. Next, I utilized NVivo 8 to analyze the interviews using a semi-inductive approach (Charmaz, 2006; Strauss & Corbin, 1990) by identifying codes from both tutorial transcripts and writer and tutor interviews. In vivo codes “consist of widely used terms that participants assume everyone share” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 55), and attending to these codes allowed me to draw comparisons for things might be viewed similarly. For example, writer comments in the interviews that pointed towards difficulties in understanding what the tutor meant were coded as “difficulty understanding x,” where x might be a suggestion. Similarly, tutors might indicate that they felt the writer had difficulty understanding ‘y’. This was added as a code for tutor interviews. Once in vivo codes were established, I reviewed the codes and focused on how they fit into larger
segments (themes) of data. Essentially, when viewing my data I asked myself, “What’s happening here?” or “What does this distill down to?” (Grbich, 2007).

Analyzing Across the Data

After all of the data was coded, I compared the differences and similarities in what writers and tutors said in their interviews and inputted them into tabular format to draw quicker comparisons. Where appropriate, I used the writer check-in/out form and tutor shift report to draw comparisons on how perceptions aligned or failed to align. I went back and looked for instances in the transcript specifically pertaining to the statements and looked for discursive indicators for why there might have been alignments or lack of alignments. See Table 8 for a sample of how differences and similarities were analyzed.

Table 8. Cross-data analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Statement</th>
<th>Artifact</th>
<th>Tutor</th>
<th>Writer</th>
<th>My Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What do you think was difficult in the tutorial?</td>
<td>Potential transcript use</td>
<td>I think getting the writer to understand structure was the most difficult part because…</td>
<td>I had a hard time following the tutor because there was so much he was saying…</td>
<td>Dependent on transcript and tutor/writer responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did the writer/you take out of the tutorial?</td>
<td>Tutor reported x on writer check-in/out form or shift report (outlining)</td>
<td>I think the writer learned/will outline…</td>
<td>I learned about /will outline in the future</td>
<td>Area of transcript revisited to unpack what occurred and why there may be alignment/lack of alignment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analyzing the data in this way will allow me to gain a fuller understanding of what NES tutor/NNES writer tutorials look like at both the meta-structure and discourse-level structure (RQ1). The interviews allow me to better understand what tutors believe to be occurring in tutorials and how they think their tutorials assisted (or don’t) their NNES writers (RQ2). NNES writer interviews afford me the opportunity to understand how they perceive their tutorials, difficulties and successes they may have encountered, and, ultimately, how the tutorial may have affected their future writing process (RQ3).

**Ethical Issues**

In my research, I adhered to the requirements instituted by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University at Albany.

*Participant Consent.* All participants were asked to review and sign a consent form outlining the scope and steps of the study, any potential risks to participants, how confidentiality will be maintained, and their right to withdraw from the study at any time. Participants were provided a copy of their signed consent form. See Appendix F and Appendix G for IRB compliant participant consent forms and Appendix H for permission to conduct research in the writing center.

*Data Treatment.* All tutorials were digitally recorded and transcribed to a digital copy. Confidentiality was maintained by replacing names with pseudonyms to reflect “T” (tutor) plus a number or “W” (writer) plus number. I assigned the corresponding pseudonyms to the artifacts collected (e.g. student written product and tutor shift reports). All data, including pairing of identifying participant information and pseudonyms were kept in password protected files on my home system. I was the only individual with access to the participant identity/pseudonym pairing spreadsheet. This information was
only used in order to contact the participants. Identity/pseudonym pairings was permanently deleted upon completion of the research. When interviews occurred, they were held outside of writing center hours and, when possible, location other than the writing center.

*Participant Protection in the Writing Center.* While it is impossible to conceal participation in the research due to the public recording of the tutorial session, collected data was shared with writing center administrators. At no time did I discuss with writing center administration who was participating in my research. Writing Center administration will have access to the final dissertation and, provided the research results allow me to make informed suggestions for changes in tutor training and practice, access to any write-ups.

**Validity Issues**

Social construction and constructivist paradigms do not view quality of research in terms of validity; rather, these paradigms view research in terms of trustworthiness and dependability (Creswell, 2007; Creswell & Miller, 2000; McMillan, 2008; Patton, 2002). Using multiple methods for collecting data of the same phenomenon increases the believability and trustworthiness of the research (Creswell, 2007; McMillan, 2008; Patton, 2002). Triangulation of data sources improves the “consistency of different data sources within the same method” (Patton, 2002, p. 556). Triangulation assisted in providing “rich, thick description [which] allows readers to make decisions regarding transferability” (Creswell, 2007, p. 209) as well as assisted in reducing possible researcher over-interpretation when compared to research utilizing one approach (Isaac & Michael, 1995). When interpreting the data and completing the case write-up, I employed tutor member
checks when possible to improve the credibility of my research. Because these member checks were completed the following year, not all of the participants were available. I was able to complete member checks with tutors in Cases 1, 2, and 4. The tutor in Case 3 and the writers had either graduated or did not respond to emails soliciting the member check. Nonetheless, even limited utilization of member checks adds to the credibility of research as it provides participants the opportunity to confirm or disconfirm whether researcher interpretations are accurate (Creswell & Miller, 2000; Patton, 2002) for those cases.

In coding interview transcripts, I followed Strauss and Corbin’s (1990) advice of stepping back and asking what was going on in the data. While I could have selected an existing protocol to code data, a preexisting protocol may not have been a valid representation of what was occurring with my specific population.

**Researcher’s Role and Management of Subjectivity/Reflexivity**

Researcher’s Role. During the study, my role was that of the researcher, not tutor. The first exception was if the writer or tutor had a specific question or needs assistance during a tutorial. The second instance of my involvement was if tutors had questions about issues they encountered during the tutorial and felt they needed to discuss with me in order to improve future tutorials.

*Management of Subjectivity.* Because each of us brings to our research and subsequent analysis of data certain biases and assumptions (Strauss & Corbin, 1990), I initially managed my subjectivity to control for research bias by following recommended bracketing strategies (Creswell, 2007; Grbich, 2007; Moustakas, 1994). I continuously interrogated the assumptions I held when approaching the data in terms of what I believe
writers might be taking out of tutorial sessions. I believe my genuine curiosity about this phenomenon allowed me to bracket more easily. Theory drove the coding process since I was using Agar’s (1985) frame for institutional discourse and aspects of discourse analysis to get at what I observed occurring in a tutorial. I recognized that how I coded something might change as a result of the interviews and member checks. While no individual can fully manage their subjectivity (Creswell, 2007; Moustakas, 1994), I believe understanding that my initial interpretations were simply my individual interpretations combined with my willingness to ask questions in order to see what my participants’ perceptions were allowed me to approach the research with a slightly more “blank sheet” (Grbich, 2007, p. 87).

**Limitations**

There are several limitations to this research.

*Final Student Product.* For practical reasons, the final student product was not included in the dataset. Analysis of the final student product could contribute to understanding how the tutorials impacted writers’ understanding of and subsequent improvements to their paper.

*Incomplete Tutorial Artifacts.* While I attempted to collect all of the artifacts related to the tutorial, some of the material was not copied or was taken by the writer and not provided prior to the interview. Artifacts were instrumental in constructing tutorial-specific questions. They also assisted me during my analysis. For example, the tutor in Case 2, Roger, made notes on a piece of paper that he could not find after the tutorial. Having incomplete artifacts from tutorials weakened triangulation. To compensate for
incomplete artifacts, any ambiguous points in the tutorial were addressed during the interviews.

_Distribution of Graduate and Undergraduate Tutors._ There was an unequal distribution of graduate and undergraduate tutors. The PhD students in the research may have had more knowledge about writing in general and may have been more comfortable discussing work with the students. On the other hand, the one undergraduate tutor had taken a semester-long course in tutor training as opposed to the three-day training PhD tutors received. Having another undergraduate tutor who had complete the tutor training course may have revealed differences in prior training and accounted for idiosyncrasies individual tutors may have. Attempts were made to solicit tutorials with more undergraduate tutors, but more frequent scheduling of tutorials for PhD students and declines from other CHC NNES writers solicited resulted in this distribution.

_Volubility._ In looking at volubility, I counted all utterances produced by both tutors and writers including instances where portions of papers were read. This may have inflated some participants’ volubility when calculating tutor:writer ratios. Omitting sections of discourse which were read may have resulted in writers having more equivalent volubility. The decision to include these was made in order to capture a complete picture of tutor and writer talk time.

_Generalizability._ Participants are from a very specific population: Confucian Heritage Cultures. Because of this, findings may not apply to NNES writers from other cultures. Generalizability may also be limited because of more graduate than undergraduate tutor participants. The goal of qualitative research is not necessarily to generalize to larger populations; rather, qualitative research often aims towards
transferability, or the ability of researchers to “transfer information to other settings and to determine whether the findings can be transferred” (Creswell, 2007, p. 209).

Length of Study. My research investigated single tutorials (with the exception of Case 4) and used two-week follow-up interviews with writers and tutors. It is limited in that truly uncovering what students take out of a tutorial requires far more time. A comment or topic covered in any tutorial may not manifest in writer change over the short-term; it may take multiple encounters with a topic to result in change. What a writer reports taking away from a tutorial in terms of changes he or she will make may not last-term. On the other hand, this information, however, may contribute long-term to a writer’s deeper understanding of the writing process. Even with a two-week follow-up interview, writers may not have had time or opportunities to deeply process the information or make connections between content and ideas discussed in a tutorial and information. In order to investigate whether tutorials contribute to long-term to a writer’s understanding of a writing process, longitudinal research tracking writers is necessary.
CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

Introduction

The main purpose of this single nested case design was to investigate writing center tutorials between NES tutors and NNES writers bounded by the same writing center context. I focused on what these tutorials look like and writer and tutor perceptions of the tutorials in order to better understand what these participants take out of tutorials. To achieve this, I asked the following research questions:

1. What do NES tutor/NNES writer tutorials look like?
2. What are NNES writer perceptions of these writing tutorials?
3. What are NES tutor perceptions of these writing tutorials?

Data were collected during the Spring 2011 semester at the University at Albany Writing Center. I employed purposeful selection and created cases based on whether the writer belonged to a Confucian-Heritage culture. Tutors were selected dependent on the writer. Because of this, I could not control whether the tutor was a graduate or undergraduate student. I did attempt to select cases that would allow me to have a balance of graduate and undergraduate tutors, but this was impossible for various reasons. In all but one potential case, writers scheduled with an undergraduate tutor declined to participate in the study. Additionally, because graduate tutors were listed first in the schedule, they tended to receive more tutorials.

My attempts yielded six NNES writers willing to participate in the research: one undergraduate NES tutor/undergraduate NNES writer pair, four graduate NES tutor/undergraduate NNES pairs, and one graduate NES tutor/graduate NNES writer pair.
The graduate NES tutor/graduate NNES writer pair was eliminated due to the writer having already graduated from her PhD program and was writing a personal story. The main reason she was eliminated was because she was not a current student. Two of the five tutorials contained the same tutor/writer pair. Because this is a case study with the tutor and writer constituting a case, those two tutorials were combined into one case. This left me with a total of four shown below:

Case 1: BaiHua (undergraduate writer) / Marc (graduate tutor)
Case 2: FengYi (undergraduate writer) / Roger (graduate tutor)
Case 3: KimYun (undergraduate writer) / Candi (undergraduate tutor)
Case 4: Hyuk (undergraduate writer)/ Jack (graduate tutor)

Case 4 consisted of two tutorials on the same topic. All participants consented to participate in the recording of the tutorial and again to participate in the interview.

Tutorial Analysis

In analyzing the data, I had to make several decisions regarding how to handle each case in terms of coding, what aspects to focus on during the interviews, and how to parse out each case to fit Agar’s model for institutional discourse. After all, each case is similar, but each case poses a problem unto itself (to paraphrase what one of the tutors, Roger, said during his interview). What I mean here is that there may be similarities between cases, and one of the goals of single-case research is to reveal aspects that are common to the situation (Yin, 2009). But Yin also cautions about focusing too closely on each case and missing the larger picture or being too holistically and becoming too abstract.

To overcome this, I conducted an initial analysis of each case the same way by transcribing the tutorial using Jefferson’s transcript notation model to mark different
discursive features I observed in the tutorial including volubility, prosodic elements, discourse markers, filled and unfilled pauses, suggestions, questions, and mitigation strategies. Not all cases exhibit the same elements, though. In describing each tutorial, then, a specific aspect covered in one tutorial may not be covered in another. For example, Case 5, which consisted of two tutorials by the same writer/tutor pair, contained elements of taciturnity. This was analyzed for Case 5 but not the others. In Case 1, the writer exhibited disfluency not evident in the other cases. This disfluency was addressed there.

I also devised a set of uniform interview questions for each participant in the case: one for the writer and one for the tutor. After analyzing the tutorial transcripts and artifacts, I modified each set of questions based on unique features I saw within each case. For instance, in Case 1, the tutor appeared to circle back to the thesis statement several times during the tutorial. This generated a question unique to that case in order to understand why this occurred. In Case 2, the tutor, Roger, utilized examples which may have been confusing to the writer, FengYi. I created questions that targeted the use of these examples and asked both writer and tutor how they contributed to the tutorial. Laughter was evident in Case 3, so I created questions that specifically asked the writer to explain the laughter and asked the tutor to provide her impression as to how she perceived the laughter. In Case 4, Hyuk, the Korean writer, appeared to be less conversationally involved and used variations of yeah as complete turns. I was interested in understanding the reason for this and how this might have affected the tutor.

*Tutorial Mapping: Institutional Discourse.* To understand the structure of the tutorial, I used the tutorial transcripts and broke each into phases found in Agar’s (1985) model of institutional discourse. This model has been by researchers in the past to
understand interactions in writing center tutorials between NES tutors and NNES writers. One issue I had to overcome was deciding the difference between diagnosis and directive since researchers in NNES writing center tutorials appear to treat these slightly differently (e.g., Ritter, 2002; Thonus, 1998b; J. Williams, 2005). How I defined these phases would potentially shape my understanding of and resultant view of each tutorial. Williams (2005) asserts that it is the diagnosis phase where tutorials seem to stay; Thonus (1998b) and Ritter (2002) indicate that the majority of activity occurs in the directive phase.

Williams considered question-answer adjacency pairs to be acts of diagnosis while Thonus and Ritter label the same acts as evaluation-response sequences and place them in the directive stage. All three agree that the diagnosis phase is where the writer identifies what brought them to the writing center – the “problem” they would like to work on. I adopted this strategy of identifying the (or “a” as the case is) central problem as the bulk of the diagnosis. Once this problem was identified, the tutorial moved into the directive phase. Thonus (1998b) defines the directive stage as being “what the student has or has not done either in the written draft or during the tutorial interaction itself” (pp. 84-85). I adopted Thonus’s definition for my analysis. I considered this to be more in line with Agar’s (1985) separation of diagnosis and directive where diagnosis entails finding out about the client and why the client has made contact with the institution. The writer check-in sheet and initial portion of the tutorial where the tutor asked the writer about the specific task and what the writer wanted to work on aligns with Agar’s characteristics of the diagnosis phase.
Within each phase, there is the potential for discourse segments which are denoted by topic changes and can be initiated by either the tutor or the writer. I identified segments based on slight topic shift and indicated who initiated the segment using $W\rightarrow$ for writer and $T\rightarrow$ for tutor. For example, the tutorial breakdown in terms of segmentation for Case 3 would be:

**DIAGNOSIS**

$T \rightarrow$ Segment 1: Requesting writer complete check-in (2 turns)

$T \rightarrow$ Segment 2: Understanding what the writer wants to work on (18 turns)

**DIRECTIVE 1**

$T \rightarrow$ Segment 1: Reads writer’s paper / providing rationale for reading / comforting writer/ correcting introduction (7 turns)

$W \rightarrow$ Segment 2: Requesting grammar work/ grammar and language work (13 turns)

$T \rightarrow$ Segment 3: Requesting clarification and correcting sentence (21 turns)

The tutor diagnosed the reason the writer came into the writing center by first asking for a writer check-in form (Segment 1) and then, when the writer did not have one, asked the writer what she wanted to work on (Segment 2). Once the overall goal of the tutorial was established, the tutor initiated the Directive 1 phase by reading and talking about the content of the material (Segment 1). The writer initiated Segment 2 by switching focus to more sentence-level grammar. This grammar work was the primary focus until Segment 3 where the tutor identified a new topic: clarifying and correcting a sentence. Work on that continued for 21 turns. All tutorials are mapped using this technique of identifying the phase in institutional discourse and segments based on topic changes.
Prior to presenting the individual cases, I provide an overview of volubility and whether the tutorial focused primarily on HOCs, LOCs, or no focus (i.e. work did not focus on a paper) in the Table 9. This data will be expanded upon in each case section.

Table 9. Volubility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Total Words</th>
<th>Total Turns</th>
<th>Word per Turn</th>
<th>Total Words in Tutorial</th>
<th>% of Contribution</th>
<th>Ratio T:W Words</th>
<th>H O C</th>
<th>L O C</th>
<th>N A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W: BaiHua</td>
<td>58m</td>
<td>2954</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>8579</td>
<td>34.43%</td>
<td>1.9 X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T: Marc</td>
<td></td>
<td>5625</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>17.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.57%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W: FengYi</td>
<td>41m</td>
<td>1333</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>6133</td>
<td>21.73%</td>
<td>4.3 X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T: Roger</td>
<td></td>
<td>4800</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td></td>
<td>78.27%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>W: KimYun</td>
<td>48m</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>5422</td>
<td>33.42%</td>
<td>2 X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T: Candi</td>
<td></td>
<td>3610</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>11.99</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.58%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4*</td>
<td>W: Hyuk</td>
<td></td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>4.4181</td>
<td>6204</td>
<td>16.52%</td>
<td>T: 3.8 X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T1: Jack</td>
<td>53m</td>
<td>5921</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>63.20%</td>
<td>T2: 1.2 X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T2: Jane</td>
<td></td>
<td>1258</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>22.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4*</td>
<td>W: Hyuk</td>
<td></td>
<td>702</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>4636</td>
<td>15.14%</td>
<td>5.6 X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T: Jack</td>
<td>44m</td>
<td>3934</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>19.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>84.86%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Case 4 consists of two tutorials merged to maintain a single case.

Based on the data, all writers exhibited less volubility than the tutors with the highest tutor-writer ratio being 5.6:1 (Case 4 - Hyuk and Jack) and the lowest being 1.9:1 (Case 1 - BaiHua and Marc). Cases 2 and 4 focused more on higher-order concerns, Case 3 more on lower-order concerns, and Case 1 saw a mixture of higher-order and lower-order concerns. These will be investigated in more detail in the sections analyzing each case.
Structure of Cases Analyses

Following is an overview of the how I arranged the four cases I used in my research and how those relate to my research questions.

1. Writer/Tutor Background
   
   This is used to establish pertinent information for each participant. For writers, I looked at their prior educational and writing experience. For tutors, I inquired about their educational background, experience and training as a writing center tutor, their tutorial philosophy, and what they believed to be a “high quality” tutorial.

2. Summary of Case Tutorial(s)
   
   This provides a general overview of the tutorial to establish context.

Addressing RQ1: What do NES tutor/NNES writer tutorials look like?

3. Tutorial Breakdown with discussion of discourse phases
   
   a. Map of institutional discourse phases and segments including who initiated the segment, the focus of and length of segment, and whether the segment focused on higher-order concerns, lower-order concerns, or a mix.
   
   b. Salient features of what occurred in each phase

   This provides a more granular view of salient features in each tutorial. Certain segments are isolated and expounded upon in order to provide a better understanding of what the tutorial looked like. These sections are unique to the individual tutorial as different things occurred in each tutorial.
c. HOC/LOC Work

This covers the type of issues being addressed in the tutorial: whether
focus was on higher-order concerns or lower-order concerns.

d. Process

This section deals with the part of the writing process the tutorial appeared
to be in during the tutorial and/or discussions by the tutor about the
writer’s writing process outside of the tutorial including suggestions for
changed process.

e. Volubility

This reveals who spoke most during the tutorial and is instrumental in
establishing tutorial control with higher volubility suggesting more control
on the part of one interlocutor (Ritter, 2002; Thonus, 1998b; J. Williams,
2005).

f. Discourse Markers and Backchannels

This section highlights the main features of discourse markers and
backchannels. Emphasis is placed on features that appeared to impact
interaction within the tutorial or reveal how the features were used by the
participant(s).

Addressing RQ2: What are NNES writer perceptions of these writing tutorials?

4. Writer Interview

a. What the writer reported learning from the tutorial

b. Difficulties the writer may have had during the tutorial
Addressing RQ2: What are NNES writer perceptions of these writing tutorials?

5. Tutor Interview
   a. Difficulties and frustrations the tutor may have experienced during the tutorial
   b. Writer Take-Away – what the tutor hoped the writer learned out of the tutorial encounter

6. Overall Summary
   This summarizes the tutorial by providing a brief synthesis of the tutorial and writer and tutor perceptions.

7. Recommendations
   This section provides recommendations from both the tutor and writer on what they believe could be improved for future tutorials. Writer recommendations include what they would like to see done differently in or added to tutorials; tutor recommendations include additional training they think might improve their ability in dealing with NNES writers.

Following is a detailed analysis of each case using the structure listed above.

Case 1: BaiHua and Marc Tutorial

Writer and Tutor Background

*BaiHua: Writer.* BaiHua is a female Chinese student and was a senior majoring in Business Finance and Management at the university at the time of this study. She indicated being in the U.S for two years and having attended the university for the entire time. BaiHua took the International Test of English as a Foreign Language (IELTS) exam and scored a band of 6.0 on writing and a composite band score of 6.0. These scores meet
the minimum requirement expected by the university and, as such, BaiHua did not need to take intensive English language courses designed to prepare NNES students for regular academic courses. BaiHua’s formal English study began during her primary school years in China. She was uncertain what grade she began studying English, but she believed it was during Primary Grade 3 or 4 and continued through her sophomore year in college; this reflects total approximately 12-13 years of studying English. Her exposure to English in China was limited to formal courses that taught grammar and five-paragraph structure necessary to pass TOEFL tests. For the past two years, BaiHua was immersed in an English environment as a result of attending the university. Although she was immersed in an English-speaking environment, she indicated that she tended to associate with other Chinese and spoke Mandarin Chinese with peers when not in class. BaiHua did not feel confident in writing in English. During her interview, she indicated that she frequently relies on electronic Chinese-English dictionaries and Chinese-English translation software to produce papers written in English. She was confident she is far more proficient writing in Mandarin Chinese. Prior to the tutorial included in this research, BaiHua indicated that she visited the writing center every semester since arriving at the university. For the current semester, she estimated that she had been to the writing center three times prior to the recorded tutorial.

Marc: Tutor. Marc is a male, first-year PhD student enrolled in the English program. He obtained a M.S. in English and double-majored as an undergraduate in philosophy and English. This was his first time working as a tutor in a writing center, but he indicated that he previously had volunteered as an ESL tutor for adults at a public library for approximately one year in a Southern state. Marc’s training was limited to the
initial tutor training provided to graduate assistants prior to them completing their one-
semester placement in the writing center. His past exposure to NNESs was through his
years of culinary work in the restaurant industry; he indicated that he dealt primarily with
native Spanish speakers. As mentioned, Marc did have experience tutoring adult ESL,
where he worked primarily with a Latino-American population.

Marc’s personal tutorial philosophy is intimately tied to process. He indicated that
he wants to look at a writer’s process – how the writer comes up with their thesis
statement, how they created their draft, and how the prose relates back to the thesis
statement. As Marc says, “that’s the most important part for me... focus on having them
[writers] find the thesis... statement and... showing me how they - how they proved it or
argued it” (Marc Interview). Marc’s vision of a high-quality tutorial reflects his personal
philosophy in that it is a discussion about the writing process – a discussion about how
the writer created their draft, outlining they might have done, the mechanics of their
thesis statement, the structure of the paper, and how the elements in the paper fit together
in a logical way. Ideally, there are multiple tutorials where writers work on their writing
process with him and where the writer is active, takes notes, contemplates the process,
and contemplates their paper. Marc went on to contrast his idea of a high-quality tutorial
by stating that a high-quality tutorial is not when a writer comes in looking for
confirmation that a paper is “good” and concluded with: “There has to be a willingness to,
to learn. But there also has to be, of course, from the tutor, a willingness to hopefully
kinda break through some of those, you know, some of those unwillingnesses” (Marc
Interview).
Summary of Case Study 1 Tutorial (T1): BaiHua and Marc

BaiHua went into the UAWC to work on a paper analyzing the role of male dominance in the text, Linden Hill’s. This paper was due the next day. For the first forty minutes of the tutorial, Marc focused on organization and the lack of a clear thesis statement. As the tutorial breakdown, examples, and interviews will show, the first portion of the tutorial was problematic for both the writer and tutor. Recognizing this difficulty, Marc switched to working on surface features of BaiHua’s writing and interwove this work with global aspects.

Case 1 Tutorial Breakdown

OPENING
None recorded

DIAGNOSIS
T → Segment 1: Establishing what writer is working on and class (5 turns)
T → Segment 2: Completing check-in form (8 turns)
T → Segment 3: Continuing establishing purpose of paper - type of paper, course (8 turns)
T → Segment 4: Identifying structure as work based on reading paper (1 turn)
T → Segment 5: Requesting writer to summarize paper - understanding what writer has (21 turns)
T → Segment 6: Recasting question asking writer to talk about paper (3 turns)
T → Segment 7: Establishing tutorial will deal with structure and language (1 turn)

DIRECTIVE 1
T → Segment 1: Working on thesis/ identifying lack of thesis (25 turns) [HOC]
T → Segment 2: Questioning source use (4 turns)
T → Segment 3: Asking writer to explain specific sentence meaning (8 turns) [HOC]
T → Segment 4: Identifying potential thesis statement/ suggesting writer expand on terms first (3 turns) [HOC]
W → Segment 5: Initiating topic change to look past sentence/ identifying difficulty
expressing thoughts in English and using translation software (16 turns) [HOC]

T → Segment 6: Reinforcing student sentence structure/ reinforcing sentence for potential thesis (3 turns)

W → Segment 7: Indicating she had spoken with her professor/ explaining process she used and that focus is on gender (7 turns) [HOC]

T → Segment 8: Requesting writer identify topic sentence/ writer summarizing paper and explaining book and paper (16 turns) [HOC]

DIAGNOSIS 2

T → Segment 1: Asking why writer came into the writing center (1 turn)

W → Segment 2: Identifying she does not have a clear thesis (7 turns) [HOC]

DIRECTIVE 2

T → Segment 1: Discussion how overall idea of the paper and how to relate paper back to “humanistic values” sentence (38 turns) [HOC]

(lengthy exchange culminating in writer indicating that she feels her paper structure is sound)

T → Segment 2: Reinforcing writer (1 turn)

W → Segment 3: Requesting to work on language “language” - grammar and word choice - resulting in local editing both with T and W identifying errors (16 turns) [LOC]

T → Segment 4: Discussing revision and editing strategies - process work (12 turns) [PROC]

T → Segment 5: Opening floor for additional work (1 turn) [NA]

W → Segment 6: Working on conclusion / reviewed instructor notes / scaffolded editing (101 turns) [LOC]

T → Segment 7: Relating conclusion back to thesis / suggesting connections (3 turns) [HOC]

T → Segment 8: Suggesting post-tutorial thesis work (5 turns) [HOC]

W → Segment 9: Grammar work (12 turns) [LOC]

T → Segment 10: Thesis work and post-tutorial thesis work (4 turns) [HOC]

CLOSING

T → Segment 1: Calling tutorial end and checking to see if writer has enough to work
on (2 turns)
W/T → Segment 2: Overlapping agreement and thanking each other for work
T → Segment 3: Summarizing writer’s next steps / reminding writer about proof-reading / reminding of thesis (3 turns) [HOC]
W/T → Segment 4: Leave-taking

REPORT
None recorded

Discourse Phases. As can be seen, this tutorial pattern did not follow a traditional series Opening → Diagnosis → Directive → Closing/Report pattern of institutional discourse. Instead, there were two diagnosis phases and two directive phases.

During the Diagnosis 1 phase, Marc, the tutor, initiated all 7 topics and made multiple requests for the writer to first summarize her paper. In response to Marc’s first request, BaiHua provided a summary that spanned 19 writer turns (314 words). Once she finished, Marc responded with, “yeah that’s ok. tell a little bit about your paper (0.33) like what...” (45t). After BaiHua’s second explanation of her paper, Marc referred to the writer check-in form and isolated the need to work on structure and form. Based on the information the writer provided and BaiHua’s responses to his initial request for her to tell him about the paper, Marc also began with focusing on the global aspect of the thesis statement.

In Directive 1 phase, Marc initiated 6 of the 8 topics and recursively addressed global issues of the thesis/topic statement. During segment 1, Marc asked six times for BaiHua to show him her thesis statement or argument with BaiHua verbally explaining what her paper was about. This question-response sequence eventually led BaiHua to a
paragraph she thought might be the claim with “uh-m: (11.09) (•h) °°maybe here:°°” (64w). From that paragraph, Marc identified this specific sentence:

Linden Hills is the place of male chauvinism Luther Nedeed’s thirst for power provides the catalyst for the demise of humanistic values and the triumph of materialism in the lives of the people of Linden Hills.

(from BaiHua’s Paper)

This sentence became the focus of segments 3 and 4 as Marc isolated it a potential thesis. He then asked BaiHua about secondary sources and the meaning of both the sentence and specific terms in the sentence. In segment 5, BaiHua initiated slight change by asking to look past that sentence and at different parts of the paper. She then spent time attempting to explain the sentence and ended with expressing that she has difficulty writing in English and, as a result of frequently using translation software, could not explain her thoughts in English. Segment 6 was devoted to reinforcing the writer’s sentence structure and potential thesis. In her second initiated topic (segment 7), BaiHua told Marc that she had already met with her professor about the paper and described her research process. The last segment of the Directive 1 stage involved Marc again asking about the thesis statement and ended with BaiHua describing the structure of her paper and possibly adding to the paper to analyze the sentence previously identified.

The Diagnosis 2 stage was extremely brief and appeared to operate as a clarification check as Marc asked BaiHua why she came to the writing center. At this point, segment 2, BaiHua clearly identified for the first time that she lacked a clear thesis statement and that she needed one at the beginning. When Marc asked her where it currently was, she responded that she did not know.

The Directive 2 stage saw BaiHua initiating three of the ten topic segments and was broken into two parts: global work establishing the rationale for the sentence dealing
with humanistic values and local revision and editing. Marc initiated the first segment
was paragraph by paragraph and dealt with ways in which BaiHua could relate parts of
her paper back to the “humanistic values” sentence and lasted 38 turns. This segment
ended with BaiHua essentially stating that she felt her structure was fine in the following
exchange:

172t  yeah so: (0.98) so if you- y-y-you need to describe a little bit of
that=
162w  yeah.=
173t  but we also need to relate it back to: (0.57) your: (0.36) mai:n (0.35)
claim=
163w  yah ((writer exhales with this as if laughing at the same time))=
174t  you know so each:- each paragraph would be: (h) the reason
you’re describing the:se the relationship between the husband and
wife in each of these paragraphs (h) is because you want to:
exhibit (0.57) how: this works (0.36) so this is- this is your thesis
statement you’re interpretive claim so you want to exhibit how that
works (0.47) in each of the:se- in each of these paragraphs (h) so it
might help you if if you haven’t talked about this (0.81) u:m in
these paragraphs then it might help you to add in: to these
paragraphs maybe some: (0.37) some (1.35) u:h (0.90) eh- show
how: (0.15) show how: (0.25) this is: (0.59) [exam]pled in these=
164w  [yeah]
175t  paragraphs. you know?
165w  yep
176t  does that make sense?
166w  yeah: I have (0.19) u:h I think I have the (0.50) ex- u:h
example to: show this
(0.89)
177t  ri:ght o\kay. okay. gr\ea:t um so then then it sounds like you’re
doing pretty goo:d (h) it sounds like the structure is pretty goo:d
(0.60) from the paper then if that’s what
(1.43)
167w  u:m (1.30) I also want to show: my language in u:h (0.35) can you
understand what I’m writing?=  
178t  ↓yeah I do: yep I do u:m definitely so: eh eh: (hh) let’s take a look
here: so. Willa Prescott (0.50) Needed (0.95) was:- okay so we
need an article here (0.27) so. it’s the: same
In turn 166w, BaiHua’s comment resulted in a change of topic to work on language (167w), which began segment 4 of the Directive 2 phase. The rest of the Directive 2 stage largely dealt with revision strategies and grammar work with Marc suggesting thesis work for after the tutorial.

Grammar work in this stage was scaffolded by the tutor as he initially identified recurring errors and modeled how to read for grammar and word choice and make changes.

182t (∙h) but you know- no. it- it’s not bad I mean I can- I can unders:- I can understand it and that’s what we:= 171w m=
183t that’s what we’re looking for is like we’re looking for: u:m (0.82) (∙h) u:m (0.27) so let’s see ((reads a little then)) we’re looking for your presentation of ideas. so can I understand your ideas when you are you know when you’re rea[ding] (0.33) when I:’m reading you know=
172w [yah]
184t so:=
173w m=
185t u:m (1.12) one th- two things that- two things tuh tuh: really pay attention to (∙h) one is articles (0.44) so u:m so-and-so the: a: you know uh-um you know tha- that type of thing you know=
174w yeah=
186t so (∙h) one is articles another one is: u:m (0.51) is tense (0.29) so like her she: um so (0.87)...

In the above portion, Marc provided BaiHua with two grammatical errors to focus on: articles and tense. He eventually turned control of this text-based revision to BaiHua allowing her to be an active participant in the process. Williams (2004) discusses this type of scaffolding in writing center tutorial as being an effective strategy to stimulate
revision. Marc provided two types of scaffolding in the tutorial: cognitive and motivation (Cromley & Azevedo, 2005; Thompson, 2009).

Cognitive scaffolding involves “demonstrating, setting up forced choices between alternatives, hinting to simplify tasks, strategy suggestions, [giving] part of an answer, or focus[ing] attention” (Thompson, 2009, p. 427). Marc’s use of cognitive scaffolding is seen in the following:

182t (-h) but you know- no. it- it’s not bad I mean I can- I can unders:- I can understand it and that’s what we:=
171w m=
183t that’s what we’re looking for is like we’re looking for: u:m (0.82)
(-h) u:m (0.27) so let’s see
((reads a little then)) we’re looking for your presentation of ideas.
so can I understand your ideas when you are you know when you’re real[ding] (0.33) when I’m reading you know=
172w [yah]
184t so:=
173w m=
185t u:m (1.12) one th- two things that- two things tuh tuh: really pay attention to (-h) one is articles (0.44) so u:m so-and-so the: a: you know uh-um you know tha- that type of thing you know=
174w yah=
186t so (-h) one is articles another one is: u:m (0.51) is tense (0.29) so like her she: um so (0.87)
((reading))
Willa found that in the end of-
((stopped))
okay so
((reading))
following the bible uh: wrote by Luwana Packerville (-h) Willa found that in the-
((stopped))
so this is past tense (0.42) so Willa found (0.50) this Willa found so found is the verb of (0.41) that Wi- ((inarticulate utterance)) found is the action that Willa is performing he[re] (-h) so =
In the above, Marc identified two things for BaiHua to work on: articles and tense. In 185t, he indicated *the* and *a* as being things BaiHua could look for. In 186t, he provided an answer with “so this is past tense”. Marc went through and initially provided direct correction. He moved on to providing alternatives to BaiHua and eventually turned the grammar correction over to BaiHua and employed motivational scaffolding.

Motivational scaffolding provides feedback and assists in keeping writers engaged in the process (Thompson, 2009). This motivational scaffolding occurred throughout the latter portion of the Directive 2 stage and is exemplified in the following tutorial segment:

```
206w  ((reading))
   the novel presented the society who was- which was dominated by men. wo- women (0.50) was in the role of serving the foil to (1.10) men
   ((stopped reading))
   (0.37)
207t   right okay. so (0.14) so here we’ve got um (0.70) um this one is=
207w   oh:
208t   yeah:
   (0.42)
208w   were
209t   you got it! see? yeah. it just takes a little bit of a: you know just a little bit of time with it you know so. u:m (0.41) okay. so yeah so that’s: (0.31) so
```

In 207t Marc identified an error, BaiHua made the verb tense correction in 208w, and Marc followed up with reinforcement and that error correction takes time. As the tutorial continued, BaiHua began to identify tense changes on her own; these instances were positively reinforced by Marc.
Also important is Marc’s attempt to connect the line-by-line grammar work with the writing process. In addition to mentioning elements such as articles and verb tense, Marc identified that she needs to pay attention to her future editing and attempted to illustrate his personal writing process regarding editing in the following exchange:

191t you know like we were talking about your thesis [an]d then your =  
186w [oh:]  
191t supporting evidence you know that type of thing (hh) and the:n(.)  
I’ll go back later (0.68) and read it for: grammar and make sure  
I’ve got all my tenses matched up so i- I may read my same paper  
maybe ten times y[ou know be]fore I turn it in yea:h so =  
187w [ten ti:mes!](writer inhaling))  
191t yeah (0.35) yeah-yeah. yeah (0.17) it- it’s a- I mean I won’t- you  
know I won’t read it for grammar ten times [but] by: the- =  
188w [oh.]  
191t from the time I start (0.47) writ†ing until the time I turn it in I will  
probably have read it maybe ten times

The Closing stage was relatively short lasting 7 turns. Marc reinforced the need for BaiHua to take time to proof-read her work looking for articles and consistent tense use and to make sure she had a central claim with the paragraphs reinforcing the claim.

*HOC/LOC Work.* This tutorial began with Marc identifying that BaiHua needed to work on the overall structure of her paper in the Diagnosis phases (Segment 3) of the tutorial, and the majority of HOC work was in Directive 1 of this tutorial. Marc began by identifying the lack of a thesis statement in Segment 1 with “Let’s take a look at the thesis statement first. Where: where is your thesis in: in the paper?” (71t). In Segment 3, he asked BaiHua to explain the meaning of a specific sentence and how it related to her paper. Six out of the eight segments focused on HOCs in this phase. This work continued in the Directive 2 phase. In Segment 1 there was a 38-turn exchange as Marc explained
the purpose of a thesis and where it typically falls in a paper and how the following paragraphs need to relate back to this thesis:

168t like from here: does this. do the next. number of paragraphs when you talk about their wo- the wives (·h) do those paragraphs reflect (0.87) this=
158w yeah.=
169t s:statement? okay: (0.58) u:m (0.35) so if they ↓do: (1.21) if each paragraph refers back to: (0.53) thi:s statement (0.90)
159w yep (0.21)
170t then I don’t see: (0.24) that y-you- I don’t see how- that you’ll have any pro:b↓lem. I think that’s: that’s-that’s that’s a good thing (0.67)
160w m:: I’m not sure: i- i- (0.49) is th- (0.33) is that a (0.96) I just uh (0.26) m: describe ther: (0.57) describe how their p- how (0.34) how (0.42) how (0.37) their husband. treats them ((writer seems unsure))
171t mhm=
161w and duh their: life (6.13)
172t y↓eah so: (0.98) so if you- y-y-you need to describe a little bit of that:=
162w yeah.=
173t but we also need to relate it back to: (0.57) your: (0.36) mai:n (0.35) claim=
163w yah ((writer exhales with this as if laughing at the same time))=
174t you know so each:- each paragraph would be: (·h) the reason you’re describing the:ese the relationship between the husband and wife in each of these paragraphs (·h) is because you want to: exhibit (0.57) how: this works (0.36) so this is- this is your thesis statement you’re interpretive claim so you want to exhibit how that works (0.47) in each of the:se in each of these paragraphs (·h) so it might help you if if you haven’t talked about this (0.81) u:m in these paragraphs then it might help you to add in: to these paragraphs maybe some: (0.37) some (1.35) u:h (0.90) eh- show how: (0.15) show how: (0.25) this is: (0.59) [exam]plied in these=
164w [yeah]
175t paragraphs. you know?
The type of exchange seen above is a typical example of the discussion Marc explaining to BaiHua organizational issues in a paper.

Although he addressed LOCs in Directive 1, the majority of LOCs work occurred in the Directive 2 phase of the tutorial – mainly editing for verb tense and article usage. I previously provided a more detailed description of the type of LOC where I discussed the scaffolded grammar work Marc provided. This was the typical LOC work in the segments where [LOC] is indicated in the tutorial breakdown. Marc did not focus only on LOCs during this time, though. He continued to address higher-order concerns in the paper.

Process. Throughout the tutorial, Marc addressed the stage of the writing process BaiHua was in as well as made suggestions for how she could improve her process. During Directive 1, Segment 5 and 7, discussion occurred about BaiHua’s process. In Segment 5, BaiHua indicated that she relied on translation software to assist her writing and is considered a part of her process. During Segment 7, she indicated that part of her process in composing this particular piece was to talk with her instructor. Marc urged that she continue this practice. He also discussed ways for BaiHua to review and edit her work in the future:

189t you know (h) so yeah. so I think a lot a- in a lot a cases and m:aybe u:m (0.28) (h) it would help just to sit dow:n and take a little bit of time (0.22) to: you know go through and and try to catch a few of those. just proof-reading you know [wha]t I mean =

183w [yah]

189t like you know. cus you kn↓ow. you obviously know what you- you know what you need to do you know: you know like the: (·h) a very good (0.24) grammatica:l structure so you know like (0.42) y- you know you learn- you learn very technical. English writing (.) you know=
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Here he discussed a strategy for BaiHua to use in future revision. He also advised her that:

- to keep global aspects in mind when writing and linking paragraphs back up with the statement they were talking about.
- to read through and make sure everything matches up.
- to write, then change it for structure when writing a paper, and then go back later to read it for grammar and make sure tenses are matched up. She may read the same paper ten times before turning it in.
- to definitely keep the things mentioned in mind while looking at the rest of the paragraphs.

As will be seen during BaiHua’s interview, this discussion on her future process was something she took out of the tutorial.

**Volubility.** BaiHua and Marc had the closest 1:1 ratio in volubility at 1:1.9. Over 320 turns, Marc had 5,625 utterances for an average of 17.6 words per turn, and BaiHua had 2,954 utterances and averaged 9.0 WPTs. She exhibited the most volubility of all writers in this study. These numbers alone might suggest less conversational dominance.
by one interlocutor. Another feature of this tutorial is that their combined utterances were the highest out of all the tutorials. This may be because their tutorial ran uninterrupted for 58 minutes.

*BaiHua’s Filled Pauses and Disfluency.* One of the most salient features BaiHua exhibited throughout the tutorial was disfluency in spoken English. Throughout the entire tutorial, her speech was rife with filled pauses (various discourse markers), unfilled pauses, retraced restarts, and untraced restarts. Within the first fifty turns, she had 68 unfilled pauses, 43 filled pauses, ten retraced restarts, and 5 untraced restarts. A typical instance of her disfluency in speech follows:

```
48w  so: m:: (0.41) °↓m::° (1.06) I want to say: m:: (0.97) this is ther: she- (0.42) um (0.46) (-hh) (0.52) uh: I think she is-er: (2.12) survivor ôs (1.07) uh-the woman in ther: (0.20) in this famir↑y=
```

BaiHua’s turn included six filled paused (m::, °↓m::°, m::, um, uh:, uh), eight unfilled pauses for a total of 7.23 seconds of pause time, and two untraced restarts (in bold). This type of utterance was common in her speech throughout the tutorial and may have posed difficulties for Marc.

*BaiHua’s Backchannels.* BaiHua’s backchannels consisted mostly of minimal response tokens m and yeah (also yah) and typically indicated that she was conversationally involved.

```
182t  (-h) but you know- no. it- it’s not bad I mean I can- I can unders:- I can understand it and that's what we:=

171w  m=

183t  that’s what we’re looking for is like we’re looking for: u:m (0.82) (-h) u:m (0.27) so let’s see ((reads a little then)) we’re looking for your presentation of ideas. so can I understand your ideas when you are you know when you’re rea[ding] (0.33) when I’m reading you know=
```
Turns 171w and 172w and 173w are all backchannels to indicate reception. It is important to note that BaiHua also used variations of m that were considered filled pauses. The difference being that these backchannels occurred in isolation and constituted entire turns.

Marc’s Discourse Markers. Discourse markers such as right, okay, yeah, and so have been shown to function as discursive strategies to return to on-topic talk (Condon, 2001) with so also being used to preface sequence. During the Directive 1 phase of the tutorial, Marc used combinations of discourse markers when he did not appear to fully understand BaiHua’s explanations.
okay (•h) so u:m so w:hat does that mean in the sense of humisz-
humanistic values and the triumph of materialism then?

Here, Marc utilized a string of discourse markers that preface his difficulty understanding
an explanation BaiHua had provided. So as used in 74t and 82t were instances where
Marc technically reopened an abandoned topic (Bolden, 2009), the thesis, even though
BaiHua answered the question; the answer Marc received was unsatisfactory and resulted
in him reintroducing the question. So in 78t was a stand-alone so that served to prompt
BaiHua’s response (Raymond, 2004).

**Writer and Tutor Interviews**

**BaiHua’s Interview**

BaiHua reported being comfortable and found the tutorial very helpful. According
to her, she was nervous about her grammar and began visiting the writing center because
one of her previous professors required her to visit the writing center to improve her
writing. BaiHua’s central concern is, “can American understand what I’m writing”
(BaiHua Interview). To this effect, BaiHua requested to work on structure and language.
When asked what she meant by these terms, she meant grammar and word order in a
specific sentence as being “structure”, and using the correct English word as “language”.

*Learned.* Overall, BaiHua felt she learned a lot from her tutorial regarding both
the paper she was working on and things she needs to change in her writing process. First,
she felt the tutorial assisted her with the specific paper she took to the writing center in
several ways. She indicated that her conversation with Marc allowed her to better
understand the requirements for the paper she was writing. She also realized that she did
not have a clear thesis statement and came to realize the importance of a thesis statement:
W Yeah. He help me, mm, read the requirement in detailedly, because (quick laugh) I didn’t, uh, put my the- my (. ) uh- I didn’t put my main sentence, the main sentence… the topic?

I Your thesis?

W Yes! Thesis, yeah. (laughs). The thesis very clearly. And he helped me. He helped me to get the thesis of mine and, uh, to read the requirement in detail and then know what’s the professor want us- want me to write.

I Okay, you went in with a paper already written.

W Yep. Yeah:, but uh (. ) I changed my sculpture [structure] and put the thesis paragraph in the first one and the (?)

She later indicated that she worked on revising the paper to add a clear thesis after the tutorial. Another aspect of the tutorial BaiHua appreciated was the scaffolded editing Marc provided in the Directive 2 stage.

For writing process for future papers, she reported recognizing needing to change her process in several ways. First, she indicated that she needs to fully understand assignments and that she would do this by visiting the writing center prior to starting work on her papers. She also intimated that she will do more research and brainstorming prior to composing as well as attempt to the writing center earlier to understand the assignment and check to see if her initial research and what she brainstormed were in line with what the assignment was asking. After she did this initial check, she would compose an initial draft with constructing a clear thesis and relating the paragraphs back to the these and attempt to revisit the writing center discuss what she had written. Last, she came out of the tutorial with a better understanding of how to revise and edit her paper hoped to be able to spend more time in this part of the writing process.

Difficulties. The issue of understanding the assignment and the language used in the assigned posed a stumbling block to BaiHua. She was not clear on what “critical
reading lens” and “interpretive claim” meant. One of her concerns was that Marc asked multiple questions during the first two-thirds of the tutorial often using these two concepts in the question. Adding to difficulties in not understanding some of the terms, BaiHua said she thought “...maybe it’s too much [meaning multiple questions]. I only can answer one or two of the questions at the same time. Maybe I will forget some questions to answer it.” These bundled questions primarily occurred during the Directive 1 stage of the tutorial:

As seen in this example, Marc asked three questions in succession with no pause and used “interpretive claim”. BaiHua responded to these with, “uh-m: (11.09) (h) oo°maybe here:oo” (64w).

Perhaps the most pronounced instance of Marc asking multiple questions came in tutor turns 142-148 where Marc solicited explanations from BaiHua on the meaning of her sentence describing Linden Hills as being a place of “male chauvinism... [and] the catalyst for the demise of humanistic values and the triumph of materialism in the lives of the people of Linden Hills.”

okay. so: what what can we say: about those ways that the interact with the husband then? like what- what- what is important about (0.56) about the ways that those wives interact with: that one husband (0.39) (h) and the power structure there: what’s important about that?

right. they’re not independent. right. exactly. (h) okay so: u:m (0.20) so: th:: that’s ri:ght. so: w::what (1.46) what can we say about that then? how can we look a little: (1.43) deeper into that? like what- what are- what are some of the consequences of that?
Over those four turns Marc asked 11 questions. These were all areas BaiHua identified as causing her difficulty during the tutorial.

She also expressed concerns with the amount of time spent during the tutorial looking at the specific portion on “triumph of materialism” because she felt that there was additional information later in her paper that might assist them understand the specific sentence. She felt that too much time was spent on thesis work and wanted him to look at the entire paper by actively voicing with “can we look the for in all paper because” (82w). When asked why she thought Marc kept returning to this sentence, she said, “”Maybe he think (.) uh this sentence is a thesis.” Time as issues both in the tutorial and outside of the tutorial came up during the interview. For her, the tutorial was very short and an extra hour would have led to improvements in the paper. With respect to time limitations outside of the tutorial, she explained that she was taking six courses and only had a limited amount of time to devote to proof-reading. Part of her process to assist with editing was to visit the writing center, and one of the personal changes she planned to make was to visit the writing center earlier instead of waiting until the day before a paper was due.
Marc’s Interview

At the beginning of the tutorial, Marc formed a several opinions and held assumptions that may have influenced his tutorial strategies. According to his shift report and reinforced in his interview, Marc believed BaiHua was looking for topical fixes and not looking to work on global issues: “I kind of knew what she wanted to work on at first. And it was gonna be the paper-pushing thing. I think she wanted me to read the paper and go line by line and edit.” Based on the philosophy in the writing center to address global and process issues over local, grammar-based issues, Marc went off the writer check-in form and identified structure, which he defined as organization of the paper, as being what the tutorial would focus on and began focusing on having BaiHua explain her thesis and how the paragraphs related back to the thesis; this approach is Marc’s “default tutorial process”. As seen in the outline of the tutorial presented earlier, Marc attempted to work on this structure until segment 3 of the Directive 2 stage. It was at this point Marc described himself as thinking “I can’t really go any farther with the thesis statement, with the interpretive claim” and moved onto grammar work.

Difficulties/Frustrations. Marc presents a unique instance in that he requested a short interview session immediately after his tutorial with BaiHua so he would not forget his initial reaction to and thoughts about the tutorial. During this impromptu interview, Marc expressed frustration with this tutorial and felt it was a “failed” tutorial until the tutorial shifted to local revision. Part of his frustration was due to his perception that BaiHua was summarizing the novel in her paper and in response to his questions about her argument. When probed in the interview about how he reacted to this, Marc said:

And so I ended up kind of like repeating over and over and over again what a thesis statement and what an interpretive claim is.... Yeah, ‘cus
every sentence I have in here I ask like three questions in every sentence. You know, so. And I think that might be just be- that’s also me personally. That’s a rhetorical thing. Um. So when I’m in a- I think when I’m in a situation where either I’m talking to a student about something like this, I’ll ask a lot of questions. So… Um. So I think that’s partly, personally my rhetorical thing too.

These comments provide insight to both Marc’s repetition of and variations of the same question as well as the multiple questions Marc asked during the Directive 1 stage of the tutorial. He perceived the turning point of the tutorial to be when they began working on grammar:

I felt like about half-way through it seemed to turn around. I think like for the first thirty minutes, I was like, “Man, this is going to be a fail. You know, this is just going to be a fail. I’m not getting through. We’re not, like working on any time of writing here:. This paper is, you know, it- it’s gonna be tough, you know. This is gonna be a tough one.” For some reason, I felt like it started to turn around when we really started looking at- to be honest with you, it could have been when we started applying the humanistic values (laughs) and stuff, too. Or like, after we got through that, like talking about the novel and the structure of the paper. But then, I think when (.) when we got maybe to the line by line stuff, you know. Um, I think that’s maybe, you know. Maybe giving her what she wanted was, you know, was a little more- was maybe what was the most successful about it.

Later during the member-checking portion of the research, Marc clarified his difficulties understanding BaiHua to mean some difficulty understanding what she uttered but more difficulty in understanding what her message was. Two clear examples of Marc’s difficulty understanding BaiHua occurred in the following sequences.

In this first sequence, Marc had just obliquely suggested that the sentence dealing with humanistic values and triumph of materialism could be BaiHua’s thesis statement:
This exchange was BaiHua attempting to explain the meaning of the sentence Marc had identified as a potential thesis statement. Filled and unfilled pauses as well as breaks in discourse where BaiHua repaired or changed her utterances may have contributed to difficulties Marc had in understanding as these elements lead to choppy speech (Francine, 8 The name of the person in text is “Nedeed”, but both writer and tutor pronounced it as “Needed”. When using the name outside of a quote, I use the correct spelling.)
Marc’s inability to understand BaiHua is clear in 87t with his repair initiation, “wait can you say that one more time” (Riggenbach, 1991). Additional issues may have resulted from gender switches where BaiHua used “her” when she was referring to Luther Nedeed.

In this second sequence which happened during the grammar-work portion of the tutorial, Marc again explicitly indicated his inability to understand. Here BaiHua is attempting to clarify the meaning of a sentence they were working on:

254t how ‘bout not because of Luther.
(0.74)
255w uh: (0.55) be- (1.36) she (0.53) she lived in the world. do not someone some woman will they only focus her husband but she is not
(0.62.)
255t that- say it again? can you say that one more time?

In 225w, BaiHua’s disfluency is clearly evident from her filled and unfilled pauses (Riggenbach, 1991). The message BaiHua attempted to convey was lost in her inability to articulate a syntactically correct sentence. While these are extreme cases of BaiHua’s linguistic difficulties, they are instances of what contributed to Marc’s frustrations and inability to understand her messages.

Tutorial Turnaround. Marc identified the turning point from a potential failure to a success as being in the Directive 2 stage of the tutorial where he began working on grammar. Marc discussed that he felt the first portion of the tutorial was a “failure” but that he was able to turn it into a productive session by refocusing on grammar. He said:

Yeah. Um. Yeah, ‘cus at that point I knew like, later on in the tutorial- I think probably the last twenty minutes, I was like, “Okay, well.” I seem- I feel like I’ve exhausted the- you know, I can’t really go any farther with
the thesis statement, with the interpretive claim. Like she- I don’t think she was… I don’t think it was… I feel like it wasn’t sinking in.
...
But yeah, it was interesting. I felt like it was - at first I felt like it was a fail but maybe there was- after a little while it got turned around somehow you know. I wanted to give her something to go away with. What it ended up being was that just spend a lot of time on reading and like going through line by line by line by line over and over and over again. I told her I sometimes read my paper, at the very least, ten times before I turn it in. She was like “whoaaa”. I told her she needed to spend the time. She would read and she would see the mistakes and she’d write them in like after we talked. I pinpointed a couple of things and said okay you’ve got your articles and you’ve got your tenses, you know.

In this interview segment, Marc’s frustrations come to light. He felt as if he had “exhausted” the topic and that what he was doing wasn’t “sinking in”. For Marc, the addressing grammar salvaged this tutorial.

**Writer Take-Away.** Marc did not really know what the writer took away. He expressed hope that the work on the thesis and introduction was helpful to BaiHua but was unsure. At the very least, Marc hoped that the portion on grammar and editing strategies were something BaiHua took out of the tutorial.

**Overall Summary**

Both the writer and tutor appeared to struggle initially during the first portion of this tutorial. Part of Marc’s tutorial philosophy was to focus on higher-order aspects with emphasis on the thesis statement and how the paper supported the thesis. Difficulties arose as BaiHua was unable to identify a clear thesis, and this led Marc to a repeated return to the missing thesis in his questioning. This topic cyclisity (Thonus, 1998b) continued until BaiHua explicitly requested to move on other portions of the paper with “can we look the for in all paper because (?)…” in 82w. The tutorial eventually moved on
to grammar work with Marc scaffolding the work to allow BaiHua increased independence in identifying and correcting grammatical errors. Although Marc was uncertain if his work with the thesis statement was beneficial, BaiHua indicated that the tutorial made her aware of the missing thesis. This was something she worked on after the tutorial.

Marc also worked on discussing different aspects of the writing process during the tutorial. He explained to BaiHua the need for a thesis and how the subsequent paragraphs need to relate back to the thesis. He reminded BaiHua to keep this in mind as she composed her initial drafts in the future. He also addressed the revision phase of the writing process and provided her with errors she was consistently making and scaffolded ways for her to self-edit. He emphasized that editing takes time and that she needs to allow herself that time in order to thoroughly proof-read her paper.

**Recommendations**

One recommendation for future training Marc made was for frequent refreshers in staff meetings about issues tutors might encounter during tutorials with NNES writers. These “refreshers” would include having tutors share tutorials with NNES writers they had, difficulties they might have encountered and discuss ways to overcome those difficulties, and successful tutorial encounters. He also recommended that writing centers have a resource such as English as a Second Language writing consultant to step in and assist tutors who might be having difficulties with a tutorial and to model techniques tutors can use in tutorials with NNES students.

Many of the recommendations BaiHua made were things already being done by writing center staff such as assisting students understand the assignment, brainstorm, and
create outlines for paper. The other recommendation she made dealt with time. She felt that a one-hour tutorial was insufficient to address all of her needs. She may have had few recommendations because she felt that the tutorial she had with Marc was very good in addressing both global and local issues despite the one-hour time limit.

Case 2: FengYi and Roger Tutorial

Writer and Tutor Background

FengYi: Writer. FengYi is a Chinese male who was sophomore with an undeclared major and taking five courses. He had only been in the U.S. for four months at the time of the research. He revealed that he scored a 21 on the TOEFL writing portion and a composite score of 94. His prior exposure to English was limited to his coursework in China and a brief intensive English course he took in China prior to coming to the U.S. FengYi did state that he frequently listened to Western music and watched Western television shows and movies in order to improve his listening. His writing experience was limited to five-paragraph opinion-style essays. In response to a follow-up question during the interview, FengYi elaborated on his writing experience by saying that it was largely limited to grammar work and imitating. He expressed that he was unprepared for the type of writing he encountered in the U.S. and elaborated by saying: “I feel very limited. There’s lots of things I can’t really express.... It’s just overwhelming” (FengYi Interview). He was far more confident writing in Chinese than English and was modest about his Chinese writing proficiency. He initially said he was “just alright” writing in Chinese but later revealed that he had scored the highest in his province on the Chinese language exam when he was in Senior 1. Prior to the tutorial for this research, FengYi had never visited the writing center.
Roger: Tutor. Roger is male and was a first-year English PhD major at the time of this study. His undergraduate degree is in general education, and he received a Master’s in Literary and Cultural Studies. Roger’s tutorial experience was limited to his tenure in the writing center for the one semester. He received the one-week tutor training session provided to graduate assistants as described in Chapter 3. He recalled mostly the theories about process-based writing and constructivist oriented writing. He specifically mentioned reading an article by Blau, Hall, and Sparks’s (2002) which discusses tutors as cultural informants. Roger initially indicated that his experience with NNESs was extremely limited outside of taking courses with NNESs enrolled. During the tutorial, however, Roger revealed at least two additional instances of exposure to NNESs he did not mention during the interview. The first instance was when the writer was describing his home town in China. During this portion of the tutorial, Roger told the writer that he had actually been to the writer’s home town for a week during his senior year in high school as part of a jazz band exchange program. The other instance of his exposure to culture was when he took a seminar during his Master’s study that contained a unit on Chinese poetry. In essence, Roger had more exposure to Chinese culture and people than he acknowledged during the interview.

When asked about his personal tutorial philosophy, Roger responded with “whatever works.... whatever works without me doing the writing” (Roger Interview). Expanding on this, Roger commented that he believes that “lots of writers have similar problems, but each writer is sort of a problem unto themselves” (Roger Interview). Roger said, in discussing his tutorial philosophy, that he attempted to avoid a rigid structure in the tutorial and tried to allow things to develop based on the individual writer and the
writer’s situation. He later explained that he tends to assume a position of authority\(^9\) and that he believed this to be more influential in the writer taking the advice he offered. What this means is that Roger attempted to work on exactly what the writer requested and no more. This did not mean that he gave the writer control of the tutorial, just that he would focus on exactly what they requested while maintaining a position of authority. A high-quality tutorial for Roger is short and involves “a single but significant kind of clarification about a writing problem... either someone making a breakthrough in terms of construction of sentences or paragraphs or coming to a realization that sort of opens their way forward about an assignment” (Roger Interview). When I asked Roger why he felt a high-quality tutorial is short, he replied that he found writers to get tired if the session was too long. He believes that a writer can stay active for approximately the first 25% of the tutorial and seems to get tired if the session runs too long resulting in the writer being more passive and the tutor having to “carry” the writer through the remainder of the tutorial.

**Summary of Case Study 2 Tutorial (T2): FengYi and Roger.**

FengYi went to the UAWC in order to learn about MLA citation to use in a fiction story he was writing due the next day. This was, in fact, the only request he made. The beginning portion of the tutorial was devoted to understanding the assignment and instructor’s directions. Roger began explaining citation, stopped, and read the first paragraph of FengYi’s paper aloud. He then stopped and asked FengYi for a little background about the paper and setting. Roger asked FengYi if he knew of any citation that FengYi could find that might better describe the city, but FengYi indicated that he never mentioned the city and, therefore, did not see how this would be meaningful for his

---

\(^9\) Roger indicated that he attempted to position himself less of an authority in his tutorial with FengYi.
paper. After this line of questioning, Roger then attempted to explain citation to FengYi about how items they found online could be worked into the paper. Next, Roger provided an online resource FengYi could use to cite material. He also provided examples he both created and found. This continued for the majority of the tutorial. Roger ended the tutorial after 41 minutes after introducing FengYi to an online citation machine, EasyBib.com.

Case 2 Tutorial Breakdown

OPENING
T → Writer and tutor introduce themselves (5 turns)

DIAGNOSIS
T → Segment 1: Establishing tutorial purpose is for writer to understand/learn citation (9 turns)
T → Segment 2: Inquiring about quotes the writer may have (2 turns)
W → Segment 3: Expressing confusion about citation/ discussion about possible reasons for the assignment (3 turns)

DIRECTIVE
T → Segment 1: Providing verbal example of citation (8 turns)
W → Segment 2: Asking about and addressing citation style (4 turns)
W → Segment 3: Requesting example (3 turns)
T → Segment 4: Identifying need for quote (6 turns)
W → Segment 5: Explaining limited time in the U.S. and identifying limitations with language (4 turns)
T → Segment 6: Asking about story/ explaining story (9 turns)
T → Segment 7: Reviewing assignment/ establishing due date (27 turns) [PROC]
(During this time, writer asks if he should cite the blog where he got the idea about the paper)
T → Segment 8: Meta-commenting on assignment and reason to cite in this story (17 turns)
T → Segment 9: Reading paper (2 turns)

W → Segment 10: Expressing discomfort with tutor reading/ questioning if it needs to be done/ tutor assuages writer’s concerns (8 turns)

T → Segment 11: Reading paper and requesting specifics about paper such as setting (13 turns) [HOC]

T → Segment 12: Discussing necessity of finding quote and asking writer for description (11 turns)

T → Segment 13: Looking for information and explaining potential ways to use it (27 turns)

(The tutor does all of the work here searching for information.) [PROC]

W → Segment 14: Asking about citation – how to cite (27 turns)

(Ends with tutor asking if writer has an idea of how to cite.)

→ Requesting example / Asking if he should cite “transgender” / Tutor creates examples [HOC]

T → Segment 15: Providing resources on how to cite – EasyBib.com – and demonstrating how to use resource (27 turns) [PROC]

W → Segment 16: Discussing how to cite for terms specific story using resource (19 turns)

T → Segment 17: Asking about writer’s writing habits/location (8 turns) [PROC]

T → Segment 18: Additional citation conversation and examples (28 turns) [PROC]

W → Segment 19: Discussing what things can be cited and revisiting assignment requirements (20 turns) [PROC]

T → Segment 20: Comforting writer and suggesting to talk to instructor (10 turns) [PROC]

CLOSING

T → Segment 1: Post tutorial suggestions (8 turns)

W → Segment 2: Indicating he has enough information and expressing appreciation (4 turns)

REPORT

T → Segment 3: Record keeping request (3 turns)
Discourse Phases. This is the only tutorial recorded where there was a clear Opening where both the tutor and writer introduced themselves. The tutor initiated this introduction, asked FengYi his name and provided his to FengYi. During the Diagnosis stage of the tutorial, FengYi initiated 1 of the three topics by expressing both a lack of prior experience with citation and, based on his knowledge, expressed confusion about why his instructor would have him cite while writing a fiction story. Roger agreed that the assignment was unusual but interjected that it might be “sort of an experiment” by the instructor. This statement ended the Diagnosis stage, and Roger proceeded onto the Directive stage.

FengYi initiated 7 of the 20 segments in the Directive stage. These segments typically consisted of fewer turns and with the exception of segment 5 where FengYi identified limitations with his language, directly addressed citation by asking for examples, or asked for clarification. In order to better understand the assignment, Roger and FengYi went to the computer and reviewed the assignment posted on Blackboard:

66t  ((reading))
paper temple[ate
58w  [you must find a way to
(6.48)
67t  but n:ot in the internet so it say:s (0.30.) you must find a way to
cite lecture and our book=
59w  °ah:°=
68t  you may: cite (0.28) other tex:t sources but no:t the internet (0.83)
there must a separate bibliography pa:ge (1.35) there are cheat
sheets on the Bla:ckboard discu: uh-er- there are cheat sheets on
the blackboard discussion board=
((stopped reading))
During segment 11 of the Directive stage, Roger asked where the story is set. FengYi indicates it is set in his hometown, and Roger indicated that he had been there.

There is a side conversation on why Roger visited FengYi’s home city, but it is brief.

Roger redirected this line of discussion back to citation. Segment 13, which was initiated by FengYi, dealt with how to quote. FengYi was unsure how citation works and asked if he had to change the original material. His concern was that he might have to change the
Roger indicated that he did have to quote. In Directive segment 17, Roger addressed process briefly by asking FengYi where he wrote and suggested FengYi write in the library so he could be close to sources – books and staff who might assist him in locating sources – he would need to use.

Roger consistently maintained control of the discussion during the tutorial by shutting down potential items that may not have contributed to the topic of citation. In segment 108w so you ↓ have-

115t I been- I ↓ know: I- I: know something so: (0.61) [o:ne] thi: ng =

109w [o:↓h] ((starts very high))

115t you could think about now (1.43) ((teeth sucking sound)) is: (0.48) if you wa:n↓ ted to: basically you’re gonna need to incorporate quotations from[ o]ther=

110w [mhm]

115t people’s texts right? (0.36) so if you can fi:nd- do you know any good descriptions? (1.36) of Chengdu? (1.45)

111w right ↑ now:?

116t ↓ yeah: like in other books you might have rea:d or:

In 115t, Roger took over the conversational floor and refocused the tutorial to citations. This is particularly evident with his use of “so:” which functions to close the previous topic (Schiffrin, 1987) of Roger’s visit to FengYi’s home city and redirects it back to the discussion on citation. This same use of so to close a topic and shift it back to the topic of citation occurs a few turns later:

116w pretty lazy in Chengdu. Chengdu people is pretty lazy

(1.27)

121t ((teeth sucking sound)) okay (0.33) no[w:

117w [lazy and uh
123t is there a
118w [flat
(0.70)
123t it’s a flat place?
119w flat place (0.63) an:d u:h (3.08) pretty much [peace]ful. I don’t =
124t [okay.]
119w know
(0.46)
125t so one of the things you might do: (0.28) is find an author (0.40) whether they be: Chinese or American or whoev\’er (0.34) who has written about Chengdu

In this exchange FengYi was describing his hometown as being lazy and flat. In 125t, Roger again closed down the topic where FengYi was describing his home with “so one of the things you might do:” and redirected this back to citation and finding a piece that could be used. Roger underscored the need for the citation to come from a written text as he stressed the word “written” in his comment.

**HOC/LOC Work.** There were no recorded instances of HOC or LOC work during this tutorial. This is most likely due to Roger leaving the paper early on in the tutorial in order to instruct FengYi in citation. Roger felt that reading the paper would not be instrumental during this tutorial session. The closest instance of work in this area was in Directive, Segment 11 where Roger attempted to have FengYi add description to the setting by using his hometown as a focal point:

103t ((reading))
she is gazing at the river (0.39) the river which flows all through
the city where she was born and raised
((t. reads the first paragraph – this is not transcribed. after, he stops and says))
oke\’y \ great! (0.46) so where is she? (0.46) what is this city?
(0.58)
97w this is my city:
do you know any good descriptions? (1.36) of Chengdu?

so one of the things you might do: (0.28) is find an author (0.40) whether they be: Chinese or American or whoever (0.34) who has written about Chengdu

and if you can find a description (0.92) so: if someone has written (0.29) you know it could be anything

((reading student paper- paragraph 1))

an interesting combination of modern and the ancient class and the tolerance and diversity that gave her space to find who she really was

((stopped))

u:m and then you could say: (0.67) near her (0.93) you know there was (1.16) a bridge of st-you know a-u:m (0.97) where well let’s find we gotta have to find one (3.00)

ah: okay this could be interesting (1.62) u:m (0.66) so: (4.03) so something about this bridge right if you say: (0.52) she lived near: (0.58) this ah: (0.46) this bridge (0.58) there: are houses in which a great deal- so quote right? there are houses which a great deal of trade and industry is carried on: but these how-er- for even- this is a great quote- but these houses are all of wood merely (0.34) and they are put up in the morning and taken down in the evening. (0.62) right? (0.29) so that’s a quote about the old times right? the ancient times

[so you’re gonna want to quote something. you have to":se some

[oh:::

[okay] I see what you are talking about

[you see?]
This was the only time Roger referred to the text aside from an initial reading of the first few sentences of FengYi’s story. This was only discussion-based work for FengYi to complete after the tutorial.

*Process.* While FengYi came in with the majority of his paper complete, the process work that occurred might best be characterized as prewriting as it was largely devoted to understanding the assignment and generating ideas on how to use citation in the piece of fiction that FengYi had brought to the tutorial. As seen in the tutorial breakdown, Roger operated as an information by providing information necessary for FengYi, part of the prewriting process crucial for FengYi to complete the assignment. Roger did address FengYi’s writing habits briefly towards the end of the tutorial. He asked FengYi, in Segment 17, where he typically wrote and suggested that FengYi write in the library in order to have secondary sources readily available and to be able to use the reference desk as a resource while writing.

*Volubility.* In FengYi and Roger’s tutorial, Roger exhibited the highest levels of volubility with 4,800 utterances spread out of 304 for an average of 15.8 WPT. FengYi, on the other hand, uttered 1,333 words over 302 turns for 4.4 WPT.

*Discourse Markers.* FengYi’s most significant use of discourse markers were backchannels occupying entire turns and included mhm, m, hm, yeah, okay, oh, and ah. These accounted for 75 out of 302, or 25%, of his total turns. Out of these backchannels,
mhmm and variations of m, both of which are minimal response tokens, accounted for 45% of the backchannels FengYi uttered. The most notable use of discourse markers for Roger was his use of right and okay rising tone tag questions in order to engage FengYi in the conversation. Tsui (1994) argues that rising tone tag questions typically serve two functions: to elicit agreement or confirmation from the addressee. In a sense, these are rhetorically conducive questions where the answer, if given, is expected to align with the speaker’s utterances (Kiefer, 1980). Throughout the tutorial, Roger utilized rising tone tag rights 63 times, rising tone tag alright 3 times, and rising tone okays 11 times. I will discuss the possible implications of Roger’s use of right and how those may have impacted FengYi’s use of backchannels during the analysis section for this case.

With respect to discourse markers, Roger’s use of tag questions may have resulted in increases in FengYi’s backchannels which functioned as politeness strategies rather than signifying actual understanding. In the following sample, Roger introduced EasyBib.com to and explained how to use this tool:

```
188t and then (0.54) I would go to EasyBib (1.04) now: Smith is imaginary so I’ll give you: do you have a favorite book you l↑ike?
184w no. I [really don’t really I:]
189t [you have no:] favorite books?
185w I haven’t read a lot [yet
190t [okay (0.91) we:’ll do one of my favorites (1.09) ((typing)) of the grea:t. trans.for.mation) (4.64) okay so I said- this is a title of a book and see here: it says autoci:te (0.57) in M L A: that’s the style you’re to use here (0.51) it will automatically do it (0.38) so ↓this is the book I ↑wa:nt (1.49) by Karl Polanyi it’s a book about ecronomic- economics (0.54) in England=
186w yep.
191t so I cite it (0.57) I make sure: this is all right (0.81) I create the citation o↑kay? (1.58) now here is my citat↑ion (0.57) it produces it for me:
```
As seen in 188t, Roger attempted to recruit FengYi’s active participation in the process by asking him if he had any favorite books. FengYi’s negative responses in 184w and 185w resulted in Roger creating an example that FengYi identified as being difficult to understand due to the unfamiliar author and abstract way in which the idea was presented. This type of tag question is used in order to check NNES’s comprehension (Thonus, 1998a). It is also illustrative of difficulties Roger identified in his interview regarding how he was unsuccessful in his attempts to get FengYi to personally connect to the content being discussed. As seen, Roger used four rising tone tag okays and three rising tone tag rights. FengYi’s turns 188w and 192w may have been more politeness strategies. Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford (2005) discuss NNES students who were participating in writing conferences exhibited backchannels that, on the face, appeared to indicate listener
attention/reception but were, in fact, politeness strategies and not representative of listener understanding or reception. Furthermore, the backchannels in 188w (mhm) and 192w (m) are typical backchanneling strategies for Chinese speakers (Clancy, Thompson, Suzuki, & Tao, 1996; Karpiński, et al., 2006).

A more salient example of FengYi’s backchanneling as a politeness strategy is seen in this portion where Roger was discussing techniques Chinese poets during the Tang Dynasty used poetry:

253t  right? (0.36) it might no:t (0.53) be able to be possi|ble cus so:me stories (0.59) just need to be written the way they’re written t-tuh come out the right way
248w  do pe- (0.46) (author usually) (0.21) do:n’t cite fi[ction
254t  [no:t (0.27) no:t (0.83) normally (0.51) not normally but someti:mes they ↓do: sometimes they do it but they- usually when they do it they don’t have to do what you’re gonna have to do (0.61) so oftentimes (0.48) authors (0.43) you uh (. ) y-y-you you-uh do you read any uh- like tang dynasty poetry? or chinese poems? no?
249w  n[o: 255t  [have y- did you ever have to? [in school? okay
250w  [I’m not very literature person before (‘fore’ is high pitched)) (0.48) I don’t have time to read before this=
256t  okay. okay okay. so: in- in tho:se poems (0.35) you know you will have the poem in the center=
251w  (hhh) ((sounds like laughing))
257t  and then you will ha:ve (0.44) ↑right? (0.31) in your characters around it commentaries (0.40) o:n the old tang poems ↑right?
252w  okay
258t  now those commentaries- if you get – this- is I know it’s very hard transi↓tion (0.75) but (0.50) tho:se commentaries in some ways (0.26) so there’s an original poem maybe about a beautiful woman=
253w   m=
259t  and there’s one scholar who is:-who:- the emperor said I want you to write a commentary on this beautiful poem. and he writes a
commentary. and then the next guy he writes a commentary on the same poem and the other commentary- very confusing bad example. ignore it.

In this sample, FengYi was questioning whether authors typically cite fiction. Roger’s response was to use Chinese literature versus Western literature, and despite FengYi indicating he was not familiar with Tang Dynasty poetry, Roger continued to use the example. Although Roger only utilized two rising tone tag rights, this resulted in a backchannel of okay from FengYi in 252w. FengYi identified this use of okay and the second backchannel, m in 253w, as both politeness strategies; he did not understand why Roger continued and was simply being polite. Roger eventually recognized this to be a poor example and terminated the line of discussion.

This last example is an instance where Roger controlled the conversational floor for an extended period and utilized tone rising tags. In this segment, Roger was discussing things FengYi could do in terms of integrating quotes into his paper. The segment begins with Roger reading a portion of FengYi’s paper:

149t ((reading student paper- paragraph 1))
◦interesting combination◦ of mo:dern and the ancient class and the tolerance and diversity that gave her space to find who she really was
((stopped)) (0.62)
\text{u:m and then you could say: (0.67) near her (0.93) you know there was (1.16) a bridge of st- you know a-u:m (0.97) where ◦well let’s find◦ we gotta- have to find one (3.00)

144w ◦m◦

150t ah: okay this could be interesting (1.62) u:m (0.66) so: (4.03) so something about this bridge right if you say: (0.52) she lived near: (0.58) this ah: (0.46) this bridge (0.58) there: are houses in which a great deal- so quo:te \textbf{right?} there are houses which a great deal of trade and industry is carried o:n. but these how-er- for even- this is a great quote- but these houses are all of wood merely (0.34) and
they are put up in the morning and taken down in the evening.
(0.62) ↑right? (0.29) so that’s a quote about the old times ↑right?
the ancient times
145w ↓m.
151t now if you said (0.45) ↓here: (0.80) the interesting combination.
↑right? and then you said (0.29) no lon:ger was it the case ↓that.
↑right? (0.59) uh: these houses (0.32) these houses are all of wood
merely and then they are taken up in the morning and [taken] =
146w [oh yeah]
151t down in the evening you could put that quote in th↑ere (0.71.)
↑right. now:: (0.51) now: the city was modern. (0.54) ↑right? you
could say it. ↓that could be your sentence (0.93) ↑right? so no
longer quote (0.86) and about the houses being [put
147w [you mean I have
to change the para:- the para↓raph?]
152t you would have to add a sentence or two
(0.67)
148w ah: s[o
153t so you’re gonna want ta quote something. you have to ↑u::se
some of a[nother’s text
149w [↓oh:::::
150w [okay] I see what what you are talking about
154t [you see?]
154t so: it will be- it will be diffi↓cult (.) but you don’t have to [do] =
151w [>(it’s all
right)<]
(.)
155t too many and you’ll- you can u:se- you can use them in interesting
ways, right?= 
152w ungh=
156t you don’t have to: (0.53.) u:se the text for instance there are: some
po↓ets (0.59) in the nineteen fifties here in Americ↓a: (0.45) who
used to like to just take (1.08) maybe we say we have this paper
and this paper and they would cut some of your paper ↑up=
153w ah:=
157t and they would cut some of this up and they would rearrange it to
make a poem
154w okay
158t  n-†kay? in some ways: (0.35) you are taking your: paper (0.36) and s- a few other pieces of paper and you’re cutting pieces out the theirs and you putting it- you’re integrating [in]to yours
155w  [m:]

In 149t, Roger was creating a possible sample but did not actually use a secondary source. In 150t, he used a portion out of a portion they had previously located out of The Travels of Marco Polo. Beginning with this turn, he began to use right as either a comprehension check or to maintain conversational floor. In 150t through 151t, Roger used 8 rising tone rights. In many cases, these did not have pauses before or after and may have been a type of verbal tick (Roger Interview). Out of 13 turns, FengYi gave minimal responses through backchannels in 9 of the turns. Two of his turns, 145w and 155w were confirmed by him in the interview as being politeness strategies. His last turn in this sequence is a repetition of Roger’s statement and might be considered a backchannel to signify reception. What is also interesting here is that FengYi asked “you mean I have to cha:nge the para:- the para↓graph” in 147w. Here FengYi was asking about changing the original text from The Travels of Marco Polo, but Roger seemed to think FengYi was talking about changing the paragraph in his writing. This was not fully explored in the tutorial. When I asked FengYi about this in the interview, he indicated that he did not really understand. Exploring this aspect might have changed FengYi’s misconception that citing means to directly quote other pieces of writing.

**Writer and Tutor Interviews**

**FengYi’s Interview**

FengYi indicated that the main reason he visited the writing center during this tutorial was because he was having difficulty with citation. His assignment required that
he utilize sources in a fiction story he was writing, and this was his only concern. His general impression of the tutorial was that it was useful in allowing him to understand the assignment and how to use citation a little better but that he still did not completely understand its use. He articulated in the interview that he was “very relaxed” during the tutorial and described Roger as “really good”, “very friendly”, and “just very good person”; these contributed to his comfort in the writing tutorial.

*Learned.* FengYi reported have a slightly better understanding of how to use citation in academic writing and, more specifically, in relation to the particular piece that motivated him to visit the writing center. It was difficult to determine his change in understanding citation. In answering questions about what knowledge he took into the tutorial, he responded, “Because I never cited. I never know the- know nothing about that.” He reported being able to recognize citation when he saw it in text but that he did not “know how this work out.” In respect of his understanding of citation changed as a result of the tutorial, FengYi said, “I think I got to know citation a lot more.” It was ultimately established, through a series of questions, that he came to understand that citation meant using quoting direct language from secondary sources such as pulling sentences from other works and using it in his writing:

> Like. You write a paragraph and you don’t know how to cite- uh, uh you have no idea what to cite, you just find a story and find a beautiful sentence and change– put that sentence into the paragraph and cite the sentence you put in from the text.  
> (FengYi Interview)

Ultimately, FengYi learned that citation involves direct quotes. When asked about paraphrasing as citation, he said, “I still don’t quite know how to use. [inhales] I don’t know because we don’t really…. When we, when we talk about it, that’s not really, you
know associated with paraphrase.” The other piece FengYi reported learning from the
tutorial was how to use an online citation machine, Easybib.com.

**Difficulties.** Throughout the interview, FengYi expressed confusion with the
tutorial – confusion which resulted from both the assignment and the type on information
Roger provided him. At the onset of the tutorial, FengYi indicated general confusion with
citation in general and why he needed to and how he would cite in a fiction story.

The main difficulty FengYi had during the tutorial was the “strange examples”
Roger provided when explaining citation. By “strange example”, be meant that Roger
used different citation forms (i.e., MLA versus APA). For example, early in the tutorial,
Roger provided a citation example that was a “non-traditional example” (28T).

“Strange examples” also occurred in what authors and works Roger used as
eamples, many of which were hypothetical or obscure authors. In 168t, Roger gave
FengYi a rather broad example with that appeared to confuse FengYi:

```
168t  yes. you: quote Shakespeare. you: quote the cereal box. you: quote
164w  ah: (0.78) I don’t know Rousseau or whatever=
169t  is that clear?= 
165w  u:m=
170t  do you have ideas about where you might do such a thing?
166w  I-I I can know
```

Although he did not fully understand the example Roger provided based on his interview,
FengYi indicated that he “can know” with the intention of attempting it after the tutorial.

The examples Roger provided proved even more confusing and difficult for
FengYi because the examples contained comparatively obscure authors or were, in
FengYi’s view, unrelated to his assignment, which required using citations in a purely
fictional work. The examples identified by FengYi during the interview include authors
such as Borges and David Foster Wallace. The following exchange exemplifies one of Roger’s examples where he bundled both authors into a single, verbal example:

245t  some times (1.55) these things become very interesting. there are a couple of authors who do: this very practice of citing in (0.29) stories and novels (0.80) so one is named Borges (0.33) he’s an Argentinian (0.69) a: author he writes novels (0.90) and in Borges’s novels what he’ll like to do is (0.57) he’ll say: my reader: you know (0.55) u:m Jose was sitting in a room (0.35) he was looking through the dictionary staring in the mirror and he read this entry (0.38) and then cites it and then he’ll go to the footnote. (0.46) and what’s interesting about Borges is that sometimes Borges makes up (0.62) he cites something that doesn’t exist (0.71) right? it were very strange (0.43) we- we have to talk a long time about why: Borges does this (0.49) so this is not uncommon another person who does it is a contemporary (0.37) he just died a while ago- American author named David Foster Wallace (0.70) and he does the same thing (0.23) he likes to put funny jokes (0.61) in his so he’ll have sentences (0.33) and he’ll just have the footnote=

240w  David Foster?
246t  David Foster Wallace. [Wa]llace is his last name. he wrote a=
241w  [okay]
246t  book called infinite just [is ]his=
241w  [ah:]
247t  famous famous big big big big novel (0.99) u:m (0.20) ↓but (1.31) if that (0.51) does that answer your question a little bit about how: (0.47) you will use these quotations and citations?
(1.46)
242w  yep
248t  yeah?
243w  mhm
(0.78)
249t  and you think you can find a way to fit it into your story?
244w  (hh) I think so
250t  I think [you can
245w  [maybe not maybe not very good but I think I can do it
During the interview, FengYi expressed confusion with both of these examples. The example using Borges was slightly confusing because it dealt with an author who fabricated citations in his work. This did not make sense to FengYi. On the other hand, the point Roger made about Borges citing a dictionary entry did fit with FengYi’s question of directly citing “transgender”. FengYi’s rationale for wanting to cite transgender was because it was a new and unfamiliar term to him, and he was operating under the assumption that unfamiliar terms are defined so the audience can understand them. This idea was not explored during the tutorial except for Roger to discuss how this would be done.

The second example using David Foster Wallace was confusing because it was very brief and dealt with jokes Wallace would footnote. There was some confusion as seen in 240w where FengYi attempted to clarify by asking if Roger was referring to David Foster, a contemporary composer of movie scores and one of FengYi’s favorite composers. After the correction, Roger asked FengYi if he understood a little better about using citations. Although he responded in the tutorial that he understood, FengYi revealed in the interview that he was, in fact, confused: “Yeah, it’s a pretty- I guess I was really confused when he talked about those things. It’s just a lot of names, I guess. It’s just kind of like- he told me about some authors. I don’t know. That not really make much sense here.” In short, FengYi expressed that he did not understand much of what was being said but that he acknowledged what Roger was saying out of politeness.

FengYi felt he learned a little more about citation than what he knew before visiting the writing center. Overall, he felt that Roger was quite knowledgeable; however, FengYi felt some things in the tutorial prevented him from fully understanding citation.
One small issue was Roger’s rate of speech. FengYi’s difficulty in understanding Roger’s speech may be explained by FengYi’s following comment: “You should know that when I talk to an English person, I don’t one-hundred percent follow each word. So, I guess I missed a couple of sentence or words” (FengYi Interview).

**Roger’s Interview**

Roger’s typical approach to tutorials was to control the tutorial and keep it short. His approach during his tutorial with FengYi was different for a few reasons. First, the assignment was unconventional because it asked FengYi to integrate secondary sources into a piece of creative writing. Roger said, “...because I had no idea for the- for a lo:ng part of the- in terms of time I wasn’t clear what we were working on, so I really needed him to tell me, and I couldn’t take that sort of authoritative role. Alright. He had to lead me in some ways.” Roger perceived FengYi as being “quiet” and identified breaks in language and slowed down so FengYi could understand him. Roger eventually recognized that “citation hadn’t happened” for FengYi before and attempted to explain how citation worked, what that would look like, and resources that would assist him.

**Difficulties/Frustrations.** The main issue Roger discussed during the tutorial stemmed not from issues related to FengYi but from the assignment itself. He expressed at the beginning of the interview a sense of puzzlement over the assignment:

> It was a creative writing assignment. But, uh, the question about citations sort of tripped me up. Because it wasn’t clear whether he was supposed to cite like a theory of fiction writing or something like that or if he was actually just supposed to quote something.... But clearly this was an assignment in which the writer- or the teacher wanted the writers to be forced to, like, make a collage or some kind of creative use, so. I tried to model that although I was puzzled.
The assignment directions left Roger guessing at the instructor’s intention; this is evident in the following tutorial excerpts:

75w now: but the citation thing is just [it bothers
85t [the citation: okay. (0.65) so.
           let’s go back. I ↓think I have an idea: and I think what (0.42)
what (0.29) u:m (2.19) what the goa:l here ↓is (0.33) is to get
you: (1.01) to be forced to u:se an incorpo↓ra:te another’s
writing
(0.74)
76w mhm
(0.60)
86t that’s (0.87) that’s the chall↑enge
:
:
158t n-kay? in some ways: (0.35) you are taking your: paper (0.36) and
s- a few other pieces of paper and you’re cutting pieces out the
theirs and you putting it- you’re integrating [in]to yours
155w [m:]
(0.73)
159t this is what I think your teacher wants you to do (0.85) and so.
   it’s st↓range=
156w it is strange=
160t very strange=

Turns 85t and 159t are illustrative of Roger’s confusion with the assignment. This difficulty Roger experienced was compounded by a lack of resources from both the instructor and writer and continued throughout the tutorial as Roger appeared to struggle to find examples that would allow FengYi to understand citation enough so he could employ it in his paper. This was verified during a member-check. Roger reaffirmed his difficulties in the tutorial because of the nature of the assignment. This led him to examples including Borges, Wallace, and even an instance of Chinese poetry from the Tang Dynasty that was abandoned once Roger realized FengYi did not understand.
To a lesser degree, Roger had difficulty understanding FengYi relating to his manner of speaking: “He was very quiet. Um, and, the sort of breaks in language, sort of knowing the idiom of when to interrupt somebody was a little weird. So I had to slow a lot down for FengYi.”

*Writer Take-Away.* Overall, what Roger hoped FengYi took away from the tutorial was clarity on what needed to be done with the specific assignment. He also hoped FengYi would seek further clarification from his professor and would benefit from the portion of the tutorial dealing with EasyBib.com.

**Overall Summary**

Work in this tutorial focused more on Roger instructing FengYi on how to integrate citation into a fictional story FengYi was writing. Few opportunities allowed Roger to address HOCs and no opportunity to address LOCs. It was more aligned to prewriting in that additional research was necessary in order for FengYi to complete his assignment. Revision did not occur during the tutorial, but opportunities for Roger to address higher-order concerns on how to change the text to incorporate the type of citation the instructor appeared to be looking for did present towards the end of the tutorial.

Roger’s understanding of the assignment as requiring that FengYi needed to quote or pull direct language from a secondary source resulted in glossing over other aspects of citation such as the use of paraphrased information as legitimate forms of citation. This focus on direct quotation was likely a result of both Roger’s and FengYi’s shared confusion about the assignment. Roger confirmed that he might have focused a little more broadly on citation and sounded surprised that FengYi had no exposure to citation
in China when this focus was brought up in the interview. FengYi had indicated that he had no prior exposure to citation during the tutorial, but Roger simply missed this piece of information. In a way, Roger may have too narrowly focused on using direct quotes as the primary method of citation; this may have led to FengYi’s limited understanding of citation but may have actually begun when FengYi indicated that he wanted to cite “transgender”. Misunderstanding also may have occurred as both attempted to make sense of an unorthodox assignment.

The direction of the tutorial and types of examples Roger presented were likely a result of FengYi not having brought anything into the tutorial other than the first portion of his writing and his assignment. Throughout the tutorial, Roger seemed to have been forced to come up with examples on the spot because he was unable to successfully engage FengYi in the conversation. During the initial stages of the tutorial, Roger asked if FengYi had any story he was interested in a story that he might use to pull a citation; FengYi indicated he could think of nothing that was related to his current story. The assignment directions, as read in the tutorial, indicated that FengYi needed to also cite lecture notes and the course text as well as potential outside resources. Roger asked FengYi if he had a book or notes from class; FengYi had not brought this material. The resulting example Roger created was difficult for FengYi to understand. When Roger attempted to have FengYi consider citing information that would elaborate on the location, which was FengYi’s hometown of Chengdu, FengYi indicated that he never specifically mentioned the location and thought using something to describe the actual city did not seem to work. After these instances, Roger essentially provided examples that were more and more confusing to FengYi.
**Recommendations**

In discussing things which may have improved the tutorial, FengYi commented that one way change that might have assisted him was for Roger to speak more slowly. Another suggestion is for tutors to use examples a NNES might more readily recognize: “OH, okay, okay. Don’t talk about too many authors here because we don’t know- the authors don’t make sense to us. If you talk something, you know, some strange, you know, author’s name, what they do. We don’t know.” FengYi went to the writing center in order to better understand citation. Although he did not leave with a complete understanding of citation conventions, he did acquire slightly more knowledge than what he previously possessed.

Roger said he could have clarified sooner what FengYi’s specific questions were and looked at ways to tie the tutorial to citation in a broader sense as well as connect citation use to FengYi’s writing process. Roger did not think he made a “better writer” and felt that these changes might have provided more long-term benefits to FengYi. Last, Roger discussed how improved tutor training on issues tutors might encounter when dealing with NNES writers would be beneficial. Some of the information he said he would find helpful is being exposed to different culture’s communication patterns, differences between cultural writing styles, and other culturally relevant information such as whether the culture utilizes conventions such as citations.

**Case 3: KimYun and Candi Tutorial**

**Writer and Tutor Background**

*KimYun: Writer.* KimYun is female and was an international exchange student from Korea at the time of the research. She was enrolled as a junior majoring in Chinese
and taking four courses, three of which were writing intensive. KimYun had been in the U.S. for one semester and was returning to Korea at the end of the term. She reported taking the iBT with a writing score of 24 and composite score of 98. KimYun had been studying English for 10 years and was exposure to English only in academic settings. She had previously taken a writing course at her home university in Korea. She felt that this course was basic compared to the writing required of her at the University at Albany; her Korean university required persuasive and narrative essays no longer than one to two pages and typically following a 5-paragraph style. She self-reported that she was an average writer in Korean but that she was far stronger writing in Korean than English. Prior to the recorded tutorial, she had attended three to four tutorials to work on various papers and assignments.

Candi: Tutor. Candi, the only female tutor in this study, was a senior majoring in English and minoring in business and Greek literature. The semester the research took place marked Candi’s forth semester as a tutor in the writing center. Candi completed a semester-long tutor training course offered through the university English department prior to working in the writing center and remembered covering methods and theory with emphases on North’s (1984) view of writing centers and minimalist tutoring (Brooks, 1991). She recalled working on how to address grammar in tutorials but could not recall the text used. Her exposure to material covering NNES writers in the course was limited to two readings from her course text. Prior to her work in the writing Center, Candi described herself as having minimal exposure to NNESs outside of one or two Spanish-speaking friends, and this was during her high school years. She did take six years of Spanish and has exposure to both the language and culture.
In response to my question about her personal tutorial philosophy, Candi described her process and indicated that she attempts to home in on what a writer appears to need through questions to the writer. She evaluates the writer’s paper or assignment and uses what the writer expresses they want to work on with an evaluation of what she thinks they need to work on in order to determine the focus of the tutorial. She recognized this as a change from the tutorial practice she employed when she first became a tutor; then, she would have simply worked only on what the writer requested while attempting to maintain a “hands-off” approach and not directly correcting or altering the paper. She made suggestions but left it to the writer’s discretion to accept or reject possible changes in product. Throughout the interview, Candi articulated that she typically does not work on grammar and expects the writers to develop editing skills on their own. One reason for her avoiding grammar is her self-proclaimed lack of grammar knowledge. While she can identify a grammatical error and correct it, she indicated lacking the inability to be able to explain the grammatical aspects to the writer. Her description of a high-quality tutorial reflects her desire to see a balance between writer request and tutor evaluation and her hands-off approach with respect to grammar.

Summary of Case Study 3 Tutorial (T3): KimYun and Candi.

KimYun visited UAWC with a speech and PowerPoint presentation on bilingual education she was to give the next day in her American Culture class. Her concern was with clarity, flow, transitions, developing her ideas, and grammar. KimYun and Candi worked on these four aspects throughout the tutorial. Candi read through the majority of the presentation pointing out grammatical errors, suggesting changes to the language, asking for clarification of sections she had difficulty understanding, and offering
opportunities for KimYun to paraphrase certain sections of the presentation and make changes to her product. In turn, KimYun read some portions of her presentation and stopped to ask clarification questions regarding language and clarity. The tutorial lasted approximately 48 minutes and focused on the presentation KimYun took to the writing center.

Case 3 Tutorial Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPENING</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T → Requesting writer’s name/ T. does not provide name (1 turn)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIAGNOSIS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T → Segment 1: Requesting writer complete check-in (2 turns)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T → Segment 2: Understanding what the writer wants to work on (19 turns)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIRECTIVE 1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T → Segment 1: Reads writer’s paper / providing rationale for reading / comforting writer/ correcting introduction (7 turns) [LOC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W → Segment 2: Requesting grammar work/ grammar and language work (13 turns) [LOC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T → Segment 3: Requesting clarification and correcting sentence (21 turns) [LOC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T → Segment 4: Reading and grammar work/ writer paraphrases (5 turns) [LOC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W → Segment 5: Reading asking if specific sentence is clear (3 turns) [LOC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T → Segment 6: Reading / direct correction and clarification (65 turns) [LOC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W → Segment 7: Seeking feedback on flow (3 turns) [LOC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T → Segment 8: Grammar and language work (39 turns) [LOC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W → Segment 9: Reviewing video use in presentation/ PowerPoint work on grammar and wording ( 58 turns) [LOC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W → Segment 10: Working on paraphrasing video / grammar and language work (15 turns) [LOC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W → Segment 11: Working on writing final sentence of presentation / paraphrasing (12 turns) [HOC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| CLOSING 1 |  |
Discourse Phases. As with other of the tutorial, KimYun’s and Candi’s tutorial did not follow the more traditional Opening → Diagnosis → Directive → Closing/Report pattern of institutional discourse. This tutorial structure revealed an Opening → Diagnosis → Directive 1→ Closing 1→Directive 2→ Closing 2 pattern.

The Opening phase of this tutorial consisted of a single exchange where the tutor inquired about a work location (i.e. where to sit) and the writer’s name. While asked for the writer’s name, she never provided hers. The Diagnosis phase followed a typical pattern of asking what the writer was working on beginning with Candi asking for the writer check-in sheet. KimYun did not have one and completed this during the initial stages of the tutorial. In order to establish what KimYun wanted to work on, however, Candi depended on asking KimYun directly. During Candi’s interview, she indicated that she did not look at the writer check-in form. Candi did ask to see the assignment sheet the professor provided KimYun, but KimYun had not brought it to the tutorial session. Over 18 tutor-writer conversational exchanges, Candi ascertained that KimYun
wanted to work on the flow and transitions in the speech and PowerPoint presentation she was to give the next day in class.

In the Directive 1 phase of this tutorial, KimYun initiated 6 of the 11 tutorials turns. The initiations dealt primarily with requests for grammar work, checks to see whether her language flowed and was understandable, and work on paraphrasing.

During segment 1 of the Directive phase, Candi essentially took control of the tutorial:

22t  okay (.) (h) is this pretty much finished? [or] are you- okay
22w       [yeah]
23w  but (.) I think (.) it should be at more: or: change some of the (.)
23t O↓kay (.) u:m (.) how ‘bout I’ll read it out loud=
24w  okay=
24t  and you can stop me if you: hear anythin:g that sounds ↑off or if you have any questions (right) (. ) ◦okay◦
    
    
    
25t  yeah that way you can hear it so: you’ll know how it sounds as au- as audience too (.) u:m okay [how

Out of 32 instances of reading, Candi read 25 of those times. This reading was not continuous. Rather, the tutorial had a start-stop pattern with the either Candi or KimYun reading a portion, stopping and working on various aspects of the speech and PowerPoint presentation making direct corrections, clarifying language, and rewriting portions of the presentation. Small instances of ways to change the language to make it less formal or more ‘native-like’ occurred. One instance was at the beginning of the tutorial where Candi suggested changing the opening of KimYun’s presentation:

24t

  ((tutor reading))
Hello ladies and gentleman ((This directly from the KimYun’s paper))
((tutor interrupted))

(items omitted)

(is it okay to put (. ) s::: ((drawn out ‘s’ sound))
↑u::m it’s up to you I mean (.)
what is the usual (. ) introduction in: (. )
right. say hello ladies and gentlemen (. ) uh like good afternoon:
↑u::m good morning (. )
[ah::] [good after- a good afternoon ((sounds to be laughing)) (. ) hello good afternoon (. )
do you still want to say ladies and gentlemen or (. ) take that out? (. )
↑u::m (. ) take that out (h)

Here, Candi took the opportunity to provide KimYun with alternate ways introductions in presentations – changing “Hello ladies and gentlemen” to a less formal “good afternoon”. Instances like this are discussed by Blau, Hall, and Sparks (2002) who contend that tutors are in a unique position to serve as cultural informants to NNESs and can assist in allowing students to understand broad aspects of a target culture as well as culturally-specific ways in which writing may occur. This was the most evident instance of cultural informing in the tutorial. The other instances came in the form of suggestions for how to change the language in the presentation discussed a little later.

Candi initiated the Closing 1 phase of the tutorial by asking KimYun if she felt comfortable with what they worked on10 with “so how do you feel now?” (271t). After an exchange of small talk establishing that the presentation was the next day, Candi reopens the tutorial (Directive 2) by suggesting that KimYun integrate pictures into the PowerPoint presentation with “did you think about putting pictures in your slides?” (275t). In addition to exploring integrating images that were representative of various

10 This was interpretation of Closing 1 was verified during the tutor interview. 146
cultures and subtle language changes in the presentation, Candi recommended that KimYun double-check with her instructor about citation. KimYun initiated the Closing phase with, “you’re done” (308w). After small talk about the class size, Candi wished KimYun luck on the presentation, and leave taking occurred.

Grammar Correction. One feature of this tutorial is the type of grammar correction that occurred. This work falls into LOCs. There were 29 instances of discussion devoted to grammatical errors in the tutorial. Of those, five were scaffolded attempts to correct and 24 were direct corrections. During the first four instances of grammar work, Candi attempted to scaffold grammar correction by indirect error identification:

31t so let’s look at the s:- I think the first sentence. (.)
31w m (.)
32t second sentence
((reading))
as we all know America is (.) ā im- (.)
((stopped)) (.)
32w oh (.). right (.)
33t the a: (.)
33w America is immigrant’s nation (.). immig↑a:nts (.)
34t I don’t think- I think it can be singular (.)
34w oh:
35t an immigrant nat↑io:n (?) ((knocking sound)) (.). America is (.)
and you would probably have something in here: between is an immigr↑ant (.)
35w is an: (.)

In this section, Candi indicated a grammatical error by stopping. KimYun recognized the error, which Candi reinforced, and attempted to make the correction by changing “a immigrant nation” to “an immigrant’s nation”. When KimYun’s attempt was incorrect, Candi provided the correct article in 35t. Four other attempts at indirect error
identification also resulted in Candi telling KimYun the correction. The only instance where KimYun was able to make the correction was in this segment:

108t  ((reading))
now based on definition we will move on the history of developing
((stopped)) (.)
do you see anything wrong with that one?
112w  u:m (. now: based on (. now: based on this: (. definition?)
109t  m-hm (.)

In 112w, KimYun inserted the correct determiner. Afterwards, Candi simply provided direct correction for the remaining 24 instances of grammar work.

*Confirmation and Suggestions.* In the diagnostic stage of the tutorial, KimYun and Candi established that KimYun wanted to work on clarity and flow at the surface level. Both KimYun and Candi addressed these issues in different ways. In order to make sure her writing was clear, KimYun would ask if a portion was “okay” (“Is it okay?”) or “right” (“Is it right”). She checked if the language or revision of language was “okay” or “right” ten times during the tutorial.

This work on confirming and suggesting was often a complex process with a mixture of KimYun asking if something was “okay”, followed by Candi offering a suggestion, and ending in KimYun double-checking the change. One instance of this is shown below:

81t  u:m
((reading))
therefore we are going to understand about definition of bilingual educat↑ion the history of developing bilingual education and bilingual (-h) education of nowadays
((stopped))
(.)
86w  is it clear:? ((laughs))
KimYun asked in 86w if the portion Candi had just read was clear. After a brief exchange where Candi asked KimYun clarifying questions (82t-83t) and followed up with a suggestion (84t), KimYun made corrections and checked the accuracy of her new material with “is it right?” (89w). These types of exchanges occurred in both the Directive I and II portions of the tutorial.

Candi sought clarification throughout the tutorial by directly asking what KimYun meant using direct questions of “What do you mean?” (43t and 182t) and less direct queries. These always led to changes in the way the text was written. The bulk of Candi’s suggestions came in the form of “you could” (21 times) when she encountered wording issues in the presentation as in the following example:

47t yeah increasing would work. the number of immigrants (.).

49w [yea::h ]

50w °countries° (.). or how about (.). the number of immigrants (.). was more increasing? can I do that? (.)

51t u:m (.). you could say increased more: than (.).

51w ah: increased more [than] them? (.). what is (.). m:

50t [mhm]

51t cus the them would compare it

51w yea:h=

52t cus you- (.). you’re compare: (.). say that it was the mo- like they had the most immigrants coming

52w yeah yeah [yeah

53t [so you could also say (.). u:m the: number of immigrants (.). you could say America (.). u:h (.). like America (.).

53w most no. (.). most biggest number? ((laughs)) (.).
uh: you wouldn’t want to use most. America well you

could say the most growth in

In these seven exchanges, Candi made multiple suggestions using “you could”. Candi also made less direct suggestions such as “I’m thinking it will be...” (166t) prior to offering a suggested correction. Regardless of the how Candi phrased the suggestion, KimYun made changes to her presentation. These instances represent continued work on LOCs as surface changes to the sentences were made to improve clarity.

**HOCs/LOCs.** The discussion above on grammar and confirmation and suggestions suggests that Candi addressed LOCs during the majority of this tutorial. Only one of the segments in the tutorial dealt with reorganizing KimYun’s work, and that occurred in Segment 11 of the Directive 1 phase where KimYun paraphrased a new section:

```
255w I just copy this paragraph uh I can =
243t mhm
256w understand this in word but if I talk to this part to audience I think they confuse and they didn’t understand correctly I think
244t for this part?
257w yes
245t when you were doin you had it in your own words?
258w yes I want to but it’s [difficult yeah (laughs)]
246t [you can?] do that (laughs) okay I would say
u:m I would say
259w the number of school age children who spoke language other than English at home increased by (laughs)
247t so you- you understand what it’s saying though?
260w Y:A:
248t but you don’t understand how to paraphrase it
261w [Y:Es:]
249t mhm u:m well where would you start if you were paraphrasing?
262w u:m
```
like how would you summarize it means that the children who speak their language is increased.
mhm
from Oh that’s (((laughs)))
(((starts laughing slightly after writer starts)))
so (((laughs)))
[((quick laugh))]
mmm do you see the children who:
uh I think I should put the number:
mhm (((typing))) of children who: speak their native tongue right?
mhm
tongue uh increased at home increased from two can I get rid of this part?
[yeah oh yeah that part (((laughs)))
yay (((laughs))) yeah that’s good
yeah
((reading))
this means that due to bilingual education minority group still do not forget the native language the native (((that was a correction))
tongue and it is remaining not only language but also their ethnic heritage
((stopped))
( u:h ()
this is my end of part [and] I want to say this is an important part
[mhm]
I want to say effective way to a same uh expression but ()
[mhm]
I think it still needs some part ()
you said
((reading))
this means that due to bilingual education minority groups still do not forget the native tongue and it is remaining the only language but also their ethnic heritage.
((stopped))
so you’re pretty much summing up that because they’re still learning their native tongue they’re also keeping their
There are two instances of HOCs here. In 256w, KimYun identified potential trouble her audience might have with what she had written and indicated she had difficulty paraphrasing. Candi prompted KimYun to paraphrase by asking her where she would start and, once KimYun paraphrased, indicated that the new portion was better. The prompt served as a type of cognitive scaffold to focus KimYun on the task. Candi’s indication that the new portion was better serves as motivational scaffolding. The second issue of HOC is seen in 267t where Candi asked KimYun if she was going to delete an existing portion (267t).

Process. During this tutorial, there was no evidence of the writer’s process being addressed. The closest to instance of process work occurred during Segment 3 of the Directive 2 phase where Candi advised KimYun to contact her instructor for clarification on citation. This might fall under prewriting as it is research to understand the
requirements of the assignment. The majority of process-work during this tutorial was revising and editing as is seen in the previous discussion on HOC/LOC work.

Laughter. During this tutorial, 33 instances of laughter occurred throughout the tutorial. This laughter was always initiated by KimYun and was almost always unshared laughter, especially early during the tutorial. In order for me to better understand the laughter in the tutorial, I triangulated data by asking both the writer and tutor to discuss their interpretation of the laughter present in the tutorial. Following is my analysis of laughter and how laughter may have impacted the tutorial.

Early in the tutorial, KimYun was the only interlocutor exhibiting laughter and would laugh in isolation. An example of this laughter is in the initial segments of Directive 1:

```plaintext
24t and you can stop me if you: hear anythin:⁣g that sounds ↑off or if you have any questions (right) (. ) ◦okay◦ ((tutor reading))
Hello ladies and gentleman ((This directly from the KimYun’s paper))
((tutor interrupted))
25w I (feel weir:⁣d) ((laughs nevously?)) because ((strange noise interferes with talk)) the first time to presentation: ((writer sounds panicked?))=
25t yeah that way you can hear it so: you’ll know how it sounds as au- as audience too (.) u:m okay [how
26w [is it okay to put (. ) s::::: ((drawn out ‘s’ sound))
```

KimYun’s asymmetrical laughter pattern may be seen as problematic and indicative of social distance (Glenn, 2003; Haakana, 2002). In some instances, KimYun laughed and immediately followed the laugh with “Is it clear?” (i.e., 86w and 94w). These instances of laughter → clarification question were face saving acts by KimYun in order to cope with
embarrassment or nervousness or serve as a form of apology (Foot & McCreaddie, 2006). Throughout the tutorial, KimYun exhibited these forms of laughter 11 times.

KimYun’s laughter was also a reflection of her joy and happiness during the tutorial. For example, the next example may be an example of happiness in being able to successfully paraphrase:

64w [(.) the Americans are more focused on: (.u:m (.u:m) the issue of English education for immigrants
63t okay I like the way you said that better
65w oh really? ((writer is laughing when saying this))
64t yeah (.)

Other instances of this type of laughter occurred in writer turns 79w, 223w, 240w, 285w, and 286w.

As the tutorial progressed, occurrences of shared laughter began with KimYun initiating the laughter and Candi joining in almost immediately. The first time this occurred can be seen at 265w but beginning a few conversational turns prior to the laughing:

249t mhm (.u:m (.u:m) well where would you start if you were paraphrasing?
262w u:m: (.)
250t like h-how would you sum[mar
263w [it means that (.u:m) the children who speak their language is increased (.)
251t mhm
264w fro:m (.u:m) O:h that’s [((laughs))
252t [((starts laughing slightly after writer starts))
265w so: (.u:m) [((laughs))
253t [((quick laugh))
266w m::
254t do you see the children who: (.)
267w uh. I think I should put the num↑ber: (.)
255t mhm (.)
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In this segment, Candi again had KimYun working on paraphrasing. In 264w, KimYun appeared to recognize the mistake and laughed. Candi’s laugh followed KimYun’s laugh. Again, in 265w, KimYun’s laugh was followed by Candi’s laugh. When KimYun was able to successfully paraphrase in turns 258w and 269w, both laughed after KimYun said “yay”. This type of laughter is indicative of affiliation being formed between KimYun and Candi as the tutorial progressed (Foot & McCreadie, 2006; Glenn, 2003).

KimYun exhibited far more laughter than Candi during this tutorial. For KimYun, the laughter served different purposes: it reflected embarrassment; it reflected success; it indicated happiness. Candi laughed most often in response to KimYun’s laughter and may have served more as acts of affiliation. Then again, laughter may have simply represented a recognition that a breakdown had occurred and nothing more (Partington, 2006) as seen in the following example:

245t when you were doin you had it in your own words?
258w yes (.p) I want to: but (.p) it’s [difficult yeah ((laughs))]
246t [you can (?) do that ((laughs)) okay (.p)
 u:m (.p) I would say (.p)
259w °the number of school age° children who spoke language (.p) other
 than English at home increased by ((laughs))
247t so you- you understand what it’s saying though?
260w Y↓A[:h
In this small segment, KimYun’s laughter in 258w was nervous laughter (verified during the interview), but Candi’s laughter in turn 246t and KimYun’s turn 259w are both breakdowns in the communication. Overall, KimYun initiated laughter most of the time. Based on the interviews with both KimYun and Candi, the overall effect of KimYun’s laughter was to reduce stress and establish an overall sense of affiliation between the writer and tutor.

Volubility. KimYun and Candi had a 2:1 volubility. Candi uttered 3,610 words across 301 turns for 12 WPT, and KimYun had 315 turns with 1,812 averaging 5.8 WPT. KimYun’s increased volubility is likely due, in part, to her reading portions of her presentation when the opportunity presented. Given that KimYun was working on a presentation she was to give the next day, increased volubility as a result of her reading may be expected. Had KimYun practiced her entire presentation, the result would likely have been even higher instances of volubility and may have impacted the tutor-writer volubility ratio to reflect more writer volubility than tutor volubility.

Discourse Markers. KimYun’s discourse marker use consisted primarily of um, m, oh, okay, mhm, yeah, and right for a total of 118 instances. Candi used 99 discourse markers including mhm, u-huh, okay, m, yeah, and right. Both KimYun and Candi used rising-tone right as markers of clarification and engagement. Candi’s most frequent discourse marker was mhm, which was uttered 71 times (75%) and functions as a minimal response token indicating that she was engaged in the conversation.
KimYun’s Interview

Learned. KimYun was positive in what she took away from and learned during from her tutorial with Candi. One of the most emphasized elements she took away was increased confidence in her language, especially where paraphrasing was concerned.

During the interview, KimYun indicated that the “most impressive part” of the tutorial was the instances where she was able to practice paraphrasing:

I think at the time I feel, when I started to preparize\textsuperscript{11} or summarize, I mean, Candi gave me opportunity to preparize first. So, uh so. Franking speaking, my- uh Candi - I thought that I want to Candi just give me a word - sentences to preparize because, to me, I can’t do the preparize, but (.) but I thought it’s not good. I didn’t feel confident to my preparizing. I thought that Candi want to give me a sentence for preparizing, but she gave me opportunity to do. And I started to preparize and say my word. And I realized that I can do well.

(KimYun Interview)

One instance KimYun was referring to can be seen in the following segment:

\begin{verbatim}
62t  yes (.) and you wouldn’t need and (.) okay and then you go and say
   ((reading))
   the issue of English education for immigrants (\textendash h) was
   gathering more strength (.)
   ((stopped))
   so you: (.) you’re saying that (.) [u:m
64w   [(. the Americans are more
   focused on: (.) u:m (. the issue of English education for
   immigrants
63t   okay I like the way you said that better
65w   oh really? ((writer is laughing when saying this))
64t   yeah (.)
66w   ((writing)) Americans are m\textsuperscript{\textdagger}ore (.) focused on (.) the: (.). issue of
   (.) Americans are more focused on the issue of English education
   for immigrants=
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{11}KimYun consistently pronounced “paraphrase” as “preparize” in both the interview and tutorial.
While this appears to be a reformulation of KimYun’s original sentence, the original as read by Candi in 62t was a direct copy from the Internet resource KimYun had taken into the tutorial. Turn 64w is where she was able to paraphrase and is one specific instance she discussed during her interview.

**Difficulties.** KimYun reported that one of the largest difficulties in this tutorial was time in relation to what she would like to accomplish during the tutorial. She pointed to the limited time as impeding her ability to ask more detailed questions on grammatical aspects of her writing:

> If I have a lot of time to tutorial, then I will talk more about the grammar then. If tutor check just like “put a ‘the’ here and put a ‘the’ in here” and then, if I have a lot of time, I will ask why: I should have to put the ‘the’ here. But the lack of time made me just hurried to go on the next. And just- that made me just put a “the” and “a” passively.

(KimYun Interview)

Here, KimYun specifically mentioned time in relation to grammar correction. Candi’s direct correction of grammatical errors did not allow KimYun to be an active participant in the process.

During initial portion of the Directive 1 phase, Candi took control of the tutorial as can be seen in this segment:

> O↓kay (...) u:m (...) how ‘bout I’ll read it out loud=
> okay=
> and you can stop me if you: hear anythin:ɡ that sounds ↑off or if you have any questions (right) (. ) ◦okay◦
> ((tutor reading))
> Hello ladies and gentleman ((This directly from the KimYun’s paper))
((tutor interrupted))

25w I need (feel weird) (laughs nervously?) because ((strange noise interferes with talk)) the first time to presentation: ((writer sounds panicked?))=

25t yeah that way you can hear it so: you’ll know how it sounds as audience too (.) um okay [how

When questioned about how this decision for Candi to read was made, KimYun said:

I think because she is tutor. And sometimes when students come in, student feel embarrassed about another environment. And she think she might thought it will be shy - shy to say my presentation myself. So I think she read first. But.... I actually I want to read because Candi read a whole thing, and she wanted me to stop if you want to check something. But I think - I thought I need to check more a lot of time, so, to me, when Candi follow the line, it was difficult to saw (say) stop or something like this, so I want to read.

(KimYun Interview)

The initial negotiation of the reading appeared to have been reached more as a result of KimYun’s politeness and deference to Candi as the tutor and authority (Phuong-Mai, et al., 2005; Thonus, 1998a, 2001).

Another difficulty KimYun encountered was a result of language difficulties in relation to her ability to express her meaning to Candi in a clear way as well as, to a lesser extent, not understanding some of the questions Candi asked. Specifically, KimYun had difficulty understanding a line of questioning where Candi asked how KimYun would read “ACT,” which she had consistently written with each letter capitalized versus “act”:

124t °u:m° (.) okay (.) °this act°- you’re going to say act or you’re going to say A C T? because you have it all in capitalization (.)

127w °u:m=

125t when you read it?

128w how can I: say: in: °u:sual° (.)
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KimYun felt this was a difficult line of questioning simply because this was an oral presentation; she would have read the word, not spelled it out, regardless of capitalization and did not fully understand why the capitalization made a difference.

KimYun reported gaining confidence as a writer with article usage, introductions to speech and paragraph transitions, and, most importantly for her, paraphrasing. Although she was embarrassed when Candi initially began reading, KimYun grew more comfortable. As she grew more comfortable, KimYun began taking opportunities to read her own presentation and asked questions more easily as a result of her reading.

Furthermore, KimYun felt that being an active member in the tutorial would allow her to benefit from the session. This is evidenced when she discussed how actively paraphrasing portions of her presentation resulted in her being more confident in her language skills.

**Candi’s Interview**

The tutorial here represents a very different type of tutorial in terms of both what was worked on and how she approached the tutorial. During her description of how she regularly conducts tutorials, Candi indicated that her typical approach is to avoid working on grammar. When asked why she chose to focus on grammar so closely, Candi said that she did not want KimYun to deliver a presentation with grammatical inaccuracies. Candi expressed difficulty “reading” and resulting discomfort with NNES writers, but KimYun was “more readable because she laughed a lot... and seemed a little embarrassed at
certain parts.” Therefore, Candi attempted to make KimYun more comfortable by not refusing to work on any one part of the presentation.

*Difficulties/Frustrations.* Candi encountered a few difficulties in this tutorial including from working with an unfamiliar product, a lack of understanding of grammar and difficulty explaining grammar to the writer, language difficulties, and her own perception of the writer and NNES writers in general.

The nature of this particular assignment, a presentation versus a paper, initially caused Candi difficulty.

I don’t know, it was a different- definitely way different than I’ve ever done. Most people bring in just, uh, papers. They don’t bring in something for a presentation. They do bring in personal statements and stuff, but nothing that’s really going to be- I’ve never really worked with anyone who’s actually going to be speaking and not someone else be reading.

(Candi Interview)

She was accustomed to working on more traditional paper-based product students brought into the writing center such as papers for classes and personal statements. This was her first presentation, and Candi handled it as she reported handling a more “traditional” assignment.

Grammar has been traditionally an area of difficulty for Candi in this and other tutorials. Her avoidance of grammar stems mainly from her lack of comfort with grammar and is not related to the writing center ideology of delaying grammar work until the end of the tutorial: “I’m comfortable writing. I’m not comfortable explaining it [grammar] to really anyone. Not even like a native English speaker” (Candi Interview).

In order to avoid confusing writers, Candi typically avoids grammar-work in her tutorials. In order to mitigate this lack of ability, Candi reported that she typically seizes control of
the tutorial. During this tutorial, Candi modified her typical behavior of avoiding grammar and opted to directly correct the grammatical errors with the rationale that KimYun had a lot of errors and she (Candi) just corrected them because she felt that’s what KimYun wanted. When I asked Candi why she chose to work on grammar in this way, she reported:

I tried to help her a little bit more with grammar than I normally do just because it’s something more like - I wouldn’t want to send her out there thinking that she had everything right and then go up in front of her class and feel like - not so I tried to help her.... So this one may be a little bit more of a teacher, but not so much because I wasn’t actually teaching her any grammar. I was like pointing out certain specific instances.

(Candi Interview)

She went on to add that this combination of time constraints – potentially spending too much time assisting KimYun work on grammar and working on other issues KimYun indicated – was one of the reasons she pressed to read the presentation versus allowing KimYun to read. Candi gave another reason for reading the presentation aloud:

Because I figured I: would stumble over her mistakes more than she would because I know if I read some aloud that’s mine, I’ll miss mistakes completely because I know what I wanted to say. So even if I know- like I know I need an article somewhere. Sometimes I won’t write because I wrote it fast, and I’ll still miss it. And later on I’ll get a paper back and be like “Oh, wow. I didn’t write the word ‘the’ there.” So, I feel like if someone else read it they’d read it- ‘cus they have to think about it and they have to actually read it and not so much know what they’re saying. They have to, like, process a little more than I would.

This technique of reading aloud was something Candi previously learned during a staff training session. Blau, Hall, and Sparks (2002) point to a standard practice of having NES writers read their material aloud. While more fluent NNES writers may also be able to ‘edit by ear’, not all NNES writers benefit from this practice and find that tutors reading
the papers in these situations appear to be more beneficial for writers (Blau, et al., 2002; Powers, 1993).

The only difficulties Candi mentioned in understanding KimYun’s spoken English was when KimYun discussed how she was unable to correctly paraphrase:

I think also the problem was that she didn’t really know how to pronounce paraphrasing at first. She might have been a little shy to ask about it. She was stumbling over the word so she was a little... I knew what she was saying, but I think that all of that might have added to her anxiety maybe? (Candi Interview)

Instead of saying “paraphrase”, KimYun said “preparize”. Candi may not have recognized KimYun’s mispronunciation of the word the first time:

Instead of looking at the paraphrasing, which is what KimYun was concerned with, Candi focused on surface-level errors. It was not until KimYun’s next use of “preparize” that Candi seemed to recognize what KimYun meant:

Instead of saying “paraphrase”, KimYun said “preparize”. Candi may not have recognized KimYun’s mispronunciation of the word the first time:
Small items like Candi forming an opinion that KimYun was anxious about the tutorial because of KimYun’s inability to correctly pronounce “paraphrase” was another difficulty for Candi in terms of “reading” KimYun and her reactions. Candi’s initial impression was that KimYun “was a little unsure of herself, so I thought maybe if I took control of the tutorial, then it would just – we would be able to get through the whole thing” (Candi Interview). This may explain why there was no negotiation of who would read the tutorial. Reflecting back on the tutorial, however, Candi said, “But now thinking back, maybe she was more confident than I gave her credit for? She kept giggling so I just felt like she was kind of not there at first. So, I wasn’t sure if I wanted to give her, like – and sometimes they don’t know what to do” (Candi Interview).

*Writer Take-Away.* When first asked what she thought KimYun took away from the tutorial, Candi laughed and said, “I hope... that she was more confident when it came to her presentation because it was not a conventional tutorial” (Candi Interview).

**Overall Summary**

This case reveals a tutorial where the writer and tutor worked directly on product – a class presentation in this case – and entailed a great many checks for clarification, tutor suggestions, and direct corrections; there was no discussion about the writing process, and the majority of concerns addressed were LOCs. As they worked, KimYun would ask whether a section was “okay”, and Candi would typically offer a suggestion. Candi, in the course of reading the presentation, asked for clarification, offered suggestions for improvement, and provided direct grammar corrections. Laughter was
also a noticeable feature in this tutorial. This laughter reflected different communicative effects KimYun experienced throughout the tutorial and allowed Candi to have a better understanding of issues with which KimYun might be experiencing. KimYun would have appreciated opportunities to be more actively engaged in the tutorial, especially where grammar was concerned. Candi, in looking back on the tutorial, thought she could have provided more opportunities to KimYun to both read and work on grammar. The primary issue with the grammar, however, was Candi’s inability to explain grammatical rules. This inability likely resulted in her direct correction versus working with KimYun to identify and understand the grammatical errors in the presentation. Both considered this to be a productive tutorial, especially portions where KimYun was able to practice paraphrasing.

**Recommendations**

KimYun made several suggestions for how to improve this tutorial as well as tutorials in general. First, she believes that increased wait-time when a tutor asks a question will allow NNES students to formulate their responses. She said, “I think uh even though the student feel difficulty to express in English, tutor need to wait what students want to talking about. And tutor should give student opportunity to talk more in a tutorial I think” (KimYun Interview). Another thing KimYun feels would benefit NNES writers in tutorials is the opportunity for scaffolded grammar instruction with explanation of grammatical rules when necessary. She said: “I mean, tutor more active to check grammar. But I think tutor should explain why this grammar is working here. And students also need to do the active to know about the grammar.” This statement refers to
earlier comments KimYun made regarding to her desire to be more active in the grammar correction portion of the tutorial.

For tutors, Candi made some suggestions she thought might improve tutorials with NNES writers. Her first suggestion dealt with improving tutors’ knowledge of grammar. She recognized that her current practice of “guess and check”, where she looks for something that “doesn’t look right” and “figures out the correction” (Candi Interview), led to directly correcting the writer’s work versus assisting the writer with understanding the grammar. She felt that grammar training would assist tutors in handling situations where writers needed to focus on surface-features of their writing. Another suggestion Candi made was to increase tutors’ understanding how differences in language impact writing:

I think that might help me a little bit to understand how they think about things. Not how they think about things but how they think about things in relation to their language and how it’s different because that might help when you’re looking at a sentence.  

(Candi Interview)

Although Candi identified this as a language issue, what she discussed here focused more on culture and language. She appears to be speaking more of culturally relative experience that might impact a writer’s understanding of how sentences are constructed in English versus their L1.

**Case 4: Hyuk and Jack Tutorials 4a and 4b**

**Writer and Tutor Background**

*Hyuk: Writer*. Hyuk is a male Korean international student enrolled as a sophomore and majoring in accounting. His experience in the U.S. is the most extensive

---

12 Hyuk and Jack met three times to work on Hyuk’s paper. Only the first and last tutorial sessions were captured and analyzed for this research.
of all writers as he attended an international high school in the Midwest for three years. His total time in the U.S. was five (5) years at the time of the tutorial. Despite attending an international high school in the U.S., he is considered an International student by the university. Hyuk scored 27 in writing on the Internet-based Test of English as a Second Language (iBT) and had a composite score of 105. His total time studying English amounted to approximately 12 years both in Korea and in the U.S. During high school, he had regular contact with NES peers and was placed in regular academic classes for the last two years of his high school career. Out of all of the NNES participants, he had the most experience writing in English as a result of attending high school in the U.S. Prior to the first tutorial recorded for this research, the only time Hyuk had visited the writing center was the day before to meet with the ESL consultant. At the time of the second recorded session, Hyuk had visited the writing center a total of four times.

**Jack: Tutor.** Jack is a male English PhD candidate focusing on Shakespearean studies at the university where this research takes place. He entered the PhD program directly from his undergraduate studies, where he was also an English major at a different university. In total, he has worked as a tutor in the WC for six semesters: one semester during his first year in his PhD studies and the past four semesters as the senior tutor. Prior to his experience in this WC, he worked as a tutor in his previous university’s writing center for three years. The majority of his training was during his tenure as a WC tutor as an undergraduate. While he could not recall specific material covered in the one-semester tutor training class preparing him to tutor, he did indicate that the coursework covered similar material found in popular tutor training texts such as The Longman Guide to Writing Center Theory and Practice, The St. Martin’s Sourcebook for Writing
Tutors, and The Bedford Guide for Writing Tutors. In his undergraduate career, Jack was a writing tutor at his previous university and received a three-day training session oriented towards PhD tutors which features North’s (1984) “The idea of a writing center” and Brooks’s (1991) “Minimalist tutoring: Making the student do all work”. Prior to working in writing centers, Jack’s exposure to NNESs was minimal. His first real exposure to this population came with his undergraduate tutor training where he read “a handful of articles... dealing directly with ESL tutoring” (Jack Interview). He could not recall how many he NNESs he worked with during his undergraduate tutoring experience, but he estimated that approximately 40% of his current tutorial work deals with NNES writers.

Jack described his both his philosophy and ideal view of a high-quality tutorial as being a student-centered approach with “dynamic conversation”, which Jack defined as “a fairly consistent back-and-forth between writer and tutor... about writing” (Jack Interview). This conversation, he says, does not have to be limited to the paper. He believes that a more realistic role of the tutor is to pose to the writer Socratic-type questions about the writing and assignment being discussed in order to assist the writer in personally developing a better understanding of the writing they bring into the WC as well as a deeper understanding of the process versus the tutor simply giving information.

**Summary of Case 4 Tutorial A (T4a): Hyuk and Jack**

Hyuk scheduled a tutorial during the initial stages of his writing in order to better understand the poem he had selected the previous day with the ESL consultant. His primary goal for this tutorial was to work on brainstorming and understanding the poem he had selected as well as create a proposal to his instructor explaining his paper topic.
The tutorial mainly consisted of Jack discussing the meaning of the poem with Hyuk and providing cultural historical background information. During the tutorial, Jack had Hyuk attempted to create a thesis statement which they then worked off. Also during the tutorial, another tutor, Jane, joined in the conversation three times; Jack and Jane were the primary interlocutors during these times, discussing different aspects of the poem, while Hyuk was largely absent from the transcript. The tutorial ended with Jack instructing Hyuk to read the poem several times and work on finishing the proposal he needed to have complete the next day.

Case 4 Tutorial A Breakdown

OPENING
T → Establishing what writer is working on

DIAGNOSIS
T → Segment 1: Reviewing assignment (3 turns)
T → Segment 2: Asking writer where he is in terms of the writing process (3 turns)
T → Segment 3: Understanding where writer is in the writing process (3 turns)
[PROC]
T → Segment 4: Asking what writer thought of poem (6 turn)
W→ Segment 5: Indicates that he needs to find sources (8 turns)
T → Segment 6: Revisiting assignment requirements and need for thesis (2 turns)
[PROC]

DIRECTIVE 1
T → Segment 1: Poem reading (2 turns)
W → Segment 2: Discussion of previous assignments (2 turns)
T → Segment 3: Poem work discussing poetic devises and rational for poem (65 turns)
T → Segment 4: Discussion research - process (17 turns) [PROC]
T → Segment 5: Revisiting assignment requirements (1 turn) [PROC]
T → Segment 6: Claim work in relation to poem, questions provided by tutor and writer left to write a thesis (16 turns) [PROC]

T → Segment 7: Discussion of time-line - when assignment is due (5 turns)

T → Segment 8: Discussion of writers new claim and additional poem work (15 turns) [HOC]

T → Segment 9: Additional tutor invited by tutor into tutorial - both tutors discuss the poem with Jack summarizing the discussion between both tutors (14 turns)

T → Segment 10: Attempt to connect writer’s experience with poem (3 turns) [PROC]

T2 → Segment 11: Tutor 2 re-enters tutorial with both tutors interpreting poem (14 turns)

T → Segment 12: Interpreting poem - irony (4 turns)

CLOSING 1 (attempt; member-checked)

T → Segment 1: Initial Closing - suggestions for writer after tutorial (9 turns) [PROC]

DIRECTIVE 2

T2 → Segment 1: Tutor 2 reopens tutorial and discusses additional interpretation of poem and her possible reaction (12 turns)

T → Segment 2: Summarizes discussion with second tutor (10 turns)

CLOSING 2

T → Segment 1: Suggestions for post-tutorial writer action (11 turns) [PROC]

T → Segment 2: Tutor relates personal story (2 turns)

T → Segment 3: Gauging writer understanding and reinforcement of writer’s next actions (7 turns) [HOC]

T → Segment 4: Invitation for future work and tutor name providing (5 turns)

T → Segment 5: Time-line and next action reminders and leave-taking (2 turns)

REPORT

T → Requests that writer complete writer check-in/out form
Discourse Phases (T4a). During this tutorial, Jack introduced the majority of the topics as can be seen in the outline. Of the 29 identified topic segments, only two were initiated by Hyuk, and that occurred during segment 5 of the Diagnosis stage and segment 2 of the Directive 1 stage.

The Opening phase of this tutorial was absent from this tutorial except for the tutor asking the writer what he had come into the writing center for. No names were exchanged during this point, and no small talk occurred. Instead, Jack moved directly onto the Diagnosis stage of the tutorial. Talk in this phase consisted of reviewing the assignment and asking Hyuk what stage of the writing process he was in as well as what he thought of the poem. Hyuk indicated he needed to find sources. This led to Hyuk’s initial problem of having no thesis statement. Hyuk’s only opinion of the poem at that time was that it was “intense” and that it had to do with the death of a boy.

The end of the Diagnosis phase lead to the Directive 1 phase where Jack read the poem for the first time. In an effort to better understand Hyuk as a writer, Jack briefly explored Hyuk’s previous writing and how he did on them. For the next 65 turns, in Segment 3, Jack asked a series of 20 questions\(^\text{13}\) in order to help Hyuk in exploring the poem. Most of these questions were probing questions in order to get Hyuk to elaborate on his responses:

\[
\begin{align*}
50t & \text{ so:: (1.80) given the way the poem ends (2.91) what could } \\
&\text{ Frost be saying about death?} \\
&\text{ (1.91)} \\
50w & \text{ u::m (3.99) it suddenly just come} \\
51t & \text{ you think sudden?} \\
51w & \text{ yeah:} \\
&\text{ (1.58)}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{13}\) This is the actual question count from tutorial and not a figure of speech.
and I think- where: where could you look at in the poem to: support that claim that death: just happened? 

: 

: 

mm: and like uh death is very usual it's what? 

: 

common usual oh usual okay= yeah usual 

and why would you say that?

Jack recorded Hyuk’s responses throughout this segment; Hyuk later used those responses to draft a preliminary thesis later in the tutorial. Questions like these served as cognitive scaffolding where Jack in order to increase Hyuk’s engagement in the writing task. Once they established that “nobody cares” appeared to be a reoccurring theme in the poem, Jack explored possible ways for Hyuk to research (Segment 4). After revisiting the assignment, Jack left Hyuk in segment 6 to draft a preliminary thesis based on the notes Jack had been taking. Segments 7 and 8 had Jack and Hyuk discussing the time-line for the assignment (the next day) and discussed what Hyuk had written.

Segments 9 and 11 of the Directive 1 phase saw an additional tutor, Jane, enter the tutorial at Jack’s request. Each of these segments lasted 14 turns for a total of 28 turns. The conversation in segment 9 was largely between Jack and Jane about why the use of a chainsaw\(^{14}\) versus a regular saw or axe. Hyuk was largely absent from the conversation and only responded to three questions directed towards him:

ok\(^{14}\) you could be cutting wood with an axe. anything else? handsaw:? 

---

\(^{14}\) During this tutorial, the tutors misidentified the tool Frost used as being a chainsaw, a hand-held machine, versus a buzz saw, a stationary machine.
157w yeah hand[saw]
10T2 o[kay. what's- what's the difference between uh chainsaw (1.05) and an axe (1.36) and a regular handsaw?

158w sound?
(0.68)
11T2 s-sound partly (0.50) also the spee:d=
160t it's a ma[chine
12T2 [an ability to contro:l
(0.43)
161t it's an industrial ma[chine
13T2 [it's in a machi:ne (0.61) if the kid would have been using (0.32)an axe (0.70) you think he would have lost his ha:nd?
(0.78)

159w u:m (0.62) yeah but (0.29) I don't think he's gonna die
(1.11)
14T2 er: you cut off your ha:nd you [cut off your hand
162t [it's very- it's very difficult to cut off your hand with an axe while chopping wood
15T2 yea:h I mean seri- have you ever chopped wood?
163t maybe your [foot
160w [yeah
16T2 yeah but can y- yeah you could do your foot right?

161w yeah

Prior to this excerpt, Hyuk backchanneled once in the 9 turns. After this his last response in 161w, Hyuk did not participate in the discussion, which carried on for four more turns. Hyuk participated in six of the 14 turns, but only four of them were in responses other than backchannels.

During segment 10, Jack reiterated what was discussed in segment 9 and attempted to connect Hyuk with the poem by asking whether cutting wood was something he would be doing as a childhood. At the end of this segment, Jack asked what Hyuk did as a child. Jane re-entered the tutorial in segment 11 with “you didn’t have chores to do?” (22T2). This began another fourteen-turn segment. Hyuk was even less
active in this segment, having utterances only six times spanning three conversational
turns with his longest non-minimal response utterances ranging from 3 to 1 words in
length: “maybe garbage but-” (171w); “in the city” (172w); and “Seoul” (174t). The other
three utterances consisted of two backchannels and one affirmation in the form of yeah.
Jack had twice as many turns at 12, and Jane had 21 turns. Eleven of the turns were
between Jack and Jane. In segment 12 of the Directive 1 stage, Jack summarized the
discussion, and Hyuk and Jack established that the poem used some form of irony.

Closing 1 began with Jack saying “so those are the things I’m going to send you
home with to think about (0.9) okay?” (196t). He then provided Hyuk with a list of ideas
to focus on after the tutorial:

197t  so: the- so: (0.32) what I want you to think about i:s (1.23) this
poem largely can be divided into two parts (0.53) the scene in
which the boy is working on the sa- on the saw and the scene in
which he dies (0.98) okay (0.38) so what I want ch- (0.29) you:-
the question that you need to think answer and I can't really answer
it for you
185w  yeah
198t  i:s (1.16) wh:at the- e- the general question is poem- poem mean to
you (0.48) and why:. and of course you have to find evidence for it throughout (1.16)
186w  °m°
199t  secondly or more specifically i:s you could deal with theme (0.61)
so what is Frost saying about death (1.89) and how does
this community deal with death?
(2.67)
199t  that make sense?
187w  yeah can I uh=

Hyuk copied these as Jack repeated them. At the end of this segment, Jack reinforced an
erlier statement Hyuk had made about the poem being dramatic, and this transitioned
into the Directive 2 stage, segment 1, with Jane returning when her name was mentioned.
Jane offered additional interpretation of the poem over 14 turns. Again, the discussion here was between Jack and Jane with Hyuk’s utterances being “yeah” twice. In Segment 2 of Directive 2, Jack summarized the new information discussed by Jane and Jack.

Further interpretation of the poem occurred during this section with Jack focusing on the last lines of the poem and the reaction, especially the use of the buzz saw and the family’s reaction to the boy’s death:\(^{15}\):

218t [why the- why: the buzz-saw (1.21) u:m why: does Frost. describe the buzz-saw like he does (1.35) he personifies it it snar:ls (1.10) okay it jumps (0.77) alright? (2.37) and another question that you: might want to consider i:s: (1.23) how do we read the la:st two lines?

(3.50)

196w u:m yea:h I mean (1.10) does it saying that (1.26) like uh does it mean that- so they can't do anything anymore and thus [they:

219t [well no more to build on there what- what could that mean?

(4.80)

197w u:m

(0.41)

220t kay so here=

198w yeah

221t third line from the end- boy dies (2.27) no more to build on

(1.20)

199w that's it?

(0.70)

222t °well that's interes[ting°

200w [it means (0.34) that's it.

223t there's nothing=

201w yeah=

224t that you can't- there's no:- all of his possibilities have been (1.16.) snubbed out

(1.85)

\(^{15}\) The interpretation of the family’s reaction came out of the last portion with Jane. In fact, the only time a member of the character’s family is mentioned was when the boy’s sister came out to retrieve the boy for dinner. The family was not mentioned at all. Jack later discussed with me how this interpretation may have led Hyuk down the incorrect path. This was eventually corrected in the second, unrecorded session, of this three-series tutorial.
202w  ah so he (0.69) d↑one?
225t  he's done=
203w  oh (say?)
226t  it’s not no more to build- when we say to build on someth↑i:ng
we mean to develop=
204w  oh =
227t  to grow (1.09) but it’s usually more an architectural sense or
construction sense to build on bu: we can also say to build on our
knowledge (0.59) things like this (·h) so it's- it's there's nothing
more it's (0.65) snuffed ou:t (0.81) out. out.

((reading))
and they: since they were not the one dead turned to their affairs
((stopped reading))
that: it's really the crucial thing (0.58) to interpret in this poem is the
families reaction (0.73) is it because they can't deal with it? (1.25.)
or because this is common (2.79) I: can't make that decision for
you unfortunately

Jack again employed cognitive scaffolding in 219t with “what could that mean?” This
further focused Hyuk’s attention to aspects of the poem.

Based on this, Jack began the Closing 2 phase and directs Hyuk to do a few things
after the tutorial. First, he asked Hyuk to read the poem aloud a couple of times and that
this is a “general recommendation” he gives to both NES and NNES writers. Second, he
asked Hyuk to think about the meaning for the following lines:

Leaped out at the boy's hand, or seemed to leap—
He must have given the hand. However it was, neither refused the meeting.

Directly after this, though, Jack appeared to have interpreted the lines for Hyuk:

231t  ((initial portion omitted))
     what is that suggesting? (4.13) so in one ca- in one case the s- saw
leaps at the boys hand (0.78) like a a dog snapping at a stick
(1.08)
209w  so who: were his the meeting?
(0.83)
that's my question I don't know here is says he must have given the hand however it was neither refused the meeting whatever the scenario was this was- it's almost like it was meant to be

so chain- chainsaw and his: hand?

so it's like- is: the active agent the chainsaw leaping at the boy’s hand or is the boy: reaching

so it's the seems to leap so there's doubt he must have given the hand in together- it's like he's shaking hands with the thing=

ah: so no one knows. what really happened?= nope

and that adds to your how could that add to your argument about death being sudden?

random (?)

it just happens and we can never fully explain it

yeah

then we get to the end depending on how you interpret it and they move on with their affairs because it's so sudden. it's so shocking and all they have is their work

Although Jack asked a question in for Hyuk to look at later, he appeared to answer it in. This type of tutor question/tutor answer pairing occurred throughout the entire tutorial. In the last two segments, Jack reinforced that there was a great deal Hyuk could
do with the poem and invited him to visit again. It was in the last segment that provided
his name and only after Hyuk asked.

Summary of Case Study 4 Tutorial B (T4b): Hyuk and Jack

This was the third meeting between Jack and Hyuk and began with conversation
about the writing Hyuk brought in and focused Hyuk’s generalization of Robert Frost’s
themes across poems instead of an analysis of the specific poem. Throughout the tutorial,
Jack asked a series of questions, took notes, and returned to the poem and Hyuk’s writing
in order to facilitate Hyuk’s understanding of the poem and revision of the product. Jack
and Hyuk also accessed the Internet to obtain more resources to use in Hyuk’s paper.
Three-quarters into the tutorial, Hyuk was given 10 minutes alone to revise his thesis
statement based on their discussion. The remainder of the tutorial was spent refining
Hyuk’s thesis and looking for supporting information. The first five minutes of the
tutorial was not recorded. Excluding the time Jack gave Hyuk to write, the total talk time
recorded in the tutorial was 34 minutes.

Case 4 Tutorial B Breakdown

OPENING
Unrecorded b/c tutorial was in progress

DIAGNOSIS
Unrecorded b/c tutorial was in progress

DIRECTIVE 1

T → Segment 1: Reading opening paragraph with clarification statements intermixed
(8 turns) [LOC]

T → Segment 2: Clarification of nature (24 turns) [HOC]

T → Segment 3: Poem work - listing aspects of poem (66 turns) [PROC]

W → Segment 4: Resources - locating and discussing additional resources (14 turns)
[PROC]
T → Segment 5: Referencing literature and other culture to assist understanding in relation to poem (13 turns) [PROC]
T → Segment 6: Organizing thoughts in outline/brainstorming (16 turns) [PROC]
T → Segment 7: Offer to writer to work on paragraph and left to write (6 turns) [HOC]
T → Segment 8: Acknowledging and exploring new thesis/claim (9 turns) [HOC]
CLOSING 1
T → Tutor asks writer if he has enough to work with (1 turn)
DIRECTIVE 2
W → Segment 1: Revision work - deleting paragraph (4 turns) [HOC]
W → Segment 2: Revision work - adding additional thoughts (6 turns) [HOC]
CLOSING 2
T → Segment 1: Indication that writer seems ready to work his own (5 turns)
W → Segment 2: Discussing steps necessary to finish the paper (24 turns) [PROC]
T → Segment 3: Request for paperwork (2 turns)
T → Segment 4: Leave-taking (1 turn)
REPORT
None recoded

Discourse phases (T4b). The opening and diagnosis stages of this tutorial were not captured on digital recording. Nonetheless, there are clear differences during this second recoded tutorial between Hyuk and Jack from the first tutorial discussed. Namely, this tutorial reveals Hyuk as more active in initiating topics in the directive and closing stages. Out of 15 segments, Hyuk initiated four. Based on the interviews with Hyuk and Jack, the opening and diagnostic stages were minimal and consisted of basic greetings and agreement to work on what Hyuk had written. Jack indicated that there was no need for a diagnostic stage since this was a continuation of a previous tutorial. The first two
segments in the Directive 1 phase dealt with Jack reading Hyuk’s first paragraph and asking clarification questions about the paragraph and about the use of nature described in the paragraph.

Segment 3, which was initiated by Jack and lasted 66 turns, saw a return to interpreting the poem. In this segment, Jack addressed the interplay of nature and technology by asking Hyuk questions. Jack also made corrections to things that Hyuk had addressed in his paragraph but were not in the poem:

37t what is directly in front of us?
(3.08)
41w u:m
38t [what does the majority of the poem talk about?
(2.47)
42w boy and chains aw?
39t ye: ah. (0.85) it’s like there’s that nice idealistic s- and now. pull back up your paper for a second let’s take a look at it (4.04) okay (4.54) ((tutor reading softly to self)) (6.08) cus you tell me right here ((reading))
he consistently showed the struggle of human beings with nature yet he also showed the possibility of man’s control of nature ((stopped))
(h) I don’t see this emerging in the poem
(0.46)
43w yeah: (1.94) «yeah» ↓yeah you are right
(0.75)
40t what’s the relationship between- I mean (1.08) so we have VA:ST (0.55) going back to: (0.45) so: it’s va:st (0.33) how else would you descri- how else (1.10) do you see nature presented in the poem? so vast in one part
(0.88)
44w um it show big mountain: (communty?)
41t m-hm:=
45w the ((cough))) scene of Vermont?

16 During the interview, Jack indicated that this was the first time Hyuk had brought in written product. Their second tutorial, which was not captured for this study, focused on discussing the poem.
m’kay: so scene. alright is: it pretty?

(0.45)
42t m’kay: so scene. (3.11) alright (1.32) is: it pretty?
(1.35)
46w ye:↓ah=
43t ↓yeah (3.99) preste:ne (0.66) and this is a:ll in the back↑ground
(0.67)
47w yeah
(0.26)
44t to wha:t?
(1.22)
48w to:: (1.61) the dea:th of (0.52) boy?
(1.03)
45t in the grand scheme of things the death of the boy:
(0.53)
49w ↓yeah
(1.10)
46t bu:t also: (0.60) the machi:ne
(0.88)
50w yea:[h
47t [chai:nsaw (5.28) and actually (0.98) what is the chainsaw ↓doing? (2.33) before: before it cuts off his hand?
51w cutting wood ((pronounced w/o the w))=
48t where does wood come from?
52w nature
(2.15)
49t think there might be something else to that?
(0.73)
53w ↓yeah like (1.08) controlling him? I mean exploitin:g the nature?
50t ↓good (5.28) and let’s go back to- to: u:m that topic of personification (0.76) how is the: how is the chainsaw described?
(2.87)
54w u::h (2.61) very u:m (0.88) violent?
51t violent
55w yeah (0.26) basteel ((bestial))
(1.22)
52t ex↑cel↓lent. (4.22) it’s almost like it’s consu↓ming the wood=
56w yeah=
53t ea:ting it
In this extended excerpt, Jack asked Hyuk for clarification about the poem. As seen at the end of 39t, Jack identified an area in the paragraph Hyuk had written that was not in the poem. The series of questions are further examples of cognitive scaffolding on Jack’s part to involve Hyuk in analyzing the poem. Through the entire series, Jack recorded Hyuk’s responses on notes which Hyuk used to construct a new thesis statement. This note-taking occurred in turns 42t, 43t, 50t, 51t, and 53t.

Jack also reintroduced what was discussed with Jane during the first tutorial and corrected the notion of the family introduced in the first tutorial by saying that the family really was not present in the poem. This segment ended with Jack discussing technology and reinforcing Hyuk’s idea of technology being personified as a “demonic figure”:

74t to meet the boy’s hand it’s a- like a do:g snapping at a bone (1.21) okay? or an attacker (1.01) so: (2.04) may:be this poem isn’t necessarily about man’s struggle with (1.17) nat↓ure. (1.30) maybe it’s about something else

75t per↓haps (0.43)

76t I think there’s a point to be ha:d when the fact is that the-the-the buzzsaw is the- the mea:ns of the boy:’s death. (0.69) and the fact that: (0.69) Frost personifies it like this demonic figure

Here Jack focuses on the poem being on the struggle of man with technology and not the struggle of man with nature.

This led into segment 4, which Hyuk initiated by discussing research Jack had asked him to conduct between their second and third (current) tutorial. This led to discussion on additional research to assist Hyuk in forming his arguments and focused on
using the Internet as a source. This segment, while initiated by Hyuk, had Jack asking poem-based questions to elicit responses from Hyuk and led into segment 7, which Jack initiated, where Jack drew a diagram (see Appendix I) to assist Hyuk in writing a new thesis statement.

Jack initiated segment 7 in Directive 1 phase by asking Hyuk, “Do you want to spend some time seeing if you can write that up?” But it was Hyuk, in 145w, who said, “yeach I mean can I: (0.82) reconstruct my thesis statement?” This indicates that Hyuk was also dissatisfied with what he had written and wanted to create an improved product. Jack left Hyuk to write for 10 minutes. When he returned in segment 8, it is clear that Jack thought Hyuk’s information had improved:

144t what’d you come up with?
(·)
151w (maybe it this how: our destination) and be kind of fragile from alienation (attending?) from community and nature by (machine?)
145t (((claps four times)) y↓es:
152w is it? (laughs))
146t ↓YES THAT’S a CLAI:M (1.38) that’s the type of (0.85) l-
language and stance that you need to occupy and you do that within the confines of this particular poem- I know Frost will prob’ly write about nature or machines differently in other poems but (·h) this is the artifact that you’re dealing with
(0.40)
153w ↓yeah

In 145t, Jack clapped right after reading Hyuk’s revised thesis statement. In 146t, he emphatically indicates that Hyuk has both made a claim that the claim focused only on the poem Hyuk was working with. This was in contrast to Hyuk’s previous work which attempted to integrate Frost’s other work and other ideas that did not fit the poem with which he was working. After exploring this new thesis, Jack begins to close out the
tutorial session with “alright? do you think you can work (0.58) with ↑that to get something to↑gether?” (161t).

Hyuk reopened the tutorial\textsuperscript{17} with “u:m ↓yeah: but do you think I need to erase u:m second paragraph?” (166w). This resulted in a 10-turn exchange (segments 1 and 2 of Directive 2) where Hyuk wrote and revised and solicited Jack’s assistance. Jack initiated Closing 2 with, “I think you got it (1.22) you finally got to it” (173t). The remaining segments dealt with finishing the paper with Hyuk asking Jack if he thought he could finish the essay. Jack’s recommendations included Hyuk getting the thesis statement finalized, writing the minimum to turn in the assignment, to asking for an extension. This was followed by Jack reminding Hyuk to complete the writer check-in/out form and leave-taking.

\textit{Tutorial 4a HOC/LOC Work}. Hyuk entered into the first tutorial without any written product, so focus on higher-order or lower-order concerns was impossible. The entire tutorial centered on assisting Hyuk understand the poem. In a sense, this entire tutorial could be classified as prewriting. Throughout the tutorial, Jack aided Hyuk in understanding the poem and brainstorming ideas to focus on. While Jack did have Hyuk freewrite between Segment 6 and 7, the claim Hyuk developed, “This poem trying to showing how our life is fragile and void,” was addressed for one tutor-writer exchange where Jack asked Hyuk to explain why he chose “void”. This segment dealt more with Jack further explaining the poem Hyuk. This was the only instance where Jack was able to address HOCs or LOCs.

\textit{Tutorial 4b HOC/LOC Work}. During this second tutorial, Hyuk had brought portions of a paper he had drafted. It is here that work on HOCs/LOCs occurred. This

\textsuperscript{17} This is Hyuk’s second of four segment initiations.
only occurred for the first two segments of Directive 1, however. In Segment 1, Jack identified that Hyuk used “lavatory” instead of “laboratory” (turn 1t). In 6t of the same segment, Jack corrected the sentence by indicating that Hyuk probably meant “vast”. Jack addressed a higher-order concern in Segment 2 by asking Hyuk what he meant by “nature” (7t).

This led into more poem work. Intertwined here was process work as Jack worked with Hyuk to list out aspects of the poem (Segment 3 of Directive 1 phase) and discussed additional resources Hyuk might locate (Segments 4-7 of Directive 1). A return to prewriting occurred in Segment 6 as Jack worked with Hyuk to brainstorm for a new thesis statement. Jack left Hyuk, returned at the beginning of Segment 8, and discussed the new thesis with Hyuk. This addressed higher-order concerns by restructuring the thesis statement.

During the Directive 2 phase, both segments dealt with higher-order concerns. These segments were, however, initiated by Hyuk. This may show how Hyuk began to be aware of the interrelation between the thesis statement and the rest of the paper. The second paragraph he proposed to eliminate in Segment 1 of Directive 2 did not align with the new thesis. When he asked Jack if the paper would be better by deleting it, Jack asked: “What do you think is valuable in that paragraph given our conversation?” (163t). Hyuk made the decision to delete the paragraph. Hyuk also discussed possible additions to the paper in Segment 2.

Process. These tutorials can be characterized largely as process work. The main reason for this is because, during the first tutorial, Hyuk had no paper to work on. In Diagnosis Segment 2, Jack asked Hyuk, “Alright, so what have you done so far? Have
you done: have you done any writing?” (1t). Hyuk responded that he had just chosen the topic. This led into Segment 4 of Jack asking Hyuk what he thought of the poem. Gillespie and Learner (2008) talk about what to do when a writer has no paper. Their suggestions included asking the writer questions about the assignment, having the writer identify parts of the target text that was meaningful for the writer, brainstorming, providing the writing with information necessary to complete the task, and assisting the writer with research. These all fall into prewriting, and this is what largely occurred in both tutorials. In a sense, both of these tutorials might be considered a part of Hyuk’s process. Knowing that he did not have sufficient knowledge to write his paper, he sought assistance from a person more knowledgeable in working with writing papers and poetry.

*Volubility.* Across the tutorials, and eliminating Jane (the second tutor), Jack’s volubility was just over four times Hyuk’s volubility. In their first session, Jack uttered 3921 words over 255 turns for an average of 15.4 words per turn. Hyuk uttered 1025 words over 232 turns and averaged 4.4 WPT. During the second tutorial, Jack’s utterance increased slightly to 3934 words over 202 turn with an average of 19.5 WPT, and Hyuk decreased to 702 words over 208 turns for 3.4 WPT. While Jack had fewer turns during the second session, he uttered more words on average per turn suggesting that he had longer turns than during their first session. It is interesting to note that Jane, who only had 57 turns total during the first session, had the highest WPT at 19.5. Despite being in the tutorial for so short a time (approximately 15 minutes), she uttered 1258 words, 235 words more than Hyuk who was in the tutorial the entire time. Overall, the data suggest that Jack dominated the tutorial in terms of talk-time. As I will show in the section
discussing Hyuk’s interview, though, looking at volubility is insufficient and does not necessarily fully describe what occurred in a tutorial or why it occurred.

Change in Writer Volubility. Initially, I suspected that the introduction of Jane (the second tutor), may have affected Hyuk’s potential to interact conversationally during the tutorial. My suspicion was partly due to her contributing approximately 20% of the total utterances in the tutorial; Hyuk, 16.5% and Jack 63%. In the analysis of the second tutorial, data reveal that even without a second tutor, Hyuk only contributed approximately 15% of the utterances in the tutorial, a decrease from the first tutorial. Hyuk’s total words uttered went from 1025 in the first tutorial to 702 in the second tutorial. In looking at these total utterances, time must be accounted for as their first tutorial was nine minutes longer than the second and may partially account for the decrease in volubility. Looking at words per turn shows that Hyuk’s volubility went from 4.4 words per turn in the first tutorial to 3.4 WPT in the second tutorial. Hyuk’s decreased volubility may support Thonus’s (1996) findings that tutor-writer familiarity increases tutor volubility over writer volubility.

Backchannels. Of all the writers, Hyuk utilized backchannels most with yeah being most frequent. One feature of note across the tutorials is the change in how Hyuk used yeah. During the first tutorial, Hyuk’s use of yeah followed a “creaky voice” pattern which Grivičić and Nilep (2004) indicate as reflecting passive recipiency:

48t okay (2.14) but I think death is a reoccurring theme (0.58)
48w yeah:
49t [throughout- or its- its its essential the:me (0.23)
49w yeah: (1.01)
50t so:: (1.80) given the way the poem ends (2.91) wh:at could Frost be saying about death?
(1.91)
Hyuk uttered variations of yeah: which, according to him during the interview, was a planned event frequently uttered with the intent to keep Jack talking (Drummond & Hopper, 1993) and provide more information about the poem. As Hyuk became more familiar with the poem and more confident in his understanding of the poem, this creaky voice yeah was replaced with a flat-tone and terminal falling-tone (non-creaky voice) yeah and a quick, falling-tone yeah (↓yeah) which acted as minimal response tokens at times and expression of agreement or affirmation during others (Gardner, 1997).

_Taciturnity._ As Tannen (1993) states, silence does not necessarily reflect powerlessness, and volubility is not always a sign of dominance; “taciturnity itself can be an instrument of power” (p. 177). In his interview, Hyuk elaborated a little on his use of yeah, other backchannels, and taciturnity. When asked about his use of yeah, for example, Hyuk responded:

_I mean, like if I say nothing and just continue, it’s you know, talking. He, he might be discouraged or something like. You see? I mean, he might think in that way like, “Is he understanding what I’m saying?” so, I just want him to continue and I just want him to know that I’m listening to him. So. You know, that’s why I said “yeah”. Continue something.... I just repeated “yeah” to: make him continue._

(Hyuk Interview)

Although Hyuk had less volubility, he may have been exercising more dominance than Jack as he used yeah strategically to keep Jack talking. As Ting-Toomey
(1999) points out, silence is also a sign of respect for another’s expertise. In the interview, Hyuk indicated that he felt Jack as quite knowledgeable and that his (Hyuk) use of yeah and silence were attempts to keep Jack talking in hope that Jack would give him “hints” about the poem.

**Writer and Tutor Interviews**

I now turn to the interviews with Hyuk and Jack. The interviews have been combined in order to fit them into the larger context of the case study framework. During both interviews, I asked the participants about both of the tutorials beginning with the first tutorial followed by the second tutorial and then moving on to connections each participant might have made with the tutorials. Each interview lasted approximately one hour and forty-five minutes whereas the interviews in the other three cases lasted approximately one hour each. While it may seem that less time was devoted to discussing Hyuk’s and Jack’s tutorials, the shorter time is a result of omitting demographic questions from the second round of interview questions where we discussed their second tutorial.

**Hyuk’s Interview**

Hyuk’s reason for visiting the writing center was to understand the writing assignment he had been given and, once this was accomplished, understand the material he chose to write on - the poem “Out, Out” by Robert Frost. Hyuk was not sure if he was relaxed during the tutorial. He said, “Relaxed? I don’t know, ‘cus, um. To be honest, I don’t like, you know… To be honest, I hate English. Of course.” He appeared to overcome his initial lack of relaxation in the first tutorial by the time he had his last tutorial with Jack:

But I just came- but I enjoyed, you know, conversation with Jack because (.) I think he is very smart about, you know, English. And, I keep visiting
because, um, I realize, um, without his help, I cannot finish this essay. Yeah. I mean, I visit. I mean. Yeah. (.) I mean, I visited, um, [my teacher] and, yeah, and I mean, I came to see her during office hours. But it didn’t help me to- help me to construct idea.

(Hyuk Interview)

Not only did he appear to become more comfortable and enjoy the tutorials with Jack, Hyuk believed that he would not have been able to complete his essay without Jack’s assistance in understanding the poem. Overall, he found both tutorials instrumental in contributing to his understanding of both the assignment and the poem.

*Learned.* The most important thing Hyuk discussed about the tutorial was Jack’s explanations allowed him to understand the poem in a far deeper way than had he not attended the tutorials. This understanding allowed Hyuk to generate a thesis statement that would allow him to complete the assignment. He began to understand how conversations about poetry occur through his observation of Jack and Jane’s interactions. Last, he indicated that he began to recognize the need to do additional research in order to be able to understand and write about the topic. It was through Jack’s urging Hyuk to do additional research and pointing him to a companion text that allowed him to read about Frost’s background and reasons for incorporating items into his works that cause Hyuk to realize that there is more to a poem or story than what one first sees.

*Difficulties.* During the first tutorial (T4a), Hyuk was ‘lost’ during the portion where Jack brought in the second tutor, Jane, to discuss the poem (Directive 1 segment 9 & 11, and Directive 2 segment 1). At the time, he had a limited understanding of the poem.

At the time, as I said, I didn’t have, you know, good understanding about the poem. So, I was like, “Wow” (laughs), you know. What- what they are saying? You know. Then just smile and basic, you know.
Upon further discussion, Hyuk said that he sat there during this time period and allowed Jack and Jane to discuss the poem. Hyuk would then have Jack explain what was talked about during those segments: “Basically, I stick to what Jack said.”

Understanding what Jack said and interacting with Jack did not pose a problem in general. The only instances where he had difficulties with the tutorial were when Jack introduced culturally situated information in attempts to assist in explaining the poem. The first instance was in the first tutorial when Jack utilized a quote by Robert Frost in an attempt to assist Hyuk in understanding a final line of “Out, Out”, “No more to build on there. And they, since they were not the one dead, turned to their affairs”: 

88t you- (.) did you: uh: one of (0.3)Robert Fr.: I can't remember the exact poem but- or if it's just a quote Robert Frost is known as saying good fences make good neighbors
89t (0.68)
90t (0.86)
91w oh: ((not sure if the writer understood why tutor introduced this))
92t now what does that mean?
93w like um: (1.45) good fences?
94t good fences (1.00) make good neighbors
95w may:be (2.16) um (0.45) ↑I: don't know
96w (0.54)
97w ↓ell (0.64) well it's the idea is that y- you know you have your house and the- your yard is fenced off=
98t yeah=
99t good fences makes good neighbors means because (0.53) you don't bother each other
(0.72)
100w ↑ah: y↓eah:
101w (0.48)
102t that. k↑ind of sounds p↓ositive but he meant it ironically
103t (1.53)
104w ah! like nobody cares?=
One of the largest difficulties Hyuk experienced was not with the tutorial but with understanding the poem he had chosen to write about. When we explored why he did not understand the poem, Hyuk said:

Like I don’t know about background of, you know, Western culture. You know? And that’s problem, like uh when I see one subject, even though I find- I found the meaning of the word, I don’t get what is it saying like, “Okay, it’s saying about machine, so, so what?”

and

So, what I’m saying is, um, when- I mean, it’s not only about West or East, but when we see phenomenon, we have to understand about background and history first to understand that subject. So, like um, you know, like um (.) So, that’s why, um, for international student, like um, literature or writing is the most important- uh, the most (.) um, hard subject.

(Hyuk Interview)

Here Hyuk discussed the importance of understanding the background (culture\textsuperscript{18}) and historical context surrounding the poem he had chosen. He went on to say that he was successful in his other subjects. When it came to writing about literature, though, he was at a disadvantage and needed assistance understanding the chosen piece in order to be able to write about it. In order to assist him, he visited the writing center. It was through his discussions with Jack that he became more knowledgeable and, therefore, more confident in writing his assignment. Hyuk said, “After third tutorial, I started to think about that, and I final- finally could make my own thesis statement” (Hyuk Interview).

This breakthrough is apparent at the end of the second tutorial in the case, which was

\textsuperscript{18} Hyuk clarified that by “background” he was also referring to “culture” later in the interview.
actually the third tutorial Hyuk had with Jack, when Hyuk said, “ah: I wish I had one more day to write this” (T4b 98w).

Hyuk mentioned time as being a constraint during the tutorial –he wished he had more time to finish the paper despite attending three tutorials with Jack over several weeks. During the interview, he mentioned once time in relation to time spent working on specific aspects, and that was the time Jack spent reading the poem during the start of the first tutorial. He said: “I mean, Jack didn’t know- Jack never read about this poem, you know. So, he had to, you know (laughs) read, you know, this poem several times, you know. And because of that, I think we kind of waste out time, yeah, at the beginning.”

This is the only instance Hyuk mentioned regarding time. While he recognized that Jack needed to read the poem, he felt that it was a waste of time. His assumption here seemed to be that Jack could have read the poem only once and understood it.

**Jack’s Interview**

Through all of the tutorials, Jack viewed the series of tutorials as successful. He considered the first tutorial as “pretty standard” and thought that the instances where Jane was a part of the tutorial to be the most successful portions:

I thought this was actually the best part of the tutorial itself is where Jane and I were starting to actually have a conversation about the poem. And even better is we had dis- slight disagreements on how to read the poem. Which I think served as- you know- a kind of a demonstration to, ah, Hyuk. That all of literature is about argument. It’s about debate. And Jane brought in some excellent questions that I wasn’t thinking of. Why use a buzz- or why the buzz-saw (.) and not an axe.

He indicated that he felt as if he was acting as a cultural informant in both of the tutorials as he attempted to assist Hyuk understand the poem enough for Hyuk to be able to write.
Difficulties/Frustrations. While he considered the tutorials successful, Jack mentioned a number of difficulties and frustrations with the tutorials.

The first difficulty he had was in “reading” Hyuk during both of the tutorials. In discussing the first tutorial, Jack elaborated on what he meant by “reading” Hyuk:

He’s very- he really didn’t have much of a reaction to things I was saying, so I couldn’t tell if things I was saying or questions I was asking were sinking in the way- in the most productive manner.... Um, usually you get a feeling if like they don’t understand something they’re start to fidget or, you know, a furrowed brow or whatever it’s called. Um. Their eyes will start to wander or glaze over. And in this case, it was just very little reaction from him.

Jack was relying on facial expressions and other body language to alert him of Hyuk’s engagement in the conversation. When he did not receive these cues, he felt compelled to continue talking.

Jack’s inability to “read” Hyuk continued into the second recorded tutorial. Instead of the silence and lack of paralinguistic cues Jack was accustomed to seeing in writers, he encountered Hyuk’s backchannels (largely in the form of yeah) and felt as if he was interpreting the poem instead of Hyuk engaging in the poem:

So again, I’m interpreting the poem in from of him [writer] and he’s just kind of responding “yeah, yeah, yeah” Whether or not he’s just saying yes because it’s all he has to say or yes as in agreement, I’m not certain I can’t exactly recall.

This interpreting the poem unsettled Jack as he considered the tutorial to be to be an overly directive tutorial and came close to “crossing the line of writing the paper for them”.
As the tutorials progressed, especially during the second tutorial, Jack had the expectation that Hyuk would become more conversationally engaged in the tutorial and working with the poem. This was another source of frustration for Jack. He said:

"In the earlier sessions, I think I can define it as this: after working with me for a while- or in initial tutorials with ESL students or like a one-shot deal I don’t mind offering myself as a cultural informant. In fact, I usually find it enjoyable. I think the frustration came from this particular session of tutorials is because I have to keep going back to being that cultural informant, and I wanted him to start developing it on his own. I wanted him to take the information I had fed him earlier and build a foundation on that, I guess."

These comments relate back to assumptions on the levels of engagement Jack likes to see out of the writers he deals with. In his ideal tutorial, there is dynamic conversation occurring and a steady back-and-forth between him and the writer. He elaborated on this and related it back to his teaching practice by saying that when he teaches poetry he expects that “students have a- even a slight personal attachment or emotional attachment to the words in the poem” (Jack Interview). In his tutorials Hyuk, there was far less back-and-forth and none of this attachment Jack expected. The lack of the type of engagement Jack expected of writers led him to doubt his “ability to instruct or talk about the poem correctly”. This statement reflected Jack’s view of the segments in the first tutorial where he and Jane were discussing the poem in front of Hyuk as well as his ongoing comments to the writer about possible ways the poem could be interpreted.

Writer Take-Away. Jack hoped that Hyuk was more confident as a result of the tutorials. He also hoped that through his model conversations with Jane and the types of questions he asked Hyuk during the tutorials that Hyuk began to understand that there are differing interpretations people have of literature and the type of conversation that can
result from interacting with another. As the tutorials progressed, Jack’s interpretation of
the poem and the nature of the poem changed; he hoped that Hyuk seeing this allowed
him “to understand the nature of poetry in general and in a larger degree.” In the end,
Jack said he was hoping “in the back of his mind that he [Hyuk] was beginning to see that
he could participate in this type of discussion” and began to see how poems and literature
could be interpreted.

Overall Summary

The two tutorials captured in this case study were the first and third tutorials
between Hyuk and Jack discussing a poem Hyuk needed to write about: Hyuk needed to
understand the poem and visited the writing center. Both of the tutorials involved Jack
explaining and re-explaining the poem and providing cultural information Hyuk needed
to better write. His frequent questions served as cognitive scaffolds for Hyuk and allowed
the conversation, although considered one-sided by Jack at times, to continue throughout
both tutorials. Since Hyuk did not take a written product into the first tutorial, there was
no work on HOCs or LOCs. During the second recorded tutorial, the tutorial contained
minimal work on LOCs at the beginning and work on HOCs at the end.

Overall, both considered the tutorials to be successful. Although Jack’s interview
gave light to his many frustrations during these tutorials because of not being able to
meet his ‘ideal’ tutorial of having a fairly well-balanced back-and-forth between the
writer, he did recognize the changes in Hyuk that alluded to Hyuk’s increased
understanding of the poem. One change he specifically mentioned was in the types of
questions Hyuk asked from the first to the last tutorial. He felt that Hyuk’s questions
became “more specific to the text and to the task at hand.” And although Jack was
frustrated with being what he considered a cultural informant throughout the tutorials, he
did come to identify it as an important feature of the tutorial when he said: “I think he
actually needed (.) needed somebody who could sit down with him and analyze a poem
line by line. And how to engage the text.”

Hyuk found the line-by-line analysis extremely helpful in understanding the poem.
He also began to see the process involved in analyzing a poem and that things are not
immediately apparent through how Jack’s knowledge of the poem changed: “But I think
um he started to – not only me, but Jack started to have better understanding about the
poem “Out, Out” after second tutorial and third tutorial” (Hyuk Interview). This repeated
reading contrasts with the time Hyuk considered a waste as Jack read the poem more than
once. One the one hand, he seemed to expect Jack to understand the poem the first time
he read it. On the other hand, he recognized that the repeated readings throughout both
tutorials allowed Jack to understand the poem and, in return better assist him (Hyuk) in
his own understanding of the poem.

**Recommendations**

Although grammar was not addressed during the tutorial, Hyuk made the
suggestion that tutors should spend time discussing both grammar and structure since
“many international students do not have experience about writing an essay” (Hyuk
Interview). After a little more discussion, Hyuk added that there are differences in how
international students write versus how Americans write in how essays are organized and
knowledge conveyed. He believed that tutors should be aware of these differences. He
also recognized that writers need to attend the writing center as frequently as possible
when dealing with material that is tied to culture. Frequency of visits, however, is not
something the writing center staff can change. When I mentioned this, Hyuk said that the writing center could perhaps make itself better known to international students.

Jack’s recommendations focused on tutor training. He believed that tutors need to have regular training for dealing with NNES writers with an emphasis on understanding that tutors will need to modify their tutorial approach depending on the level of the writer and the nature of the work. Tutors need to understand that they will often be operating as cultural informants: “[I]t’s the cultural discrepancies that come into account…. not having the historical background” (Jack Interview). It is this that Jack believes tutors should recognize and receive training on – how to identify when it is an issue with a writer lacking the background knowledge necessary to complete an assignment.

Summary

In the preceding sections, I provided analyses of each case describing the participants, how each tutorial adhered to Agar’s model of institutional discourse, writer and tutor perceptions of the tutorials, summaries of key points, and recommendations the writers and tutors had in order to potentially improve writing center tutorial practice. The following chapter, Chapter 5, begins with an overview of this dissertation study. I then discuss the findings, themes that emerged between cases, and items that may be unique to each case and potential reasons for these. I will end by discussing the significance of my findings as they relate theory, practice, and for future research.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In Chapter Four, I analyzed four cases involving CHC NNES writers and NES tutors. I provided backgrounds for each participant, broke down each tutorial using Agar’s model of institutional discourse to provide a view of each tutorial, closely examined salient features in the phases of the tutorial, and investigated writer and tutor perceptions of the tutorials. These perceptions included what the writers took away from the tutorial, what the tutors believed the writers may have learned, difficulties both experienced, aspects both considered to be strengths, and recommendations both had for tutorial improvement. In this chapter, I draw comparisons across the cases and discuss common concerns and features unique to each case framed using my three research questions:

1. What do NES tutor/NNES writer tutorials look like?
2. What are NNES writer perceptions of these writing tutorials?
3. What are NES tutor perceptions of these writing tutorials?

Following this analysis, I discuss the major findings as related to the research questions. I begin with discussing the structures of the tutorials (RQ1). But because what occurred during the tutorials is connected to writer and tutor perception, I combine my synthesis of all questions to generate overall emerging connections. I conclude with the significance of the findings in terms of considerations for theory, practice, and future research.

**Tutorial Structure**

Researchers (i.e., Ritter, 2002; Thonus, 1998a, 1998b, 1999a; J. Williams, 2005) have used Agar’s institutional discourse phases as a frame for researching the structure of
and interaction in writing center tutorials. Based on their work, I analyzed tutorials based on discourse phases as indicated by topic initiation and volubility. The model presented by Agar entailed Diagnosis → Directive → Report phases, but all of the research in writing centers added openings and closings in order to better capture entire tutorials.

**Discourse Phases**

Of the five recorded tutorials\(^{19}\), only one followed a typical pattern described by Agar in his model of institutional discourse, Case 2 tutorial with FengYi and Roger. Case 1 contained two diagnosis and two directive phases as Marc attempted to salvage what he considered to be a failed tutorial. In Case 3, Candi reopened the tutorial to address a previously unaddressed point of adding slides to KimYun’s PowerPoint presentation. The first tutorial in Case 4 may have ended up containing only one directive and closing phase, but the second tutor, Jane, interrupted the Closing 1 phase and began a new directive phase which lasted 13 turns. Without this interruption, this first tutorial may have contained a single directive and closing phase. In the second tutorial in Case 4, Jack initiated the second direct phase by offering further interpretations of the poem.

While Thonus (1998b) readily admits that “not all writing tutorials exhibit all of the phases” (p. 441). Additionally, prior research has disagreed on which phase is more pronounced during tutorials. Specifically, Thonus (1998b) and Ritter (2002) indicate that the majority of activity occurs in the directive phase, while Williams (2005) asserts that it is the diagnosis phase where tutorials seem to stay. These disagreements and the lack of adhering to the discourse phases as described by Agar and the variation across tutorials of the phases in my research raise the question of consistent application of the model.

\(^{19}\) Case 4 contained two tutorials which results in five tutorials across the four cases.
Moreover, a larger question can be asked regarding the appropriateness of using Agar’s institutional discourse framework as an accurate tool to be used in describing tutorial structure. In his discussion of institutional discourse, Agar is explicit in mentioning that diagnosis and report phases are necessary conditions to qualify discourse as institutional discourse. Williams (2005), however, appears to minimize the report phase by indicating in a footnote that it does occur but that tutors it is a brief written evaluation of the tutors’ experiences. Other research on institutional discourse (e.g., Ritter, 2002; Thonus, 1998b) in writing centers also minimizes this report phase. While tutorials may share dialogic characteristics of institutional discourse, this does not necessarily qualify them as actual instances of institutional discourse. The lack of the critical report phase and disagreement on what diagnosis and directive phases may look like in tutorials raises questions regarding the validity of claims on tutorials being institutional discourse as envisioned by Agar.

**Volubility**

Across the tutorials, there was a noticeable difference in volubility of female writers compared with male writers. Both the female writers in my study uttered more total words and more words per turn than the male writers. In Case 1, BaiHua contributed 34% of total utterances, and KimYun, in Case 3, produced 33% of total utterances. The male participants, FengYi (Case 2) and Hyuk (Case 4), uttered 16.5% of the words in tutorial 1 and dropped to 15.1% in tutorial 2. See Table 10 for a breakdown of writer and tutor volubility.
Table 10. Volubility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Writer</th>
<th>Tutor</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Total Words</th>
<th>Total Turns</th>
<th>Word per Turn</th>
<th>Total Words in Tutorial</th>
<th>% of Contribution</th>
<th>Ratio T:W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BaiHua</td>
<td>Marc</td>
<td>58m</td>
<td>2954</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>8579</td>
<td>34.43%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>FengYi</td>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>41m</td>
<td>1333</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>6133</td>
<td>21.73%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>KimYun</td>
<td>Candi</td>
<td>48m</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>5422</td>
<td>33.42%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hyuk</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>53m</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>6204</td>
<td>16.52%</td>
<td>T: 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3921</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>63.20%</td>
<td>T2: 1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1258</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>22.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hyuk</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>44m</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>4636</td>
<td>15.14%</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One explanation for higher female writer volubility might be attributed to gender differences. Tannen (1990) has suggested that women may exhibit more volubility in “private” spaces than men. On the other hand, increased writer volubility was more likely due to the type of tutorial, type of information the writer was seeking or work being done, and type of questions the tutors asked. Cases 1 and 3 differed from Cases 2 and 4. In Cases 1 and 3, the writers came in to work on issues of grammar, organization, clarity and flow. Both writers had a specific product and wanted to work on that product.

Writers in Cases 2 and 4 were slightly different. FengYi (Case 2) asked to work only on
citation, and Hyuk (Case 4) had a series of tutorials that were essentially designed to help him understand the poem. These two cases posed very different problems than Cases 1 and 3.

Walker and Elias (1987) assert that talk time (e.g. volubility) is not a key determiner of success. That no writer reported issues with the tutor talking more and that they also reported feeling some measure of success during the tutorial despite exhibiting less volubility appears to support their argument. Each writer reported taking something away from the tutorial independent of how voluble they were. This finding aligns with prior research which find that while tutors conversationally dominate the tutorial than writers (Ritter, 2002; Thonus, 1999a, 2001; J. Williams, 2005), this dominance did not appear impact what these writers took away.

**HOCs and LOCs**

The cases each varied in terms of focusing on HOCs and LOCs. In only two of the tutorials were these dimensions consistently addressed: Case 1 and Case 3. Case 2 dealt more with Roger instructing FengYi on grammar, and Case 4 had no paper during the first tutorial. During the second tutorial in Case 4, HOC-work did occur, but it was mainly initiated by Hyuk, the writer, and only at the end of the tutorial. I only discuss the Cases 1 and 3 in this section since they dealt directly with the writers’ previously written papers.

Case 1 contained two separate Directive phases (1 and 2). During the first Directive 1 phase, Marc primarily addressed HOCs by focusing primarily on the thesis statement and supporting paragraphs. In Directive 2, during the phase where grammar was the primary focus, more LOC work occurred. As seen in the analysis of this case,
this was scaffolded grammar work. Marc did not focus exclusively on LOCs in Directive 2, though. He continued to address HOCs for organization. In Case 3, with the exception of audience (HOC) being mentioned, Candi focused exclusively on LOCs by asking for clarification, directly supplying words, rephrasing sentences for KimYun (usually by saying “how about...” or a similar technique), and directly correcting grammar.

Tutors are urged to deal with HOCs before LOCs (i.e., Gillespie & Lerner, 2008; McAndrew & Reigstad, 2001; Ryan & Zimmerelli, 2010), but this view has been challenged by some researchers (for example, Blau, et al., 2002). They recognize that unskilled tutors may focus on LOCs. But the danger here is that the tutor may begin to focus on local errors and miss higher-order concerns such as organization, logic, and focus. This did not appear to be the issue with Case 3. However, the way Candi addressed LOCs was typically by providing direct ways of correcting the errors in KimYun’s paper, and KimYun reported that this lack of active involvement in the tutorial process did not lead to perceived improvement in future writing. Again, Candi’s direct correction method may have stemmed from her discomfort in explaining grammatical rules.

Marc, on the other hand, mixed work on HOCs and LOCs. Blau, et al. (2002) argue that working on both simultaneously can be beneficial as long as HOCs are addressed first when necessary. Marc attempted to address HOCs during Directive 1. Because he believed that the tutorial was stalling due to a lack of understanding of thesis statements by BaiHua, he switched to LOCs in the Directive 2 stage. He did not singularly focus on LOCs, though; he continued to address HOCs at the same time. He therefore accomplished both his goal of addressing organization of the paper and BaiHua’s concern of surface errors. Because the tutor had scaffolded the LOC work,
BaiHua felt she would be able to self-edit better in the future. Also, because the tutor continued on HOCs, BaiHua eventually came to see that she was missing her thesis statement.

**Process**

One of the things tutors in the UAWC are asked to focus on is the writing process by talking about the writing process as per North’s (1984) vision of making better writers through dialogue. In order to understand how this unfolded in these tutorials, I looked for instances of discussion about the writing process: what stage of the process the writer was in; conversations about what writers do in each stage; advice by tutors about improving their process.

In Case 1, Marc addressed the stage of the writing process BaiHua was in (revision) and made suggestions for how she could improve her process. Specifically, he discussed with her ways that she could revise (edit) her paper in the future. He scaffolded editing strategies and eventually had her edit her own paper while he sat with her. He also discussed with her strategies to include in her process like researching more before writing and clarifying the directions with the instructor (all of which are prewriting). These changes in process were things BaiHua took away from the tutorial. In Case 2, the writer was technically in the prewriting stage of the writing process. The only change in process Roger suggested was for him to work in an area where he had access to secondary sources. Similarly, there was little discussion of process in Case 3. In fact, the closest Candi came to discussing process with KimYun was to advise her to ask her instructor about citation. During Case 4, the both tutorials were essentially part of Hyuk’s process – prewriting.
Analysis of Themes

**Writer as Active Producer as a result of Tutor Scaffolding**

There were also similarities and differences regarding whether the writer was an active producer in the tutorial and how that production or lack of production impacted the writer. There are several points of comparison when considering the writer as an active producer. One instance is between Case 1 (BaiHua/Marc) and Case 3 (KimYun/Candi) in terms of grammar work. Another is between Case 2 (FengYi/Roger) and Case 4 (Hyuk/Jack) with producing new portions for the paper each was working on. Jack modeled different ways for Hyuk to work in prewriting including brainstorming and researching. Hyuk reported this as being something he took out of the tutorial.

In the cases where the tutors took time to model a part of the writing process and discuss strategies to be used during future writing, the writers reported a potential change in process. In the cases where there was no explicit connection to process made to modeling or discussion about process, the writers did not report a potential change in process. These findings seem to support North’s idea that the way to make a “better writer” is through discussion about the writing process and not focusing the tutorial on improving a product.

**Contrast 1: Grammar – Case 1 (BaiHua/Marc) & Case 3 (KimYun/Candi).** During both of these tutorials, the tutors worked with the writer on grammar. The approach for how this grammar work was done, however, differed, with one being scaffolded grammar correction connected to the editing process and the other being direct correction with no connection to editing.
In Case 1, Marc and BaiHua worked on grammar for a portion of the tutorial. This work was done by Marc pointing out two types of errors in BaiHua’s writing: verb tense and articles. Marc began with cognitive scaffolding by showing BaiHua the grammatical errors in the sentence and showed her how to correct them. He eventually had BaiHua find grammar mistakes in her own work and make the corrections. During this time, he supported her by providing motivational scaffolding like, “Yeah, you got it”. BaiHua indicated she felt being active in the grammar correction was beneficial to her. She reported gaining confidence through this practice self-editing practice.

Scaffolding was minimal in Case 3. Only five of the 29 grammar corrections were scaffolded. The remaining 24 were direction corrections by Candi, which resulted in KimYun being a passive recipient. Candi began the tutorial indicating that an error was present in the presentation and asking KimYun how to correct it. One of Candi’s rationales for direct grammar correction was that it would allow KimYun to pick up on the error and eventually learn the correct form: article use.

The type of grammar work seen in Case 1 is preferable for several reasons. First, direct grammar correction is largely ineffective. Specifically, Truscott (1996, 2007) and Truscott and Hsu (2008) argue that direct grammar correction during revision is ineffective in improving writers’ use of the target form. While Candi may have improved the product by supplying KimYun the correct grammatical form, she did not allow KimYun opportunities to revise her own work. Second, Ferris and Roberts (2001) found that less indirect error identification resulted in more active writers and improved writer’s ability to self-edit than more direct feedback (i.e. directly correcting grammar).
Contrast 2: Understanding – Case 2 (FengYi/Roger) & Case 4 (Hyuk/Jack). Two of the four cases consisted of writers who needed to understand specific items in order to complete an assignment.

In Case 2, FengYi asked to work on citation. During the tutorial, Roger provided different examples of how to cite and create a bibliography. Roger did not, however, attempt to have FengYi employ this knowledge during the tutorial. Instead, Roger asked:

249t and you think you can find a way to fit it into your sto↓ry?
244w (·hh) I think so
250t I think [you can
245w [maybe not maybe not very good but I think I can do it
251t (·h) I think you’re r↓ight (. ) part of it is learning to do the citations=

In line 251t, Roger seemed to be saying that the key was actually creating the citation and not in how to incorporate information from a secondary source into the story.

FengYi reported not having a very good understanding of citation after the tutorial. One potential reason for this is the lack of shared understanding crucial in scaffolding a task (Puntambekar & Hübscher, 2005). Students (and writers) must see the point and appropriateness of the task in order for instruction and work with the task to be effective (Langer & Applebee, 1986). This was not the case with FengYi’s and Roger’s tutorial. In fact, neither saw the reasoning behind citing other literature in a creative story. The ongoing struggle Roger had may have prevented him from being able to effectively explain and scaffold citation work. Even with a lack of full understanding, Roger attempted to engage FengYi in conversation about what it might look like to incorporate cited material into a piece of creative writing. His attempts to engage FengYi, though, proved unsuccessful.
Contrasted with engagement in Case 2, instances of the writer being actively engaged were evident during both tutorials in Case 4. Throughout the tutorial, Jack provided cognitive scaffolding by posing questions in order to get Hyuk thinking and talking about the poem. During both tutorials in this case, Jack walked away and left Hyuk for five to ten minutes to write or revise his thesis statement. During the first tutorial, the thesis served as a launching point for the conversation and was used to further develop ideas. The thesis statements Hyuk produced were a result of his responses to Jack’s scaffolded questions and recorded notes.

In the beginning of tutorial 1, Jack had difficulties because of his lack of familiarity with “Out, Out”. To assist him in better understanding the poem, he called upon an additional tutor, Jane. Although Hyuk was minimally involved in these episodes, Jack felt that this was the best part of the first tutorial they had together as it provided a model for how people may interpret poetry differently; it also, according to Jack, modeled for Hyuk the type of conversation that can occur about poetry within a discourse community. Instances like this reflect Bruffee’s (2008) argument that “[p]eer tutoring provides a social context in which students can experience and practice the kinds of conversation that academics most value” (p. 210). Jack provided cognitive scaffolding in the form of questions in attempts to lead Hyuk to a better understanding of questions that can be asked and a better understanding of the poem in general. Despite there being a lack of back-and-forth, Hyuk stated that his extended conversations with Jack allowed him to understand the poem better.

Summary. There are two conclusions to be reached here. The first is that active engagement appeared to have result in more reported writer take-away. The second is that
the use of scaffolding provides opportunities for writers to be active during tutorial sessions. Researchers (I. L. Clark, 1988a, 1990; J. Williams, 2002, 2004) note that students learn best when they are active participants and not passive recipients of information. However, FengYi, who was more involved conversationally, did not have the opportunity to actively use the information Roger provided him. While Hyuk appeared to be a passive recipient of information in both tutorials, he had opportunities to actively construct thesis statements based on the information Jack recorded during their conversation about the poem. Jack was successful in scaffolding the discussions to increase Hyuk’s engagement with the poem.

The impact as a result of the scaffolding and subsequent activity by the writer was evident during the interviews. Hyuk reported having a better understanding of the material he was grappling with as a result of the thesis statement work done in the tutorial. FengYi, on the other hand, reported that he still did not understand how to incorporate citation. The difficulty FengYi had, though, may also have resulted from the unique request from the instructor to use citation in a creative work which left both FengYi and Roger at a loss. Although the writer appeared to be engaged in the process of learning citation, a necessary component for scaffolding (Wood, et al., 1976), shared understanding of the task is crucial for successful scaffolding (Puntambekar & Hübscher, 2005). This lack of shared understanding – even individual understanding – was a barrier for Roger during the tutorial.

**Cultural Informing**

In two of the cases, Case 2 and Case 4, the argument can be made that the tutors served as cultural informants. Bruffee (2008) argues about the importance of missing
knowledge tutors can provide writers: “If the tutee does not bring to the conversation knowledge of the subject and assignment, the peer tutor’s most important contribution is to begin at the beginning: help the tutee acquire the relevant knowledge of the subject and the assignment” (p. 213).

In Case 2, Roger provided FengYi with information on citation as per FengYi’s request. During the tutorial, FengYi indicated to Roger that he did not know how to cite; this is something he confirmed during the interview. Although he had seen citations in texts, his knowledge of citation was quite limited as he thought he only needed to cite “strange word” (FengYi Interview). Quotation and citation are largely Western conventions (Matalene, 1985; Pecorari, 2006; Pennycook, 1985, 1996; Scollon, Tsang, Li, Yung, & Jones, 1997).20 Roger did not explicitly indicate that he served as a cultural informant. He did, however, indicate that “quickly it became clear that citation had not, um, probably happened for FengYi before or that he’d been left to pass by” (Roger Interview). In this writing center and based on personal observation and tutor reports, NES writers have struggled with citation. For FengYi had only been in the country for one semester and did not have prior exposure to citation and needed instruction in academic citation.

Jack (Case 4) served as a cultural informant as he discussed with Hyuk the cultural and historical contexts of the poem Hyuk had selected. In the tutorial, Jack provided Hyuk with necessary historical background knowledge including information

---

20 The notion of citation as a Western, cultural convention has been discussed by various authors of L2 writing and how individuals from CHC cultures are taught ‘collective ownership’ of written material and how this impacts citation (in addition to the aforementioned authors, see also C. K. K. Chan & Rao, 2009; Ramanathan & Atkinson, 1999). My research does not investigate the phenomenon of citation in terms of this ‘collective ownership; rather, citation is addressed as a cultural phenomenon to which this writer was not exposed and the discourse produced between Roger in attempts to explain citation to FengYi.
regarding technology utilized during the time period and rural life in America during the early 1900s. He made attempts to connect the poem being analyzed with other work by Frost. He also provided resources for Hyuk to investigate between the first and third tutorial. He also cognitively scaffolded questions that one might ask of a poem. Hyuk indicated that he could not have written his paper without Jack’s assistance and that he learned techniques to analyze poetry in general. This assistance in understanding was best captured when Hyuk said the following during the interview:

Also, I think, um, it is, um, important to consider that, like, English is very abstract subject. Not like science or mathematics. Um, I mean science or mathematics it says, this is, you know, this because of this and those. We have to do this or those. It is something. But English, you know. He [Frost] just talk about the death of boy by chainsaw. And, like, not only international student … see this poem, he’s gonna say, “So what?” …. I mean, even American students do not like English, so why- I don’t know, um, why, um, yeah. I just don’t understand, yeah. Too much for me.

Hyuk needed conversation with a person from the culture in order to understand the poem. Through his discussions with Jack, he felt as if he was more knowledgeable about the poem and, therefore, more able to successfully write.

**Summary.** Powers (1993) and Blau, Hall and Sparks (2002) write about tutors serving as cultural informants to NNES writers. While Powers’ discussion focuses on “culture” in terms of rhetorical strategies, Blau, Hall and Sparks extend the conversation to cover a “mutual exchange of information” (p. 30), which includes information writers might not have. Both of the tutors discussed here brought to the tutorial some level of knowledge the writers did not possess.
Time

Tutorials in the UAWC can last anywhere from 30 minutes to one hour, and all of the tutorials in my study lasted approximately one hour. The writers in Cases 1, 3, and 4 had concerns about time and discussed this during their interviews.

In Case 1, BaiHua thought that Marc spent too much time working on the thesis statement. She intimated:

Maybe every tutorial will only have one hour. I think it’s- it will be short because my paper will be five page or six pages. If I- if we can’t read it in very detailedly (.) m: (.) we only can have very- look at it in very- in big- how to- uh I don’t know how to say it. In very big… I think, ah, maybe I will (.). that time I think the time is very short if I have if we can talk another hour to improve this paper better.

Marc focused on two issues – thesis work and scaffolded surface revision – versus BaiHua’s desire to improve the entire paper. Despite her mentioning spending too much time, she did indicate that the discussion focusing on the thesis assisted her in revising her paper later that evening. BaiHua expected that her entire paper could be covered in a single tutorial, and the solution for here was increased time devoted to the tutorial.

In Case 3, Candi mentioned time, but it related to her rationale on directly correcting the grammar; she felt that the time she saved providing direct correction allowed her to address the entire paper. KimYun also indicated that she would have liked to have more time to work on grammar: “But the lack of time made me just hurried to go on the next. And just- that made me just put a “the” and “a” passively” (KimYun Interview).

In Case 4, both Hyuk and Jack mentioned time. Hyuk talked about time in the tutorial and during the interview. In the interview, he articulated that he wished he had
more time. This points towards his final understanding of the poem. He felt that the time spent in repeated tutorial was ultimately beneficial to him being able to write about the poem. His complaint of Jack spending too much time reading the poem seemed to be replaced by a realization that Jack, although a person Hyuk considered as extremely knowledgeable in the field of literature, also needed extended time to understand the poem.

**Summary.** Like most forms of human-mediated interaction, tutorials take time. These issues of time reported by both tutors and writers are unsurprising findings as past research has found that both writers and tutors feel a single tutorial session is insufficient to deal with all of the concerns a writer might have (Blau, et al., 2002; Geither, 2010; Thonus, 1998b; J. Williams, 2002). Research (Huang, 2010) has previously identified time as being an issue for NNES writers in writing papers, so it is unrealistic that all of the concerns a writer might have would be addressed in a single tutorial. Tutor training manuals recommend that tutors should isolate one or two issues to deal with during tutorial sessions (i.e., Murphy & Sherwood, 2008; Ryan & Zimmerelli, 2010). This focus on one or two aspects has been corroborated by prior research (Blau, et al., 2002). One benefit of isolating one or two issues for a single session is that complicated problems can be addressed in more detail. Time is necessary to engage in a deep, bi-directional dialogue for understanding. Attempting to work on too many items in a short time (30-60 minutes) can create tutor pressure and result in tutors not allowing dialogue to occur; instead, tutors may find themselves being more directive by telling students what to change and preventing active participation by the writer (Thonus, 1999a). Aspects of what can reasonably be worked on at the beginning of the tutorial should be negotiated at
the beginning of the tutorial in order to guide the structure and create realistic expectations within the writer (Blau, et al., 2002; Harris & Silva, 1993).

**Expedience**

In relation to time, two instances of expedience were evident. In Case 2 and 3, there seemed to be a stronger sense of expediency on the part of the tutors; that is, the tutors were conscious of time and the time it took to accomplish certain tasks. In Case 2, Roger attempted to end the tutorial after approximately 30 minutes. His reasoning behind this was that he had found that writers tended to lose focus if tutorials went on too long. Candi, in Case 3, appeared to offer direct correction in order to be able to cover the entire presentation within the allotted time. Whether it was the tutor’s expedience to keep the tutorial short (Case 2) or to avoid more difficult aspects such as grammar correction (Case 2), this desire or tendency reflects Thonus’s (1999a) findings that tutorials between NES tutors and NNES writers as being shorter than average. These shorter tutorials are often a result of a lack of understanding of L2 training and a lack of understanding in what NNES writers are asking to work on versus what they need to work on during tutorials.

**Assumptions**

In Case 1, Marc assumed that BaiHua understood the idea of a thesis statement. This resulted in difficulties during the beginning of the tutorial. Marc utilized the terms “interpretive claim” and “critical reading lens”, both of which were directly from BaiHua’s assignment sheet. BaiHua, however, reported during the interview that she did not really understand what either of these terms meant. This may have resulted in Marc’s recursively asking multiple times where her interpretive claim was in her paper. As the
tutorial progressed and Marc explained that the interpretive claim was a thesis, BaiHua was able to speak about what she thought was her thesis. She responded that she eventually had some understanding that her paper lacked a clear thesis.

The tutor in Case 2, Roger assumed FengYi had prior exposure to citation despite FengYi indicating at the beginning of the tutorial that he did not know how to cite. In his attempts to explain citation to FengYi, Roger used obscure examples. As Reynolds discusses, using obscure terms and examples can lead to excessive backchannels with NNESs, and FengYi reported that he did use backchannels in order to simply be polite and not as indicators that he understood what Roger said.

In Case 3, the tutor, Candi, assumed that KimYun was not proficient enough with English and would not be able to identify her grammatical errors by reading her own presentation. Her rationale was: “I just decided that it’d be better for me to read it out loud so it might be easier for her to pick out mistakes if she heard it” (Candi Interview). This assumption is not totally without merit as Powers (1993) asserts that reading aloud to edit by ear did not work for the NNES writers who visited her writing center. Candi thought that KimYun would not be able to read and edit by ear based on KimYun’s laughter, which Candi mistook for nervousness. After the tutorial, however, she changed her opinion: ”But now thinking back, maybe she was more competent than I gave her credit for.” Candi’s assumption may have prevented KimYun from being more conversationally active during the tutorial.

Jack (Case 4) met with Hyuk a total of three times. Only two of these tutorials were captured and analyzed: tutorial 1 and tutorial 3. Jack’s philosophy was to engage in a conversation with the writers about the writing. During tutorial 1, he operated as a
cultural informant. During the third tutorial, though, he held the assumption that Hyuk would be more conversationally involved during the last tutorial. Contrary to Jack’s expectation, Hyuk was less conversationally involved. This did not prevent the tutorial from going forward, but it did cause frustration for Jack and led to increases in his volubility.

Each of the tutors in the cases entered the tutorials with assumptions. Past studies (Harris, 2008; Thonus, 2004) have cautioned against assuming that NNES possess knowledge about items such as lexicon and cultural and historical conventions necessary to complete a writing task and assumptions that writers understand what will occur during a tutorial. Tutorial breakdowns can occur if tutors begin asking questions using terms they assume writers ‘should’ know. Discussing unfamiliar abstract terms and examples can lead to increased levels of backchanneling or a breakdown in the tutorial (Reynolds, 2009). Powers (1993) cautions that applying collaborative techniques which “depend so heavily on shared basic assumptions or patterns” (p. 91) to NNES writers may result in failure because expectations may lead to tutor frustration or ask writers to engage in a dialogue with which they are unfamiliar or expect them to have knowledge necessary to complete a task. Assuming that the writer knows a tutorial will be more dialogic can also have negative ramifications. “Without shared assumptions about what will happen [during the tutorial], the tutor and ESL student can proceed on opposite tracks and spend their tutorial time trying to get the other person to move in their direction” (Harris, 2008, p. 207).
Writer Take-Away

Table 12 provides an overview of what the tutor perceived writers taking away from the tutorial versus what the writers reported taking away from the tutorial.

Table 12. Writer Take-Away

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Marc</th>
<th>BaiHua</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutor Perception</td>
<td>Understanding thesis</td>
<td>Writer Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More knowledgeable of editing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Roger</th>
<th>FengYi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutor Perception</td>
<td>Understanding of what he had to do</td>
<td>Writer Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources to use when writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seek clarification earlier in process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 3</th>
<th>Candi</th>
<th>KimYun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutor Perception</td>
<td>Confidence in presentation</td>
<td>Writer Reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 4</th>
<th>Jack</th>
<th>Hyuk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutor Perception</td>
<td>Confidence with poetry</td>
<td>Writer Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Able to participate in conversations about poetry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding of the “nature of poetry” and how it can be interpreted in different ways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tutor Perception. During the interviews, I asked the tutors what they thought their respective writers took away and the writers what they learned as a result of the tutorial session(s) they had. The tutors all indicated that they were unsure what the writers took out of the tutorial encounters. At best, they indicated what they hoped the writers took away. Marc (Case 1) hoped that BaiHua left with a better understanding of a thesis statement and how to edit her paper for grammar. Roger (Case 2) hoped FengYi was clearer on what he needed to do for this particular assignment, took away resources he could use to assist him, and, in terms of process, would seek clarification earlier in the
writing process. Candi (Case 3) hoped KimYun was more confident with her presentation. Finally, Jack (Case 4) hoped Hyuk was more confident with poetry, understand the “nature of poetry,” how poetry can be interpreted in different ways, and be able to participate in conversations about poetry.

*Writer Report.* The writers all reported taking something away from the tutorial including understanding of new material, increased confidence, and process-related changes. BaiHua (Case 1) indicated that she realized that she did not have a clear thesis and that she learned more about what a thesis entails. She indicated that she would attempt to change her process in several ways: clarify the assignment earlier; research and brainstorm more; and work on drafts earlier. She also took away strategies for editing her papers. FengYi (Case 2) felt he had a better, although incomplete, understanding of what it meant to cite. What he reported taking away was related to direct quotes and not how to paraphrase other works, however. KimYun (Case 3) reported being more confident in paraphrasing than before she went into the tutorial. Last, Hyuk (Case 4) said he understood the poem more deeply than he had prior to attending the interview.

*Summary of Perceptions.* In most circumstances, what a tutor believed the writer might have taken away from a tutorial is not aligned with what the writer reported taking away. The exception here is Case 1; tutor and writer responses aligned with understanding a thesis and edit strategies. With Case 4, Jack and Hyuk both indicated better understanding of the poem. Jack, though, hoped that Hyuk would be able to participate in discussions about poetry. Hyuk gave no indication that this was the case. Responses in Case 2 and Case 3 differed for tutors and writers.
Connection to Writing Centers and North’s Vision. Perhaps unsurprisingly, what tutors report as being writer take-away is different than what was reported by the writers. This last point raises concerns with North’s (1984) statement indicating that tutors “must measure success not in terms of the constantly changing model they create [in tutorials], but in terms of changes in the writer” (p. 439). To accurately track changes in writers, writing centers would need to have resources that allow them to track writers and not, as practice of tutors in Williams’s (2005) research and the practice in the UAWC where this research took place, reports of tutor perceptions of the tutorials.

**Writer and Tutor Recommendations**

*Writer.* The recommendations made by the writers appeared to be closely tied with the specific tutorial. The one common recommendation was increased tutorial length. Other recommendations included that tutors speak more slowly, using culturally sensitive examples that the writers would recognize, increased wait-time, tutors allowing writers to be more active in work dealing with grammar, and increasing NNES students’ awareness of the writing center as a resource.

*Tutor.* Tutor recommendations were slightly more aligned. The most common suggestion was increased tutor training for how to deal with NNES writers. This training would include increasing tutors’ knowledge of cultural writing styles and conventions used (i.e., citation), training covering cultural differences in communication, and how tutors serve as cultural informants to NNES writers. One tutor recommended grammar training so tutors would be prepared to deal with grammar if the need should arise. Opportunities to discuss issues tutors encounter during tutorials with NNES writers was suggested. Last, one tutor recommended that writing centers have a full-time individual
specifically trained in dealing with NNES writers and who is accessible to assist tutors who might encounter difficulties.

**Significance of Findings**

**Considerations for Theory**

Social constructionism, my primary theoretical lens, posits that knowledge, ways of thinking about knowledge, and discourse associated with knowledge is socially constructed through interactions by individuals of like-minded peers (Bell, 2002; Blau, et al., 2002; Crotty, 1998; Gergen, 1985, 1999, 2001; Gergen & Gergen, 2008; Hinds, 1990; Jones, 2001). This includes how to appropriate language and ideas that may be used within certain discourse communities. All of the tutors in this study, as members of the same discourse community (the academic English community in this case), shared common knowledge of rhetorical structures, conversational strategies, and knowledge about writing. The writers, on the other hand, were all from CHC cultures which typically employ different rhetorical structures, different ways of presenting information, and different conversational strategies which include silence and backchannels. The tutor is in a position to serve as a cultural informant for both linguistic and informational purposes (Blau, et al., 2002; Powers, 1993). The extent to which tutors operate as cultural informants, however, is little examined in past research. My study extends prior research by illustrating how tutors provide culturally specific information such as historical context crucial a NNES writer potentially needs to complete a writing task.

**Social View**. Operating as a cultural informant ties in with social views of writing and dialogue that occurs in social context by members from discourse communities. In making a better (NNES) writer (North, 1984), researchers need to investigate how what
occur within the tutorials assists in changing the way these writers think about knowledge and create prose in order to align to Western conventions. Scaffolded activities (Cromley & Azevedo, 2005; Ewert, 2009; Thompson, 2009; Wood, et al., 1976) may help in assisting these writers create new knowledge. These are more structured activities that create opportunities for dialogue through modeling, questions, and hints.

One instance of this occurring in my research was Hyuk’s change from not understanding Frost’s use of the buzz saw in “Out, Out” to understanding it as symbolizing man’s struggle with technology and that it alienated individuals from nature and, ultimately, community (Case 4, Tutorial B). Through his conversation with Jack, Hyuk began to appropriate a new discourse and ways of looking at how symbolism can be used in Western poetry. Hyuk said: “I didn’t know about- I didn’t know why Frost keep use chainsaw... But, like um, he made me to think about that” (Hyuk Interview). By this, Hyuk meant that the types of questions Jack modeled and the information Jack provided allowed him to begin to understand how to begin looking at poetry and ask questions.

Another instance of created knowledge was FengYi’s beginning understanding of how to use citation. He entered the tutorial not knowing how to cite, although he had seen citation in work he had read. Through his discussions with Roger, he was able to begin understanding how citation worked enough to be able to complete his assignment. His construction of knowledge here was limited to thinking citation meant directly quoting. This is likely a result of the following exchange:

163t ↓so:: what do you mean? to quote something?
160w I mean [just] (0.87) [quote?] (0.39) I don’t >y-yeah-yeah< I =
164t [(?)] [(just)]
160w mean I don’t have to quote anything? (.)
In this portion, we can see that Roger indicated that FengYi had to quote. While this may have been in response to this particular assignment, FengYi reported new understanding of quotation.

Contrastive Rhetoric. I also used contrastive rhetoric as a lens in my research. Contrastive rhetoric emphasizes that different cultures produce different thoughts, and these thoughts, in turn, are often represented using differing rhetorical structures (Blau, et al., 2002; Grabe, 1989; Hinds, 1987, 1990; Kaplan, 1966, 1987, 2001). In Case 1, how different cultures utilize different patterns became apparent. When Marc asked what BaiHua’s thesis statement was, she read a section he considered to be a summary of the story. Furthermore, her paper appeared disorganized to Marc. Bliss (2005) discusses how CHC NNES “students rely on their native cultural and linguistic patterns of explanation and, as a result… their writing seems disorganized” (p. 17). Additionally, Kirby, Woodhouse, and Ma (1996) found that Chinese writers tend to write shallow summaries and recall of details using patterns that did not adhere to Western conventions such as a clear thesis statement with each paragraph supporting the thesis.

CHC NNES students entering higher education are often faced with new and different writing tasks. Succeeding in these tasks may be dependent on what they know culturally and historically in the C2, their ability to write in accordance with a specific C2 rhetorical style, or general knowledge about conventions used in Western writing. My research here supports how extended dialogue, even when writers appear to be less conversationally involved, supports social constructionist ideas in terms of appropriation.
of rhetorical structures and how knowledge is constructed and conveyed within specific
discourse communities.

In Case 1, the discussions between BaiHua and Marc led to several take-aways for
BaiHua: a rhetorical structure common in Western academic writing, a better
understanding of how to self-edit, and potential changes in her writing process. In Case 2,
FengYi reported becoming more aware of citation through his discussion with Roger.
This conversation on citation was essential for FengYi and represents the type of
dialogue that can result in writer change. Past research has pointed out how individuals
from Confucian Heritage Cultures are “encouraged to repeat scholarly works word for
word as their way of showing respect and acknowledgement” (S. Chan, 1999, p. 300).
They do not attribute works to individuals and, as a result, are unfamiliar with citation
(Shi, 2004). Chan’s (1999) statement on word-for-word use also applies to Case 3.
Through her discussion with Candi, KimYun gained confidence in paraphrasing where
she would typically have used the original text without attributing it to the original author.
Perhaps the greatest support comes with Case 4 where Jack modeled the type of discourse
necessary to become a participant in the conversation (i.e., Hyuk’s paper) as well served
as a cultural resource by providing necessary historical information and equipped Hyuk
with tools to connect knowledge (i.e., resources to use to continue the conversation).

Considerations for Practice

Resource Use

How tutors utilize their resources during a tutorial can affect how well the tutorial
is managed by the tutor. During tutorial one of Case 4, Jack brought in another tutor in
order to assist him in understanding a poem with which he was unfamiliar. In effect, he
sought assistance in interpreting the poem and, by extension, provided Hyuk with a model of how literature can be interpreted differently. Jack’s discussion with Jane allowed him to continue the tutorial with greater confidence and knowledge. In Case 2, Roger struggled with the tutorial because of the unfamiliar requirements set by the instructor.

The implications here are that tutors need to make use of available resources. One common solution, which Roger did, is to refer the writer back to course instructors for clarification (Thonus, 2002, 2004). This strategy is effective because instructors are best able to clarify assignments to students. A previously unaddressed finding is how tutor use of resources assisted the tutor during the tutorial. When Jack began encountering difficulties interpreting the poem, he sought outside assistance from Jane. In addition to assisting Jack, it modeled the type a specific discourse used in English for Hyuk. This suggests that tutors need not treat tutorials as closed encounters; consulting additional resources can assist in being able to better meet the needs of the writer as well as create instances where writers can observe the type of dialogue that occurs when discussing a subject or writing.

Training

Increased tutor training for dealing with NNES writers has been a consistent trend throughout the literature (i.e., Powers & Nelson, 1995a; Thonus, 2002, 2004). Consistent with those findings, tutors in this study felt as if they would be better able to work with NNES writers if they had ongoing training in cultural awareness on issues such as communication differences (i.e., being able to read because of different interactions), and
scaffolding training in explaining and working with both higher-order and lower-order concerns.

*Cultural Awareness*. Increased awareness of cultural communication patterns is necessary for writing center tutors. In Cases 2 and 4, the writers did not appear as conversationally engaged (i.e. the writer was silent or utilized backchannels), and this engagement could result from different reasons. One reason for reduced engagement may be a result from their prior experiences in classrooms from their home country (Harris, 2008). Another reason for silence may be out of politeness (Clancy, et al., 1996; Karpiński, et al., 2006; Ting-Toomey, 1999).

It is important to note that the writers in my research did not indicate issues with how voluble they were compared to the tutors. One of Young’s (1992) conclusions was that “[t]he positive aspect to monological teacher talk is that it allowed the student to experience ‘conversation’ not only with a native speaker of English but one who was capable of modeling academic discourse” (p. 254). This was certainly true in Case 4 where Jack was more voluble in both tutorials. Hyuk was able to, as was the Taiwanese student Young described, able to “extract ideas that would help him... [with] his current assignment... [and] generate his next text” (p. 254). Tutors need to be made aware of these types of issues in communication.

Cultural awareness also extends to being aware of what types of writing NNES students are asked to produce in their home country. Roger was unaware that FengYi had no exposure to citation. Marc even saw difficulties because of BaiHua’s tendency to summarize and not make claims. The lack of claim-work was even evident in the tutorial with Jack and Hyuk. Prior studies support my findings that tutors need additional training
in cultures and how cultural attitudes and knowledge of writing affect writing styles (i.e., Blau, et al., 2002; Severino, 1993).

Tutor training needs to also address communicative patterns of individuals from high-context cultures such as those cultures which are traditionally identified as Confucian-heritage cultures. In my study, there were instances where culture may have influenced communication and resulted in lost opportunities for tutors to provide additional information. Specifically, in Case 2, FengYi responded to Roger’s question of “and you think you can find a way to fit it into your story?” (149t) with “(hh) I think so... maybe not maybe not very good but I think I can do it” (144-145w). As I mentioned in the analysis, FengYi did not actually feel confident with completing the task but answered in this way, perhaps, to be polite. On the other hand, this indirect, high-context type of response may have been FengYi’s way of not offending Roger. On the other hand, it may have been a face-saving act on FengYi’s part. These two phenomena are discussed at length in Sim, Kim, and Martin’s (2008) synthesis on indirect and high-context communication patterns and their interpretation and misinterpretation by Western interlocutors. This is in addition to literature on backchannels used by individuals for CHC cultures and their potential meanings (i.e., Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 2005; Cathcart, et al., 2003; Gardner, 1997, 1998; Karpiński, et al., 2006; Schiffrin, 2001a, 2001b). Tutors need to be trained in recognizing instances where these forms of interactions may negatively impact active participation by the writer versus when the same verbal signs may be signifying active writer participation.

Scaffolding. The most successful tutorials appeared to be those where the tutor scaffolded the tutorial. In Jack and Hyuk’s case, Jack acted as a cultural informant and,
with the assistance of Jane during the first tutorial, modeled ways the poem could be interpreted while providing background information critical for Hyuk’s understanding of the poem. The two writers whose tutors scaffolded the tutorial and isolated specific elements reported greater take-away than the two writers whose tutors did not scaffold the tutorial.

In discussing the level of scaffolding, Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994) note that scaffolded intervention should be graduated and contingent. For them, graduated means “the minimum level of guidance required by the novice to successfully perform a given task” and contingent is assistance “should be offered only when it is needed... and withdrawn as soon as the novice shows signs of self-control and ability to function independently” (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994, p. 468).

*Transcript Use.* Tutor training in both cognitive and motivational scaffolding and the types of interaction occurring in tutorials can occur through use of tutorial transcripts such as those used in my study. During my research, I used excerpts of the transcripts from this study and from prior studies as models to provide tutors training in effective scaffolding and how to deal with situations where a tutor might have had difficulties as a result of a writer’s communication patterns. This proved to be an effective strategy in assisting tutor training and has positively impacted the way out tutors interact with NNES CHC writers. Informal tutor reports reveal increased confidence and better understanding of how to approach tutorials with writers from these cultures. Writing centers should consider the use of transcripts during staff training to better equip tutors with skills needed when dealing with this population.
Time

Three writers suggested increased time for tutorials. Williams (2002) believes that the “automization of new linguistic knowledge” takes time and that it is unlikely that this will occur in a 50-minute time period. This need for time is extended when the writer lacks historical and cultural knowledge necessary to complete a task. All of the writers attending tutorials at the UAWC went voluntarily, and three of the four went the day before their project was due. Devising new ways to promote the writing center and impress upon NNES writers that they would benefit from engaging in tutorials earlier in their writing process may be necessary.

Considerations for Future Research

Past studies have focused on interaction and control in writing center (Blau, et al., 2002; Geither, 2010; Harris & Silva, 1993; Ritter, 2002; Thonus, 1998a, 1998b, 1999a, 2001, 2004; Walker & Elias, 1987; J. Williams, 2002, 2004, 2005). These have uncovered different tutor and writer behaviors including tutors as dominating tutorials with NNESS writers, types of conversational strategies used by tutors to control the conversation, whether tutorials focused on higher-order concerns or lower-order concerns, and perceived success of tutorials.

In my research, I used Agar’s (1985) model of institutional discourse in order to map the structure of each tutorial. I identified topic initiations by either the tutor or writer in order to understand where breaks in the opening, diagnosis, directive, closing, and report phases were. As can be seen, only one of the tutorials followed a pattern found in prior research (Ritter, 2002; Thonus, 1998a, 1998b, 1999a; J. Williams, 2005). All of the tutorials in this research focused on tutorials where students brought in product or worked
directly on product. While the model is instrumental for researchers in mapping out rough tutorial structures, I have some concerns about its use. First, only one of my cases reflected the typical pattern. This could be a result of the different types of tutorials occurring in my cases. Tutors in my research were more voluble than the writers, a finding that supports previous studies (e.g., Ritter, 2002; Thonus, 1998a, 1998b, 1999a; J. Williams, 2005). But this does not necessarily mean that the tutors controlled the tutorial. Recall that Hyuk utilized variations of “yeah” in order to keep Jack talking in both of the Case 4 tutorials. Future research needs to look beyond “typical” tutorials to see how well this framework applies. Future research should also look into reasons why writers might not be as voluble and whether this lack of volubility truly represents tutor dominance.

The current research extends these by looking more closely at the convergence between tutorial structures and writer takeaway. Writers reported taking away more from tutorials (Cases 1 and 4) where scaffolding occurred. In the two cases (2 and 3) where scaffolding did not occur, writers reported minimal take-away, and this take-away did not align with what the tutors hoped the writers took from the tutorial. In fact, in Case 3, Candi hoped that KimYun left with increased confidence in her presentation. KimYun, on the other hand, reported increased confidence in paraphrasing. This paraphrasing work was partially scaffolded with Candi asking KimYun where she might begin, KimYun paraphrasing, and then Candi supplying motivational scaffolding by saying, “Yeah. I like that. just the way you said it” (Case 3 Tutorial Transcript 75t).

Earlier, I raised serious questions of whether the model of institutional discourse is an appropriate framework based on the lack of the critical report phase and inconsistent results regarding what constitutes diagnosis and directive phases. Future research may
need to reevaluate tutorials as being instances of institutional discourse. On the other hand, as Thompson (2009) recommends “looking beyond descriptions of tutors’ strategies based simply on their directiveness to consider tutors’ perceptions of students’ cognitive and motivational readiness to participate actively in the conference” (p. 420). This supports focusing on active participation of the writer versus directiveness of tutors and writer response to directives.

Future research should continue to investigate how scaffolding contributes to writers’ understanding and take-away. Future research should also focus on this aspect of tutorials in order to understand any long-term affects tutorials have on writers’ writing processes if the goal of the center is to make, as North indicates, better writers and not a better product.

**Conclusion**

In contrast to past research that relied on discourse analysis to merely explain interactions, control, and what writers and tutors perceive to be a “successful” tutorial, my research looked at what these tutorials look like, inquired after writer and tutor perceptions of the tutorials, and investigated what the writer reported gaining from the tutorial. Each of the tutorials was unique in the product that was being worked on, and each tutorial has a slightly different structure using Agar’s institutional discourse model. While both writers and tutors reported difficulties in the tutorials, all of the writers reported learning something from the tutorial. A significant finding in my research is the use of scaffolding during tutorials. Writers reported learning more in the cases where tutors cognitively and motivationally scaffolded the tutorial and where students were active participants. If we are to make “better writers”, we need to be aware of techniques
that can be used to meet the need of NNES writes. Continued research on how scaffolding and sustained dialogue can assist in making better writers is called for. Additionally, to develop a better understanding of how writers change, more longitudinal research should be conducted.
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APPENDICES
Appendix A

Writer Check-In/Check-Out Form

Number:_______

Part 1: Check-In (Please complete this before meeting with your tutor).

Your Name: Date/Time:

Major:

Circle One: First-Year Sophomore Junior Senior Master’s PhD.
Faculty/Staff

You would like to work on:  
A. Understanding the assignment or the instructor’s comments
B. Brainstorming ideas
C. Clarity/flow
D. Developing my ideas

What part of the writing process would you like to focus on?

Part 2: Check Out (Complete this at the end of your tutorial and return it to your tutor).

A. Who asked more questions (circle one)?
   1. The tutor asked most of the questions
   2. I asked most of the questions
   3. It was an even balance

B. Describe your level of confidence after your tutorial (circle one):
   1. I am more confident after the tutorial
   2. I am less confident after the tutorial
   3. My level of confidence has not changed because of the tutorial

Part 3: TO BE COMPLETED BY YOUR TUTOR

What changes do you anticipate the writer will make when approaching the same, or similar, writing task in the future?
Appendix B

Tutor Shift Report

Name________________
Date_________________

How many tutorials did you do during your shift?

What else did you do?

For each tutorial include the writer’s name and the length of the tutorial. Describe the focus of the tutorial and identify any shifts between “local” issues, such as surface features or assignment-specific questions, “global” issues, such as general discussions of structure, aesthetics, or rhetoric (purpose/audience/stance/genre), and “meta” issues like the role of writing in learning and life.

A. What three positive observations did you make to the writer?

B. Where is the writer in their process? Briefly describe your sense of the writer’s habits and practices and what approach the tutorial took in terms of addressing these practices.
Appendix C

Transcript Analysis Coding Protocol

= – contiguous utterances (no pause between interlocutor utterances)
[ ] – overlaps and interruptions
[[ ]] – used when multiple occurrences/interruptions are layered in transcript
(·h) – inhalations
(h) – exhalations
↑ ↓ – rising of falling intonation prior to occurrence
°° – indicates talk which is quieter than surrounding talk
. – stopping fall in tone or end of sentence
? – rising inflection and/or question with rising inflection
: – extension of sound syllable
:: – sequence of : indicates prolonged stretches of sound syllable
_ – underlined areas indicate emphasis
CAP – capital letter indicates louder emphasis in word or surrounding talk
(0.0) – pauses in seconds and tenths of seconds
(#m #.#s) – time that spans minutes
(( )) – sounds which are not utterances OR transcriber notes
( ) – unknown utterance or alternate utterance; also time and inhalation/exhalations
- – dashes between words indicate utterances which are strung together or sudden breaks

>< – phrase inside said quicker than the interlocutor’s typical pace
/ – breaks between syllables
' – stress of next syllable (APA notation only)
→ – turns of transcriber interest
(?) – transcriber doubt or other unknown utterance

(adapted from Atkinson & Heritage, 2001)
Appendix D

Interview Questions (Writer)

Opening statement:

Hi, (name). Thanks for agreeing to talk with me in more detail about your tutorial. During this interview, we’ll talk about what your perception of the tutorial I recorded was, things you think went well, things which might have been difficult, things you think might have been improved, and what you took out of or learned in the tutorial. First, I’d like to get a little background information.

(Demographics)

1. Where are you from?

2. How long did you study English in (country)?

3. How long have you been in the U.S.?

4. How long have you studied English?

5. What types of writing did you do before coming to the U.S.?
   a. How does that compare to the type of writing you’re required to do in your classes? (contrast)
   b. How good of a writer do you feel you are in (writer’s native language)?
   c. How does that compare to your English writing? (contrast)

6. How many tutorials did you have before the one we’re talking about?

(Tutorial-specific questions)

7. What did ask to work on when you went into the writing center the day you had your tutorial?
a. What did you end up working on?

8. Describe your tutorial.
   a. How comfortable were you during the tutorial?
   b. What types of things did you say?
   c. What types of things did your tutor say or recommend?
   d. Who did more of the talking? (clarification to triangulate from writer check-in)

9. What suggestions do you recall the tutor making?
   a. Can you identify them in the transcript?
   b. What did you understand from this? (statement specific to tutorial based on tutorial transcript)
      i. How do you think this affected your future writing?

10. Your tutor recommended x (based on tutorial transcript).
    a. Tell me what you thought about this.

11. What did you learn from your tutorial?
    a. In what ways do you think you’ll use what you learned?
        (Other probes asked in situ)
    b. What things do you think your tutor said that (led to/ prevented) you from understanding or leaning?

12. What was the most difficult thing in the tutorial?

13. What might you liked to have seen done differently in the tutorial?
Appendix E

Interview Questions (Tutor)

Opening statement:

Hi, (name). Thanks for agreeing to talk with me in more detail about your tutorial. During this interview, we’ll talk about what your perception of the tutorial I recorded was, things you think went well, things which might have been difficult, and things you took out of the tutorial.

First, I’d like to get a little background information.

(Demographic questions)

1. What’s your major?
   a. What degree are you pursuing?
      i. (PhD student detail question) Did you obtain a Master of Arts or Sciences before enrolling in the PhD program?
      ii. What was it in?

2. What year are you in the program?

3. How long have you been a tutor?

4. What training did you receive?
   a. (detail) How long was your training?
   b. What things did you cover?

5. What is your previous exposure to non-native English speakers?
   a. In what context?

(Tutorial-specific questions)

6. Describe what you feel a high quality tutorial would look like?
a. How does what you’ve describe align to the tutorial you did for this study?  
(contrast question)

b. How does it differ?

7. On the check-in/out form, the writer indicated he/she wanted to work on X.
   a. What did you work on in your tutorial?
   b. How did you negotiate this topic? (with the writer? based on what they saw or heard in the writing?)
   c. Why did you work on this? (provided it differed)

8. On your shift-report and the tutor check-in/out form you indicate that the student will do (item) differently next time. Discuss why you thought this. (contrast question)
   a. What in the tutorial leads you to believe this? (probe)

9. What things in the tutorial do you think went well?
   a. What things do you think didn’t go well?

10. What do you think would assist you to be more effective in tutorials where the writer is a non-native English speaker?

11. What suggestions do you recall making to the writer?
   a. Can you identify them in the transcript?
   b. What was your intention when you said this statement? (statement specific to tutorial based on tutorial transcript)
      i. How do you think this affected the writer?

12. What do you think you could have done differently in the tutorial?
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PARTICIPANT CONSENT FOR RECORDING TUTORIAL SESSION

Study Title
Anatomy of process-based writing center tutorials with NNES writers: What writers take away

Principal Investigator & Contact Information
Jason Vickers, Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Educational Theory and Practice, University at Albany, State University of New York. (845)857-4196, jv5784@albany.edu

Supervising Advisor
Dr. Carla Meskill, Department of Educational Theory and Practice, University at Albany, State University of New York. (518) 442-5007, cmeskill@uamail.albany.edu

The Purpose of the Study
The purpose of this study investigates what occurs in writing center tutorials between native-speaking tutors and non-native speaking, Asian writers and what these writers may be taking out of the tutorials. This study will be used by the investigator, Jason Vickers, to prepare a dissertation research project.

Description of Involvement
For the initial portion of the study, your involvement consists of participating in the writing center tutorial as originally scheduled. The investigator will record your tutorial session using a digital voice recorder. The investigator will not be present during the tutorial session unless the tutor or writer request specific writing-related assistance. The duration of participation is limited to the length of the tutorial (30-60 minutes).

You may be asked to participate in a follow-up interview. If you choose to participate in the interview, the investigator will contact you by e-mail or phone to arrange a time and location for the interview. You will be provided an additional consent form to sign at the interview.

Request for Copy of Written Product (For Writer)
The investigator also requests that a copy of the paper be provided either at the beginning or end of the tutorial session as well as a copy of the paper should you or the tutor make
notes on it. This original paper will be used when analyzing the tutorial transcript in order to better understand interactions between the tutor and writer during the tutorial. Your paper may be used as part of the investigator’s dissertation and in any subsequent papers or professional presentations. All information identifying you will be removed from the original document. If you agree to provide a copy of your writing, you will be asked to acknowledge your decision at the end of this form.

Risk & Discomforts of Participation

We do not anticipate any risk in your participation other than you may become uncomfortable being recorded during the tutorial.

In order to reduce the risk of you becoming uncomfortable, the digital recorder will be positioned on the table as far away from your tutorial as possible but still close enough to clearly record your tutorial.

Potential Benefits

Although you may not receive direct benefit from your participation during this phase of the research, others may ultimately benefit from the knowledge obtained. These benefits include using results to train writing center staff to better tutor non-native English speaking students.

Confidentiality of Records

All information obtained in this study is strictly confidential unless disclosure is required by law. In addition, the Institutional Review Board, the sponsor of the study (e.g. NIH, FDA, etc.) and the university or government officials responsible for monitoring this study may inspect these records.

All identifiable information will be removed from written products (i.e., dissertations, presentations, journal articles). The investigator will use pseudonyms in place of your actual identity.

Data will be in the direct physical possession of the investigator. Copies of the consent form and other artifacts (writer papers) will remain in possession of the investigator. All digital copies of tutorials will be kept in a password protected computer. At no time will individuals other than the investigator have access to the audio recordings. All transcripts, forms, digital recording or other material pertaining to this research will be destroyed upon completion of this research.

Voluntary Nature of Participation

Your participation in this project is voluntary. Even after you agree to participate in the research or sign the informed consent document, you may decide to leave the study at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you may otherwise have been entitled. I
will maintain records, collected data and analyzed data up until the time of your withdrawal. Upon your withdrawal, I will destroy the records.

Contact Information

One copy of this document will be kept with the research records of this study. You will be given a copy of this form to keep for your personal records. If at any time you have questions regarding this study, your participation in it, or wish to withdraw from the study for any reason, please contact the investigator. His contact information is listed on the first page of this consent form.

IRB Contact Information

If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research participant that have not been answered by the investigator or if you wish to report any concerns about the study, you may contact the University at Albany’s Office of Regulatory Research Compliance at (518) 442-9050 or orrc@uamail.albany.edu.

Consent of Writer Paper (for Writer)

(Please initial next to your choice.)

_____ I give permission for the researcher to retain a copy of my paper for research purposes and use it in his dissertation, in conference presentations, and/or in articles.

_____ I give permission for the researcher to retain a copy of my paper for research purposes. I DO NOT give permission for him to use it in his dissertation, in conference presentations, and/or in articles.

_____ I DO NOT give permission for the researcher to retain a copy of my paper for research purposes.

Consent for Writing Center Documents (Tutor and Writer)

(Please initial next to your choice.)

_____ I give permission for the researcher to use any document related to the tutorial under examination including tutor shift reports, writer check-in/out forms, and future documents used to report on tutorials in his dissertation, conference presentations and/or future articles.

_____ I give permission for the researcher to use any document related to the tutorial under
examination including tutor shift reports, writer check-in/out forms, and future documents used to report on tutorials. I DO NOT give permission for him to use them in his dissertation, conference presentations and/or future articles.

I DO NOT give permission for the researcher to use any document related to the tutorial under examination including tutor shift reports, writer check-in/out forms, and future documents used to report on tutorials.

**Interview Interest**

(Please initial next to your choice.)

- [ ] I am interested in participating in the interview portion of this research.

- [ ] I am NOT interested in participating in the interview portion of this research.

**Consent**

I have read, or been informed of, the information about the study. I hereby consent to participate in the study and have my tutorial recorded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Name</th>
<th>Participant Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact Phone Contact E-mail

Writer Tutor (Check appropriate box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher Name</th>
<th>Researcher Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PARTICIPANT CONSENT FOR INTERVIEWS

Study Title

Anatomy of process-based writing center tutorials with NNES writers:
What writers take away

Principal Investigator & Contact Information

Jason Vickers, Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Educational Theory and Practice, University at Albany, State University of New York. (845)857-4196, jv5784@albany.edu

Supervising Advisor

Dr. Carla Meskill, Department of Educational Theory and Practice, University at Albany, State University of New York. (518) 442-5007, cmeskill@uamail.albany.edu

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study investigates what occurs in writing center tutorials between native-speaking tutors and non-native speaking, Asian writers and what these writers may be taking out of the tutorials. This study will be used by the investigator, Jason Vickers, to prepare a dissertation research project.

Description of Involvement

This is the follow-up interview to discuss the tutorial you participated and had recorded. I will ask questions about your past educational experiences and focus on different things in the tutorial you had.

The interview will last anywhere around one hour. It may, depending on what you have to say, last slightly longer.

Risk & Discomforts of Participation

We do not anticipate any risk in your participation other than you may become uncomfortable talking about a topic. If I ask a question you’re uncomfortable answering or do not want to answer, please let me know so I can refocus or skip the question.
In order to reduce the risk of you becoming uncomfortable, the digital recorder will be positioned on the table as far away from interview as possible but still close enough to clearly record the interview. This is provided you agree to have the interview recorded.

**Potential Benefits**

Although you may not receive direct benefit from your participation during this phase of the research, others may ultimately benefit from the knowledge obtained. These benefits include using results to train writing center staff to better tutor non-native English speaking students.

**Confidentiality of Records**

All information obtained in this study is strictly confidential unless disclosure is required by law. In addition, the Institutional Review Board, the sponsor of the study (e.g. NIH, FDA, etc.) and the university or government officials responsible for monitoring this study may inspect these records.

All identifiable information will be removed from written products (i.e., dissertations, presentations, journal articles). The investigator will use pseudonyms in place of your actual identity.

Data will be in the direct physical possession of the investigator. Copies of the consent form and other artifacts (writer papers) will remain in possession of the investigator. All digital copies of tutorials will be kept in a password protected computer. At no time will individuals other than the investigator have access to the audio recordings. All transcripts, forms, digital recording or other material pertaining to this research will be destroyed upon completion of this research.

**Voluntary Nature of Participation**

Your participation in this project is voluntary. Even after you agree to participate in the research or sign the informed consent document, you may decide to leave the study at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you may otherwise have been entitled. I will maintain records, collected data and analyzed data up until the time of your withdrawal. Upon your withdrawal, I will destroy the records.

**Contact Information**

One copy of this document will be kept with the research records of this study. You will be given a copy of this form to keep for your personal records. If at any time you have questions regarding this study, your participation in it, or wish to withdraw from the study for any reason, please contact the investigator. His contact information is listed on the first page of this consent form.

**Compensation**
Participants who wish to participate in the interviews will be compensated for their time with a credit card gift in the amount of $15.00. The compensation will be presented at the beginning of the interview. Participants who withdraw from the study or wish to discontinue the interview will keep the gift card.

**IRB Contact Information**

If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research participant that have not been answered by the investigator or if you wish to report any concerns about the study, you may contact the University at Albany’s Office of Regulatory Research Compliance at (518) 442-9050 or orrc@uamail.albany.edu.

**Consent to Record Interview**

(Please initial next to your choice.)

- I give permission for the researcher to audio record this interview and use portions of it in his dissertation, in conference presentations, and/or in articles.

- I give permission for the researcher to audio record this interview. I DO NOT give permission for him to use it in his dissertation, in conference presentations, and/or in articles.

- I DO NOT give permission for the researcher to audio record this interview.

**Consent**

I have read, or been informed of, the information about the study. I hereby consent to participate in the study and have my tutorial recorded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Name</th>
<th>Participant Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Phone</td>
<td>Contact E-mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher Name</td>
<td>Researcher Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CONSENT TO CONDUCT RESEARCH IN WRITING CENTER

Study Title
Anatomy of process-based writing center tutorials with NNES writers: What writers take away

Principal Investigator & Contact Information
Jason Vickers, Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Educational Theory and Practice, University at Albany, State University of New York. (845) 857-4196, jv5784@albany.edu

Supervising Advisor
Dr. Carla Meskill, Department of Educational Theory and Practice, University at Albany, State University of New York. (518) 442-5007, cmeskill@uamail.albany.edu

Permission to Conduct Research
I have been asked to give permission to the investigator to gain access to the University Writing Center to conduct a dissertation study that has been reviewed by a dissertation committee and reviewed and authorized by the Institutional Review Board.

The purpose of this study investigates what occurs in writing center tutorials between native-speaking tutors and non-native speaking, Asian writers and what these writers may be taking out of the tutorials and will take place from late Spring 2011 to the end of Spring 2012.

I understand that:
1. Four to six tutorials will be audio recorded with the consent of the tutor and writer.

2. The investigator has permission to use writer check-in/out sheets and tutor shift reports provided he has consent from the writer and tutor (for check-in/out sheets) and tutor (for tutor shift reports).

3. The investigator will not be present during the tutorial session unless he is asked to assist. This assistance will be within his function as the writing center ESL consultant and applies only if he is scheduled to work during that period.

4. I will not inquiry about the ongoing research or the tutors he has selected to interview as the participant information is confidential.
All information obtained in this study is strictly confidential unless disclosure is required by law. In addition, the Institutional Review Board, the sponsor of the study (e.g. NIH, FDA, etc.) and University or government officials responsible for monitoring this study may inspect these records.

5. Agreeing to the research may not have immediate benefits to me or the writing center. Research findings may inform future tutor training and practice.

6. Research findings will be used in the investigator’s dissertation. Additionally, research findings may be used at professional conferences and in professional articles.

**IRB Contact Information**

I understand that if I have any questions concerning the research that have not been answered by the investigator or if I wish to report any concerns about the study, I may contact the University at Albany’s Office of Regulatory Research Compliance at (518) 442-9050 or orrc@uamail.albany.edu.

(Please initial next to your choice)

___ I give the researcher access to existing and future tutor shift reports and writer check-in/out forms to be used in his research.

___ I DO NOT give the researcher access to existing and future tutor shift reports and writer check-in/out forms to be used in his research.

**Consent**

I have read, or been informed of, the information about the study. I hereby consent to all this research to take place in the University Writing Center.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing Center Director Name</th>
<th>Writing Center Director Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Phone</th>
<th>Contact E-mail</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher Name</th>
<th>Researcher Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Case 5 Tutorial 2 Notes by Tutor and Thesis Statement by Writer

Nature: “Out, Out”
- Death
- Vast
- Scenic
- Pristine
- Exploited
- Violent / bestial
- Observer
  - Bay and machine
  - Human
  - Technology

diminishing
how life is being diminished and become fragile from care of human being from
community and nature by machine

Machine

Community

Bay

Nature

@ 24:30
Sample Tutorial Transcript

1t cool okay. so what you got goin on?
1w m: my paper is a literary a- analyze (.) [of] er: th↓is book
2t [okay]
3t okay. coo.:l. [alright] good deal. (h) who’s this for? (0.72)
2w [ m: ]
3w ↑hm?
4t who is this for? (1.19)
4w u[h
5t [who- wha- who is the professor?
5w (h) u: professor name is (.) u:m (Mal) (0.60) m- (0.44) Mell↑on I’m not sure I- I only know: her office is in this building: the three ninety
(0.45)
6t ↑okay: ok[ay (h) u:m (.) o↓kay. so: u:h did you- did you fill out your paper from.
(0.94)=
6w [((small exhaled laugh that trails off))
7t the: the?Cindy did you give her a piece of paper? (.) the-
WS no sorry
8t the- that’s o↓kay (0.86) ((next is to writer)) do me a fa↓vor- fill this out real quick an:d I’m gonna (0.47)
7w °thank° (0.53) thank you
(23.68)
7w uh. I need all help ((laugh while saying this))
9t hh-huh ((a laugh)) all of it?
10t/w ((tutor and writer both laugh))
(0.67)
11t okay. so just- yeah t- here: for now so you can pro’bly circle the entir[e:] thing =
8w [m.]
(0.93)
12t if you want to not a problem and the:n (0.23) and then this here: but
(4.14)
9w (h) m: (5.17) °uh°
(0.93)
13t °and I’m gonna look at this here:° ((reading writer paper))
(41.80)
14t °okay:° what u:m what class what level of class is this?= 10w m: one hundred (0.59) z
15t one hundred z?= 11w yeah=
16t ok↓ay
(1.93)
12w is lower writing classes
(0.72.)
y: eah that’s right m-h[m](0.22) m-kay [m.]
(8.82)
(-h) oh:-kay:
(1.35)
so u:[m] (0.45) ah: I writing: the: nove:l (0.52) uh: re- I (h) I’m focused on the tem ((theme)) of gender=

o\ka[y
[so I’s u:h I write three (forms?) in: dis book
mhm. okay-okay (-h) grea:t so u:m so I see you’ve got- you’ve >kind of< worked some of this out here: on the- on like kind of a structure almost huh? (-h) like u:m (0.28) this is: (0.18) this looks like maybe: (0.63) (-h) like what you’ve: (0.40) like an outline?= 
m-yep=
or a structure?= 
yep
do\ka(y (0.36) (-h) g\ood so u:m let me: tell me what you’ve got going on the- explain it to me a little bit
((large inhale)) oh-kay: (0.25) m: ( .) in the (0.72) (h) (?) tell me the story about this a[
[ YEAH: yah-yah like kind a- kind of summarize it for me what [you’ve =
[okay]

m: (-h) uh: (0.45) (h) this pa- this paper: (-h)(h) the story: it happen in linden hill in linden hill- in linden hi:lls =~

(-h) uh:: (0.67) ↓hm it’s a (0.47) it’s focused on the: lu- luther needed ((Luther Neded)) famil↑y:=

and the ah: my: topic is focus on: the Luther Neded’s- the w↓ife (0.53) (-h) uh there are th- three generations of Luther Nedeed they are- they are all named Luther Neded=
oh. oh-kay (((laughs))) yeah.

[so: first wife is uh- the first generation and then the second then- then the third=

okay=

so: ((clears throat)) the- (0.40) I think the Luther Neded will. be. very (-h) uh: (h) it. it’s a soci- I think ther: soci- (0.37) uh: (0.44) they linden hill is like sma:ll soc↑iety (-h) [and]

[mmm]

the which is dom- dom-ate by ma:le=
ok:
so women’s uh states ((status) will be very low

mmm=
(·h) and ((clears throat)) their wife always ah:: (0.24) always uh: (0.85) to be the pret- (0.58) to be th:- the: (·h) their husband is to: for produce (0.37) birth

o:↓kay
(0.26)

puh-du- produce birth=

go:t↓cha

y↓eh m. so: this story begins with ther: (0.16) (↓mh) (0.84) with the: s: th:- fourth wife [fourth] =

[mhm]
genations (0.64) (·h) uh-uh generation of Luther Nedeed’s w↓ife=

[mhm] =

because he: (0.27) (↓h)-uh (0.29) because he (married) with the: Luther Nedeed (·h) but-uh he produce uh: (0.37) because they are all black pe- black (0.21) peo↑ple:=

[mhm] =

but uh: (0.47) (·h) uh: h-he:- she produced a: bab↑y: (0.55) n:ot (black look?)=

[okay: ↓yeah

[so: ha- her husband did not belie:ve her: (0.30) it’s (0.42) believe her

r↓ight r↓ight [that] it was his yea:h=

[so:]

so he: punish he- punish her in the basement=

okay=

with her: little (0.42) (↓h) (0.17) little son [for:] (0.31) many t↑imes. oh- for many

[okay]

years wow: ok[ay

[so: in the basement (·h) the: (0.47) i- this woman the fourth generations wife named uh W↑illa=

okay=

(·h)(h)(·h) he found ther:s the- the ne- ther: last-uh three: generations (0.24) the other three: (0.36) Luther Needed’s wife (0.29) their: (0.53) their:- life a:ll (0.41) (h) also very (·h) very fake- very humble like- like ↓her:

yeah=

the first one: (0.16) u:h (0.19) ((clears throat)) uh: first one- first-uh people who named- I w↓ill (0.16) uh introduce e- each- uh- everyone=

yeah that’s o:↓kay. tell me a little bit about your paper (0.33) [like what-

[the my paper- it tell

(0.16) uh is: m: (·h) uh in the first (0.46) uh: just a (0.37) uh: describe the story of the three womans and the (·h) and the(·h) and- and- I con: (0.37) I conclusion that the:r (0.24) male- the woman also n- ignored by their husband ((husband))=

[okay:

[ ·h) an:d eh: the woman stays always low:=

[mhm] =

and eh: (1.58) m: their husband (0.13) uh always: very: (·h)(0.46) bad for:- so I just uh: (0.26) like this one ((quick breathy laugh))

[okay: ↓yeah. so you’re looking at the structure: (·h) you wanna look at the structure of the paper then ↑righ t? [the structure and the language
[the: also the language m: course (0.43) language is very very (0.55) the (0.19) problem for me: ((very quick breathy laugh here))

okay. [okay. (·h) right. so:- so tell me: erh - so let’s look at the structure first. =

[and:]

tell me a little about: (0.31) (·h) your: th- about your thesis statement and yo[ur]=

[uh]

interpretive claim like what is your: what is your claim here?

(0.87)

uh my: th-th-thesis [is:] er: (0.76) uh: the: (0.37) the low state for the woman in =

[mhm]

this story okay: um (0.20) what’s your ↓argument?

(0.72)

argument but I think (0.29) uh (0.85) because (·h) the three generation (0.15) the thr- the thr- (0.17) the: last-uh-three woman all (0.42) uh: (0.20) finally (0.38) they are suicide (0.91) they are thied ((died))

ok[ay]

[lots uh: some are suicide not (0.23) some are died=

[mhm]

finally (·h) but uh: (0.16) ↓mh ((clears throat)) (0.76) eh: (0.17) the: (0.11) the fourth one the w- Will↑a (·hh) I think she: is different from the other thr↑ee:=

okay=

she has (there?) uh she has (0.41) keep her ideas about-uh (0.26) life [(·hh)

[m↑hm]

so: m:: (0.41) ↓m:: (1.06) I want to say: m:: (0.97) this is ther: she- (0.42) um (0.46) (·hh) (0.52) uh: I think she is-er: (2.12) survivor ös (1.07) uh-the woman in ther: (0.20) in this famir↑y=

[mhm]

and the he also ended ther: (·h) (0.314) dyn- dynast↑y=

[mhm]

of ther:- this family

↓right. okay.=

[m]=

so we’re looking at it from- uh- through a critical reading lens (·hh) which is what you: ‘ve-you’ve done is t- what you’ve cho↓sen to do is look at it through the gender:=

↓yah.

right? (·h) so what (0.64) this u:ually does is wha- what this usually does is it looks a↑t (·hh) (0.96) ¨u- eh¨ to be very simple about it it looks at the power relations (0.25) [po]wer relationships between:n male and female

[yeah]

yah

and how females n- (0.26) um especially like in a feminist [read]ing (·h) negotiate

[m.m]

those (0.58) relations. what they do: to negotiate those relations either to u:m (0.26) to live within or to: gain some sort of power themselves- you know that
kind of thing (∙h) u:m (0.70) so going back here: wh- what is- so what’s your
thesis statement? what do you argue? (.)
(1.19)
56w uh: argue that-uh woman (0.60) u:h also has their power (0.24) to: (1.04) ‘to°
stand up
(0.50)
63t o:kay
57w ((slight laugh)) a woman cannot- wo-woman also h- has their: (0.40) has their
power (∙h) not only the (0.20) uh: (0.48) déter: (0.26) dah:ment (dominate?) (0.41)
by man
64t mhm. okay. okay.: [an]d so: (∙h) and so (0.29) th:en- then you show:- y:ou talk..
58w [m]
65t about how the text (0.20) show:s ↓that
(0.16)
59w yah
66t then. okay:
60w (∙h) u:h in the (0.13) I:- ↓I: in:: (0.30) I s:how some (0.29) uh: text to evidence
[to] (∙h)
67t [mhm]
60w to: (0.42) prove (0.37) in p-prove=
68t mhm=
(0.64)
61w °but° (0.34) to prove °do you (understand?)
69t y↓eah. [that’s okay mhm=
62w [in prove pro:ve uh: (∙hh) uh: (0.66) uh to prove the process (∙h) they
(hows) their husband to: (0.29) punish-eh them
70t o:kay. (0.23) mhm. okay [okay
63w [ maybe you want see some-
71t y↓eah: let me s- well let’s see- let’s take a look at the
thesis statement first where: where is your thesis in: in the in the (0.51) (∙h) the
pa↓per?
(0.67)
64w (∙h) (2.15) (∙h) m: (. ) (∙h) m: (1.74)
72t like where: do you make your argument? where do you make your claim? (0.42)
in the pa↓per (∙h) it should be the first couple of paragraphs. where do you come
out and say: (0.90) like that you:- that you’re: (0.20) like where- where do you
come out and say that you’re making an argument? (0.29) you know [like] you =
62w [uh:]
72t say hey (∙h) this is- you know like y- you so you told me what the thesis is you
know that you’re: that- that (∙h) you want to show that the fema:le um: (0.41) you
know is either taking back (0.18) you know the ur- uh-uh claiming power:
somehow: or reclaiming power through the (∙h) you know- the- uh- in the: (∙h) so
where- where- where: do you: articulate thi:s?: (∙h) u:m this is the most important
part here of this: or this wh- what d- the professor’s trying to get you to do: or the
what the instructions trying to getchu to do: (∙hh) is: work on: work on (0.46) the
thesis statement (0.75) (∙h) um through a critical reading lens- that’s c- the
interpretive claim right here like you’ve got it underlined you know: so (h) um (.) so this is th- (1.24) this looks like it’s gonna be one of the most important aspects of the paper: itself: (0.70) so um (2.52) let’s see
((reading W3S11-assignment note 1))
°indicate your method of approach to the topic°
((stopped))
so: (0.55 ) so here
((reading portions of assignment - see W3S11-assignment))
define your topic. the question issue problem and state (0.30) what it matters (h) indicate your method of approach to the topic. um (1.22) after a work (0.70) eh um after your
work[ing the]sis=
63w
[(is this?)]
73t
that your paper develops
((stopped reading))
74t
(h) so: (0.14) so y¶eh. so so: w:here is: this? I mean like this is the introduction but where (h) where is the thesis statement? can you:- (0.22) or the interpretive claim? can you show that here:?
(0.44)
64w
uh-m: (11.09) (h) °°maybe here:°°
(3.46)
75t
(h) so that looks like- okay so this- this statement here this looks like it’s a summary statement [(h) y-] you’re summarizing the: you know so- (h) (0.28) =
64w
[yep uh.]
75t
um (0.72) what eh:er maybe down h↑ere? um (0.70)
((reading student paper - inaudible; writer also says something unknown during this time. then)) she never lost the courage to live and has been trying to master her own fate (h) um (0.65) this is the reason that her son was not like the Neededs’s ancestor his (0.95) husband punished her by locking her in the basement with her son
((stopped))
(h) okay let’s see the next page ((page turns - 4.2 s)) okay: um (2.42)
((t reading from paper))
okay also this tragedy is hear:d and all of them had same duty (h) which is to help the Needed family produce offspring. when they finished this task they would become useless women in the Needeed’s family
((stopped))
okay so. (1.33) okay um
((reading))
Linden Hills is the place of (0.43) male chau:vinism (h) (0.54) Luther Needeed’s thirst for power provides the catalyst for the demise of humanistic values (2.07) (h)(h) and the triumph of materialism in the lives of-
((stopped))
okay (0.81) did you:- do you have (2.05) do you have um (0.25) your source er- uh: sources? do you have other (0.78) outside
(0.68)
Luther Needed’s thirst for power provides the catalyst for the demise of humanistic values and the triumph of materialism in the lives of the people of Linden Hills (h) even their wives been ((all from page 2 of W3S11 paper - mid-first paragraph))

so: (0.69) this sentence here: (h) (0.78) ((reading))
Luther Needed’s thirst for power provides the catalyst (0.75) for the demise of humanistic values and the triumph of materialism in the lives of people- of the people of Linden Hills
((stops))
(h) what does that mean exactly?

(h) (6.86) (h) I think he is very (h) um it see:ms like this could be: (0.90) a thesis statement
y- so yeah: m: it (0.36) it’s some: it’s u:: (1.11) it’s a:- the describe all her personal↑ity? (·h) and uh:

so (·h) this uh this personality of him (will?) (0.62) lead to: their: (0.47) lead to (·h) uh: (0.13) to him to (1.26) why they will treat their hus- (0.61) their wifes like (0.58) like punish their wife (0.55) or:

wait can you say that one more time?

yeah: h-he also want to control all the people in the Linden H↑ills=

mhm (0.36) okay=

yeah=

okay (·h) u:m (0.45) okay. so yeah: so that’s- (7.14) ((tutor reading silently?)) I’m still- I’m still having a little trouble (0.66) understanding what this sentence mea:ns though (·h) and what it means to the rest of the: (0.43) kind of the rest of this paragraph here

and what these humanistic values and the triumph of materialism is (·hh) u:m (1.31) you know for the simple fact that like- it seems like you could expand on these terms (·h) these are terms that- you know triumph of materialism and humanistic values (2.10) it seems like those are:- those are terms that you could expa:nd on (0.40) th[at] that wou:Id

(0.46)

yeah:

that would- you could use those to kind of write (0.71) you know revolve around on the rest of the pa:per (·h) but I: I gotta know what those m- you know like I’d like to know what those mea:n f↓irst to you: and why: you chose to put them in here

I’m not sure:° ((sure is exhaled with slight laughter)) because I uh write it (0.31) uh: (3.26) ugh(h:) (1.30) (·h) can I look (for:-ê:)?

what’s that? ((t sounds to be laughing with this))

((laughs)) can we look the for in all paper because [ (?)

[yeah. yeah.

exa- yeah [absolute]ly. yeah. w- is there [a s]pecific spot you wanted to take a =
look at or a specific area that you’d like to work on?

Yeah, okay.

Okay. I’m because I can’t understand these words because I used the dictionary to find the meaning I want to say but now I can’t remember whether I will try it again = [(laughing)] okay.

Sorry sure no take your time that’s alright no worries

Oh, it means he is the same as success?

Well the triumph is it could be a form of success. mhm. Right. like you’ve won you know or it’s something is won ou:t like something is

[OH: I understand this meaning oh you should m: in the first page I have write about uh mh] ((writer is turning pages)) ((reading))

in the Linden Hills the most affluent people=

mhm

families live at the bottom of the hill while the less affluent live at the top ((stopped reading))=

that’s interesting okay:. mhm=

uh the Luther Nedeed is in the bottom. of the hills so: so I say they =

are- sh- he is the most successful of people in this society=

okay

do you understand? ((nervous sounding))

I sure do: yeah absolutely okay and so um and so:

[oh.]

and uh (0.97) the (0.30) humanist values in: (0.58) uh: (5.66) ((slight laughter)) (hh)(h) (13.41) it means die?

(2.74)

↑we’ll (0.20) it’s like a downfall

it’s end ing?

(0.30)

↑yeh: uh-huh i- well it’s it’s like a gradual it’s something that’s going towards- yeh. it’s- it’s- it’s end ing: (0.31) it’s end-ing: it’s in the process of ending [yeh (0.41) yeah:]

[yeah (h) because m: this this was because I: used a: (0.26) I understand it in Chinese=}
I look this (0.19) ↓u: (0.18) I (h) an:d (0.37) I: (0.12) in my- I use the words in my mind and f- to find the word in the dictionary so[so that I can’t (h) remember what I’m
[yeah: >yeah-yeah-yeah< ri:ght (0.42) right (0.46) no I got’cha I got’cha yeah it’s tough to- you know- keep (0.18) you know things (0.14) going >it’ll like< be back and for[th you know yeah:
[because my mind is. in.
the Chinese=
y↓eah=
because e-(h) I really have difficulty in English writing (((laughs)))
[ri:ght right-right-right-right (.) no it’s y-y-y you’re a: you’re a pretty good writer I mean like y- I d- I don’t see: (·h) like I mean there are certain small things but I mean most cases it’s- you know: it’s- r-r-writing y-you’ve go:t a: pretty good (0.26) you know like a pretty good grasp on on (0.36) (·h) presenting your ideas. you know. so it’s- you know. or presenting at least- you know in the sentence- in the sentence structure (·hh) what I’m concerned with here is that (·h) is that we want to make sure that we fulfill (0.61) the:se (0.97) you know these types- >the-yuh-the< the- the things that w- that (0.16) your (0.33) instructor’s talking about here. so having (·h) having a thesis statement and: (·h) u:m (0.74) a pr- you know having an opr-wou-
that includes an interpretive ↓clai:m
(yep.)
>·m.<
(h) u:m (1.60) and then th: you know and th: talking about the novel (·h) in a way: that (0.67) that approaches the clai:m from a critical reading lens (·h) so: like talking you know t- t- talking through: - through that lens of gender=
you know: u:m (·h) so: u:m
I have talk in my: (0.55) topic (0.37) to my professor=
mhm=
I uh she: said it okay because (0.78) he give me some choice because uh like al-
also kind of (resident? den till??) enough?=
mhm=
(fertile?)
y↓eah
because I write (0.48) not familiar with this one=
yeah
it was above your step by step (0.40.) uh: (h) I look some- I: look some- do some research about this one
uh-huh
this this book is (0.29) some - I also look some other papers to analyze (0.62) this paper w-with uh in the [final
[↓yeah:. yeah.
it’s very very s- the sculpture ((structure)) is very similar but I’m not familiar with it so I choose a gender to (-h) analyze it=

o kay. cool yeah definitely u:m (0.60) okay so you said that you talked about your topic with your:- with your instructor right?

yeah

okay so how does that get into here where:’s the- where i:s the: (-h) show me where the topic i- like i- it works then. where the argument your making (1.49)

u:h ah: (1.19) °what’s the meaning?°

(0.42)

u:m (0.75) yeah. like like the topic. like how- you know where is: (0.83) ok↓ay. (-h) (1.02) wh- (hh) (2.23) ((pages turning)) let’s see (5.28) (-h) okay so: so (22.25) ((tutor might be reading here)) °m:Kay:° (2.63) (-h) okay: so: u:m (0.75) okay so. yeah got- I got this you’re setting up the background here with this. this is-s kinda summarizing (-h) summarizing uh the- the- the novel (-h)=

m.=

okay (-hh) u:m (0.45) okay. so yeah: so that’s- (7.14) ((tutor reading silently?)) I’m still- I’m still having a little trouble (0.66) understanding what this sentence means though (-h) and what it means to the rest of the: (0.43) kind of the rest of this paragraph here (0.50)

u:h the- this paragraph is the summ↑ary=

uh-huh=

an:d then from this (0.55) this (0.94) uh this paragraph is talking about the first ↓wi:fe

m-hm

and-a this is the sec- (0.85) second wife (1.79) (Wynona? uh ?) is in her na:me ((page turning)) and uh this was uh (0.96) the second- the first one wife=

okay:=

and this is the th:ird wife=

mhm:=

(1.23)

an:d uh (h) (6.36) (cus?) uh: it is a (1.33) a story that uh (1.40) mph uh: (0.48) it’s a (0.98) it’s not in: (1.59) eh in (0.46) do you know uh (0.24) I c[an show uh you can write on here if you want yeah [go ahead

[(·h) it’s no:t (0.29) in the process of A to B [it’s] B to A to: it’s c:ome back

[·mhm]

yeah it’s all over right?

[((laughs)) I can’t say I don’t (?)]

[yeah okay. okay. yeah. sure. no] problem. no problem

it (quick laugh) because it uh: (0.85) (is ?) because the fir- or the fourth wife was in (0.42) in the: (0.45) in the basement because he- she is punished by the bay- (-h) by- in the basement he found the (-h) o:ther: (0.16) other wife material in the basement so: [tha]t is a story (-h) u::h (0.38) she=
found it. maybe she is uh: has her: or she is er (1.41) she is founder of the other (0.50) the other: (0.50) other wives

[and this is: first and second and third (·h) and uh:
(2.36)
]

maybe this uh: sentence I will (0.72) will: some conclusion about they and this is analyze the wo↑man?
(0.29)

so what- what do you: u:m (0.16) what did you come (0.17) to the writing center here to work on then? what did you want to: - did you want to work on: (0.57) (·hh) u:m (0.16) o↓kay cus I - I’m: (0.73) (·h) I’m wondering if we should (0.48) maybe look at

(yes)

yeah: [I’m because: I- I-] I’m- I understand I haven’t a: definite (0.67) the: =

[some of the stuff here]

my s: (0.58) my ther: ther: (0.75) my ther:
(0.72)

your thesis?

the[sis isn’t] very clearly (·h) I should uh bri:ng a ver: uh: (0.37) maybe (0.69) =

[mhm. mhm]

m: (0.61) can I (0.31) put my: th- theory statement in first sentence or:

yeah usually it goes [in the] in the first couple of paragraphs=

[in the f-]

so- so- [yeah:

[mhm within one of the first couple of paragraphs. mhm=

maybe I will put some sentence (0.49) put my (theoris) (0.36) sentence here:

y- (0.40) y↓eah so where w- where- is that in: here right now? in the paper?

(h) (0.53) [I’m: not sh:

[somewhere in the paper?]

((laugh)) I will also (0.36) I: just want to say: (·h) m: (0.22) my paper is talking about these women in the: (0.79) (·h) ¨oh° (0.35) +maybe:° (3.54) ((small breathy laugh)) I really don’t know what’s [my the:s (·h) ((w. laughing with last))

[((laughs)) yeah. so wh- what do you want to say abou:t (0.15) about (0.39) about the women [then? like you]- so you

[u:m:::

want to (·h) so I see like you’ve g- you’re talking about all th- [four of] the wives? [you] know:=

[yeh, yeah]
okay. so: what what can we say: about those ways that the interact with the
husband then? like what- what- what is important about: that one husband (0.39) (-h) and the power
structure there: what’s important about that?

(1.99)
m: (1.77) these two man in: this story (0.26) also dominate by man?
(0.87)
y:-eah okay. so.(0.27) ↓right. so that:’s- that’s kind of:
[they don’t have their life=
(0.42)
right.=
134w they: ungh (1.14) they are controlled by: their husband=
145t mhm right=
135w and don’t in:- they don’t (0.48) they don’t independent?
146t right. they’re not independent. right. exactly. (-h) okay so: u:m (0.20) so. w:: th::
that’s right. so: w:what (1.46) what can we say about that then? how can we look
a little: (1.43) deeper into that? like what- what are- what are some of the
consequences of that?
(0.36)
136w (·h)(0.61)(hh) ((slight laught?)) this sentence will
(1.13)
147t okay: s:ure. so we can go back to the sentence. most definit:ely]: u:m (0.34) so: =
137w
147t wh- so. (0.33) w:hat how: (1.11) what are the demise of humanistic values then?
how does that happen? I mean like wh:at (1.23) w:hat does- and-and-and also. so
is it the triumph of materialism over: humanistic val:ues?
(0.65)
i: i (0.96) i (0.49) I think uh: (1.58) I think (0.85) the Luther Needed don’t have
the (0.64) (-h) human:istic hu- human (0.65) eh: humanistic (0.36) values because
(hh) if they are normal people they (0.50) they don’t w- will treat their hu- wife
like this:
148t okay:. okay. (-h) so yeah. so if they’re normal they wouldn’t treat their wife (0.54)
like- ↓yeah dominating [an]d-yeah that type of thing (-h) u:m (0.44) what about
the structure of society in=
139w [yeah.]
148t the book though?: when- when is this when does this book take place? (0.36.)
when [does] this =
140w [u:h]

story take place?=
141w the story (h) u:h at first I have write the summary of the story [but] my professor
said no need=
149t [mhm]
141w so I delete the [one] page for: -
150t [right right]
151t right
u:h so: this sto↑ry: (0.64) m:: (0.37) I can tell you that (2.26) ((pages rustling)) in: (1.56) ((pages turning)) it’s a norma- nor↑mal (0.68) in the: in the first-uh of the story it’s about- talk about the (were?) eh what in the Lin- Linden Hills (-h) and-duh uh: (0.56) they are this uh the:n begins with the date. from December nineteen [to:] =

[okay:]

December: twenty-four [I] thi:nk the: date it will be: specially

[okay]

okay. so what y- what year is it? (0.26) do you kn↑ow?

u:h (0.30) m. m. nineteen eighty nine- eighty five

yeah=

okay: okay (·h) um because you know- so let’s look at- let’s look back at this sentence here

so: (1.24) u:m (0.17) so (1.90) the- the thing is like y-you know the-the-the (-h) uh treatment of (1.05) the: the hus- a husband’s treatment of their wi:fe (0.65) u:m (2.10) isn’t always like (0.21) it doesn’t always have to be: - it doesn’t always have to be good. you know what I mean? or it has- it should be: (0.39) [but]= it usually i-isn’t you know:=

[yeah]

[it’s- it’s] you know l- so. so what we’re looking at then is like. like (-hh) the=

[yeah yeah.]

humanistic value:s (1.54) so. (0.58) so Luther Needed’s thirst for power (1.13) u:m provides the catalyst (0.49) for the demise of humanistic values (0.74) and the triumph of materialism (0.68) so: (1.95) so yeah so what I: what I want to s-what I want to see is like what are: what are the humanistic d-values that are in demi:se here? (-h) and what is the triumph of materialism (0.16) how- how does materialism triumph over: (0.52) [the hum]anistic values?

[oh: (. ) u:h]

Luther Needed is um (0.44) m: m (0.44) his family is really wealth↑y?

(0.36)

mhm okay=

so: (0.98) it can- it has the (0.22) he had money=

mhm=

he can (0.10) -can (0.74) i- u::m (1.06) in the: rest of I ha:ve talk about that (0.38) he bought she (hills?) and rent all the

(1.65)

m[hm

[so that he g- (0.40) he has money

(0.18)

eya[h. yeah

[he r- he he was (0.16) very well-wealthy so:=

okay.
so then: in this case it looks like maybe the triumph of materialism. Luther needed to lose the humanistic values, okay? yeah, okay. so I think that maybe um okay so moving down here then like from here: does this do the next number of paragraphs when you talk about their wives do those paragraphs reflect this statement? okay so if each paragraph refers back to this statement then I don't see any problem. I think that's a good thing. m:: I'm not sure: it is that a just uh m: describe their describe how their p- how how their husband. treats them ((writer seems unsure)) mhm and duh their: life, yeah so: so if you need to describe a little bit of that: yeah. but we also need to relate it back to your main claim= yah ((writer exhales with this as if laughing at the same time))= you know so each paragraph would be: the reason you're describing the relationship between the husband and wife in each of these paragraphs is because you want to exhibit this works so this is your thesis statement you're interpretive claim so you want to exhibit how that works in each of these paragraphs so it might help you if you haven't talked about this u:m in these paragraphs then it might
help you to add in: to these paragraphs maybe some: (0.37) some (1.35) u:h (0.90) eh- show how: (0.15) show how: (0.25) this is: (0.59) [exam]pled in these=

164w [yeah]
175t paragraphs. you know?
165w yep
176t does that make sense?
166w yeah: I have (0.19) u:h I think I have the (0.50) ex- u:h example to: show this
177t ri:ght ok okay. great um so then then it sounds like you’re doing pretty goo:d (·h) it sounds like the structure is pretty goo:d (0.60) from the paper then if that’s what

167w u:m (1.30) I also want to show: my language in u:h (0.35) can you understand what I’m writing?=
178t ↓yeah I do: yep I do u:m definitely so: eh eh: (·hh) let’s take a look here: so. Willa Prescott (0.50) Needed (0.95) was:- okay so we need an article here (0.27) so. it’s the: same

168w oh: yeah=
179t as the other Needed’s (0.27) u:m (0.39) ((reading))

women as a: as the other Needed’s who were (1.40) dead finally but her belief (·h) to fight against her destiny was different from the others (0.50) so. Willa Prescott’s (0.27) Needed destiny was different from the others her (0.48) belief to fight against her destiny
((stopped))
(0.95) u:m (0.31) okay so that’s a quote u:m
((reading))
the first Mrs. Needed was bought as a slave and never (?) although her husband saw to the legal freedom of her child her husband (0.59) a: br:ought this would be brought (1.19)
[br:ought] her before u:m- wait bought her=

169w [ oh: ]
180t I’m sor- no-no it’s not-it’s-not-it’s-not bought (1.24) her before he:::=
170w married with her=
181t ye- yeah he marry- he married her so we need a subject there=
182t (·h) but you know- no. it- it’s not bad I mean I can- I can unders:- I can understand it and that’s what we:=
171w m=
183t that’s what we’re looking for is like we’re looking for: u:m (0.82) (·h) u:m (0.27) so let’s see
((reads a little then)) we’re looking for your presentation of ideas. so can I understand your ideas when you are you know when you’re rea[ding] (0.33) when I:’m reading you know=
172w [yah]
184t so:=

296
one thing that two things that really pay attention to is articles so you know that type of thing you know =

so one is articles another one is tense so like her she: um so (0.87)
((reading))
Willa found that in the end of-
((stopped))
okay so
((reading))
following the bible uh: wrote by Luwana Packerville Willa found that in the-
((stopped))
so this is past tense so Willa found this Willa found so found is the verb of that Willa is performing he[re] so =

((reading))
Willa found that in the end of her life she: lose her faith and even said there can be no god
((stopped reading))
(0.77) so in this case it would actually be lost [becau]se it’s the past so it’s referring =

((reading))
back to: the- the original you know (0.27) tense of the sentence so those are: those are basically eh: two things I think to look for is like the use of articles and making sure that that your tenses match up you know=

so you know the present [and] past tense

so all ther: (0.44) all ther: (0.63) uh all the word I u- I should use the past tense (0.75)

(h) well it’s up to you because you: y- so you y- you have to remain con[sistent] mhm right

well it’s up to you because you: y- so you y- you have to remain consistent

[yeah m]

is u-

[the past tense is not bad the- in-in-fact you’re writing mostly in the past tense here wait]

((tutor reads then))
so all of them had- all of them had the same duty which was to help the Needed family produce offspring
perfect. yeah that’s- you- so you saw it exactly you know kn- =

[I know]
you know (·h) so yeah. so I think a lot a- in a lot a cases and m:aybe u:m (0.28) (·h) it would help just to sit dow:n and take a little bit of time (0.22) to: you know go through and and try to catch a few of those. just proof-reading you know [wha]t I mean like you know. cus you kn↓ow. you=

[yah]

obviously know what you- you know what you need to do you know: you know like the: (·h) a very good (0.24) grammatica:l you have good grammatical structure so you know like (0.42) y- you know you learn- you learn very technical. English writing (.) you know=

m.=

(·h) so you have the- you have the ability to do it (·h) now: it’s just about taking the ti:me (0.31) you know sitting down and-and reading through: and making sure everything matches up. you know (·h) when I write a paper I’ll generally: (1.11) I’ll generally write (1.13) and the:n (0.28) and then i- (0.90) change it for: (0.44) ↑struc↓ture=

m.=

you know like we were talking about your thesis [an]d then you’ll supporting evidence=

[oh:]

you know that type of thing (·hh) and the:n (.) I’ll go back later (0.68) and read it for: grammar and make sure I’ve got all my tenses matched up so i- I may read my same paper maybe ten times y[ou know be]fore I turn it in yea:h so yeah (0.35) yeah-yeah. yeah (0.17) it- it’s a-=

((writer inhaling in shock?))

I mean I won’t- you know I won’t read it for grammar ten times [but] by: the-

[oh.]

from the time I start (0.47) writ↑ing until the time I turn it in I will probably have read it maybe ten times

I think maybe: I can’t find my grammar mistake because (·h) my mind is always the same so: (·h) may I think if [others can (.) help me:=

[I- I]

right.=

maybe they will (0.80) more: (0.13) er- easily to find the (0.23) mistake by (0.38) “m::° my mind=

d↓sure. absolutely. I completely a[gree

[because I’m (h) my mi:nd is all (0.43) can- cannot change very very quickly ((laughs a little))

right right. exectly. so what we: do here in the writing center is to show you: (0.41) w-w-we can give you a couple of things to work on=

yehah=

you know to think abou:t when you go to edit your paper=

yehah=

because we don’t actually we won’t go line by line and cha[nge you know change things=

[ ah: yeah: I understand it=
cus you know y-u:m so. but what we can do is like I can say to you: hey you know so I see there’s there’s an issue with the tenses here: so now you can go: and work on the paper and say okay yeah: let me keep in mind when I’m re-reading my paper (h) that: you know that I need to: make sure everything’s in the past tense or make sure that I have all my (h) uh gender my number (0.43) m:my: number corresponds with my subject. you know the number of things correspond with my subject. make sure you have (h) you know your articles in the prop- you know article- proper articles in the proper places you know so=

(yap=)

(h) and that’s that’s just the time that it takes: to: write (0.44) you know- to ta understand to like lear:n=

mh:m=

how to: - you know how to: (0.56.) put together like (0.24) wr- good er good writing. you know so and the- it just takes time. you know so (h) and what you said on the g- it’s it’s a (h) you know you kind a hurried : you know you wanna make s- you know y-you’re not sure: exactly what you’re looking for: (h) I:’m gonna give you something to look for and now you can go and take ti:me to: (0.19) you know to look through and improve your writing [yo]u know: so: (0.58)

[yap]

r↑i:ght? (0.86) okay so um: is there: (0.20) are there: is there another spot around here maybe that we- you know that you wanna look at? or another section (h) we’ve got about maybe ten minutes left so:=

m:: I also n- wh- wh- can I look about the conclusion?

(Yap)

sure yeah let’s take a look at the conclusion. definitely. ((paper rustling))

(3.28)

maybe fro:m m:::: m::maye the conclusion will be very very long.last conclusion (0.79) I (wrote kinda long)((writer laughing while saying “last conclusion I”))=

yeah I see you’ve got this written down here.

((reading notes on the writer’s paper that the instructor had written during a meeting))

so return to the thesis why does it matter (0.53) don’t simply repeat (0.48) but update (1.04) pursue implications (0.37) uh consider broader issues (0.85) and identity: uh-uh identify limitations.

((stopped reading))

(0.57)

okay. so yeah so let’s take a look and see if you’re thesis (0.13) you know (0.21) or y-your your conclusion does that.

(0.49)

m. (1.78) almost to every Needed women were- ((writer seems to be reading from page 4, first full paragraph))

here’s- ↓yeah so here’s here’s once again the article so we need - you know so: (0.18)(h) here you need- you need an article: (h) like how many of Needed’s women so all but but [it’s almost=}

[oh:

it’s

every ONE OF (0.58) Needed’s women because=
uh (?)=
downarrow yeah: (0.59) so i-every-e-(0.28.) so every one of Needed-e-every [one of]
yeah: right. right =

Needed’s women were miserable. Okay so go ahead go ahead.

(0.52)

((reading))
their existence were always denied by their husband
((stopped))=

mhm=

so. (3.04) ↓m (h) (0.26)(h)
((reading))
women’s role in the Linden Hills was insignificant. they had no value to their family.
((when finished the tutor says))

o|kay

((reading))
the novel presented the society who was- which was dominated by men. wo-
((stopped reading))

((reading))
women (0.50) was in the role of serving the foil to (1.10) men

(0.37)
	right okay. so (0.14) so here we’ve got um (0.70) um this one is=

(0.42)

were

you got it! see? yeah. it just takes a little bit of a: you know just a little bit of time
with it you know so. um (0.41) okay. so yeah so that’s: (0.31) so

((reading))
women were in the role serving as a foil to men
((stopped))

okay.

((reading))
their tradi-kuhl fate reflects the Luther Needed’s (0.43) cruel
((stopped))

(0.65)

uh I don’t know how to pronounce it

((stopped))
cruelness:

(0.24)
cruelness

mhm

((reading))
and affected (0.26) eh- (0.4) (facul?)
((stopped))
writer whispers something, but it is so soft that it is indecipherable)

212t yeah: so this is a word here that we- we (0.80) we u:sually don’t use too often u:m=

212w oh=

213t we wou- we might say like lack of affection (0.57) [you know]

213w [lack] affection?=

214t yeah lack o:f (0.30) you know so (0.17) yeah: (0.73) no this is okay. this is okay. this is good (-h) it’s this word right here: that=

214w okay=

215t yeah we:- you know

(2.96)

215w (*how to think°?)=

216t uh i- it’s the same as this one right here so [it’s] yeah: it’s the same word it’s just a little=

216w [oh oh]

216t different (0.37) so affect↓ion yeah: yeah you got it. yeah (-h) so u:m (0.19) so (1.81) so ((reading))

((reading))

217w their tragic fate reflected ((stopped))

and so you don’t usually need an arth- article when you have a pronoun

217w (with?)

217t right right: (0.58) (-h) o↓kay:

(1.19)

218w Nay:lor is a write- un n- the writer of this book=

218t uh-huh: right=

219w use an in:direct way to describe the un:(usual?) society=

219t okay. mhm.

(1.52)

220w ((reading))

to some extent mental (0.50) uh:: ((struggles with word)) (0.57) ta:=

220t torture=

221w tort↑ure=

221t mhm=

222w would be more painful than in the physical=

222t okay=

223t (·hh) three women in the Linden Hills were tor (0.69) tortured by their husbands and-

223t look at this you read (-h) you read the right thing here:=

224w oh:=

224t y- you said it right (0.34) but you ↓yeah (1.24) you got it ok[ay] you’re good you’re fine. =

225w [“no:°”]

225t don’t worry about it=

226w ((reading still))
and each also ended their life in an (0.70) abnormal way

(0.77)

fortunat- fortunately Willa was awakening and she recognized her spiritual (0.91) kinship

(0.72)

mhm=

with these women=

mhm it’s good

(0.54)

which she:

((stopped reading))

(2.64) no which ((“which” sounded like “we”, but the text had “which”))

(1.13)

no y-you’re fine. it’s good. m↑hm

(0.39)

((inaudible question))

↓yep (0.42) you’re good. cus yeah. no that’s okay that’s good. which (0.46) u:m which refers back to: (0.84.) the: u:m okay. so

((reading))

Willa was awaken- fortunately Willa was awakening and she recognized her spiritual kinship with these women (0.80) which she was first denied

((stopped))

so which (0.33) r- refers back to the spiritual kinship. (·h) so that’s okay. you n- you need that there to indicate that y- you’re referring back to the spiritual kinship. which (0.44) is equal to the spiritual kinship so. eh you could read it this way (·h)

u:m-

((reading))

which (0.48) she was f-further denied by label↑ing (0.50) them as cra↑zy?

((stopped))

uh-huh. yep. so which she was first denied by labeling:

(0.48)

y-yes. that’s right. mhm. which she was first denied by labeling them as crazy okay

((reading))

during the days in the basement she read ((writer pronounces this as rēd))

((stopped))

(0.75) reading?

read ((like red)) mhm you’re right no you’re right yep because you’re talking about the past tense=

(0.48)

yeah:

but this is also the [same as] the present tense. yeah you got it. right.

[the same]
in China w- we should remember all the words in past tense uh (0.50) the normal word past tense and the: (0.65) I don’t know how to say (0.71) uh: (0.52) we should in (0.24) use after have

(0.41)

okay.

(0.86)

have done

(0.39)

yeah

uh done mean ((writes on top of paper)) do: did. done. (0.49) so: these three (·h) I: w-w-w-we also in the middle school all the English classes we should remember some most of words (1.68) to in different way:

right right [↓yeah

so mostly will be w-as e. d. or:: (1.12) mostly e. d. some wor- some words will change in different also (·h) we have the sheet to remember

YEAH: right the same exactly exactly

((laughing with above))

well this is a funny word because you don’t have the indicators you know [it] doesn’t change from past tense to present tense=

[yah]

yeah

or: also in the future tense I am going to read (·h) or you know I will read. so you have the indicator of future tense but you don’t you know but the word still doesn’t change you know so it’s just yeah. not not like this does

((laugh))

so yeah it’s funny it’s uh - we need a shape ((t laughs and then writer laughs for a brief moment))

okay so go- go ahead

and: which u:m (0.39)

((reading))

during the days in the basement she read all the Bibles, cookbook, photos or the previous wife

((stopped))

it stand for: Bible it stand for the first wife and cookbook for the s[cond (.] the photo =

[Oo:::h  ]

is the fourth uh stand for the third wife=

right

they: can’t get kill from her- by the husband so (·h) they kill by book cookbook or the photo ((laughs))

oh: wow: wow. interesting ((writer is laughing during the above tutor turn))

these are thier: (0.27) second w- husband

(0.39)

yeah yeah

((reading))
she: did not want to: be ended (0.57) the same as the other Needed’s (0.69) wife. ((stopped))

(0.50)
247t yeah okay so let’s look at this here so she did not want to: (0.50 ) u:m (0.34) okay so: (1.39) wh- what do we have going on here? what do you think?

(1.82)
247t she did not want to: (0.33) so sh- we’re talking about the past tense
(0.78)
248w tw- (1.73) no need (0.50) no be?
(0.33)
248t r:- correct. right.
(1.79)
249w to ↓end
(0.40)
249t yes. exa:ctly. (1.48) you got it
(1.00)
250w (h) (0.60) and as:
(0.36)
250t that’s fine that’s fine. yep she did not want to end up- (sniffs in) OH YEAH and as. you’re right. yep. as.: yep. (0.83) so we need up.

251w oh. okay=
251t but we don’t need as. ri:ght right. right-right. (·h) so she did not want to end up (0.39) um: (0.45) th:e: (0.40) same as the other: (1.07) u:m (0.36) th- the same as:
(·h) how bout the same as the Needed’s (0.31) other wives?

252w ↓yeah:
(6.66)
252t there you go. and so then- then the wives will not have the ī in there either:=
253w oh yeah.=
253t yeah: so (0.18) u:m (·h) and I saw that in a couple of other places so when you proof read it again (·h) just make sure you- yeah. so. you know like in the first- I believe it was in the first paragraph here to: so u:m (0.76) where was it? uh::
(3.10) “where is it?” (0.23) or maybe the second uh (1.07) the second (3.72) uh yeah I saw it- I saw it one other place in here so just keep an eye out for that. so u:m, the wives- you know the w- the wives (0.67) okay. so go ahead with the next uh the sentence there

254w ((reading))
she examined and evaluated herself, she was stuck in the basement not because Luther
((stopped))

(1.73)
254t how ‘bout not because of Luther.
(0.74)
255w uh: (0.55) be- (1.36) she (0.53) she lived in the world. do not someone some woman will they only focus her husband but she is not
(0.62.)
255t that- say it again? can you say that one more time?
256w  some woman (·h) will (0.46) ah (0.76) think (0.74) their husband is the most
important people in their life
256t  uh-huh
257w  but-uh (0.52) she think sh- (0.42) she’s thunck do not thinks like this way
((difficult to notate))
257t  ↓right. right right exactly.=
258w  but to: m[aybe
258t  ［how about saying that?
(1.07)
259w  ↑hm?
259t  how ‘bout how ‘bout using this: (0.46) how ‘bout um she examined and evaluated
herself (·h) and then (0.30) say th- what you just said (0.13) right here?:
(0.41)
260w  oh: okay
260t  yeah so. exactly what you just said (0.44) just (.) you know- wr:ite it- you know
write it on the paper. cus I think that- I think that sounded really good.
261w  okay. ((talking to self - inaudible)) (6.06) m: she: live (2.05) °how to say° (0.27)
(·h) she (2.55) °may:be the world not only for her husband°
(0.54)
261t  ↓right (0.26) right.right.right.(0.64) (·h) but for herself or: she [lived] for- yeah
exactly
262w  ［yah]
261t  you [know
262w  ［she lived for herself not not only
(1.15)
262t  I like the- I like the way you have it set up. so. not only for her husband but for
herself=
263w  okay=
263t  you know yeah:. I think that’s good. I think the way you had it set up there is very
good
(5.50)
264w  m.
(5.82)
264t  ((laughs - not sure why))
(3.79)
265w  °and Will↑a make [her own] choice to go back°=
264t  ［alri:ght]
265t  mhm:
266w  ((reading))
266w  she got the power to leave the: (1.06) inferno (0.63) that means (0.55) the e:vil?
(1.19)
266t  (·h) okay yeah: yeah u:m (0.70) yeah [but here:
266t  ［I. I found I want to found the meaning (0.53)
but eh (0.49) to; there are so:me same meanings in the: dictionary=
267t  ri:ght right right. yeah it’s dangerous (.) yeah because you don’t exactly know
what know [what =
[yeah: this is more like uh this is- this means more like a fire (0.35)
fire?
yeah. like uh like um
which one is better? you. can
[I-I-I-I I think um I think evil be good or or:
something that’s um let’s see she-uh-uh um:
((reading))
make her own choice to go back she got the power to:
((stopped))
um: (1.27) to uh like what about escape? [escape escape] evil
[ah::: ]
(1.02)
ah ↓yeah
(0.37)
↓yeah:
(1.37)
maybe in (?) I have used escape
(0.57)
↓yeah:
(0.83)
ees (2.70) sks ((the writer is sounding out how to spell “escape”))
↓yeah. I think that works
(5.60)
but uh (first this is?)
(0.98)
okay:
(0.58)
((reading))
Willa’s struggle (0.48) witnessed her pain in the basement no one can bear the life
without sunshine and light=
mhm=
even with corpse of her son
wo:w. that’s tough [((laughs))] that’s tough
[yah:::]
(0.31)
(?) her son is died
okay so this is where y- it looks like this is where we get into the conclusion right?
((reading))
however Willa was one of the luckiest (0.76) of the wh-wh Needed’s women
((stopped))
yeah and so here: we have the article again that we don’t nee:d. [remember] =
[ah: yeah:]
because sNeeded is still a pronoun so.
she was saved by Will (0.62) the other people (0.37) but she:
((stopped))

is that it that Willa? [no]: that’s somebody else [okay]: wow ((laughs))

[no] [yeah]

he helped her escape from the evil?
((stopped))

((reading))

that’s fine. in this case it might be the basement though=

okay okay=

because evil is an abstract thing here: you might be talking about a concrete you

know something concrete you know so

[(she wanted to rebuild her life as to the)

reason that she should responsible for herself

((there is overlap here with the tutor reading the same thing but at a different

place. the writer cuts off the tutor and asks))

(is same answer)?

(0.57)

yeah: it is is. so it’s repeating that. yeah. yeah. so. (1.87) um b-b-b-but

wanting to rebuild their life is okay:

(0.26)

m.

but the second part of that sentence. you might want to find something else to

say there

(3.16)

delete it?

(0.98)

yeah: yeah and the: um (1.27) so she wanted to rebuild her like and the: um

so how was she going to rebuild her life basically? you know so um

(0.36)

at first she: she should um (0.36) escape from the basket °°basket°°

yeah: ((into laugh)) [true: this] is [true] exactly (-h) well h-how can relate

basement [yeah]

some of this=

back to: the first you know (0.13) the first (0.55) well this: °where was it here:° (0.47) the

first uh: (0.33) sentence? (0.39) you know th- i-it’s important to relate some of

this stuff back to: back to this (0.26) you know so like (-h) you know how: (0.23)

how in the end maybe she triumphed over (1.27) (-h) you know over the: over the

materialism or whatever you know. so: or maybe her humanistic =

[m:]

values won out you know over materialism something like that. so.
I think uh I have u:h mentioned that (·h) ther writer is use indirect way to (0.28) “uh” (1.52) uh: I think my: paper it write the woman’s story (·h) I think it reflects man’s u::h (1.16) man’s (0.41) u:h (0.29) social power? and=

uh-huh right. yeah exa- social power exa:ctly. so she: uses and indirect way of doing it

yay

the:n (0.65) it might be a good thing for you: (0.28) to point out (0.72) where she [does.] so if it’s indirect you gotta point out ho[w: you ]know

[yay:] [ I think uh]

like be di↓rect about pointing it out you know

yeah

so which is: which is maybe what you do: so you know it’s (·h) like maybe kinda what you do. but think about that as you’re writing your- you know- you’re conclusion you know so show you know like y-you want to restate your argument (0.35) like h↓ere (0.42) so return to the thesis (0.44) and why does it matter: (0.48) u:m you know so you wanna kind of use this to kind a return back to your ((taps on table .) your argument you know so

maybe we can how (·h) uh the women

(0.26)

m↑hm:

(0.63)

in the linden hills (0.46) [not

[this is going to be capitalized too: so:=

oh yeah=

yeah:

(2.02)

men but their different life reflected the male’s was (1.67) despotim?

uh-huh despotism so u:m but their different life reflected (·h) u:m (2.42) the male’s society maybe ↑as despotism?

(1.08)

ah okay

(1.69)

↓uh:

(0.39)

(·h)

((reading))

Luther Needed always (0.36) m (0.15) (·h) avoi:d their wives feeling

uh-huh

the lonliness made them distorted the- in their persen (0.31) personali↑ty

okay=

fortunately Willa did not follow the tragedy of the Luther Needed’s women=

yeah: here’s that article again remember yeah:

(h) (h) by reviewing the his.tory- history of the previous women in the (1.14) N-Needed’s family Willa realized that she must be responsible her life=

uh-huh

for her life without the im (0.71) impentuh (0.85) im: im
impenetrable husband she believe that she can she could have=
you got it yeah way to go:
she could have a new life=

imagination was: always m: beautiful=

(·h) Willa could broke

out the myth of the dead of the Needed’s women

so: um

[ so finally she died

so who did? s- oh Willa did?
yeah
okay so: um

(·h) m: (0.28) ↓ when (0.17) when she in the process of the fighting for her husband but she: died=

wow: wow that’s tough. okay. u: h that’s tough um (3.54) ((reading to rest of paper - barely audible))

okay so: um (0.39) so I think that you might want to include a couple a sentences in here: (0.60) once again just talking about how: (0.49) because you talk about this you say that you like y- you have imagination (·h) you have education (0.41) which are: kind of um (0.76) i- y-y- which are kind of like humanistic values you know (0.33) so like (0.46) Luther Needed looks like he was trying to keep his women from being educated (0.36) so he was trying to keep them uneducated (0.44) he was trying to keep them away from humanistic values (0.29) (·h) um so that he could use them for: ((tapping on table 0.70)) um you know for: (0.72)
[basically ] for physical mean you know [so

[oh yeah] [yeah m: aybe I haven’t (0.22.) I didn’t put so: me (0.93) physi- us: so evidence to: (0.25) prove this (1.62) do you think?

↓yeah: um (0.11) let’s see ((reading quickly and quietly)) so um (3.46) well what we want to do: is you want to show the effects of this you know of this statement (0.58) so you have- you have (0.42) you know this is a- this is a statement you’re making and a claim here=

yep=

(·h) and you wanna show the effects of that you know [so] you wanna show =

[yah]
how that- how that works in the text. you know so. which is what I think you know what you’re what you’re attempting to do here=

oh maybe I will (0.57) write mo:re (0.31) in-clusion of (9.81) I will write more sentence inclusion of this the:-

↓yeah: yeah kinda of relate it back to that [so:] (0.46) okay? (oh)

okay

does that give you enough to think about?
yeah

((laughs)) okay okay [we’re cool]

[thank you: thank so mu:ch]
yeah: no problem at all thanks for coming in=
yeah=

so yeah you know. definitely. I enjoyed u:h you know enjoyed looking at this with you. so.
yeah I keep doing my paper and (do it?) it due tomorrow ((laughs))

((laughs)) what’s that? oh you’re gonna bring it in tomorrow?
yeah

yeah sure. so- so yeah. take some- take some time and proof-read remember to go through: you know like- talk- look at some of the stuff we talked about today: yeah you know with the articles: and uh the tenses and stuff like that you know . I think it’s just a matter of like ike reading: very: careful and close like reading it very closely over and over again [you] know=

[yah]

so. but it’s good it’s good. I think that u:m- you know so yeah. so u:m- and then keep this- you know keep this in mi:nd=

↓yah=

and u:m () these: these things here: so definitely keep those in mind. you know- as you’re writing- as you’re looking at the rest of the paragraphs (-h) u:m make sure that your- s- you know (0.20) linking (0.28) those- the paragraphs (0.29) back up with that statement that we were talking about. okay?

thank you so much ((sounds excited))
cool. YAH: no problem. no problem at all. good luck ((laughs and leaves))