

# Showing What We Do: Mock Tutorials during Tutor Training Orientation in the University Writing Center

---

**Juhi Kim**

The Ohio State University

## **Abstract**

The shift in literacy education has reshaped the perspective of writing instruction in its theory and philosophy of the writing center in the US. This study examines how the writing center tutors instruct themselves for the work of writing instruction through mock tutorials. The tutors demonstrate how they make sense of the collaborative process of writing instruction for both cases with an ideal tutee and a troubled tutee during the tutor training orientation. This study provides the transcripts of the mock tutorials and analyzes the talk in interaction during the tutorials.

*Keywords:* mock tutorial, tutor-training, collaborative process, writing tutorial, writing center

## **Show What We Do: Mock Tutorials during Training Orientation in the University Writing Center**

### **Introduction**

In a small glass-walled cubicle, two chairs and a round table with a computer are placed in the center. On the round table, there are pencils, colored pens, and a highlighter with a small notepad ready for use. Right next to the cubicle, the same-looking cubicles surround the room next to each other. In the center of the room surrounded by those cubicles, a comfy-looking sofa and cushioned chairs, along with a coffee table, are located. A couple of students are sitting and waiting for their appointments with their papers in hand. Inside the cubicle, a tutor and a tutee are sitting next to each other at the table. They are looking at the paper between them and reading it together. The tutor marks on the paper - circling, underlining, and highlighting - and the tutee takes notes on the paper. The tutor points at a line on the paper and asks a question; the tutee answers and explains to the tutor. They read the writing that the tutee brought, discuss what they read, and share their understanding.

This is the typical scene of the tutorial area in the writing center. The tutor and the tutee are sitting next to each other, and the paper is placed in between them, not necessarily on the tutor's side, but in between. The tutor reads the paper, marks on the paper but does not correct it. They work on the problems together by talk. The tutee

takes notes and corrects sometimes. The same work sometimes is done through the computer screen instead of printed paper but the way they work with the writing is still the same. Their work for the writing tutorial is performed by talk.

The university writing center in the US was initiated as a writing lab in its inception in order to help the domestic students who have deficiency in academic writing; however, along with the change of the concept of the literacy education, the pedagogy of the writing instruction has been evolved and reformulated from the traditional concept of error-correcting remedial services to the socially negotiated process in the contemporary writing center (Lunsford, 1991; North, 1984). The concept of writing instruction in the traditional writing center was fixing the mechanical errors to make the paper error-free; however, the new concept of writing instruction in the contemporary writing center is focusing on the *process* of writing, not the product of writing (Harris, 1986, 1992; Lunsford, 1991; North, 1984). Thus, in this regard, writing instruction during the tutorial is a socially negotiated collaborated process between the tutor and the tutee. This change of the pedagogical approach of the writing instruction puts its emphasis of the instruction on the *writer* in the *writing process*, not the writing as a product. The instruction is conveyed through *talk*, not through text.

This new concept of writing instruction in the writing center is declared and supported by North (1984), "The writing center is to produce better writers, not better writing" (p.438). As stated, teaching writing in the old scheme of the writing center was a straightforward error-correction paradigm, which viewed knowledge as immediately accessible, measurable, and a conveyable exterior substance; however, the new scheme of the contemporary writing center views writing as a collaborative process, which is abstract and ambiguous to articulate clearly what they do and how they enact writing instruction in the new paradigm. Thenceforth, writing centers have become engaged in the task not simply of teaching writing, but also teaching how it will teach writing.

What the writing center does for the work of writing is closely tied to how they prepare novice-tutors in the tutor-training orientation and what they share about their work during the staff meetings. The tutor-training orientation and staff meetings are the places that show and share *how we work* in the writing center. Particularly, the mock tutorials demonstrated during the tutor-training orientation show vividly *what we do* during tutorial, and share their ideas about the work of writing tutorial with one another. Also, the issues and concerns about their actual tutorial experiences during the staff meetings are shared and discussed. They share their knowledge as members of the writing center by

showing and sharing what they do and how they do it across the multiple sites of instruction in the writing center. Saying what we do and showing how they do it represent how the contemporary writing center views writing instruction as it is embedded in the daily work of the tutorials, staff meetings, and tutor-training programs.

In this regard, I will examine how the writing center instructs themselves and others in *showing* and *sharing* what they do for the work of writing instruction and how they make sense of the work of the *collaborative process* of writing instruction through the mock tutorials during the tutor training orientation. Along with the ethnographic data from the center, I will provide the transcripts of the mock tutorials that the tutors demonstrated during the orientation, for both cases with an ideal tutee and a troubled tutee, and analyze their talk-in-interactions for the writing tutorials. In these instructional sites, the new paradigm of the writing instruction is manifested as a practical enactment for the work of writing tutorials.

## **Literature Review**

### **University Writing Centers in the US**

University writing centers have played a significant role in university education for the last 50 years since they were established as an English department “writing lab” (North, 1984) in the US. Along with shifting concepts of literacy from home-based

literacies in the eighteenth century to standardized schooled literacy in the twentieth century, the pedagogy of the writing center has also changed since it first appeared in the 1930s. Initially, the instruction of the writing centers focused on remediation services for the students who were deficient in their writing ability; however, their services broadened to a wide range of academic services subsequently for students, faculty, and staff across departments (J. Kim, 2014, Thonus, 2002, Y. Kim, 2000).

The theory and philosophy of writing instruction have been reformulated as its focus has moved from text-oriented perspectives, based on the traditional models of rhetoric and grammar, to the collaboration-focused perspective of social constructionism. Collaboration-focused theory and practice is the most prevalent theory in contemporary writing center instruction (Murphy & Sherwood, 1995; Thonus, 1998, 1999b; Whitted, 1966; Y. Kim, 2000). Traditionally, literacy was defined as a decoding skill, which is the ability to read and write. Graham (1980) defined literacy primarily as a “cognitive enterprise,” which refers to the “ability to read, communicate, compute, develop independent judgments and take actions resulting from them” (p. 127). As the concept of literacy has shifted within a school context from cognitive ability, decoding and encoding skills, to a collection of skills and talents as a socially constructed phenomenon, literacy learning has been focused on as a process, which is acquired in

everyday life through interactional exchanges and the negotiation of meaning in many different contexts (Cook-Gumperz, 1986). This social perspective on literacy views learning not only as the acquisition of cognitive, psychological skills but also as a social process of demonstrating competence and knowledge ability (Cook-Gumperz, 1986). Writing centers may have taught *rules* of correct writing at one time; however, the curriculum of the contemporary writing center is more than just teaching rules. It is rather how to shape the instruction that the writing center provides and how to make sense of the instruction between text and talk through writing and speaking in the face-to-face tutorials.

### **Learning Through Collaborative Engagement**

Vygotsky (1978, 1986) viewed learning as a social activity. Learning takes place primarily through the social interaction with experts such as adults or capable peers. By joining the social practice with the experts, the novice learns how to perform the activities to achieve the shared goals. Vygotsky (1978) defined the space where the novice and experts interact with each other as the *Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)*, which is the “distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem-solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers” (p.86). The interactions occurring in the ZPD are of two different levels: interpersonal and

intra-personal interaction. By participating in the social practice with the guidance of experts, the learner can acquire knowledge both from the inter-personal interaction with the members in the community, and from the intra-personal level of interaction occurring in the learner's experience between the prior and the new. The knowledge achieved from the internal level of intra-personal interactions occurs from the experience of the exterior level of interpersonal interactions with the community members. Both inter- and intra-personal knowledge development processes require interactions that are mediated by participatory engagement of the social practice (Vygotsky, 1986).

### **Scaffolding Through the Transformative Process**

Along with the concept of how learning occurs in the ZPD, Wood et al. (1976) introduced scaffolding as a strategy that the tutor can help a student solve a problem and achieve a goal beyond their current level of abilities. Wood et al. (1976) defined scaffolding as:

a process that enables a child or novice to solve a problem, carry out a task, or achieve a goal which would be beyond his unassisted efforts. This scaffolding consists essentially of the adult "controlling" those elements of the task that are initially beyond the learner's capacity, thus permitting him to concentrate upon and complete only those elements that are within this range of competence. (p.90)

Wood et al. (1976) discussed that the tutor must be able to



demonstrate and correct students' errors and motivate the students to perform the task successfully as well as the students' need to actively participate to learn the strategies and principles. From other studies that Wood & Middleton (1975) and Wood & Wood (1996) conducted about effective instruction, they found the "region of sensitivity to instruction" (Wood & Middleton, 1975, p.181), which enables the most effective instruction for the child to measure their current task ability and if they are ready for the next level of the task. If the child succeeds, the next level of intervention for instruction should offer less help, if not, vice-versa (Wood & Wood, 1996). Along with Vygotsky's ZPD theory, the concept of scaffolding as an effective strategy for learning, has been expanded in various concepts by many scholars. (Brown et al., 1989; Brown & Palinscar, 1987; Chin et al., 2004; Gallimore & Tharp, 1990; Rogoff, 1990). Thompson (2009) and Mackiewicz & Thompson (2014) analyzed how the experienced tutors employ the various strategies during writing tutorials for instruction, cognitive scaffolding, and motivational scaffolding verbally and nonverbally and suggested the detailed specific strategies that the tutors use for satisfactory conferences for the resources for the tutor training program.

Not only in the research about writing tutorials, the concept of scaffolding was employed widely in various educational fields as an important concept, particularly highlighting the transformative process of learning. Rubin and Kantor (1984) suggested that helping

the students to reduce the gaps between their speaking and writing could facilitate not just their “mechanic skills” such as articulation, spelling, and punctuation but also the “organizational skills” that include the discourse and knowledge of language pragmatics. Making the transition freely between speaking and writing, between oracy and literacy, is parallel with the Vygotsky’s theory of learning between the interpersonal and intrapersonal process. By making a connection between speaking and writing and enhancing both skills, learners can organize their thoughts and share knowledge that is transformed from their oral discourse into conversation (Rubin & Kantor, 1984; Weissberg, 2008). Hacker and Graesser (2010) studied the collaborative dialogue in naturally occurring tutoring that enhances the students’ reading comprehension. Sharing their thoughts through dialogue enables reciprocal teaching and collaborative learning. Polman and Pea (2010) carried out a study on how the transformative communication draws the students into knowledge development in the project-based science classrooms. What the teacher did was scaffolding students’ work in the classroom project by modeling, structuring, and coaching, which is supporting and guiding the students’ work along the way. The transformative communication takes place from the mutual appropriation mediated by interaction between thinking and knowing and creates meaning from the transformative process from students’ actions into more successful

moves. For the learners to interact effectively in the language-mediated educational context, utilizing the different modes of language between speaking and writing, and listening and reading is essential to make the instruction successful. In this light, the interactive process of engagement through the four language skills - speaking, writing, reading, and listening - is critical for scaffolding learning to provide a successful collaborative environment for knowledge construction.

## **Data and Methodology**

### **Ethnographically Approached Case Studies**

This study can be described as case studies approached ethnographically in order to understand the work of the writing center. According to Stake (1995), case study is defined as “the study of the particularity and complexity of a single case, coming to understand its activity within important circumstances” (p.xi). He claimed that case study research is determined not by the methods of inquiry used, but by interest in each case observed. Gall et al. (2003) characterized a case study as “the in-depth study of instances of phenomenon in its natural context and from the perspective of the participants involved in the phenomenon” (p.436). With the particular interest of the multiple instructional activities in the writing center as cases to study, this study was conducted following the ethnographic approach.

Ethnography is the study of human, human behavior, and activity in the specific cultures. Malinowski (1922) highlighted the significance of participated observation to understand the life of the natives and established the concept of fieldwork in ethnography while interacting with them. Geertz (1973) introduced the widely known concept of *thick description* to provide the ethnographic findings. Spradley (1980) explained ethnography as “the work of describing a culture” (p.3). Along with the turn of social constructionism in the field of language education, the interest of ethnographic studies has been increased and suggested for its naturalistic methodologies (Bishop, 1999). Babcock and Thonus (2018) described ethnography as “a broad category of research typically involving participant observation or immersion”(p 52), introducing ethnography by quoting Emerson et al. (2007) for “establishing a place in some natural setting on a relatively long-term basis in order to investigate, experience and represent the social life and social processes that occur in that setting” (p. 52).

### **The Setting and Context**

This study was conducted for my fieldwork in the writing center located in a major Midwestern university in the US. The university had a population of 55,000 undergraduate and graduate students on its main campus. The number of the tutors in the writing center, including graduate and undergraduate tutors, was 25. Their academic majors were diverse, and all were native English speakers.

The client population of the writing center was roughly a 50/50 ratio of English native speakers to non-native speakers. The native country of the non-native English speakers varied from East Asia, Africa, South America, and Europe. In order to understand the complexity of the work of the writing center, I attended the multiple instructional events in the writing center, e.g., writing tutorials, staff meetings, tutor training course, and orientation program as a participant observer for 12 months.

Among the data I collected during my fieldwork, I will introduce the mock tutorials performed by the tutors during the tutor orientation program as cases to look into in detail, along with the ethnographic data from my field notes that captured the comments and discussion during the events and the interviews with the tutors.

During the mock tutorial, provided as part of the tutor training orientation, the experienced tutors demonstrated a writing tutorial with a troubled tutee and discussed the issues and problems presented. Then, the experienced tutor and the new tutor paired up and worked with each other on a short paper distributed (anonymous tutee's writing). They took turns as a tutor and a tutee and shared their thoughts about the work of the tutorial. The mock tutorials were videotaped with the consent of the tutors and IRB permission and transcribed following the convention of transcript notation (Sacks, et al., 1974) for the fine-grained, turn-by-turn analysis. (Appendix A. Transcript Notations) Informal interviews

with the tutors were conducted over time during my fieldwork about the questions listed in Appendix B. They were audiotaped, logged, and identified by the themes related to the study's research questions and gathered for analysis.

### **Conversation Analysis as an Analytical Framework**

Conversation Analysis (CA) was employed as an analytical framework. CA focuses on the "interactional organization of the social activities" (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008, p.12) and describes the structure of the interactional organization, moment-by-moment, turn by turn talk-in-interactions. It is a systematic analysis of naturally occurring everyday human activities.

CA describes organizational structure such as turn taking, sequence organization, and repair practices (Goodwin, 1981; Sacks et al., 1974). Turn taking is controlled interactionally and joined collaboratively in the sequence of the prior and the next turn, i.e., each turn provides a context for the next turn and each next turn shows the speaker's understanding of the prior turn (Moreman & Sacks, 1988). In this regard, *adjacency pair* is the basic unit of the organization in conversation: first pair part (FPP) and second pair part (SPP). At the end of each possible turn constructional unit (TCU) in the FPP, a transition relevance place (TRP) becomes available for the next turn in the SPP (Sacks et al., 1974). CA examines a speaker's social actions through talk and the mutual understanding (intersubjectivity) that are witness-ably observable in

their management of the interactional context. In terms of analyzing talk through CA, the key question is *how*, and no contextual factors (e.g. race, gender, etc.) or predetermined coding categories are allowed for its account of intersubjectivity. Intersubjectivity is described strictly by the interactional sequences of the participants; the relation between the researcher and the participants is completely observational (Thonus, 2020, p. 180).

However, concerning the ethnographic data in CA combined with ethnography, Waring et.al. (2012) summarized the potential benefits of utilizing the talk-extrinsic data in four ways: confirm, specify, disambiguate, and correct the vague parts from an initial CA analysis by providing the questions of *what* and *why* through the informal ethnographic interview with participants.

Ethnographic information in a CA study enables “systematic and rigorous attention to the fullness of the participants’ spoken sociality and its generic structuring” (Maynard, 2003, p.70). The description of the setting, participant’s identity, and the institutional history provide the contextual knowledge to the researcher and the study that can clarify the ambiguous puzzling patterns of conduct and serves as evidence for claims about discourse (Pomerantz, 2005). This study presents an ethnographic description of the instructional sites of the writing center and the new scheme of writing instruction that the center pursues: writing as a collaborative process.

## **Mock Tutorial Training**

In this section, I will introduce the opening sequences and the sequences from the main work of the mock tutorials, which were demonstrated by the tutors for cases with a troubled tutee and with an ideal tutee. First, I will introduce the opening sequences with both the troubled tutee and the ideal tutee. Then the sequences from the main work with both the troubled and the ideal tutees will follow. The case with a troubled tutee was demonstrated first to the whole group of the tutors and the cases with an ideal tutee were demonstrated later. The names of the tutors used in this paper are all pseudonyms (T: Tutor, C: Client).

### **Showing What We Do: Opening the Tutorial**

The opening stage for a writing tutorial is important in terms of establishing the direction of the work of the tutorial. The tutor and the tutee greet each other and find out what to work on during the tutorial. Depending on the tutee's knowledge and experience about the work of the writing center, they can either move on to the work of the writing smoothly, or they may require preparatory instruction first that introduces and explains what can be accepted as work for the tutorial before moving to work on their paper (J. Kim, 2018b). If the tutee makes a request that cannot be accepted as work of the writing center, such as proofreading, then they have to negotiate first what to work with before moving on so that they do not violate the center's policy (J. Kim, 2018b).



### *Opening Sequence with a Troubled Tutee*

Selma and Helen, the two experienced tutors, mock a tutorial of the case with a troubled tutee. Selma plays the role of the tutor and Helen plays the role of the troubled tutee, who is not ready to work with the tutor. After greeting each other, the tutor and the tutee begin discussing how to work on the paper. T in the transcript signifies the tutor, Selma, and C, the client (tutee), Helen. The names used here are pseudonyms.

#### **Excerpt 1.**

1 T: Hi. Are you Helen?

2 C: U-huh

3 T: Hi I am Selma

4 C: = [Hi

5 T: = [It's good to meet you

6 I'm going to be your tutor today

7 So I am ready to get started when you are

8 C: Okay(.) Alright

9 T: Come on in ((T and C, sitting around the desk))

10 ► So (.) so what are you- what are you working on today?

11 C: Um it's just an assignment(.) its- it's for my class

12 ► It's- my teacher told me to come

13 And so I just- um: I am but I have to work so

14 I'm going to have to leave just like a little bit early

15 And then I have to hand it today(.) So

16 T: Okay

17 C: =Um(.) just(.) you know(.) if you can just tell me

18 what I need to do to fix it (.) um that would be great

The tutor and the tutee greet each other in lines 1-5. The tutor, Selma, makes sure of the tutee, Helen, and then introduces herself. The tutee, Helen, simply accepts who she is in line 2 and says “Hi” simultaneously with the tutor, Selma, in line 5. Selma continues introducing herself as a tutor to work with for the tutorial today. Then she leads Helen to the chair to sit down at the desk. The tutor takes the lead, and the tutee follows, sitting with the tutor.

Selma then asks the routine, opening question in line 10, “What are you working on today?” This is the typical opening question that the tutor asks in the beginning of the tutorial, and it is important to establish the agenda of the work for the tutorial. The tutee, Helen provides her *why I am here* in lines 11-15. Helen begins by introducing her work as an “assignment” for “my class”(line 11) without specifying what kind of assignment or for what class. Then she continues saying that her teacher told her to come to the writing center (line 12) and that she came to the writing center not because of her own volition but because she was told to come. Helen continues saying that she has to work at her job, so she is going to have to leave early (lines 13-14) and that she has to submit the paper today (line 15). Without providing any specific information about the assignment or the class of the paper, Helen says that she has to leave early and she has to submit the paper that day. The tutor, Selma, marks receipt by latch in line 16, and Helen finally formulates her request about what she wants from this tutorial in

lines 17-18, *if you tell me what to fix, that would be great.*

The request that Helen made in lines 17-18 is the compilation of all the problems that the tutor shared during the interview, which makes the tutor frustrated. The tutee never provided any specific information about the assignment, class, comments from the instructor, and besides she has to leave early and has to submit the paper that day. So, what she wants from the tutor was simply, *You tell me what to fix (then, I will take them)*, the request of proofreading, which is not accepted as work of tutorial in the writing center. The problem of this request is that the work to be done for the tutee's paper was tossed to the tutor. What the tutee is going to do is just to wait for the tutor to finish the work so she can submit it as quickly as possible. The nature of the tutee's formulation of what she wants is basically making the tutor work for the tutee's paper, and this is why many tutors and the writing center declare this proofreading request as cheating (J. Kim, 2018b, 2022). As it was developed from line 11 to line 15, the proofreading request does not come solely by itself, the request of *You do the work (proofread), and I will wait and take it* comes with many more additional problematic issues, such as a lack of information about the assignment, which oftentimes comes from a lack of understanding of the assignment; being required to visit the writing center, which means that they were forced to visit; no time for working or revising the paper, etc. All the issues described show that this tutee is not willing or prepared at all to

work for her paper with the tutor during the tutorial. Helen made this problematic request, formulated by a troubled tutee, so clearly and vividly in this opening sequence.

One of the significant pedagogical philosophies that the writing center follows is the non-directive approach that goes with the student-centered, process-oriented approach. The tutor in the writing center is not there to fix the tutee's paper; the tutee has to bring their own concerns and problems of what to work on during the tutorial, and the tutor helps them to solve the problems they bring through the conversation. This means, the role of the tutor is not to tell the tutee what to fix. The tutee brings the problems and fixes them as well. They are expected to do both sides of the work. The tutor is there to *help* the tutee to solve their own problems in their writing. However, oftentimes, the first-time visiting tutee or the tutees who come to the writing center for class requirements do not know what to ask for or what to do for the tutorial (J. Kim, 2018a, 2018b). Asking the tutor to tell what to fix for the tutee's paper shows a complete misunderstanding about the work of the tutorial in terms of what the tutee is expected to do for the work of the tutorial. What Helen demonstrated here exhibits most of the critical issues that the unprepared tutee brings to the work of the tutorial.

### *Opening Sequence with an Ideal Tutee*

The next excerpt is an opening sequence of a mock tutorial demonstrating the case with an ideal tutee. Reyna, an experienced tutor who has been tutoring for three years, plays a role of the ideal tutee. Brian, a newly hired undergraduate tutor plays a tutor in this excerpt. Reyna plays the role of a well-prepared, ideal type of tutee for the work of the tutorial.

#### **Excerpt 2.**

- 1 T: Hello How's it going? ((shaking hands))
- 2 C: It goes well=How are you?
- 3 T: Good (.) I am Brian(.) //Nice to meet you.
- 4 C: //Hi Brian I am Reyna.
- 5 T: Hi(.) would you like to sit down?
- 6 C: =Thanks ((T and C, sitting at the desk))
- 7 T: So(.5) how's your day been?
- 8 C: It's been okay
- 9 T: Good good
- 10 C: It could be (.) way better (.2)
- 11 if this paper was:: better (.2) done ((giggling))
- 12 T: =Yea I know the feeling(.) I know the feeling
- 13 It's that time of the year(.) Things are coming up
- 14 C: =Yes they are
- 15 T: =Due dates are coming
- 16 ► So (.) what do you have here?
- 17 ► C: I have a paper here(2.) that explains or at least is a discussion of
- 18 ► how Beowulf is supposed to be the model(.) of a traditional folk hero
- 19 T: ((nodding))

- 20 ► C: Um: It's- it's an analysis paper in terms of (.) the poem and  
21 ► I'm supposed to go ahead and take various portions of that  
22 ► to support (.) whatever I am arguing in here

The tutor greets the tutee, and they introduce themselves in lines 1-4. The tutor, Brian, greets Reyna and Reyna responds to him, "How are you?" in line 2. Brian responds to Reyna then introduces himself. As soon as he introduces himself, Reyna introduces herself by saying "Hi, Brian. I am Reyna," in line 4, overlapping with the following, "Nice to meet you," by Brian. Each of their turns of greeting and introducing themselves were offered turn by turn, with no pause or hesitation. Both willingly and skillfully welcome each other.

In lines 5-6, Brian offers her to take a seat and Reyna thanks him. Both now are sitting at the desk. Brian initiates small chit-chat for breaking the ice in line 7, Reyna responds quickly. Brian marks receipt, "Good, good" in line 9. After greeting and small chitchatting, Reyna is mentioning the paper first with giggling in lines 10-11, which shows that she will now begin talking about the paper for a mock tutorial. Brian responds quickly with agreement in lines 12-13 and 15. Reyna shows the immediate agreement to Brian as well in line 14. By agreeing with each other, both move toward talking about the paper (lines 10-15) and now are ready. In line 16, Brian asks the question of *why you are here* to Reyna, "So(.) what do

you have here?" This is the routine, opening question that the tutor asks the tutee, *why you are here*, which is asking about how the tutee wants to be helped during the tutorial. This is an important question, which sets up what to work with for the work of the tutorial. The response that the tutee provides for this question, which is critical to establish the agenda for the following course of action for the tutorial, reveals the tutee's knowledge and experience of the work of the writing center.

Reyna, to this question of asking *why you are here*, now begins formulating her why I'm here in lines 17-18 and 20-22. Based on the piece of prepared writing (presumably for the tutee's paper) earlier they received, Reyna first introduces her assignment in lines 17-18, specifically the topic of her paper, "how Beowulf is supposed to be the model of a traditional folk hero". The tutor nods for receipt (line 19). Reyna then explains the genre of the paper, "analysis paper" in line 20, and explains what she is supposed to write for the paper in lines 21-22. Reyna provides the basic overview about the paper she brought. She shows that she has a clear understanding about the assignment ("analysis paper"), knows what has been written so far (the topic and the content), and what to do further to complete this assignment (take various portions of the poem to support her claim). By doing so, she clearly shows her expertise of what is expected for a tutee for the work of the writing tutorial.

Since this is a mock tutorial, the assignment is not real, and she does not have her own paper or an argument. Reyna quickly improvises what she will need to do for the assignment. However, her improvised introduction about her assignment is clear and specific in her understanding of what to do about the topic and the form of writing. What Reyna displays here in this excerpt is that she has a clear understanding about her assignment and what she needs to do for the assignment. In this way, Reyna, the experienced tutor plays a role of an ideal tutee who knows what to do for the work of the tutorial. She is leading the direction of the work of the tutorial now.

### **Showing What We Do: Getting to Work of the Tutorial**

Once the tutor and the tutee introduce the assignment and set up the agenda for the work of the tutorial, they begin working on the paper. Either the tutor reads the paper quickly in silence, or one of them reads the paper aloud line by line. Either way, both the tutor and the tutee read the paper and begin identifying the problems to work with for the work of the tutorial. Ideally, the tutee is expected to find a problem to work with; however, if the tutee does not show the initiation, the tutor takes the role to find a problem to work with for the tutorial.

### ***Sequences from the Main Work With a Troubled Tutee***

This is a sequence from the main work of the mock tutorial demonstrated as one with a troubled tutee. The two experienced



tutors, Selma and Helen, who were introduced earlier in the opening sequence with a troubled tutee, played here the roles of a tutor and a troubled tutee, respectively. This is a sequence from the following part of the same mock tutorial of Excerpt 1. The tutor, Selma, reads the paper distributed, which was prepared for the mock tutorial and identifies the problems to work with for the tutorial. Helen who plays the role of a troubled tutee does not show any meaningful engagement in the work of problem-solving.

**Excerpt 3.**

85 ((T and C read the paper distributed for the mock tutorial))

86 ► T: Um(.) I have some questions about(.) some of your decisions (2.) (h)(h)

87 ► Um(.2) particularly about (.) word choice?

88 ► Do you think (.) kind of as we read as we re- as we read it out loud

89 ► Did anything(.2) kind of jump out to you?

90 C: ((avoiding eye contact with the tutor)) Well, I did=say

91 \*(that it was black and white like twice)\*

92 T: =Yea, yea I think that's good

93 ► There are just a couple of things that seemed a little bit redundant(.)

94 U:m and yea I think right in here

95 I think we talk about it being (.) the black and white photo (.)

96 ► And I think that it happens again(.)There's another part down here(.2)

97 ► Um:: that that seemed like a little bit redundant to me as well(.) here

98 ► =\*And I can't actually find it\*

99 ▶ So (.) um(.) and I think that's something you want to think about

100 ▶ just a few parts where you may be repetitive or-

101 ▶ C: =Okay you can write that down if you want to

102 ((chewing gum and stroking her hair))

103 T: =U::m I feel- I don't know(.) ((Some of the audience laughing))

104 you can- you can take some notes (.) or (.)

105 if you think you'd remember it (.) I think that works out too (.)

106 so= whatever you wanna do?

107 C: Well(.) I'll start writing ((Audience laughing))

108 T: =Okay

After reading the paragraph from the paper distributed, the tutor, Selma points out some of the tutee's decisions about word choice and she asks what the tutee thinks (lines 86-89). The tutor points out a problem to work with for the tutorial and invites the tutee to engage to the work of problem solving. Helen, playing as a troubled tutee, avoids eye contact with the tutor who tries to invite the tutee to engage the work for the tutorial. She answers in line 91, "black and white," which was the repeated phrase in the paper. Helen here seems to provide the right answer to what Selma pointed out. Her answer in line 91 was soft and quick, which was difficult to hear for the audience. As an experienced tutor herself as well, Helen seems to be engaged automatically by providing the answer to Selma without thinking much of improvising the

troubled behavior for this moment. So, she answered quickly in a low soft tone, which is to show her intentional insincerity and careless attitude to the work of the tutorial.

The tutor, Selma agrees with Helen with a compliment (line 92) and continues to identify more of the problems that show redundancy in lines 92-98. Selma looks for another example for redundancy that she believes there was (lines 93-97), but fails to find the example, as she states quickly in a low soft tone that she can't find it (line 98). So instead of finding more problems for the work, Selma invites Helen to find a problem she thinks to work with, maybe about repetition or something else (lines 99-100). Helen sees what Selma is doing to invite her to engage to the work, so she takes the turn by latch without pause. Along with distracting behaviors like chewing gum and stroking her hair, Helen brings up another problematic issue that the troubled tutee shows during tutorial by saying, "You can write that down if you want (line 101)." What Helen said here is another version of saying, *You do the work for my paper (I won't do it!)*, which is a request of cheating that is against the center's policy. All in the audience – new and old tutors – are watching this demonstration silently.

Selma, who is playing the tutor, takes her turn quickly in line 103, but her response was delayed with hesitation, "U::m", moderate rejecting, "I feel- I don't know(.)" in line 103. Some in the audience are laughing at this moment. They all understand this

awkward moment for the request made by the troubled tutee as unacceptable; but, as tutors who want to help the tutee genuinely, they feel uncomfortable to reject directly to the tutee's request, despite the fact that this is an unacceptable request. Instead of a direct rejection, Selma makes the suggestions that either the tutee can take notes, or she can remember it instead of taking notes in lines 104-105. With the suggestion, the tutor tosses the work for the paper back to Helen in line 106. Selma, the tutor gives her opinion about the work of the tutorial as a suggestion. She never gives away directly what to do to the tutee. All of her opinions about the paper were given as a suggestive form with the following question to make sure of the tutee's idea about her suggestion. This is how the tutor invites the tutee to be engaged in the work in each and every turn for the tutee to do the work of the tutorial. In line 107, Helen, the troubled tutee, finally agrees to write it down. All in the audience are laughing at this moment, which shows that they are happy now as the problem was solved – inviting the troubled tutee to be engaged in the work of writing – at least with this issue. Selma marks receipt immediately by latch with agreement in line 108.

This is a mock tutorial that was improvised instantly during the tutor training orientation with papers distributed just right before this mock tutorial. Selma and Helen demonstrated one of the problematic situations that the tutor can encounter during the tutorial, which is, *You (the tutor) do the work and I (the tutee) will wait*

*for you to work on my paper.* This is one of the routine problems that the tutor encounters in the everyday tutoring experience, particularly with the first-time visiting tutees (J. Kim, 2018a, 2018b). The philosophy of the writing center is student-centered, non-directive, process-oriented instruction. What the tutor does is to assist the tutee's work of writing, not to do the tutee's work. However, many times, this fundamental instructive approach is mistaken by the tutee, especially the first-time tutees or L2<sup>1</sup> tutees who never experienced the writing center previously. The other issues that Helen demonstrated are closely tied to the misperception that some of the troubled tutees bring to the writing center, which is avoiding eye contact, not concentrating on the work of the tutorial, and being distracted by chewing gum and stroking their hair, being distracted by the cell phone, etc. All of these issues demonstrated by Helen and Selma represent the challenges that the tutors may encounter in their tutoring with the unprepared tutees who have lack of understanding of the work of the writing center (J. Kim, 2014).

### ***Sequences from the Main Work with an Ideal Tutee***

The next excerpt is a sequence from the main work of the mock tutorial demonstrated as one with an ideal tutee. This sequence is from the following part of the same tutorial that was introduced in

---

<sup>1</sup> L2: second or foreign language, L1: first or native language

Excerpt 2. Brian, playing a tutor in this excerpt asks what problem the tutee wants to work with for the work of the tutorial. Reyna, who plays an ideal tutee, identifies the problem to work with for the tutorial and provides how to solve the problem.

#### Excerpt 4.

70 T: Well I mean: outside of this

71 C: =Okay

72 ► T: Is there a specific point (.) u::h specific theme that you're

73 ► trying to get across to your readers?= Uh::

74 C: Well I guess according: to the prompt

75 I will probably need to talk about epic hero or

76 T: =Okay ((T takes a note what C says))

77 C: What an epic hero(.2) is

78 T: =Okay ((T takes a note what C says))

79 ► And in your opinion (.) what is an epic hero?

80 C: U::h u:m (3.9) I guess =I probably should go

81 and take a look at my notes(.) because how I feel about

82 what an epic hero is may or may not necessarily

83 be what my teacher's=expecting?

84 T: Hm: hm: Yes= but I think what your teacher is asking

85 C: =Hm hm

86 T: is you know (.2) sort of you know(.2) hm- she is here

87 specifically asking for your ideas //about this

88 C: //Yeah

89 ► T: So I mean so (.) what (.) are your idea about a:

90 C: Well (.7) No I- (1.5) to support my ideas- my ideas

91 about him being (.8) how he fits the model of epic hero

92 T: Hm

93 ► C: So I guess I probably need to define traditional epic hero  
first

94 T: (.8) True

95 C: At least according to probably find out so

96 ► So=I need to go back to my notes

97 T: =Yes

98 C: =Um (3.0) ((C, taking a note on the paper)) to redefine (.5) this

99 T: hm hm

100 ► C:: And then I guess(.) something about my ideas about Beowulf

Brian, the tutor, asks the tutee if there is any specific theme that the tutee wants to talk about in the paper (lines 72-73). The tutor is trying to find out what to focus on, which problems or concerns that they can discuss for the work of the tutorial. Instead of him, identifying the problem or direction for this work of the tutorial, the tutor invites the tutee to talk about it.

Reyna, the tutee, now begins improvising what to answer about the paper for this mock tutorial. She begins talking about the prompt of the article, which is about the “epic hero” she received for this tutorial (lines 74-75, 77). The tutor, Brian responds immediately by latch and takes notes of what she says in lines 76 and 78. Then, Brian asks Reyna a more specific question, “in your opinion, what is an epic hero?” (line 79). Brian, the tutor makes his question more about what the tutee thinks about an “epic hero” in order to bring out more of the tutee’s personal thought about the topic so that the tutee can engage more to the work of her writing. Tutee’s answer to the tutor’s question becomes the resource for the

actual writing after the tutorial.

Reyna, in line 80, takes a 3.9-second pause then answers that she will need to look at her notes to find out if her thought about epic hero is what the teacher expects from this paper. As this is a mock tutorial, the piece of writing they read was not written by Reyna and she obviously does not have her notes for this writing prompt for this class, either. Everything Reyna and Brian say is improvised instantly with the piece of writing as a tutor and a tutee for this mock tutorial. What Reyna mentions here to the tutor's question is "her notes" and her "teacher's expectation" she needs to make sure first, which is always used for guidance for any writing assignment when the tutor gives advice to the tutees. They need a good understanding of what the teacher expects from the assignment and what they learned in class based on their notes. This is what Reyna highlights by mentioning the two issues.

Brian, the tutor, for a response reminds Reyna of what the teacher expects in this assignment and makes sure that the teacher is specifically asking for the student's ideas about an "epic hero" (in lines 84, 86). He re-casts his previous question (line 79), "what(.) are your idea about a: [epic hero]" one more time (line 89). Reyna marks receipt immediately in line 85 to Brian, mentioning what the teacher is asking. Just right after he mentions "specifically asking for your ideas" (line 87), Reyna overlaps him with "Yeah" for agreement (line 88). She also sees at what Brian points. Reyna now plans out



her thoughts about this assignment; in order to support her ideas about the topic (lines 90-91), she needs to “define traditional epic hero first (line 93)”; to do so, she needs to go back to her notes (lines 95-96). Then, she takes 3 seconds here to think about and take notes for herself as well; in order to redefine it, she will need to have some of her own thoughts about Beowulf (lines 98, 100). The tutor, Brian, marks receipt in lines 92, 94, 97, and 99.

What Reyna mocks here as an ideal tutee is showing her understanding about what to do for this assignment. Checking notes and finding out what the teacher expects in this assignment is the first task for the tutee to do to work for their assignment. So, she shows her understanding about what should be done first. The problem they are working with in this excerpt is what the main theme (topic) of her assignment is and what to provide to support the main theme. To the tutor’s question of asking if Reyna has a “specific point or theme” for this assignment (lines 72-73), Reyna, with no hesitation, goes ahead saying her theme and what to do for it, which is taking her notes and teacher’s expectation for this assignment. To another question from the tutor asking her own idea about the topic, she quickly plans what she needs to do step by step by improvising as an experienced tutor who tutored this kind of writing assignment so many times. What she reveals here as an ideal tutee is that the tutee herself has a clear understanding of this assignment and has a plan of what to discuss for her writing step by

step in detail, which reveals that she has full authorship for her own writing. To the inviting questions about the topic and her ideas about it that Brian asked, the tutee, Reyna, provided the complete plan of what to do for this assignment, step by step, as an independent writer. What Reyna mocks here is how an ideal tutee who is prepared for the work of the writing tutorial behaves. What the tutee and the tutor discuss during the tutorial will be the resource for the tutee's actual work of writing for the assignment after the tutorial.

As shown, the ways that the troubled tutee and the ideal tutee worked with the tutors during the mock tutorials are completely different. The ideal tutee knows clearly what to do for the work of the tutorial and how to work with the tutor to be helped. The agenda for the tutorial – curriculum for the tutorial – is introduced, defined, and explained by the tutee and the specific work to do for the tutorial is also settled, not by the tutor, but by the tutee. The tutee initiated the first turn for pointing out the problems for the work of the tutorial and provided the effort to solve the problems in the second turn. The ideal tutee did all the work independently and engaged the work of problem solving with the tutor. However, the troubled tutee rendered both the work of the problem pointing and the problem solving for the work of tutorial to the tutor. The troubled tutee was waiting for the tutor to find a problem (first turn) and solve the problem (second turn). The tutee did not show

any engagement to the work of the tutorial. During the mock tutorials in the tutor training orientation, the experienced tutors demonstrated the differences between those tutees and showed how to work with them in their everyday work of tutorials in the writing center.

### **Findings**

During the mock tutorials in the tutor orientation, the tutors presented the two contrasting cases: a collaboratively interactive case with a well-prepared tutee and a least interactive case with a troubled tutee. The well-prepared tutee was showing the tutee's expertise and ownership as an independent writer who actively initiated the work to solve the problems she brought with her paper. The troubled tutee was showing the least engagement in the work of problem solving and not initiating any work or providing any responses to the tutor's initiative questions. The differences between the ideal and the troubled tutees were contrasted in both of their work of the opening sequences and the sequences from the major work of the tutorials in their talk-in-interactions during the mock tutorials.

### **When It Works**

As introduced in the mock tutorial with the ideal tutee, in order for a successful collaborative instruction, a tutee's engagement should always precede the tutor's suggestion for the problem. This means, instructing the students to be able to perform the expected

role as a tutee is the first task to accomplish for collaborative work for the tutorial (J. Kim, 2018b, 2018c). Instructing the tutees what is expected for them to do for the writing tutorial, i.e., what is the goal they share to pursue in the tutorial and what are their roles for the tutorial, is the preliminary condition for the successful collaborative work for the tutorial (Harris, 1986, 1992; Henning, 2001; J. Kim, 2018b; Lunsford, 1991; Porter, 1991).

Once the tutee is engaged in the work of the tutorial to solve the problems identified, the tutor offers suggestions for correction and explanations about the problems. The instruction begins from that moment. If the tutee agrees with the tutor's suggestions for correction or revision, the problem is solved. The sequence for the problem is complete. They can move on to the next problem to work. But if the tutee doesn't agree with the tutor's suggestions, then they go back to the turn for problem pointing in the first turn. The tutee (if not, the tutor) can revise the question and reformulate the problem. The sequence to solve the problem recurs (Figure 1).

**Figure 1.***The Recurring Sequence of the Organization of the Talk in Tutorial*

<b>Turn</b>	<b>Tutor/Tutee</b>	<b>Description</b>
1st	Ideally, Tutee	problem-pointing
2nd	Ideally, Tutee	problem-solving
3rd	Tutor	explanation and/or suggestions for the problem <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instruction begins</li> </ul>
4th	Tutee	agreeing to the tutor's suggestions (problem-solved) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sequence of the problem initiated in the 1<sup>st</sup> turn is complete.</li> </ul>
<b>However, if the tutee does NOT agree to the tutor's suggestions:</b>		
1st	Ideally, Tutee	going back to the original problem <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sequence of the problem initiated in the 1<sup>st</sup> turn earlier hasn't been completed. So it is continued in the embedded sequence for the original problem.</li> </ul>

However, if the tutee does not engage in the work of the tutorial anywhere either in problem pointing or problem solving as in the mock tutorial with the troubled tutee, the work for the problem pointing and the problem solving becomes solely a work for the tutor, which means, all the turns for the work of the tutorial fall on the tutor and this situation puts the tutor in the place of doing all the work for the tutorial by themselves (J. Kim, 2018c). This is when and where the tension and conflict begin between the tutor and the tutee during the tutorial.

One of the frustrating moments that the tutor, Sydney (graduate student, 3 years of tutoring experience) expressed during interview was about the tutees who come to the writing center seemingly with no motivation or interest of how to develop ideas for the paper:

This client, I just have never met any client who doesn't have any drive at all. She was applying for some type of program...well, she was like 'I came here on scholarship.' 'Okay, would you like to share any of your stories or experiences you accomplished (...)?' All her answers were just simple no (...) It was so difficult because she came back every week with an excuse. She never did anything.

(Sydney, graduate student, 3 years of tutoring experience)

Particularly, those who come to the center just to fix the errors at the last minute before submitting the paper are those who make the tutor frustrated the most. Another tutor, Nora (graduate student, 2 years of tutoring experience) said:

One of the most difficult things is when someone comes in and shoves the paper in my face, and says 'here, proofread this,' um, and so I have to tie them in, you know, what we do and what we don't, um...and sometimes the sessions that we have when I have to make that known are difficult sessions because the client has a certain expectation whereas the tutor is bound by certain policies. (Nora, graduate student, 2 years of tutoring experience)

When the tutee comes with no drive and tries not to work for anything but just expects the tutor to fix the paper, the tutor has the burden to do all the work of the tutorial in order to move on.

### **When It Fails**

As shown in the mock tutorial with the troubled tutee, when all the negotiation for collaborative work collapses and all the effort for engagement fails, what can they do to continue the work of the tutorial? Two options are available: Stay with the non-directive approach and do not provide what the tutee wants for free such as proofreading, or just provide what the tutee wants at any cost. Although staying with the non-directive approach sounds desirable, it is not always plausible because in order to make the tutorial work, the tutee's engagement is required regardless. Without the tutee's engagement, i.e., without the tutee's initiative for inquiry or response for the collaborative next move, the tutor's instruction for the work of writing cannot be started or continued. The tutors shared thoughts about the difficult tutees who are not willing to engage to the work of the tutorial and how to deal with them for the work of the tutorial:

(...) most frustrating is, like this dependency upon the tutors where clients expect more than the center is supposed to be giving (...) sometimes that causes them to manipulate the system and, um, you know, that's really aggravating. (Ava, graduate student, 2 years of tutoring experience)

What Ava (graduate student, 2 years of tutoring experience) expressed here is just how the troubled tutee behaved in the mock tutorial. Instead of engaging to the work of the tutorial, Helen (the troubled tutee's role) had Selma (the tutor's role) do all the work for her paper. Cynthia (graduate student, 2 years of tutoring experience) during the interview shared her thoughts and how she works with them:

If it is a first or second time visitor, I don't give them what they want. I want them to think about all the issues and patterns of their writing in their organization of the paper. But if they have been working several times back and forth and visiting the center with the same paper, I do check their grammar as a reward. But for the visitor who comes at the last moment before the due date, I don't give them what they want (...) I wanna say to them in this way. They can't get what they want unless they follow my rules [policy of the writing center]. If they want to get what they want, they have to play by my rules. (Cynthia, graduate student, 3 years of tutoring experience)

As Ava and Cynthia stated, in order for the tutor to be able to help with what the tutee needs for their writings, the tutee needs to work with the tutor to solve the problems for the work of writing. The tutee's initiative for engagement for the work of problem solving is inevitable.



Hence, when the negotiation for collaborative work fails and the tutee doesn't engage to the work of the tutorial, the burden to work in the tutorial falls on the tutor. If the tutor leads the work of the tutorial by giving what the tutee wants, *proofreading*, in this case, it becomes a tutor-centered, directive instruction that violates the center's pedagogical philosophy, rather than a student-centered, non-directive instruction (, which happens quite often during the actual tutorials in the writing center). Unless the tutee does his/her own job as an initiator to solve their own problems, what the tutor can help for the problems of their writings is minimal. This is the why and how the tutor sometimes falls into the proofreading trap (Cogie, et al. 1998; Mozafari, 2015; Myers, 2003; Young, 1998) and gives what the tutee wants against their volitions – cleaning the mechanical errors from the paper without any of the tutee's engagement to the work of the tutorial. The tutor follows the tutee's request for proofreading without any alternative options that may prevent them from leaving with disappointment and sometimes even resentment. This is the dilemma that the tutors encounter in the work with first-time visiting tutees who do not have an understanding of the writing center's policy and the pedagogical philosophy.

### **Discussion and Conclusion**

What the tutors demonstrated during the mock tutorials, particularly how the ideal tutee works with the tutor, is very similar

with what Brook (1991) claimed in his article, “Minimalist Tutoring,” which is about making the student do all the work. The troubled tutee did not show any interest in doing the work of her writing; instead, she was making the tutor do all the work for her writing and just waited for it to be done. In contrast, the ideal tutee did most of the work for her writing during the mock tutorial. The ideal tutee identified the problem and suggested how to solve the problem in terms of what she needs to do to revise her own writing. The contrast between the troubled and the ideal tutee of the mock tutorials is incompatible; however, what they demonstrated reveals the core of the writing center’s student-centered pedagogy, which is epitomized by North (1984)’s famous quote, “writing center is to produce better writers, not better writing” (p.438).

Writing tutorials have no established curriculum until the tutee introduces their work and expresses the concerns about their writings. Thus, the tutor has no way to know what to work with until the tutee comes and asks for specific help for their writings. Once the tutee introduces how they want to be helped, the curriculum of what to do for the work of tutorial becomes clear. Therefore the negotiation for setting the agenda in the beginning of the writing tutorial is significant for the work of writing. (Harris, 1986; J. Kim, 2018b; Newkirk, 1989; Mackiewicz & Thompson, 2015). If the request for help for the tutorial agrees with the center’s policy, they can get to the work for the tutorial. Ideally, in this respect, the

tutee must bring their concerns about writing to work with and share their thoughts about how to solve the problems for their writings. Then the tutor can provide feedback or suggestions to help them to solve their concerns for their writings. However, oftentimes, many of the first-time visiting tutees are not prepared to work with the tutor as they are expected for the collaborative work of the tutorial. Except for those experienced tutees, returning tutees in many cases, the tutor has to instruct the tutee what can be accepted for the work of tutorial and how they are expected to work with the tutor beforehand in order to get to work with their writings during tutorials (J. Kim, 2018b).

In this respect, mock tutorials in the tutor-training orientation function as a good resource for instruction for both the new and the old hand tutors (Archer, 1996; Griggs, 2012; Hall, 2017; Kohn, 2014; Komara, 2006). Archer (1996) and Komara (2006) suggested that the mock tutorial is beneficial for training, assessing, and evaluating the tutors by demonstrating the tutorial practice and discussing the issues they observed in a way that is less invasive than direct observation. Komara (2006) described the detailed guidelines of how to use mock tutorials for training tutors. Griggs (2012) and Kohn (2014) also introduced the mock tutorials for tutor-training program, not performed by the tutors themselves, but by the director of the writing center with their own writings as a client (Griggs, 2012). Kohn (2014) suggested staffing the local science

faculty for training tutors in science writing through genre-based WAC (Writing Across the Curriculum)-WID (Writing In the Disciplines) research. Based on the benefits of mock tutorials and participant observations from the studies, Hall (2017) created the video case discussion assignment for the tutors to video their own consultations, select the segments to discuss together in groups, and present them in seminar for tutor education.

By showing what we do through the mock tutorial, it serves as a pre-service, tutor-training instruction for the new tutors and at the same time for the old hand tutors, it functions as an in-service training. Through this tutor-training orientation with mock tutorials, the writing center instructs themselves and others who we are and what we do as a tutor in the writing center. By sharing their thoughts and ideas about how to instruct writing and demonstrating what they do during tutorial, the tutors learn to become a member of the writing center community and develop the collective identity as a tutor who shares the institutional history of the writing center. This is the instructional site of their academic socialization as a tutor in the contemporary writing center.

## References

- Archer, M.M. (1996). Assessing Tutorials from the inside: Interactive Exams. *Writing Lab Newsletter*, 21 (2), 4-7.
- Babcock, R.D. & Thonus, T. (2018). *Researching the writing center: Towards an evidence-based practice* (revised edition). Peter Lang.
- Bishop, W. (1999). *Ethnographic writing research: Writing it up, writing it down, and reading it*. Boynton/Cook.
- Brooks, J. (1991). Minimalist Tutoring: Making the Student Do All the Work. *Writing Lab Newsletter*, 15(6), 1-4.
- Brown, A. L. & Palinscar, A. S. (1987). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension strategies: A natural history of one program for enhancing learning. In J. D. Day & J. G. Borkowski (Eds.), *Intelligence and exceptionally: New directions for theory, assessment, and instructional practices*, 81-132.
- Brown, J. S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher*, 18(1), 32-42.
- Chin, P., Bell, K. S., Munby, H., & Hutchinson, N. L. (2004). Epistemological appropriation of one high school student's learning in cooperative education. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41, 401-417.
- Cogi, J., Strain, K., & Lorinskas, S. (1999). Avoiding the proofreading trap: The value of the error correction process. *Writing Center Journal*, 19 (2), 6-32.
- Cook-Gumperz (1986). *The social construction of literacy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J.P. & Borg, W.R. (2003). *Educational research: An introduction* (7th edition). Allyn and Bacon.
- Gallimore, R., & Tharp, R. (1990). Teaching mind in society: Teaching, schooling, and literate discourse. In L. C. Moll (Ed.), *Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology* (pp. 175-205). Cambridge University Press.
- Graham, P. (1980). Whither the equality of educational opportunity? *Daedalus*.109 (3), 115-32.
- Griggs, C. (2012). Director as Client: Participatory Observations in the writing center. *Writing Lab Newsletter*, 36 (9-10), 6-10.
- Hacker, D. J. & Graesser, A.C. (2010). The role of dialogue in reciprocal teaching and naturalistic tutoring. In Horowitz, R. (Ed.) *Talking texts: How speech and writing interact in school learning* (pp.253-270), Routledge.
- Hall, R. M. (2017). *Around the texts of writing center work, An inquiry-based approach to tutor education*. Utah State University Press.

- Harris, M. (1986). *Teaching One-To-One: The writing conference*. NCTE.
- Harris, M. (1992). Collaboration is not collaboration is not collaboration: writing center tutorials vs. peer-response groups. *College Composition and Communication*, 43(3), 369-383.
- Henning, T. (2001, March). Theoretical models of tutor talk: How practical are they? Paper Presented at CCCC, Denver, CO. (ERIC Document Service No. ED 451 569).  
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED451569>
- Hutchby, I. & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation Analysis*. Polity Press.
- Kim, J. (2014). *Better writers or better writing? A qualitative study of second language writers' experiences in a university writing center* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. The Ohio State University. [http://rave.ohiolink.edu/etdc/view?acc\\_num=osu1398789858](http://rave.ohiolink.edu/etdc/view?acc_num=osu1398789858)
- Kim, J. (2018a). Same bed, different dreams: The mismatched expectations about proofreading in the writing center. *International Research Studies in Language Learning*, 7(4), 89-103.  
<https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrsl.2018.3004>
- Kim, J. (2018b). Could you check my grammar? The forbidden request in the university writing center. *International Research Studies in Language Learning*, 7(4), 21-37.  
<https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrsl.2017.2000>
- Kim, J. (2018c). Revising orally: The transformative process from text to talk in the writing tutorial. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 8(2), 109-122.  
<http://www.jltl.com.tr/index.php/jltl/article/view/69>
- Kim, J. (2022). Learning or cheating? Proofreading for the work of writing instruction during tutorials. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 12(2), 138-155.  
<https://www.jltl.com.tr/index.php/jltl/article/view/410/182>
- Kim, Y. (2000). *Frame analysis of NS-NS and NS-NNS discourse in university writing center tutorials: volubility and questions*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Oklahoma State University.
- Kohn, L.L. (2014). Can they tutor science? Using faculty input, genre, and WAC-WID to introduce tutors to scientific realities, *Composition Forum*, 29, Spring.  
<http://www.addthis.com/bookmark.php?v=250&username=compforum>
- Komara, K. (2006). Mock tutorials: a dramatic method for training tutors. *The Free Library*, 01, May. [https://www.thefreelibrary.com/Mock tutorials: a dramatic method for training tutors- a0198354617](https://www.thefreelibrary.com/Mock+tutorials:+a+dramatic+method+for+training+tutors-+a0198354617)
- Lunsford, A. (1991). Collaboration, control, and the idea of a writing center. *Writing Center Journal*, 12 (1), 3-10.
- Mackiewicz, J. & Thompson, I. (2014). Instruction, Cognitive Scaffolding, and Motivational Scaffolding in Writing Center Tutoring. *Composition Studies*, 42 (1). 54-78.
- Mackiewicz, J. & Thompson, I. K. (2015). *Talk about writing The tutoring strategies of experienced writing center tutors*. Routledge.

- Maynard, D.W. (2003). *Bad News, Good News: Conversational order in everyday talk and clinical settings*. University of Chicago Press.
- Mozafari, C. (2015). Creating third space: ESL tutoring as cultural mediation. *Young Scholars in Writing*, 6, 47-59.
- Murphy, C. and Sherwood, S. (1995). *The St. Martin's sourcebook for writing tutors*. St.Martin's Press.
- Myers, S.A. (2003). Reassessing the "Proofreading Trap": ESL tutoring and writing instruction. In Murphy, C. & Sherwood, S. (Eds.) *The St. Martin's Sourcebook for writing tutors* (4<sup>th</sup> edition) (pp.284-302). Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Newkirk, T. (1989). The first five minutes: setting the agenda in a writing conference. In Anson, C. (Ed.) *Writing and Response: Theory, practice, and research* (pp.317-331). NCTE.
- North, S. (1984). The idea of a writing center. *College English*, 46 (5). 433-446.
- Polman, J. L. & Pea, R.D. (2010). Transformative communication in project science learning discourse. In Horowitz, R. (Ed.) *Talking Texts: How speech and writing interact in school learning* (pp. 297-316). Routledge.
- Pomerantz, A.(2005). Using participants' video stimulated comments to complement analyses of interactional practices. In Molder, H and Potter, J. (eds), *Conversation and Cognition*. Cambridge University Press, 93-113.
- Porter, F. L. (1991). An examination of consultant-student discourse in a writing center conference. PENN Working Papers, 7(2), 93-108. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No.ED 341250).
- Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context*. Oxford University Press..
- Rubin, D. & Kantor, K. (1984). Talking and writing: Building communicative competence. In C. Thaiss & C. Suhor (Eds.), *Speaking and Writing, K-12* (pp. 29-73). NCTE.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696-735.
- Spradley, J.P. (1980). *Participant Observation*. Holt. Rinehart& Winston.
- Stake, R.E. (1995). *The Art of Case Study Research*.Sage.
- Thonus, T. (1998). *What makes a writing tutorial successful: An analysis of linguistic variables and social context*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Indiana University.
- Thonus, T. (2002). Tutor and student assessments of academic writing tutorials: What is "Success"? *Assessing Writing*, 8, 110-134.
- Thonus, T. (2020). Discourse Analysis, Critical Discourse Analysis, and Conversation Analysis. In J. Mackiewicz & R.D. Babcock (Eds.), *Theories and methods of writing center studies, A practical guide* (pp.173-185). Routledge.

- Thompson, I. (2009). Scaffolding in the Writing Center: A Microanalysis of an Experienced Tutor's Verbal and Nonverbal Tutoring Strategies." *Written Communication*, 26 (4), 417- 453.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and Language*. MIT Press.
- Waring, H.Z., Creider, S.Tarpey, T., and Black, R. (2012). A search for specificity in understanding CA and context. *Discourse Studies*, 14 (4), 477-492.
- Weissberg, R. (2008). Critiquing the Vygotskian approach to L2 Literacy. In Belcher, D. & Hirvela, A. (Eds), *The Oral-Literate connection* (pp. 26-45). The University of Michigan Press.
- Whitted, D. (1966). A Tutorial program for remedial studies. *College Composition and Communication*, 18, 40-43.
- Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring problem-solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17, 89-100.
- Wood, D., & Middleton, D. (1975). A study of assisted problem-solving. *British Journal of Psychology*, 66, 181-191.
- Wood, D., & Wood, H. (1996). Vygotsky, tutoring and learning. *Oxford Review of Education*, 22, 5-17.
- Young, B.R. (2005). Can you proofread this? In Raforth, B. (Ed.) *A tutor's guide, helping writers one to one* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition) (pp. 140-158). Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc.



## Appendix A Transcript Notations

- (.) micro pause
- (2.0) Timed silence within or between adjacent utterances
- // Notes the point at which one speaker overlaps another.
- = Notes the ending of one utterance and the beginning of a next without gap or overlap.
- \_ Underlining indicates stress
- (.h) Indicates an in-breath
- (h) Indicates out breath
- Hyphens indicate a word cut off in its production
- \* \* Notes soft speaking
- : A colon indicates a sound stretch on a word or word portion
- ( ) Empty indicates an unheard utterance
- (( )) Double parentheses contain descriptions of the scene
- [ Left bracket indicates a simultaneous start by two speakers
- ] Right bracket indicates two utterances ending simultaneously

## Appendix B Questions for the Tutors During Interview

- Q. What do you think of your work as a tutor?<sup>[L1]</sup><sub>[SEP]</sub>
- Q. What is most difficult in doing the tutorials?
- Q. When do you feel most fruitful as a tutor?
- Q. How do you prioritize the problems to work on with the L2 tutees?
- Q. How do you explain to the tutee who doesn't understand the "No proofread policy"?