

A Comparison of a Novice Writing Tutor with an Experienced Tutor: Focusing on Changes in Their Interactions with Tutees*

Sookyung Cho (Hankuk University of Foreign Studies)

Dahee Kim** (Hankuk University of Foreign Studies)

Cheol Baek (Hankuk University of Foreign Studies)

Cho, Sookyung, Dahee Kim and Cheol Baek. 2020. A comparison of a novice tutor with an experienced tutor: Focusing on their interactions with tutees. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics* 20, 829–850. This study examines how a novice writing tutor changes following his interactions with his tutee, in particular, by comparing with a more experienced tutor. To date, first language (L1) writing scholars have emphasized the roles of writing tutors as collaborators or facilitators and thereby suggested that they gain personal or professional growth as writing experts. However, while focusing on L2 tutees' different needs from their L1 counterparts, second language (L2) writing scholars have argued for tutors' more directive roles and thus have not paid full attention as to what they may learn from their interactions with L2 tutees. Drawn upon Lave and Wenger's situated learning—learning is co-constructed by all the participants, whether they are masters or apprentices—this study tries to examine how a novice tutor's interactional patterns change throughout a semester by comparing his interactions with a more experienced tutor's. For this purpose, we audio-recorded 9 writing tutorials of two Korean writing tutors across one semester. Analysis of the recorded data reveals that in his first tutorial, the novice tutor was more direct, leaving little room for his tutee's involvement in the discussion, compared to his more experienced counterpart. Yet as the tutorials progressed, he became more collaborative in his second and third tutorials. These findings shed light on tutor training by implicating that tutors become more collaborative even with L2 tutees as their experiences cumulate.

Keywords: tutor–tutee interaction, tutor feedback, second language writing, situated learning

* This work was supported by Hankuk University of Foreign Studies Research Fund of 2020.

** 1st author: Sookyung Cho; Corresponding author: Dahee Kim

1. Introduction

In the first language (L1) context, the role of writing tutors has often been considered as collaborators or facilitators rather than instructors or knowledge-givers (Powers 1993). When faced with a second language (L2) learner, however, it has been reported that this collaborating role of a writing tutor is often questioned and recommended to be modified (Blau and Hall 2002). Several L2 writing scholars, who compared and contrasted interactions of writing tutors dealing with L1 tutees and L2 tutees, even confirmed that tutors' interactions with L2 tutees become more direct and didactic than those with L1 tutees (Thonus 1999a, 1999b, 2004, Williams 2004, 2005). Oftentimes, these studies are based on one-shot recordings of several writing tutors and thus do not keep track of one tutor's interactional changes with his or her tutees across time. However, tutors' interactional patterns may change as they become more familiar with their tutees. By examining a tutor's series of writing tutorials conducted throughout a semester, this study aims to see how tutors' interactions change over time with their L2 tutees, as they grow accustomed to each other as well as to writing tutorials. In particular, by comparing and contrasting a novice tutor with a more experienced tutor in their interactions with the tutees, this study implicates that L2 tutor-tutee interactions become more discursive and collaborative as tutors' experiences are increased.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Tutor-Tutee Interactions

In the L1 context, the role of tutors has been extensively studied and considered discernable from that of instructors (Agar 1985, Bailey 2012, Gillespie and Lerner 2000, Harris 1986, North 1994, Plummer and Thonus 1999, Rafoth 2000, Shamon and Burns 1999, Thonus 2001). Drawn upon the model of collaborative learning, these scholars unanimously agree upon the fact that tutors serve as collaborators who work together with tutees, rather than knowledge-givers, although they have a better knowledge of writing than their tutees have. Within this theoretical framework, not only tutees, but also tutors come to learn from their tutees through tutorials. Some positive outcomes reported so far for tutors include growth in writing and social skills, knowledge building, and teaching-skill

development (Beasley 1997, Cohen 1986, Roscoe and Chi 2007, 2008, Wingate 2001). As Defoe and Caparas (2014) lament, however, none of these studies are experimental research. In order to see what these writing tutors gain through their experiences of tutoring, Defoe and Caparas adopted a so-called phenomenology methodology and interviewed eight tutors, focusing on (a) their initial interests in tutoring and their expectations, (b) the act of tutoring itself, and (c) their reflections on the experience. All the participants retrospectively reported that they grew professionally as well as personally through the experiences of tutoring: their tutoring experiences had direct connection to their later work and affected their personal development as a writer and their interactions with other people.

Compared to these L1 scholars who usually consider writing tutors as collaborators, L2 writing scholars have often requested more direct and authoritative roles from writing tutors when dealing with L2 tutees, upon the assumption that L2 learners have different needs from those of their L1 counterparts (Blau and Hall 2002, Moussu 2013, Powers 1993, Thonus 1999a, 1999b, 2014). For example, after investigating L1 tutors' talk with L2 tutees, Blau and Hall (2002) recommend that L2 tutees require more intervention from tutors into their writing process. Similarly, noticing L2 tutees' different needs compared to those of L1 tutees, Powers (1993) argued that tutors should work as cultural informants when they interact with L2 tutees because they are more knowledgeable both in culture and language than their L2 tutees. As these scholars recommended, it has been found that tutors actually adopt a more direct role with L2 tutees (Thonus 2004, Williams 2005). For example, Thonus (2004) found that tutors took more charge of the tutorials by using less mitigation and negotiation sequence when interacting with L2 tutees. Similarly, Williams (2005) approached tutor-tutee talk as an institutional talk that consists of three phases—diagnosis (identification of a problem), directive (fixation of the problem), and reporting (submission of a report on the tutoring session) and found that tutors spent more time on the diagnosis phases with L2 tutees than with L1 tutees. Based on these actual differences found between tutor talk with L1 and L2 tutees, Thonus (2014) arrives at the conclusion that tutors should not tutor L2 tutees in the same way as they do with L1 tutees.

Unfortunately, with too much focus on the differences inherent in tutor talk between L2 and L1 tutees, studies on tutor talk with L2 tutees tend to disregard what L1 scholars have usually emphasized as the original role of tutors, that is, collaborators or co-participants in the tutorial. As a result, there are only a few L2 studies that report what tutors gain through their interactions with L2 tutees as co-participants in writing tutorials together with their tutees (Young and Miller 2004, Yu 2020). Even these few studies only briefly

mention changes that occurred in tutor's participatory roles by focusing more on tutee's changes. For example, Young and Miller (2004), in their study of L1 tutor–L2 tutee interaction throughout a semester, noticed that not only the tutee participated more actively in their discursive practices as time went by, but the tutor also changed her role from being more directive in the first four weeks to allowing for the tutee's active participation, of which the authors noted as "growth on the part of the student" (p. 534). Through the study of tutor–tutee interactions that continued throughout a semester, Yu (2020) also found that the tutee came to participate more actively in the writing tutorial; and at the same time, that the native speaking tutor came to adopt a less–directive style towards the end of the semester. This acknowledgement that the tutor as well as the tutee changes their participatory framework through their co–participation in tutorial notwithstanding, none of these studies mainly focused on the tutor's changes.

2.2. Theoretical Framework

This study adopts Lave and Wenger's (1991) situated learning as a theoretical framework. According to Lave and Wenger, learning is not something that occurs in an individual's mind, but rather it occurs in a participation framework. By participating in a social practice, the learner experiences changes in their participatory roles in the practice and gets closer to expert performances, which is labeled as "legitimate peripheral participation." Although their theory starts from the traditional concept of "apprenticeship," that is, experts hand over their knowledge to novices, Lave and Wenger distinguish legitimate peripheral participation from traditional apprenticeship by emphasizing the relations of humans with and in their social world. Because learning is defined in this relational aspect—with their activity, with other human beings, or with the social world, Lave and Wenger's learning is not restricted to the learner, but is extended to the teacher, the master, or the old–timer, whatever labels they are given. While the learner's relation with the teacher has changed, the teacher must have experienced these changing relations with their learners as well. Quoting Goody (1989), Lave and Wenger argue that legitimate peripheral participation is a reciprocal relation between the learner and the teacher as follows:

Goody (1989) argues that the introduction of strangers into what was previously strictly domestic production (a change that occurred within an expanding market in West Africa in the recent past) led masters to think more comprehensively about the organization of their production activities. She points out that the resulting division of

work processes into segments in new, increasingly specialized occupations Legitimacy of participation is crucial both for this naïve involvement to invite reflection on ongoing activity and for the newcomer's occasional contributions to be taken into account. Insofar as this continual interaction of new perspectives is sanctioned, everyone's participation is legitimately peripheral in some respect. In other words, everyone can to some degree be considered a "newcomer" to the future of a changing community. (p. 117)

Applying this framework to the tutor–tutee relations, as the tutor legitimately allows for the tutee's participation in the tutorial, not only the tutee but also the tutor must experience changes in their relations through the social practice of the tutorial. As the masters, who accept the newcomers' contribution to the activities, reflect on their activities, the tutors cannot help but reflect on their roles and make changes in their relations with the tutees. In the forward to Lave and Wenger's situated learning, Hanks (1991) captures this reciprocity of learning between the learner and the teacher as well, by claiming "learning is, as it were, distributed among co-participants, not a one-person act" (p. 15).

Drawn upon the theory of situated learning, this study aims to explore how a novice and a more experienced L2 tutors change in their interactions with their tutees throughout a semester; furthermore, the comparison and contrast of this novice tutor with a more experienced tutor will reveal more explicitly what the novice tutor gains from tutoring experiences himself. This study tries to answer the following research questions:

1. How do a novice tutor's interactions with his or her tutee diverge from those of a more experienced tutor?
2. How do the novice tutor's interactions with his tutee change throughout a semester?

3. Method

3.1 Context of the Study

This study was carried out during the writing tutorials operated in association with a one-semester writing course, which was offered to first-year university students who majored in English at a university located in Seoul, Korea. The course required the

students to turn in three major writing assignments—summary, argumentative essay, and compare-and-contrast essay—with about a one-month interval in between them. As for the summary assignment, the students were provided with a two-page long student essay on ethnic stereotypes and asked to make a summary of it in one paragraph, while they were asked to pick a topic on their own and turn in one- or two-page long essay for both argumentative and compare-and-contrast essays. Except for the summary assignment, both for argumentative and compare-and-contrast essays, the students had to turn in their first draft, receive feedback from peers and the teacher, and resubmit their revised drafts, which was considered their final draft. Only the students who volunteered to participate in this study met with their tutors face-to-face and received additional feedback from them before they received teacher feedback. The tutoring session occurred right after the students submitted their first draft and lasted approximately 27 minutes on average, the shortest around 14 minutes and the longest around 46 minutes.

3.2 Participants

Dahee and Cheol, the two authors of this study, were tutors for this study. They are graduate students enrolled in a department of English Linguistics at the same university the undergraduate students attended. When this study was conducted, both of them were enrolled in the other author's graduate course, Topics in Applied Linguistics. While learning about how to do research on L2 writing in the course, as a kind of teaching practice, they served as tutors for the undergraduate students who volunteered for this study. Dahee had worked as a writing tutor for three consecutive semesters, but it was the first time for Cheol to work as a writing tutor, although he had some experiences of correcting high school students' writing at a private institute for more than five years. Because of her longer experiences of tutoring writing, Dahee was assigned to two tutees—Mina and Sohee, whereas Cheol was assigned to one tutee—Sumin.¹ Both Dahee and Cheol had some experiences of studying in English speaking countries: Dahee went to a high school in Australia and Cheol studied for a year in a US university as an exchange student when he was an undergraduate student.

¹ All the tutees were given pseudonyms to guarantee their anonymity.

3.3 Data Collection and Analysis

The data of this study comprise audio-recordings of writing tutorials and their written feedback to each tutee along with all the student papers, including their first and final draft. Dahee met with Mina four times—two for summary assignment, one for argumentative, and one for compare-and-contrast essay whereas she met with Sohee just twice for her summary and compare-and-contrast essay. On the other hand, Cheol met with Sumin three times on her summary, argumentative, and compare-and-contrast essay. All of these 9 tutorials were transcribed line by line and coded based on Williams (2004) with slight modifications. Williams originally categorized the writing-revision process into three stages—detection (noticing the problem), identification (diagnosing the problem and deciding how to fix it), and correction (revision). This analysis scheme is suitable for this study in that it helps to identify where co-participation occurs by identifying who initiates each stage. However, because this study's aim is to explore tutor-tutee interactions on spot without considering student revision, this study only focuses on detection and identification, splitting the identification process into identification (diagnosing the problem) and decision (deciding how to fix it). In each tutorial, all the feedback points where tutors gave feedback on a certain feature in student writing were marked and analyzed, depending on who initiated detection, identification, and decision. A feedback point refers to an incidence where the tutor discusses a feature on the tutee's writing, no matter how long the interactional turns are. This coding process was performed by two of these authors, and whenever a discrepancy occurred between them, they had a thorough discussion until they arrived at the same conclusion.

4. Results

4.1 Dahee's Tutorials

Table 1 shows the interactional patterns that appeared in the writing tutorials of Dahee and her two tutees during one semester. It reveals that Tutor-Detection, Tutor-Identification, and Tutor-Decision is the most common type of interactional pattern found across Dahee's tutorials. That is, all the actions of giving feedback are taken care of by Dahee, not her tutees. It also indicates that Dahee and her tutees used not only Tutor-

Detection, Tutor–Identification, and Tutor–Decision pattern but also different aspects of interactional patterns in writing tutorials from the first tutorial to the last tutorials.

Table 1. Dahee’s Tutorials

Tutorial	Mina		Sohee	
	T-D → T-I → T-Dc	Others	T-D → T-I → T-Dc	Others
1 st	5	T-D → T-I → t-Dc (2)	4	T-D → t-I → T-Dc T-D → t-I → t-Dc t-D → t-I → T-Dc (2)
2 nd	4	t-D → T-I (2) t-D → t-I T-D → t-I t-D → t-I → T-Dc (2)	16	T-D → T-I → t-Dc t-D → t-I → T-Dc (4) T-D → t-I → T-Dc (3) T-D → t-I → t-Dc (5) t-D → t-I → t-Dc
3 rd	9	T-D → t-I (3) t-D → t-I (2) T-D → t-I → T-Dc T-D → T-I → t-Dc		
4 th	4	t-D → t-I → t-Dc t-D → t-I T-D → T-I → t-Dc (2)		

Note. T = Tutor; t = Tutee; D = Detection; I = Identification; Dc = Decision.

Excerpt 1 (Dahee’s 1st Tutorial with Mina: T-D → T-I → T-Dc)

Detection:	1	D: When you say “ <i>Asian American</i> ”
	2	M: Ahh
Identification:	3	D: “Capital”
	4	M: “Capital”
Decision:	5	D: You should capitalize “Asian” ²

In line 1, Dahee detects the problem of capitalization in Mina’s use of the word “Asian American,” identifies the problem in line 3, and makes the decision of capitalizing the word “Asian” in line 5.

Although this type of tutor’s taking care of all the stages of feedback procedure is used quite often, Table 1 also shows that Dahee engages in different types of interactional

² All the excerpts were translated from Korean into English by one of the authors. “ ” refers to English used during the tutorials while italics indicate tutee’s texts.

patterns from the first tutorial: her tutees began to more actively participate in the tutorials by detecting, identifying, or fixing their own problems. For example, Excerpt 2 shows a case of tutee and tutor collaborating together to make a decision on how to fix a voice problem.

Excerpt 2 (Dahee's 1st Tutorial with Mina: T-D → T-I → t-Dc)

Detection:	1	D: You don't have to write " <i>Who am I?</i> "
Identification:	2	What would be better to start your essay with? Umm, what is
	3	better?
Decision:	4	M: The original text says "I," then instead of saying "I"
	5	D: "She," "Jane"?
	6	M: "The writer"
	7	D: Uhhh, you can say "the writer," or "we"? Can you say we tend
	8	to? We have this prejudice? Ah, which is better? Well, it doesn't
	9	matter because you're summarizing
	10	M: Then can I say "the writer" experiences this and that, and that
	11	prejudice still exists, so we should do this. Does this sound
	12	okay?
	13	D: Okay. You can say that.

Mina starts her summary with the sentence "Who am I?" and Dahee detects the problem of an appropriate voice for a summary assignment in line 1. But the decision stage is not straightforward as seen in Excerpt 1 and instead the procedure of arriving at a decision on how to fix this problem is layered and collaborative. Instead of giving its correction directly, Dahee asks a question "what is better?" as in line 2 through 3 and Mina suggests the word "the writer" in line 6. In the next line, Dahee agrees upon it and also makes an additional suggestion, "we." Finally, both Mina and Dahee arrive at the conclusion by integrating all of their suggestions — "the writer" and "we" together from line 10 through 13.

Dahee's tutorial with Sohee shows the case when the tutee participates in the stages of detecting and identifying her own problem.

Excerpt 3 (Dahee's 1st Tutorial with Sohee: t-D → t-I → T-Dc)

Detection:	1	S: This sentence sounds something
Identification:	2	D: This sentence looks vague.
	3	S: That's right. It is weird to say " <i>has different stereotypes with their appearance race.</i> " This sounds like everybody has
	4	prejudices.
	5	D: Ahha!
	6	S: This is weird.
Decision:	7	D: You're right. Then you can express your idea in a couple of
	8	more sentences.
	9	

In the summary assignment, Sohee said, "we can find it through the words like twinkies and eggs which describe someone who has different stereotypes with their appearance race." In line 1, Sohee detects the problem herself that this sentence does not sound right. From line 2 through line 7, both Dahee and Sohee collaborate together in identifying what the problem is with the sentence and finally conclude that this sentence is vague and too general.

This kind of collaboration when both tutor and tutee work together culminates when Dahee and Sohee work on the problem of citation in her compare-and-contrast draft during Dahee's second tutorial with Sohee as follows:

Excerpt 4 (Dahee's 2nd Tutorial with Sohee: T-D → T-I → T-Dc)

Detection:	1	D: Did you check the source?
	2	S: Yes, I did.
Identification:	3	D: Then where is it?
	4	S: It's in the reference list.
Decision:	5	D: Then you should put his name here.
	6	S: Oh, I see.
	7	D: Then you should write it here.
	8	S: But this is
	9	D: How many authors?
	10	S: One author
	11	D: Okay.
	12	S: But I cited here too
	13	D: Where? In the beginning?
	14	S: Yes. I used it there and here too.

For this particular assignment, Sohee compared and contrasted sweet potatoes and potatoes as emergency food, citing a source to prove that the potato has higher GI (glycemic index) than the sweet potato, but failed to insert the citation within her text. In line 3, Dahee points out this problem by asking Sohee where she put the in-text citation. Once Dahee makes the decision of putting the author's name in the text in line 5, Sohee raises the issue of her using the same source in multiple places and then wonders where to indicate its source in the ensuing 55 turns. Finally, Dahee suggests that Sohee put the in-text citation from the beginning of the particular paragraph that discusses GI:

Excerpt 4 (Continued)

- 1 D: Then you can put it from the start.
 2 S: Okay.
 3 D: Wait, “*despite the same kind of ...index*” uh, then shall we put
 4 it here? Like “*GI testing at Sydney University provide*”
 5 S: Umm
 6 D: “*their different degree of glycemic index?*” How about this?
 7 S: Sounds okay.
 8 D: Do you really think so? You look tired.
 9 S: Umm, how about Parkinson Center, Charles Parkinson
 10 Center? In Sydney, there is a center named like this supported by
 11 the Sydney University. How about using this center?

Faced with Dahee's suggestion that she can put the citation in the beginning of the paragraph, Sohee raises another issue whether to put a center name or a person's name in the citation. In the ensuing 15 turns, Dahee and Sohee discussed which will be more appropriate for the citation and finally Sohee herself arrives at the decision to state “this center provides” as follows:

Excerpt 4 (Continued)

- 1 S: How about saying this center, this center located in the
 2 University of Sydney provides?
 3 D: Okay.
 4 S: Okay.
 5 D: By the way, it shouldn't be there.
 6 S: Then what shall I do with the second sentence? GI something

- 7 D: Then you can put, can put it here. You said “*they are different*
8 *in degree of glycemc index*” and explained what GI
9 means
10 S: Then how about this?
11 D: “*Despite ... ?*” But this is not what the center said.
12 S: You’re right.
13 D: So you shouldn’t put the citation here.
14 S: Aha!
15 D: You should put it here.
16 S: Okay.

In this excerpt, Dahee tells Sohee to put the citation after the sentence “they are different in degree of glycemc index,” keeping her initial position. Instead of accepting Dahee’s suggestion, Sohee tried to offer a different opinion in line 10, but Dahee immediately points out that that part was not said by the center in line 11. Finally arriving at line 16, both Dahee and Sohee agree upon where to put the in-text citation within her text. This whole process takes 125 turns in total in which Dahee and Sohee collaborate together to decide how to fix this problem.

4.2 Cheol’s Tutorials

Table 2 shows that as in the case of Dahee, the most common type of interactional pattern is Tutor–Detection, Tutor–Identification, and Tutor–Decision in Cheol’s tutorials as well. It also shows that Cheol and his tutee used different interactional patterns other than Tutor–Detection, Tutor–Identification, and Tutor–Decision in three writing tutorials.

Table 2. Cheol’s Tutorial

Tutorial	Sumin	
	T–D → T–I → T–Dc	Others
1 st	12	t–D → T–I → T–Dc (3)
2 nd	46	t–D → t–I → T–Dc (2) T–D → T–I → t–Dc
3 rd	9	t–D → t–I (2) t–D → t–I → t–Dc

Note. T = Tutor; t = Tutee; D = Detection; I = Identification; Dc = Decision.

Excerpt 5 (Cheol's 1st Tutorial with Sumin: T-D → T-I → T-Dc)

Detection:	1	C: You started the summary with what the writer suffered from
	2	ethnic stereotypes.
Identification:	3	C: But this was so simplified. I think so many ideas of the original
	4	text were curtailed within this one sentence.
Decision:	5	C: So I think you'd better split this sentence into a couple of more
	6	sentences. Many things happened in the original text, right? The
	7	writer was good at math from childhood and the teacher pushed
	8	him to be good at math, bla bla bla. You can add these details and
	9	provide more explanations.

Sumin's first assignment was to write a one-paragraph summary of a two-page long essay that criticizes ethnic stereotypes prevalent in the society, like Mina's and Sohee's. Sumin started her summary with the sentence "the writer who had believed Asian students were more intelligent than other students realized his or her thought was false." In Excerpt 5, Cheol detects a problem in this sentence, points out that so many details are condensed into this one sentence, and thus suggests that Sumin should elaborate on this sentence by adding more details. In this tutorial, Cheol gave feedback on 15 points, and, out of these 15, 12 cases follow the same pattern as seen in Excerpt 5, that is, he detects a problem, identifies it, and makes decision on how to fix the problem himself without any intervention from his tutee in the talk.

In addition to this common type, in Cheol's first tutorial, there are three other cases where Sumin initiates detection, but it is immediately followed by Cheol's identification and decision about what to do with the problem, with Sumin's further actions shut off.

Excerpt 6 (Cheol's 1st Tutorial with Sumin: t-D → T-I → T-Dc)

Detection:	1	S: How long would your summary of this-length original text be?
	2	C: I think it should be about half a page.
	3	S: Is that so?
Identification:	4	C: You thought about just this length?
	5	S: I thought a summary is about the author's opinion. So I thought
	6	that mine was too long. I wanted to add some explanations about
	7	the list of words from the original text, but
Decision:	8	C: Then you can think in this way. I just showed you my example.
	9	With this example, I show you what I think a basic outline should

- 10 look like. The episodes you mentioned, you can put them in one
11 sentence, but your transition looks too abrupt... Clarify why you
12 talk about this episode and move on to the next.

For the two-page original text, Sumin summarized it into a relatively short paragraph (six-line long), but Cheol added more details to it and, as a result, he made it much longer than Sumin's first draft. Towards the end of the tutorial, Sumin raises a question about an appropriate length of a summary in line 1 in Excerpt 6. Sumin's questioning of Cheol's answer (half a page) in line 3, indicates that she may have a different opinion from Cheol's about the appropriate length of a summary. In line 4, Cheol points out the problem of summary length and ends this talk with his suggestion that Sumin can follow his outline and make better transitions between episodes.

Similarly, Cheol's second tutorial with Sumin, which occurred about one month later, does not show a remarkable difference from his first tutorial in terms of figures. Table 2 shows that the pattern of tutor's detecting, identifying, and solving a problem is still a predominant interactional pattern, for it was used 46 times out of 49 feedback points in total. In the second tutorial, Sumin detects the problem of her own writing as in the first tutorial, however, the other three interactional cases prove that Cheol tried to identify what Sumin was trying to write and to allow Sumin to participate more in the tutorial.

Excerpt 7 (Cheol's 2nd Tutorial with Sumin: t-D → t-I → T-Dc)

- | | | |
|-----------------|---|--|
| Detection: | 1 | S: By the way, if I say "robot replacements" |
| Identification: | 2 | Don't they overlap with each other? |
| | 3 | C: You mean, with "overturning," "overturning?" |
| | 4 | S: with replacement by robots? |
| | 5 | C: You mean with the word replacement? |
| Decision: | 6 | Then you can use the word "robotic requirement." Ah, you can |
| | 7 | remove the word " <i>replace</i> "...Or you can use the word |
| | 8 | " <i>mechanization</i> ." You can use one of these words. |

In Excerpt 7, Sumin initiates the feedback procedure by detecting a semantic redundancy in Cheol's suggested sentence "overturning the entire workforce with robot replacements." Unlike the interactional pattern of Excerpt 6, Cheol spends several turns figuring out what Sumin meant in her detection and identification of the problem, although he is the person who makes the decision on what to do with this problem as he did in Excerpt 6.

Excerpt 8 even shows the case that Sumin makes the decision on her problem and Cheol also gives his opinion while agreeing to her decision.

Excerpt 8 (Cheol's 2nd Tutorial with Sumin: T-D → T-I → t-Dc)

Detection:	1	C: Here you used the word “ <i>hire</i> .”
Identification:	2	When you say a company hires a robot, the robot has AI like the
	3	Terminator. Do you know who the Terminator is?
	4	S: Yes.
	5	C: You know him? Did you watch the movie?
	6	S: No, I didn't see it this time.
	7	C: Like Terminators, companies can hire Terminators, who have
	8	AIs, but industrial robots do not have AIs.
Decision:	9	S: Then I can use the word “use”
	10	C: Yes, you can use either “employ” or “use.” Either one is fine.

In Excerpt 8, Cheol detects and identifies a collocational problem with Sumin's expression “companies hire robots.” To help Sumin's understanding of his comment, Cheol gives the example of the Terminator as an AI-equipped robot. Sumin's acknowledgement that she knows this old movie character seems to contribute to a kind of better rapport in which the tutor and the tutee arrive at the same level of understanding. Once she comes to understand what her problem is in her sentence, Sumin suggests she can use the word “use” as in line 9. This is the first moment across the first and second tutorial where Sumin herself makes a decision on her writing issues and Cheol agrees it without blocking or rejecting her opinion.

In the final tutorial, which occurred three weeks after the second tutorial, more active participation of the tutee is witnessed. As seen in Table 2, in three cases out of 12 feedback points in total, Sumin takes care of all the actions—detection, identification, and decision. For example, Excerpt 9 shows that the tutee engages in each action of detecting, identifying, and solving her own problem, beyond the level of mere suggesting a correction as in Excerpt 8.

Excerpt 9 (Cheol's 3rd Tutorial with Sumin: t-D → t-I → t-Dc)

Detection:	1	S: I cited an internet dictionary here.
	2	C: Ah
Identification:	3	S: We usually put an author's name and then a date. But this

- 4 source does not have a date, so I put it like this, but I'm not sure
5 whether this is right.
6 C: What did you quote from here?
7 S: I typed the word "international communities" on the internet
8 and found this explanation, like the definition from a dictionary.
Decision: 9 C: Then you used a dictionary definition. Then you can say a
10 dictionary says, you can put Wikipedia says

In the third assignment that required her to write a compare-and-contrast essay, Sumin compared the European Union with Mercosur the Southern Common Market. She started her essay with the sentence "An international economic community of geographically adjacent countries is formed so that nations that frequently trade with each other formalize their relationship for a common economic policy," copied from a source. Sumin detects a problem in this sentence and identifies the problem of citing a source with no date. After a series of questions and answers come and go between Cheol and Sumin to solve this problem, this feedback point seems to come to an end with Cheol's suggestion that Sumin cite Wikipedia within her text. However, a few turns later, Sumin identifies another problem that she does not know how to cite sources without an author's name.

Excerpt 9 (Continued)

- Detection: 1 S: But when I put a citation, I put the author's name
2 C: Did you learn about this in the class?
3 S: No
4 C: This is not a person
.....
Identification: 5 S: I don't know what to do.
6 C: Where did you get this information? Is it from Wikipedia or
7 from a dictionary?
8 S: BC campus, I'm not sure
9 C: You don't know from where you got this?
10 S: This is not from Wikipedia. I googled and found a foreign
11 site. Dictionary or a journal?
12 C: A journal?
13 S: I don't remember it well.
14 C: A personal blog?

- 15 S: Not that kind of thing. I googled the company name, but I could
16 not find the author's name at all.
- 17 C: No author's name?
- 18 S: No, so I just put BC campus.
- Decision: 19 C: Then let's do this. You don't know the source clearly. Then you
20 can remove the citation.
- Detection: 21 S: Is it okay?
22 C: I think it is okay
- Identification: 23 S: But I copied it from the site.
24 C: This is so tricky.

In this excerpt, Sumin raises another problem of not knowing the original source clearly in line 5. Despite Cheol's efforts to figure out what type the original source was, Sumin failed to recall what kind of source she copied this sentence from and thus finally Cheol makes the decision to get rid of the citation altogether. However, here they were faced with another problem with Sumin's question, whether it is ethically okay not to cite the original source. They spend the ensuing turns in discussing whether the instructor will detect this problem or not.

Excerpt 9 (Continued)

- Identification: 1 S: Then I'm in trouble.
- Decision: 2 C: I think you can get rid of
3 S: and I paraphrase this in my own words?
4 C: This sentence? Why don't you paraphrase it?
5 S: Yes, I can do that.
6 C: You can paraphrase this because this is quite well-known to
7 people.
8 S: Yes, you're right.

This excerpt reveals that Cheol and Sumin collaborate to arrive at the conclusion that Sumin may paraphrase this sentence without referring to a particular source, for this is a common knowledge that readers are familiar with. Cheol does not take care of every action any longer as he did in the previous tutorials, nor does Sumin passively accept Cheol's decision: she initiates detection, identification or involves in decision in this case whereas Cheol gradually lets her do this by giving more room for her active involvement in the

tutorial towards the end of the semester. This series of detection, identification, and decision on a couple of questions that occurred in 67 turns in total—citing a source without a date, no clear knowledge of the original source, and the ethical issue of copying a sentence without its citation added—uncovers that both Cheol and Sumin come to learn how to work together, which is represented in their interactional patterns.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The comparison and contrast of Dahee the more experienced tutor and Cheol, who tutored English writing for the first time, reveals that not only the tutees but also the tutors learned how to collaborate with their tutees as tutorials go on. In both Dahee's and Cheol's tutorials, the most common type of interactional pattern with their tutees was that the tutors detect, identify, and correct problems, which is quite similar to the findings many second language writing scholars made, that is, tutors are more likely to dominate in their talk with L2 tutees (Thonus 1999a, 1999b, 2004; Williams 2004, 2005). However, whether they are experienced in tutoring or not makes a difference in the extent to which they collaborate in each of these stages as well. In Dahee's case, her first tutorials show various interactional patterns with her tutees other than Tutor–Detection, Tutor–Identification, and Tutor–Decision: Dahee and her tutees collaborate together to identify the problem on their writing and make decisions. In addition to this, Dahee's tutees detect or identify their problems in their writing and even make decisions on how to fix the problems on their own. Moreover, it is noticeable that these interactional patterns were revealed not only in the first writing tutorials but also in the series of tutorials throughout the semester.

On the other hand, in Cheol's case, in the first tutorial, his predominant interactional pattern is his taking care of all the actions himself—he detects a problem, identifies it, and suggests a correction on it—with very limited room for his tutee to participate in this feedback–giving procedure. Even in the few interactional patterns where the tutee detects or identifies a problem, Cheol intervenes immediately and makes final decisions on the problem. However, his attitude becomes more collaborative from the second tutorial. Although the most domineering interactional pattern is still Tutor–Detection, Tutor–Identification, and Tutor–Decision in the second tutorial, in a few cases, his tutee involves in all the three stages—sometimes she detects, identifies, and even makes a final decision

on her own problem—and Cheol also agrees to his tutee's opinions without any intervention. This, of course, shows changes in his tutee's behaviors, but this change also means that Cheol lets her involvement in the tutorials and shows willingness to communicate with his tutee. The last tutorial, which was conducted at the end of this semester, uncovers a more remarkable incidence when both Cheol and his tutee Sumin collaborated in detecting, identifying and fixing problems in as lengthy interaction as Dahee's ones.

These findings corroborate what Lave and Wenger label as situated learning. In the framework of situated learning, not only apprentices, who participate in the master's practice as legitimate peripheral participants, but also the masters experience changes in their roles as their apprentices come to involve more in their practices. Cheol's changes in his three tutorials confirm what Hanks (1991) mentions, "learning, as it were, is distributed to co-participants, not a one-person act" (p. 15). It is quite apparent that his tutee Sumin becomes more involved in the tutorial, but this becomes possible because Cheol allows more room for Sumin to participate in the tutorials, in other words, because he becomes more collaborative himself. Through their tutorials, it seems that both the tutor and the tutee come to realize that tutoring is a discursive practice constructed by both of them.

Even so, this study is limited in that it only examines a small number of participants and their limited number of tutorials. Investigation of a larger number of tutorials will produce more reliable results which can be generalized to more diverse contexts. Also, in-depth interviews with the tutors will be more enlightening in that we can hear their own opinions, feelings, and voices on what they think about their own tutorials as well as interactions with their tutees. These limitations notwithstanding, this study implies that tutors gain knowledge and experience through their tutorials. These gains are not limited to what Defoe and Caparas (2014) argue for as their professional and personal growth, but expandable to tutors' own realization that a tutorial is a discursive practice and to their changed roles in the tutorial. This finding can also be applied to the training of novice tutors by indicating that a writing tutorial is not a mere transmitting process of a tutor's knowledge of academic writing to tutees, but rather that it is a conversational act that is situated in a specific academic setting. Also, this collaborative aspect of L2 tutor–L2 tutee interactions found in this study implies that tutors' interactions with L2 tutees can be as collaborative as those with L1 tutees and hints that nature of tutor–tutee interactions is decided on by multiple factors, aside from the issue of whether they are native speakers or not.

References

- Agar, M. 1985. Institutional discourse. *Text* 5(3), 147–168.
- Bailey, S. K. 2012. Tutor handbooks: Heuristic texts for negotiating difference in a globalized world. *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal* 9(2), 1–8.
- Beasley, C. J. 1997. Students as teachers: The benefits of peer tutoring. In L. Pospisil and L. Willcoxson, eds., *Learning through Teaching*, 21–30. Perth, Australia: Murdoch University.
- Blau, S. R. and J. Hall. 2002. Guilt-free tutoring: Rethinking how we tutor non-native-English-speaking students. *The Writing Center Journal* 23(1), 23–44.
- Cohen, J. 1986. Theoretical considerations of peer tutoring. *Psychology in the Schools* 23(2), 175–186.
- Defoe, D. J. and F. Caparas. 2014. Tutoring as transformative work: A phenomenological case study of tutors' experiences. *Journal of College Reading and Learning* 44(2), 141–163. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2014.906272>
- Gillespie, P. and N. Lerner. 2000. *The Allyn and Bacon Guide to Peer Tutoring*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Goody, E. 1989. Learning and the division of labor. In M. Coy, ed., *Anthropological Perspectives on Apprenticeship*. New York: SUNY Press.
- Hanks, W. F. 1991. Foreword by William F. Hanks. In J. Lave and E. Wenger, eds., *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*, 13–24. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Harris, M. 1986. *Teaching one-to-one: The Writing Conference*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Lave, J. and E. Wenger. 1991. *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Moussu, L. 2013. Let's talk! ESL students' needs and writing center philosophy. *TESL Canada Journal* 30(2), 55–68.
- North, S. 1994. Revisiting "The Idea of a Writing Center". *The Writing Center Journal* 15(1), 7–19.
- Powers, J. 1993. Rethinking writing center conferencing strategies for the ESL writer. *The Writing Center Journal* 13(2), 39–47.
- Plummer, L. and T. Thonus. April, 1999. *Methodology as Mythology: Tutor's Directive Instruction*. Paper presented at the 21st Annual Conference of the National Writing Centers Association. Bloomington, IN.

- Rafoth, B. 2000. Helping writers to write analytically. In B. Rafoth, ed., *A Tutor's Guide: Helping Writers One to One*, 76–84. Portsmouth, ND: Boynton/Cook.
- Roscoe, R. D. and M. T. H. Chi. 2007. Understanding tutor learning: Knowledge building and knowledge-telling in peer tutors' explanations and questions. *Review of Educational Research* 77(4), 534–574.
- Roscoe, R. D. and M. T. H. Chi. 2008. Tutor learning: The role of explaining and responding to questions. *Instructional Science* 36(4), 321–350.
- Shamoon, L. K. and D. H. Burns. 1999. Plagiarism, rhetorical theory, and the writing center: New approaches, new locations. In L. Buranen and A. M. Roy, eds., *Perspectives on Plagiarism and Intellectual Property in a Postmodern World*, 183–192. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Thonus, T. 1999a. Dominance in academic writing tutorials: Gender, language proficiency, and the offering of suggestions. *Discourse and Society* 10(2), 225–248. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926599010002005>
- Thonus, T. 1999b. How to communicate politely and be a tutor, too: NS–NNS interaction and writing center practice. *Text* 19(2), 253–279.
- Thonus, T. 2001. Triangulation in the writing center: Tutor, tutee, and instructor perception of the tutor's role. *Writing Center Journal* 22(1), 59–81.
- Thonus, T. 2004. What are the differences? Tutor interactions with first- and second-language writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13(3), 227–242. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.012>
- Thonus, T. 2014. Tutoring multilingual students: Shattering the myths. *Journal of College Reading and Learning* 44(2), 200–213. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2014.9906233>
- Williams, J. 2004. Tutoring and revision: Second language writers in the writing center. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13(3), 173–201. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.009>
- Williams, J. 2005. Writing center interaction: Institutional discourse and the role of peer tutors. In K. Bardovi-Harlig, and B. S. Hartford, eds., *Interlanguage Pragmatics: Exploring Institutional Talk*, 37–65. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Wingate, M. 2001. Writing centers as sites of academic culture. *The Writing Center Journal* 21(2), 7–20.
- Young, R. F. and E. R. Miller. 2004. Learning as changing participation: Discourse roles in ESL writing conferences. *Modern Language Journal* 88(4), 519–535.
- Yu, L. 2020. Investigating L2 writing through tutor–tutee interactions and revisions: A

case study of a multilingual writer in EAP tutorials. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 48, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.100709>

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Level: Tertiary

Cho, Sookyung
Professor, Department of English Linguistics and Language Technology
Hankuk University of Foreign Studies
107 Imun-ro, Dongdaemun-gu
Seoul, Korea
Tel: 02) 2173-3194
Email: sookjungcho@hufs.ac.kr

Kim, Dahee
Ph. D. student, Department of English Linguistics
Hankuk University of Foreign Studies
107 Imun-ro, Dongdaemun-gu
Seoul, Korea
Tel: 02) 2173-3194
Email: tynuknow@nate.com

Baek, Cheol
Ph.D. student, Department of English Linguistics
Hankuk University of Foreign Studies
107 Imun-ro, Dongdaemun-gu
Seoul, Korea
Tel: 02) 2173-3194
Email: qorcjfqorcjf@daum.net

Received: October 28, 2020
Revised: December 06, 2020
Accepted: December 15, 2020