Theses and Dissertations (All)

12-2017

Multilingual Institutional Discourses of Negotiation and Intertextuality in Writing Center Interactions in Macao

Alice S. Lee

Follow this and additional works at: https://knowledge.library.iup.edu/etd

Part of the First and Second Language Acquisition Commons

MULTILINGUAL INSTITUTIONAL DISCOURSES OF NEGOTIATION AND

INTERTEXTUALITY IN WRITING CENTER INTERACTIONS IN MACAO

A Dissertation

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies and Research

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Alice Shu-Ju Lee

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

December 2017

ii

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
School of Graduate Studies and Research
Department of English

We hereby approve the dissertation of

Alice Shu-Ju Lee

Candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

_____   _____
                                    Sharon K. Deckert, Ph.D.
                                    Professor of English, Advisor

_____   _____
                                    Gloria Park, Ph.D.
                                    Professor of English

_____   _____
                                    Ben Rafoth, Ed.D.
                                    Distinguished University Professor

ACCEPTED

_____   _____
Randy L. Martin, Ph.D.
Dean
School of Graduate Studies and Research

Title: Multilingual Institutional Discourses of Negotiation and Intertextuality in Writing Center Interactions in Macao

Author: Alice Shu-Ju Lee

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Sharon K. Deckert

Dissertation Committee Members: Dr. Gloria Park
                                                              Dr. Ben Rafoth

This dissertation explores the identity enactments (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005) of 14 multilingual university writing center tutors and multilingual student writers who use English and Putonghua to negotiate their interactions. The study is situated within sociocultural theory (Vygotsky, 1978) and uses ethnographic methods such as observation, interviews, and conversation analysis to more fully describe the participants' writing center tutorial interactions. The research site is in Macao, a Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China. Macao's postcolonial past and neocolonial present help shape the discourses that are present at the research site.

The study adds to the growing body of descriptive knowledge on how identity and interaction influence multilingual language users in various contexts using an identity approach (Norton & McKinney, 2011). A total of eight writing center tutorial sessions were recorded and analyzed, followed by 16 playback interviews with individual participants. Results illustrate how the participants' social worlds and other macro contexts impact the micro context of a writing center tutorial session. Results also showcase the participants' full range of negotiation strategies as they engage with each other in goal-oriented institutional talk (Heritage & Clayman, 2010). Through the tutorial sessions and playback interviews, the study documents the complex nature of intertextuality (Bakhtin, 1981). Lastly, results demonstrate the range of tutorial strategies used to meet the needs of the multilingual student writers who had varying levels of English language

proficiency. The analysis conducted in this study sheds more light on how identities emerge through interaction and how interlocutors position themselves and each other through discourse. Suggestions for how this descriptive knowledge can be applied practically in multilingual writing centers, in multilingual language learning classrooms, and in composition classrooms are offered.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Words matter, and this dissertation chronicles how much words matter in relation to multilingual writers and users of English. Adopting a social constructivist theoretical paradigm and drawing on the works of Vygotsky (1978), Kuhn (1996), and Butler (1990), this study details how words matter to six multilingual writing center tutors and eight multilingual student writers as they express their various identity enactments through their idea negotiations in writing center tutorial sessions at the University of Macau. Using an identity approach (Norton & McKinney, 2011) along with a sociocultural linguistic framework (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005), the study describes the distinct macro contextual influences (political, social, economic, historical) that impact the tutorial interactions at the micro level. Qualitative research techniques such as observations, interviews, and conversation analysis are utilized to describe and analyze the complex face-to-face interactions between the participants as they discuss written work brought into the writing center. This dissertation contributes to the growing body of contextualized knowledge focusing on how second language users interact with each other when discussing their ideas about writing and has applications to the multilingual language learning classroom, writing center practice, and composition classroom.

As a subject of investigation, the concept of identity—originally framed as static and stable social categories such as class, gender, and race (Bendle, 2002; Edwards, 2009; Joseph, 2004)—has more recently been reframed through a poststructuralist lens (Weedon, 1997). This poststructuralist lens not only casts identity as a performance (Goffman, 1959) but also as contested and interactionally constructed (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Darvin & Norton, 2015). Seen from this poststructural perspective, it becomes necessary to better understand the various

contextual forces that contest identities (Pennycook, 2001). Appropriate contextualization deepens the understanding of how identities are interactionally constructed as well as how interactional choices are made. Exploring identity within institutional talk provides an example of how context can limit the types of identity enactments performed by the interactants (Heritage & Clayman, 2010; Waring, 2012).

This study builds upon extant poststructural identity literature and explores the interactionally constructed identities of multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers in a postcolonial and neocolonial writing center context in Macao. In this chapter, I briefly highlight my entry into this study, provide the study's context, and describe the theoretical and methodological underpinnings of the study. The purposes and significance of the study are followed by my research questions. Before I preview the rest of the chapters in this dissertation, I provide a description of my research design.

Entry Into the Study

Appropriate contextualization matters not only to the study but also to the one conducting the study. While qualitative studies place emphasis on the participants' experiences, researchers must simultaneously acknowledge the role that they play and the choices they make in putting together such a study. As Clarke and Friese (2007) state, "Researchers need to make their own situatedness as individuals explicit as well as the situatedness of their research projects" (p. 368). As part of the reflexivity that researchers need to bring to their studies, I describe the various identities and positionalities that influence the ways in which I see the world and discuss why I would ask the research questions I ask in this study. These identities have helped shape my epistemological orientations as well as my perspectives at the research site. As a woman of color, as an immigrant who did not speak of word of English when my family first moved to the United

States, as a community organizer, as an English language instructor, and as a former writing center tutor and coordinator, I see my own experiences reflected in many of the challenges that multilingual student writers face when they are engaged in academic writing in a second language (L2) while I simultaneously occupy a privileged space because of my ability to navigate and negotiate between languages. Rather than pretend that I can be an objective researcher seeking to describe the interactions of multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers, I embrace each and every one of these identities, for they have shaped my worldview and how this study has been designed.

My experiences as a multilingual language user and my own identification journey as a Taiwanese American have informed me of the dangers of essentializing a group of people. Like Clark and Gieve (2006), who reject categorizing all Chinese learners as one group and instead opt for Holliday's (1999) conception of *small cultures*, I challenge various essentializations of the multilingual language user. Holliday (1999) contrasts large cultures with small cultures, where large culture represents distinct racial, ethnic, linguistic, and geographical categories such as "Asian" or "white," and small culture is defined as "small social groupings or activities where there is cohesive behaviour" (p. 237). My own experiences as a multilingual language user have helped to shape my worldview and serve as one of my points of entries to this dissertation. As a competent language user of English, Mandarin, Taiwanese, and Cantonese, I have a strong desire to debunk what Cumming and Riazi (2000) have termed the *deficit learning model*, which they define as "one that faults the baseline learners for what they lack — suggesting that their deficiencies should form the basis for instruction, but without knowing if instruction addressing such lacks would really be effective" (p. 58). I am invested in documenting the ability of multilingual writers to work between languages, and I am equally interested in portraying writing

processes whereby multilingual students utilize all of their languages as resources to complete a writing task (A. S. Canagarajah, 2002a, 2006; S. Canagarajah, 2011). Understanding the ways in which my experiences have constructed the way I see the world helps to provide additional context to this dissertation.

Prior to my career as an English language instructor, my background was in community organizing. As a community organizer, the way I see the world, especially as situated in the United States, is through a critical lens (Creswell, 2007) in which inequality exists everywhere. The people I worked with were on the marginalized end of the marginalized and privileged continuum. However, my work as a community organizer did not end at critique. I was driven to serve as an agent of social change, leading grassroots organizing campaigns in Northern California. The model of direct-action community organizing attracted me because the organizer gradually works herself out of a job after training local community members to sustain the organization. It has been my experience that this type of a participatory agenda (Lincoln, Lynham, & Guba, 2011) can lead to a more just world. My personal paradigmatic positionality, which leans toward participatory, has not changed. Although I cannot change my worldview, nor do I seek to do so, I am mindful that this dissertation is rooted in constructivism (Lincoln et al., 2011), in which I first seek to describe the interactions of multilingual student writers and multilingual tutors.

Another way that I enter this study is my role at the University of Macau (UM). As a former writing center coordinator who still teaches at UM, I have played an instrumental role in the development of the writing center's practices, some of which are still being implemented. Although I no longer serve as the writing center coordinator, I believe that I am still seen as occupying a position of power in relation to the multilingual student writers and the multilingual

tutors because the English Language Center (ELC), where I work as a senior instructor, is the writing center's supervising unit. Besides the position of senior instructor, I have held numerous other leadership positions at the ELC, including head teacher, associate director, and acting director. While not all tutors are aware of these past roles, I believe that they are aware of my seniority. Lastly, I work closely with the current writing center coordinator, advising her on various matters relating to the writing center, including center restructuring and personnel issues. The combination of these roles that I occupy in relation to the writing center, its tutors, and the students who use its services, impact how I am seen by the participants in the study.

The final positionality that I hold in relation to this study is my training as a writing center tutor and my primary, secondary, undergraduate and graduate experience in the United States. As a former writing center tutor at a public university in California, I acknowledge that my experiences during those years have had a direct impact on the choices I have made when creating UM's writing center policies that remain in place today. As a woman of color tutoring multilingual student writers in California, time and again I saw that their styles of writing were categorized as "alternative," "non-standard," and "awkward," among many other adjectives used to describe writing that was not accepted by the specific academic discourse communities to which these students belonged. In a sense, I experienced, through these students that I tutored, their marginalization in the general academic discourse community. This experience has played a major role in shaping how I came to ask my research questions even though the context of my research site may not be comparable. On this point of marginalization, Merchant and Willis (2001) discuss the importance for the marginalized to remain true to their beliefs and their epistemological orientations when designing and conducting research.

Scholars such as Mehra (2001) have deliberated on the difficulties of doing research on participants close to themselves. She urges that rather than dismissing these relationships as trivial, the researcher and her participants are better served when there is an open discussion about these dilemmas. According to Corbin and Strauss (2008), "Researchers are translators of other persons' words and actions. Researchers are the go-betweens for the participants and the audiences that they want to reach" (p. 49). To perform adequately as a "go-between," I must be frank about my various positionalities in this study. Qualitative research recognizes the subjective nature of knowledge creation. As such, being open about the different positions I occupy in this dissertation allows readers to have more information for their own interpretation of the theoretical foundations upon which this dissertation is grounded and of the findings. Acknowledging my various positionalities and how I enter into this study also helps to ensure rigor, as suggested by Creswell (2007).

Research Context

Prior to its return to the People's Republic of China in 1999, Macao (also spelled Macau) had served as Portugal's colonial outpost for more than 400 years. Under Portuguese rule, Macao remained more or less a forgotten, sleepy, backwater island territory (A. H. Yee, 1990). The University of Macau (UM), the site of the study, was originally founded as a business venture and catered mostly to nearby Hong Kong students (Lau & Yuen, 2010). Modeled after the British system, UM adopted English as a medium of instruction. Since English is not the main language of communication in Macao, Johnson and Swain (1997) suggest that this linguistic adoption helps make English "a language of power because it provides the means for social, economic, and academic upward mobility" for not only UM graduates but also staff members working within the University (p. 167).

The use of English as a medium of instruction in a location where Cantonese is spoken and Chinese is written also calls into question issues of power, privilege, neo-colonialism, and linguistic identity (Johnson, 1997; Lai, 2005; Lin, 2006b; Pennycook, 1998; Sweeting & Vickers, 2005), all of which serve as omnipresent factors that underpin how a writing center conference may operate. Pennycook's (1998) discussion of how the teaching of English served as one of the main foundational tools upon which colonialism flourished helps to establish the context upon which this dissertation study is based and speaks to some of the power relations that are at still play in postcolonial regions such as Hong Kong and Macao.

From these broad strokes connecting colonialism to the English language, scholars have written extensively on the macro- and micro-level societal and interactional influences of English on postcolonial Hong Kong (Flowerdew, Li, & Miller, 1998; D. Li, 2002; Lin, 1999, 2005, 2006a; Lin & Martin, 2005; Lin, Wang, Akamatsu, & Riazi, 2002; Luk, 2002). More recently, Lin (2006b) has argued that the context of the learning of English in postcolonial places such as Hong Kong has become more dynamic as bilingual and multilingual speakers gain not only acceptance but also clout. Gao's (2010) study of mainland Chinese students who were somewhat ostracized by the local Cantonese-speaking students at an English medium university in Hong Kong further highlights additional complexities of the uneasy tension between the increasing mainland Chinese population, who speak Putonghua, and the local Chinese population, who speak Cantonese. This dynamic and potentially conflicting interplay of English speakers, Cantonese speakers, and Putonghua speakers, each of which wield different types of power and privilege (Cheng, 2008), helps to set the stage for this dissertation because Macao has experienced similar historical and cultural conditions.

Since this dissertation is set in Macao, it is important to discuss not only the official languages that have been in use in Macao but also the languages that appear in everyday life. Linguistic landscapes comprise of written signs that are displayed in the public (Ben-Rafael, 2009). Ben-Rafael defines the sociological approach to linguistic landscape as one that analyzes "these items according to the languages utilized, their relative saliency, syntactical or semantic aspects" as a means of indexing what people in a society deem as important, what they anticipate may be important to others, what governmental institutions deem as important, and how all of these factors interact with one another (p. 40). Because of Macao's complicated and complex political and linguistic past, its present linguistic landscape can serve as a means to understanding how World Englishes, Chinese, and Portuguese intersect with one another. The interplay of these three languages also impacts tertiary education in Macao.

As a former Portuguese colony, the official language in Macao was Portuguese until Chinese (the traditional form, not the simplified form used in the People's Republic of China) was added as an official language in 1987 (Bray & Koo, 2004). Despite its Portuguese colonial past, English has had a strong presence in the territory (de Robertis & Morrison, 2009; A. H. Yee, 1990). Walking around in Macao, one immediately notices these three languages in prominent display. Business signs are typically displayed in Macao's two official languages, traditional Chinese and Portuguese. Medium- to large-sized businesses have English on display as well. Although Macao was handed back to China in 1999, China promised not to make any changes to the territory for the next 50 years in an effort to pacify people and negate concerns about China bringing its form of authoritarian rule to the territory (Bray & Koo, 2004). Thus, Macao's official language policy has not changed despite the fact that more than 80% of the population speak Cantonese as their "usual language," and the number of Portuguese speakers

8

comprises only approximately 2.3% of the total population (Government of Macao Special Administrative Region Statistics and Census Service, 2016, p. 9).

Definitions

Throughout this study, I use the term *multilingual* to refer to the study's participants who performed the roles of tutors and student writers in the writing center tutorial sessions. I use *multilingual* because the participants in the study speak and write more than one language. I also use the term *second language (L2)* interchangeably with the term *multilingual*. Although my own preference is *multilingual*, I recognize that the term *second language* has an established history of use in the field of second language acquisition (SLA).

Additionally, the notion of *identity* lies at the heart of this dissertation. As such, its definition is crucial to understanding the approaches that I took to answer my research questions. For this study, I use Bucholtz and Hall's (2005) definition of sociocultural linguistic identity, which is that "identity is the social positioning of self and other" (p. 586). Extending this definition of *identity*, I use the term *identity enactment* to highlight the micro interactional performances (Norton & McKinney, 2011; Pavlenko, 2002) of the participants as they positioned themselves and others during their writing center tutorial sessions.

Theoretical and Methodological Approaches

This study is rooted in the constructivist tradition of inquiry (Guba & Lincoln, 1994; Lincoln & Guba, 2005). Within this tradition, reality and knowledge are understood to be socially constructed. In particular, language plays a vital role in how reality is understood (Vygotsky, 1978). According to Fuss (1989), "Constructionists are concerned above all with the production and organization of differences, and they therefore reject the idea that any essential or natural givens precede the process of social determination" (p. 3). Because of the emphasis on

9

the social, I use the term social constructivism to describe the paradigmatic inquiry approach used in this study. Further, a social constructivist approach to its inquiry is to seek to understand, and to a certain extent, reconstruct instances where people interacted with one another for a specific purpose (Lincoln et al., 2011). From a subjectivist epistemological standpoint, a constructivist should focus on "co-created findings" and "co-constructed realities" (Lincoln et al., 2011, p. 98).

Anfara Jr. and Mertz (2006) and Denzin and Lincoln (2003) advise that in qualitative inquiry, researchers should seek to ensure that there is theoretical and methodological alignment and consistency from the abstract to the concrete. That is, the paradigmatic inquiry approach should align with the research design used to answer the inquiry. Denzin and Lincoln (2003) state that the researcher "approaches the world with a set of ideas, a framework (theory, ontology) that specifies a set of questions (epistemology) that he or she then examines in specific ways (methodology, analysis)" (p. 30). In other words, a researcher's prior experiences help to shape her worldview, which then enable her to ask questions from a specific perspective. The researcher then needs to choose the methodologically appropriate means of answering these questions.

Further, Anfara Jr. and Mertz (2006) define a theoretical framework as "any empirical or quasi-empirical theory of social and/or psychological processes, at a variety of levels (e.g. grand, mid-range, and explanatory), that can be applied to the understanding of a phenomena" (p. xxvii). As this dissertation is grounded in the constructivist approach, a theoretical framework appropriately aligned with this approach is Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theory, which argues that cognitive development and different types of learning occur through social interactions. Only through adequate and appropriate interaction with others will the development and learning

take shape within an individual. Vygotsky's views align appropriately within the constructivist tradition of inquiry, and sociocultural theory serves as the theoretical framework that underpins this study. Another appropriate application of Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theory is in the area of second language learning. Specifically, the Vygotskian concept of the "zone of proximal development" undergirds much of the interactional choices that the multilingual tutors and student writers make in their tutorial sessions (p. 86).

Moving closer toward the data, I discuss the methodological decisions in my research design. Consistent with the notion of "co-constructed realities," which Lincoln et al. (2011, p. 98) state is one of the major goals of the constructivist approach, I have used ethnographic methods to construct a rich description (Geertz, 1973) of how a writing center tutorial session is shaped by the identity enactments of multilingual writing tutors and multilingual student writers from the participants' as well as my viewpoint. Geertz notes that doing ethnographic work is about more than the employment of different techniques. Beyond the means of data gathering, the researcher must engage in analysis, which Geertz defines as "sorting out the structures of signification…and determining their social ground and import" (p. 9). In using ethnographic methods, the study is informed by Hammersley and Atkinson's (1995) work. In addition, it considers the works of Hellawell (2006) and Mehra (2001) in the deliberation of the researcher's insider and outsider status. Ethnographic methods used for this study include observations (Angrosino & Rosenberg, 2011) of multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers engaged in writing center tutorial sessions, interviews (Rubin & Rubin, 2004) with these tutors and writers, and documents such as instructor assignments and student writers' written drafts (L. Prior, 2003). Conversation analytic methods, as informed by Heritage and Clayman (2010) are used for analysis.

Multilingual Institutional Discourses of Negotiation and Identity

The appropriate alignment of theoretical and methodological approaches lays the foundation for a discussion of the interactional choices the participants in this study made in their writing center tutorial sessions. From a social constructivist and sociocultural perspective, a deeper and more complex understanding of the multilingual tutors and student writers in this dissertation cannot be achieved without properly contextualizing their discourse. As such, I provide an overview of the historical, political, and academic background (Bray & Koo, 2004; H. S. Yee & Kou, 2001) necessary to understand how these participants came to the writing center using all of the languages at their disposal, but specifically privileging English (Pennycook, 1998).

The discourses in which the participants engaged are further constrained by the institution where the discourse occurs. Although thus far, studies focusing on institutional talk have mostly explored medical, legal, and news discourse (Drew & Heritage, 1992b), Waring (2012) has argued that the setting of a writing center should also be considered as institutional talk and has explored the discursive negotiations of advice receiving, advice resisting (Waring, 2005), and advice giving (Waring, 2007b) in this context. How institutional discourse influences the interactional choices of multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers is explored in this dissertation.

Using sociocultural perspectives (Vygotsky, 1978) and an identity approach (North & McKinney, 2011) provides many opportunities for in-depth explorations of the identity enactments of language learners. Within the field of SLA, much of the research focusing on identity and language learning has centered around social categories of race, gender, and class (Block, 2007a, 2007b), narratives (Pavlenko, 2007), and classroom activities (Norton, 2000).

Investigations into L2 writing and identity have included discussions of voice (Matsuda, 2001) and intertextuality (Chandrasoma, Thompson, & Pennycook, 2004). This dissertation uses sociocultural perspectives and an identity approach to describe second language learner identity enactments through their face-to-face interactions as they discuss their writing.

Purpose and Significance of the Study

This dissertation describes how multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers co-construct identities in their interactions and negotiations during a writing center tutorial session. I include in the description the various influences—including linguistic, social, cultural, political, academic, and historical—that impact these interactions. Framing these multilingual writers through an identity lens allows these interactions to be seen from multiple and complex perspectives. Helping to portray these interactions with depth and complexity positions these multilingual writers as complicated individuals situated in contexts that limit the number of choices they have (Goffman, 1959).

Additionally, following Canagarajah's (2010) suggestion for multilingual researchers to study how the minds of multilingual writers work, a description of how multilingual students negotiate the writing of English while accessing other languages as a resource in those negotiations with multilingual tutors contributes to the body of writing center scholarship (Leki, 2009; Myers, 2003; Powers, 1993; Powers & Nelson, 1995; Wang, 2012). In their overview of empirical research focused on multilingual writers in the writing center, Babcock and Thonus (2012) conclude that much more information can be uncovered regarding how multilingual writers interact with their tutors in the writing center. There is some literature suggesting that some multilingual writers at a university in the United Arab Emirates prefer a combination of directive and non-directive approaches when tutored by their multilingual peers (Eleftheriou,

13

2011). Thus far, few studies have described how multilingual tutors work with multilingual writers. Although Thonus (2014) asserts that multilingual students can benefit more from tutorials with multilingual tutors, this assertion remains largely unsupported because of the lack of research on these populations.

Given the social constructivist underpinnings of this dissertation, I recognize that knowledge is socially constructed (Kuhn, 1996). The study describes in rich detail some of the interactions taking place between multilingual student writers and multilingual tutors as they engage in the social practice of writing and tutoring in the instructional language of English. As such, the study contributes theoretical and practical knowledge to SLA and composition.

By analyzing their face-to-face interactions, this study uncovers various identities that are enacted by the multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers as they work through a text collaboratively. This reframing of multilingual language users addresses one of the fundamental values held in knowledge construction. That is, the questions we ask have direct causal relations with the answers we get (Angen, 2000). From a social constructivist position, I seek to contribute knowledge about multilingual language users from an identity approach (Norton &McKinney, 2011), thereby capturing some of the dynamism and complexity behind their decision making processes. Doing so helps to advance both SLA and composition by providing alternative portrayals of some multilingual language users. These alternative portrayals hopefully lead other researchers to rethink the questions they ask when they work with multilingual language users.

Practically, the study contributes alternative writing tutoring approaches and practices that are suitable for writing centers working with multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers. This approach can encourage writing centers in other contexts to explore possible contextually grounded theories and practices, which Kumaravadivelu (2001) has suggested is not

only appropriate but necessary. Because issues of textual and linguistic ownership arise, the study also has practical implications beyond writing center tutor training. Issues of intertextuality have implications for the multilingual language learning classroom as well as the composition classroom.

Research Questions

Because this dissertation seeks to understand how multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers co-construct their identities during writing center tutorial sessions, my primary research question is directed toward achieving this understanding:

1. What are the interactional choices that multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers make during a writing center tutorial session? (data gathered via observation, video recordings, interviews based on video playback)

Following this primary question, I ask two related secondary questions:

    a. How do the participants feel about the choices that they made during the writing center tutorial session? (data gathered via interviews based on video playback)

    b. What influences the interactional choices that they made during the writing center tutorial session? (data gathered via interviews based on video playback)

Study Design

The data for this study were collected after receiving IRB approval in October 2015 (see Appendix A). I approached and received approval from the writing center coordinator (see Appendix B) to invite the tutors working at the writing center to participate in the study, and I was invited to a regular staff meeting to explain my study. After my explanation, I sent follow-up participation emails to all tutors (see Appendix C). Six tutors consented to participate in the

study, and I met with each of them to explain and answer questions about the informed consent letter (see Appendix D). After obtaining tutor consent, the writing center coordinator granted me access to the writing center's electronic appointment system so that I could send out invitation emails to the student writers who had writing center appointments (see Appendix E). For the student writers who consented to participate, I met with each individually prior to the start of their appointment to explain and answer questions about the informed consent letter (see Appendix F).

A total of eight writing center tutorial sessions were videotaped. During each session, I made observation notes using my observation protocol (see Appendix G). I photographed the written drafts and assignment sheets that the student writer participants brought into the session. At the end of the tutorial session, I arranged to have follow-up playback interviews separately with the tutor and student writer. I then analyzed each tutorial session video, looking for instances of interaction that could be enriched by further participant commentary. During each playback interview, I asked the participant a prepared question and played a short segment of the video. The participant then answered my question and often provided additional commentary that allowed me to ask clarification or explanation questions. The playback interviews ended with the same set of prepared general questions that were in my protocol (see Appendix H). These playback interviews were audio-recorded.

With each completed set of data—including the writing center tutorial session videotape, textual data, and separate playback interviews with the tutor and the student writer—I reviewed my data gathering process and looked for ways to improve my data collection method. Using the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1999), I began the transcription and analysis processes. Because the interactions took place in multiple languages, I, a fluent user of Mandarin

and advanced user of Cantonese, created a first draft of the translated transcriptions. These transcriptions were then checked by a colleague for accuracy. All transcripts went through several cycles of coding using grounded theory techniques (Corbin & Strauss, 2008) and QSR International's (2016) NVivo 11 software. Because the nature of the tutorial sessions and playback interviews were different, these transcripts were coded separately, and different codes were developed for the different data sets. Next, definitions for each code were created and cross-referenced. Doing so allowed for opportunities to notice and eliminate redundancies. The next step was category development, and these were done separately for the different data sets. Each of the categories for the multilingual tutors and student writers were compared. I then provided examples of the categories shared by both the multilingual tutors and student writers.

Consistent with the social constructivist theoretical paradigm, I provided the appropriate contextualization through which the data should be viewed. In other words, my research questions should first be contextualized before they can be answered. Thus, I provided examples illustrating how the writing center tutorial sessions should be seen as instances of institutional talk (Waring, 2012). The participants interactional choices were further limited by the postcolonial and neocolonial discourses present at the writing center, and I provided examples highlighting these limitations. I showed transcript examples of the relevant categories and their corresponding codes. Through this process of code and category development, along with the description of the transcript examples, I arrived at four major themes, which I discuss in detail in chapter five.

Chapter Organization

Thus far, this chapter has outlined the research context, theoretical approaches, and purpose of the study. The chapter also contains the researcher's entry into the study. Chapter two

delves further into the theoretical perspectives grounding the study. It includes a literature review

of the postcolonial and neocolonial discourses that help to situate the University of Macau

historically and help to contextualize these discourses for the writing center tutorial interactions

shared by the multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers. I include a discussion of

writing center scholarship, specifically focusing on relevant studies with tutors and multilingual

student writers, and couch this discussion within institutional talk. The chapter continues with an

overview of identity research as it relates to SLA, writing, and interaction. Chapter two

concludes with a review of relevant literature focusing on institutional conversation analysis,

particularly addressing strategies of negotiation and advice giving and receiving. In chapter

three, I introduce the research setting and study participants. I describe in detail the data

collection process and explain the transcription, translation, and coding processes. The chapter

ends with a discussion of the study's trustworthiness. Chapter four contains the presentation of

the data. The data is first contextualized as institutional talk and as part of the postcolonial and

neocolonial discourses present at the research site. Following this contextualization, the data is

presented according to the different categories that arose from the coding process. The final and

fifth chapter of the dissertation revisits the purpose of the study as a way to frame the findings.

The chapter presents the four major themes that arose from the data and includes the study's

implications for the multilingual language learning classroom, writing center practice, and the

composition classroom. The chapter ends with my reflections as a researcher and suggestions for

future research.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Perspectives Grounding the Study

This study is grounded in the constructivist paradigm of inquiry (Lincoln & Guba, 2005; Lincoln et al., 2011) as it tries to understand how multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers co-construct their identities during writing center conferences. The perspectives of these tutors and writers are foregrounded in their negotiation of what it means to interact with one another during a writing center tutorial session and how they construct meaning in a conference. I situate this interaction within social, cultural, and historical contexts that are appropriate not only from a World Englishes (Bhatt, 2001; Jenkins, 2006; B. B. Kachru, 2006) perspective—which in itself is already imbued in its postcolonial legacy (Bray & Koo, 2004; H. S. Yee & Kou, 2001)—but also within the confines of institutional talk (Drew & Heritage, 1992b, 2013b, 2013c; Heritage & Clayman, 2010). I position my discussion of writing center scholarship within postcolonial and neocolonial discourses at the University of Macau because context underpins the thick description of interactional choices and identity enactments in this study.

Further to the constructivist paradigm of inquiry, this study is framed by a sociocultural perspective (Vygotsky, 1978). Vygotsky's work suggests that the acquisition of language, among other skills, is done through scaffolded social practices, or within the "zone of proximal development" (p. 86). Interactions between tutors and student writers at the writing center are structured in a way that lend themselves to be analyzed with a sociocultural perspective. I describe instances of interactions between multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers through an identity lens (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005), and the participants' various acts of identity assertions are highlighted. Through such a description, a better understanding can be generated

on how a writing center tutorial session is shaped by the co-constructed identities and interactions between the multilingual tutor, multilingual student writer, and the text.

To achieve this goal, I first describe the historical context and discourses that have helped to make English the medium of instruction at UM, including a short discussion of the significance of this decision. This historical context helps to situate the study in a World Englishes paradigm, and it is through this common language that I bring in writing center scholarship into the discussion to add institutional context to the description of the interactional choices made by multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers. After laying the historical and institutional foundations, I discuss the sociocultural perspectives of identity work that serve as a means of intersecting potential research gaps in SLA and writing. I further offer an argument that better understanding of multilingual writers can be achieved through an identity lens that analyzes their interactional choices with a specific focus on discursive advice giving and receiving.

Postcolonial and Neocolonial Discourses at UM

In discussing the colonial discourses of English, Pennycook (1998), drawing on Bakhtin (1981), has argued that history cannot and should not be divorced from any given location because its present is composed of its past and that its past is what creates its present. Similarly, the complex historical linguistic interplay between Portuguese, Chinese, and English has controlled the discourse of tertiary education in Macao. A discussion of the founding of the University of Macau (UM) sheds light on the factors pulling and pushing its language policies today. To begin, H. S. Yee and Kou (2001) and Bray and Koo (2004) have demonstrated that the motive for the creation of the University of East Asia (UEA, UM's former name) was chiefly economic in the sense that it was created to cater to Hong Kong students who were denied

20

admission into one of the five Hong Kong universities. During its brief existence, UEA's average tuition was considerably higher than that of nearby universities in Hong Kong, Taiwan, and China (H. S. Yee & Kou, 2001), and "few local families could afford the high tuition fee" (p. 78). Further catering to the expectations of its Hong Kong clientele, UEA's medium of instruction was designated as English, one of the two official languages in colonial Hong Kong. UEA also adopted many of the admission policies of Hong Kong universities.

Additionally, as some scholars have suggested, UEA's transition into UM was partially motivated by politics, as the Portuguese colonial government made one of its last attempts to solidify its legacy in Macao before the territory was handed back to China (Bray & Koo, 2004). Once purchased, many of the British-based practices put in place were removed. For example, the admission policy of using the British General Certificate of Education (GCE) score was eliminated in favor of a home-made admission exam (H. S. Yee & Kou, 2001). Further, the installation of Portuguese, Macao, and/or Macanese[1] personnel in senior level positions at UM as well as the removal of a largely international teaching staff in favor of local staff who were often seen as less academically qualified (H. S. Yee & Kou, 2001) was suggested as evidence of the Portuguese colonial government's effort to extend its influence after the handover. Deliberate changes at the top managerial level of UM affect not only educational policy within the institution but also recruitment and hiring practices, all of which contribute to the cultural and linguistic environment of the University.

---

[1] Macanese is the term used to describe people of Portuguese and Chinese descent. Because of their bilingual abilities, the Macanese most often served as the linguistic and cultural brokers in Macao (Hui, 1998), holding power and influence over the vast majority of the ethnically Chinese Macao people.

Since the handover from Portugal to China, several scholars have argued that Macao's Portuguese colonial masters have been replaced by China (H. S. Yee, 2001). Some evidence for this claim can be seen at UM in the installation of the current university rector, a mainland Chinese scholar who has spent the last 30 years working and teaching in the United States (University of Macau, 2014b). Appointed in 2008, he speaks Putonghua but not Cantonese. Putonghua is the official language of communication in the People's Republic of China. It can also be referred to as Mandarin, although the term Mandarin more commonly refers to the official language of Taiwan. There are few differences between Putonghua and Mandarin other than the matter of textual representation. Putonghua is rendered in Simplified Chinese characters while Mandarin is rendered in Traditional Chinese characters (Kurpaska, 2010).

From my personal experience of attending annual university functions from 2004 to 2014, during official functions when it has been customary for the rector to use English as a lingua franca to communicate to his multilingual staff, Rector Zhao has chosen to address his audience in Putonghua on more than one occasion. Even before Rector Zhao's appointment, UM replaced many expatriate and Macao/Hong Kong scholar department heads and faculty deans with Chinese scholars. Currently, of the seven faculty dean positions, five are held by mainland Chinese scholars: all appointed within the last nine years.

Despite the political changes that UM has undergone since its founding, it has steadfastly maintained that its primary medium of instruction is English and markets itself as such on its website and during student recruitment (University of Macau, 2014a). Its newly revamped curriculum, which includes a general education program, continues to be officially taught in English. This steadfast insistence and maintenance of English as the instructional medium— despite the fact that the vast majority of its students, faculty, and administrative staff speak either

Cantonese and/or Mandarin—helps to situate UM and much of its discourse in a World

Englishes context.

World Englishes

The University of Macau has an academic staff with diverse linguistic backgrounds, but it

is understood among its staff that all courses should be conducted in English unless otherwise

indicated. The insistence on the use of English as not only the medium of instruction but also the

de facto lingua franca for staff communication at UM brings into this study matters relating to

English as the language of power (Pennycook, 1998). As such, framing this study in a World

Englishes context within the postcolonial and neocolonial discourses at UM helps to situate the

University's choice to maintain English rather than Chinese or Portuguese as language of

communication. My discussion of World Englishes in this section thus focuses on matters

relating to the power, prestige, and practice of using English in a non-English-dominant setting.

At its core, proponents of World Englishes seek to reorient how understandings of

English are viewed around the world (Bhatt, 2001; Jenkins, 2006; B. B. Kachru, 2006). World

Englishes (Bolton, 2000; Kumaravadivelu, 2003) may situate UM's choice of English medium

instruction historically, socially, economically, and politically. Claims by Anchimbe (2009),

Yano (2009) and Seidlhofer (2009)—that many World Englishes speakers no longer look to

Inner Circle speakers (B. B. Kachru, 2006) to provide English language norms (and the power

and prestige that tend to go along with the norm bearers)—are not necessarily supported in the

UM academic context. Findings from D. He and Li (2009) suggest that in certain parts of China,

World Englishes speakers still consider British and American English to be the preferred

varieties. These incongruent understandings of the development of World Englishes between

scholars and language users raise issues of language ownership and how these language users perceive their own English use.

It should be noted that the idea of World Englishes is not without its controversies (Jenkins, 2006, 2007). Kachru's (1992) conception of the Inner, Outer, and Expanding Circles to describe the origin and spread of English and the resulting power and prestige differences between the different types of Englishes has now been problematized by other scholars. Specifically, Yano (2009) suggests that Kachru's concentric circle model can no longer account for the trend of global migration. Based on geography, this model is rendered moot when there is mass migration between the Inner, Outer, and Expanding Circle countries, as is the case at UM where there is a diverse academic staff with various linguistic, cultural, and ethnic backgrounds.

Yano (2009) has instead suggested an individualistic model for analyzing one's English language use, which attempts to remove power from Kachru's (1992) Inner Circle contexts. In this model, English is separated into English for General Purposes, English for Specific Purposes, intra-regional standard English, and English as an international language and Kachru's circles are moved to the background while foregrounding the individual's needs for the use of English. Yano uses speakers in Europe as an example of the development of intra-regional standard English, which is based on the assumption that these speakers are likely to share a first language with common features. To reach English as an international language proficiency, however, one must speak a variety with "multiethnic, multicultural, and multilingual local identities yet with high cross-regional intelligibility" (p. 251).

Yano (2009) claims that this model not only removes power from the Inner Circle countries but also allows users of English to no longer feel a sense of English linguistic imperialism. Despite Yano's attempt at the removal of power from English-dominant countries,

the application of his model to the "de-territorialized and hybrid societies" such as Macao remain in doubt (p. 253). Although D. He and Li's (2009) study focuses on university students in China, they have found that Received Pronunciation and American English are these students' preference if given a choice between learning China English and other varieties. Given that Chinese students account for 15% to 20% of UM's annual student intake (S. Ho, personal communication, June 8, 2009), their preference should be noted in the discussion of World Englishes as well as the differences between scholarly idealism and practical reality.

Although many scholars have already deconstructed the *native speaker* myth (Cook, 1999; Faez, 2011; Radwanska-Williams, 2008) and discussed the dangerous consequences of the continued use of these falsely dichotomous terms between the *native* vs. *non-native speaker* (Cox, 2010; Cumming & Riazi, 2000; Ortmeier-Hooper, 2008), the fact that Chinese students' accent/dialect preference still lean in favor of Received Pronunciation and American English speaks volumes to the gap between scholarly deconstruction and mainstream popular demand. In this regard, UM students' reaction to working with multilingual tutors who do not have access to the preferred varieties can contribute to the discussion on the perception of World Englishes.

Further, as scholars such as Phillipson (1992, 2009) have pointed out, English has dominated over other languages because of its connections with economic power, and this power has partially accounted for its popularity in use around the world (Crystal, 2003). Although Macao was colonized by the Portuguese and English is not an official language in Macao, the fact that UM has adamantly maintained English as its medium of instruction should not be ignored. It can be argued that the power, prestige, and use of English operate hand in hand to perpetuate its dominance over other languages such as Chinese in Macao. World Englishes, then, serves as not only the backdrop and context for this study but also lays the foundation for the

discussion on power and prestige differentials when students engage with the English in their academic work.

Perceptions of English in Macao. Since the issue over the adoption and use of English surfaces repeatedly in this non-English-dominant context where Macao people can use Chinese as their language of communication, it is worthwhile to note their perceptions of English and their use of this language. Thus far, I have only identified two studies that focus specifically on Macao's tertiary students. Young (2006, 2009) conducted two survey-based studies on their language learning practice and preferences. The 2006 study asks students at one university how they feel about English language learning after the handover from Portugal to China and concludes that Macao's university students would like more opportunities to learn English. The 2009 study compares student attitudes toward the learning of English, Portuguese, and Putonghua and suggests that Macao's tertiary students see a growing trend in their use of Putonghua and English while their dissatisfaction with their limited English learning opportunities remain the same as in the previous study.

The limited number of studies available addressing the use of English and/or World Englishes in a Macao context is notable both for the absence of scholarly work in this area and the opportunities for further research. Areas such as language use preference and attitude in Macao's tertiary settings would provide a foundation to discover more information not only about how students might choose to negotiate between language choices but also on matters relating to language ownership and identity. In his critique of past second language research, Block (2007b) comments that "attitude questionnaires might tell us about the preferred responses of respondents, but they do not go very far towards finding out how individuals construct themselves through language or indeed the kind of language practice they engage in" (p. 53). In

this regard, this study can be a part of a conversation that begins to reveal the complex matters of language negotiation, interaction, identity construction, and language practice of Macao's tertiary students, especially in relation to their English writing.

In this section, I have discussed World Englishes in terms of how it can contextualize the use of the lingua franca at UM. Through this contextualization, I have sought to highlight issues of power, prestige, practice, perceptions, and preference of different varieties of English as well as to open the door to further the conversation on Macao students' use of English. The specific site where I conducted this study is within UM's writing center. In the next section, I argue that university writing centers provide a space where tutors and students—however they were brought there—can talk about writing. While scholars such as Bawarshi and Pelkowski (1999) have questioned and critiqued the purpose of writing centers as they exist within the larger historical, political, and cultural academic context, nonetheless, this writing center space allows the tutors and students involved to see writing as a social act (Breuch, 2003; Casanave, 2003, 2004; Gee, 1991; Matsuda, 2003). Because the negotiation of ideas is one of the primary tasks that take place in writing centers, it may also provide opportunities for identity construction and co-construction. A description of this negotiation process may lead to a better understanding of the complicated reasons behind a student writer's decision-making. I begin first with a discussion of general U.S.-based writing center theory and practice as UM's writing center has drawn much of its practice from the United States. I include in this section the current practice of writing centers outside the United States context since they mostly operate with both multilingual tutors and student writers, and it may be possible to draw on the research done in these contexts.

Writing Center Scholarship

With the University of Macau adopting English as the medium of instruction, many common practices at other English medium universities were emulated at UM, including the establishment of a university writing center in 2003. While many writing centers established around the world claim to model theirs after ones established in the United States (Archer, 2007; Bräuer, 2006, 2009; C. W.-y. Chen, 2010; Eleftheriou, 2006, 2011; Harbord, 2003; Hutchings, 2006; Kock & Rienecker, 1996; McMillan, 1986; A. Miller, 2002; Ramsey, 2005, 2008; Santa, 2002; Turner, 2006), different aspects of the writing center at UM have also been adopted from writing center research and practices in the United States. As such, it is helpful to understand the writing center theories and practices that have been exported to other locales and how this exportation mingles with local writing practices as well as with multilingual student writers and tutors.

Collaborative learning and peer tutoring. Collaborative learning and peer tutoring are highly interrelated principles which serve as foundational principles of writing center theory (Carino, 1995; Harris, 1990). Grounded in the social constructivist paradigm and sociocultural theory pioneered by Vygotsky (1978), collaborative learning is defined by Bruffee (1984a) as "a form of indirect teaching in which the teacher sets the problem and organizes students to work it out collaboratively" (p. 637). Bruffee further argues that conversation is at the heart of collaborative learning because "any effort to understand how we think requires us to understand the nature of conversation; and any effort to understand conversation requires us to understand the nature of community life that generates and maintains conversation" (p. 640). Through these foundational ideas based on sociocultural theory, Bruffee suggests that collaborative learning is a

major channel through which students can socialize one another into the academic discourse community.

Again arguing from a Vygotskian perspective, Bruffee (1984b) suggests that peer tutoring is an effective method of assisting students to enter the academic discourse community because peer tutoring chiefly focuses on conversation. Drawing from Vygotsky, Bruffee states that conversation is an external form of thought, and reflective thought is not possible without interaction with others. Citing Kuhn's (1996) findings that scientific knowledge is socially constructed and not the objective truth that it was thought to be, Bruffee suggests that all knowledge is socially constructed. If knowledge is socially constructed, then peer tutoring can become an effective means of allowing new entrants to the academic discourse community to learn from one another as they socialize each other to this new community.

With collaborative learning and peer tutoring as the center pieces in writing center theory and pedagogy, I next focus on interaction-based studies that have been conducted in writing center contexts. I first discuss the interactions between monolingual tutors and monolingual student writers, followed by interaction-based studies with monolingual tutors and multilingual student writers.

Studies of interactions between tutors and students. Studies that focus on interactions between tutors and student writers in the writing center have sought to answer various questions related to the process and product of peer feedback, which is the primary purpose of a writing center tutorial session. Some of these studies have shown a spotlight on various tutorial approaches and strategies (Davis, Hayward, Hunter, & Wallace, 1988; Fallon, 2010; J. Mackiewicz & Thompson, 2015; J. M. Mackiewicz, 2005; I. Thompson, 2009), storytelling as a means of feedback (Carroll, 2008), writing improvement as a result of conferencing (Jones,

2001), politeness strategies during conferencing (J. M. Mackiewicz, 2001), laughter as a means of relationship building (Thonus, 2008), and power differentials between tutors and student writers (Jordan, 2003; Stachera, 2003). The central theme of these studies addresses the relationship that is negotiated and developed between the tutor and the student writer as well as the nuances of the meaning negotiations that take place during the writing conferences.

Of the various tutorial approaches and strategies, one common question often researched is whether or not tutors adopt a primary directive or non-directive approach to their tutoring. While the dominant writing center theoretical position is that the tutoring approach should be non-directive (Gillespie & Lerner, 2008), with the use of Socratic questioning as the main strategy (Brooks, 1991), many studies have shown that tutors engage in a wide range of approaches from non-directive to directive. The general underlying assumption is that a more Socratic questioning approach encourages the student writer to take more ownership of their writing and to arrive at their own answers instead of the tutor's (Powers, 1993). In a more directive approach, tutors tend to occupy the role of an expert and provide specific answers to the student writer's questions. One analysis of four conversations between graduate student tutors and undergraduate student writers revealed that the roles that the four tutors occupied depended on the situational context (Davis et al., 1988). Another study that focused on technical writing conferences between 12 dyads of tutors and engineering students suggested that tutors tend to be quite flexible in their use of directive and non-directive tutorial strategies, depending on the needs of the student writer (J. M. Mackiewicz, 2005). Both Davis et al. and Mackiewicz illustrate the fluidity and variation of communication strategies at work during a writing conference.

Other studies have investigated writing center interactions from a different theoretical lens and asked research questions which investigated areas other than the process and/or the

product of the writing conference. For instance, Fallon's (2010) dissertation sought to bring

further complexity to the tenets of writing center theory and pedagogy by looking at how tutors

and student writers interacted with one another through an identity lens. Through this lens,

Fallon is able to portray the complex nature of the types of questions, goals, risks, relationships,

and levels of awareness that both the tutors and writers bring to the conference, all of which

influence the outcome of the conference. Similarly, Mackiewicz's (2001) dissertation

approached writing center interactions from an institutional discourse perspective. Arguing that

there are a limited number of roles that both the tutor and the student writer can occupy during a

writing conference, Mackiewicz suggests that while tutors may have received training to serve as

peers, more frequently than not, they occupy the role of an expert during writing conferences,

regardless of whether they are discussing content or writing issues. By adopting different

theoretical lenses, studies that focus on interactions between tutors and student writers are able to

move beyond tutorial strategies into different realms, including the interactants' lived

experiences and power relations during writing conferences, among many other different

dimensions that can influence the nature of a writing center tutorial session.

Working with multilingual writers. When multilingual writers began using writing

center services in large numbers, writing center scholars conducted various studies to investigate

the types of interactions monolingual tutors had with these writers (Blau, Hall, & Sparks, 2002;

Myers, 2003; Thonus, 2004; Williams, 2004). In general, these studies found that multilingual

writers challenged the collaborative learning and peer tutoring ideologies derived from Murray

(1982, 2003) and Bruffee (1984a, 1984b). Research suggested that tutors struggled with the

application of Socratic questioning strategies (Blau et al., 2002) when working with multilingual

student writers, with Myers (2003) proposing that tutors be given the option of providing

answers whenever they sensed that their multilingual student writers did not know the answer and Williams (2004) advocating for tutors to work with multilingual student writers on lower-order concerns such as sentence-level problems. Thonus (2004) demonstrated through her four-year-long study that monolingual tutors interacted with multilingual student writers differently. Her results showed that, when working with multilingual student writers, monolingual tutors tended to take control of the tutorials, talk more, dictate the tutorial content and direction, and engage in less small talk.

As the number of multilingual student writers visiting writing centers for assistance rises, scholars researching writing center practice have tried to meet the needs of not only writing center administrators but also writing center tutors. In this regard, Rafoth (2015) has provided much insight to better define the needs of multilingual writers and provide alternative training for tutors who help multilingual writers in writing centers. Discussions of the need to find different ways of working with multilingual writers have partially been spurred on by writing center scholars who have called for more empirical research to be done in writing center settings (Babcock & Thonus, 2012). This call has been met by researchers who have adopted a sociocultural framework and conversational analytic techniques to generate empirical information on writing center interactions (J. Mackiewicz & Thompson, 2015).

Institutional Talk

Within the context of writing center scholarship, it is useful to engage in a short discussion on the concept of institutional talk as it relates to conversation analysis so that the interactional choices between multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers can be appropriately framed. Drew and Heritage (1992a) define institutional talk as not necessarily where the talk takes place but rather how the "participants' institutional or professional identities

are … made relevant to the work activities in which they are engaged" (p. 4). In the case of the multilingual tutors and student writers in this dissertation, their "identities are … made relevant" precisely because (1) the tutors work within an academic institution, and (2) the students are there because the "activities in which they are engaged" pertain to that academic institution. Drew and Heritage, along with Heritage and Clayman (2010), further argue that institutional talk has a set of qualities that distinguishes it from other types of talk. Specifically, institutional talk is "goal-oriented in institutionally relevant ways" (p. 22). As such, participants of institutional talk can be expected to talk in specific sequences, depending on the "institution" at hand.

Many scholars have shown that within institutional talk, the participants' choices are further limited by the purposes of those interactions. For instance, Heritage and Sefi (1992) uncovered how the talk between health visitors and new mothers were specifically focused on advice giving on the part of the health visitor, regardless of whether the advice was solicited by the first-time mother. Further, the new mothers often reacted to the advice in expected ways. Heritage and Sefi's analysis of the interaction between health visitors and new mothers illustrates both the goal-oriented nature of institutional talk, regardless of where the talk takes place, and the constraints placed upon the participants in situations of institutional talk. As Drew and Heritage (2013a) further explain, "institutional contexts function to narrow the range of salient and actionable identities that may be involved in interaction" (p. xxix).

The seminal volume on *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings* (Drew & Heritage, 1992b) included institutional discourse in the medical arena, in the newsroom, and in the courtroom, among others. Other scholars have expanded upon the types of institutions under examination to include speech therapy and telephone helplines (Antaki, 2013) to explore how conversation analysis can deepen the understanding of human interaction within the confines of

institutions. Further broadening the scope of inquiry, Heritage and Clayman (2010) point out that the conversation analytic scholarship centering on institutional talk has been limited to industrialized and, for the most part, Western settings. In Waring's (2012) investigation of writing center tutorial sessions focusing on advice giving and advice seeking between writing center tutors and student writers, she proposed to study these types of interactions as institutional talk because she considers this type of talk to be "goal-oriented" and because "special constraints exist upon what is an allowable contribution to the business at hand" (p. 100). The context has thus been appropriately set for further discussion of how multilingual users of English may negotiate meaning under the constraints of academic institutional talk that is further situated within the extant postcolonial and neocolonial discourses at the University of Macau.

Thus far in this literature review, I have presented information that helps to contextualize this study. I began by offering a brief overview of the postcolonial and neocolonial discourses that are present at the University of Macau. I further discussed the complicated relationship that various stakeholders at this University have with the English language through my review of relevant World Englishes literature. Bounded by the historical context of this University, I outlined pertinent writing center scholarship and couched the interactions taking place within writing centers as institutional talk.

The next section of the literature review serves as the conceptual underpinning for this dissertation. The review of the literature first encompasses identity as it is framed in SLA since the participants of this study are multilingual student writers and tutors. Next, I discuss identity issues in writing as the study's participants engage in the act of discussing their writing during a writing center tutorial session. Finally, I discuss the scholarship on interactional identity, with an

overview of studies specifically focusing on interactional choices of negotiation and advice in discourse.

Sociocultural Perspectives and Identity Work

In the *Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, Goffman (1959) observed that individual identities and behaviors are shaped and constructed not only by one's immediate surroundings but also by those with whom the interactions take place. Following Goffman, many other scholars have further supported this observation through ethnographic work at a high school (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 1995), narratives (Pavlenko, 2007; Schiffrin, 1996), and acts of language learning (Norton, 2000), to name a few among many relevant studies. Together, these sociological foundations complement the sociocultural framework offered by Vygotsky (1978) on how learning occurs. Through these foundations, an identity lens can be used to *look at* identity enactments between multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers as they negotiate their ideas with one another in a writing center setting.

The poststructuralist view of identity is one that is dynamic as opposed to static, negotiated instead of stable, and enacted in contrast to fixed (Block, 2007a; Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, 2005, 2008; Norton, 2000; Norton & McKinney, 2011). Goffman's (1959) notion of performance lays the foundation for understanding that there is a relatively limited number and type of interactions possible between human beings, which prompted scholars such as Schiffrin (1996, 2006) to use interactional sociolinguistics as a means of understanding how identities can be co-constructed within these interactions. Further adding to other poststructuralist views, Althusser's (1972) theories on the nature of knowledge production and unequal social structures, which are produced and replicated through *Ideological and Repressive State Apparatuses*, contribute to how identity norms are established in society. His work is exemplified through

Eckert and McConnell-Ginet's (1995) ethnographic study of Belten High School, through which they conclude that identities and "labels do not exist independently of the social practice in which categories are constructed; the use of labels is not simply a matter of fitting a word to a pre-existing category" (p. 478). From the seminal works of Goffman and Althusser, poststructuralist approaches to identity construction can be seen.

With each additional scholarly contribution, the notion of identity becomes increasingly complex, in the sense that identities are seen to be constantly shifting and in flux, constructed, re-constructed, and co-constructed by social, historical, cultural, and individual factors (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005). Bucholtz and Hall's sociocultural linguistic approach to identity and interaction attempts to capture these complexities at both the local, interactional level and the macro, institutional level. However, in connection to second language acquisition (SLA), identity discussion has been much more limited focusing on narratives (Pavlenko, 2007) and classroom activities (Norton, 2000).

Within the field of SLA, sociocultural theory, which has been credited to Vygotsky (1978), serves as the underpinning framework for much of the research on how learning occurs in general. In this arena, Lantolf (2011, 2000) explains that the concept of mediation is central to Vygotsky's work. According to Lantolf (2000), Vygotsky suggested that humans "use symbolic tools, or signs, to mediate and regulate our relationships with others and with ourselves and thus change the nature of these relationships" (p. 1). The concept of mediation is central to this dissertation as multilingual tutors and student writers sit down to discuss pieces of writing through their own perspectives. In other words, as the participants interact with one another, they use words to not only negotiate meaning between one another but also together, to try to find new meaning.

In this vein, the Vygotskian (1978, p. 86) concept of the "zone of proximal development" serves the rationale of this dissertation well, especially as it relates to second language learning. Vygotsky defines the zone of proximal development as "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). In other words, for learning to take place effectively, appropriate scaffolding should be provided to the learner. In a setting such as a writing center, where "more capable peers" work to provide advice and guidance to their peers who are less experienced in academia, the zone of proximal development underpins the rest of the literature that is reviewed in this section specifically addressing identity in SLA, identity in writing, identity and interaction, and interactional choices of negotiation and advice in discourse.

In relation to SLA, Norton and McKinney (2011) have argued for a "comprehensive theory of identity that integrates the individual language learner and the larger social world" (p. 73). Their argument primarily stems from their observation that there is a relative lack of attention on the external influences exerted on the language learner in SLA studies. Taking language learning out of its social, historical, and economic context serves to isolate the language learner and language learning as individual behaviors rather than as social acts. Although Block (2003) and Ortega (2011) claim that SLA has made a social turn—and for the better—the field has still not paid enough attention to how identity negotiations and struggles affect the language learner (Firth & Wagner, 1997).

Explorations of identity in writing have also drawn on the works of Bakhtin (1981) and Fairclough (1989). For multilingual writers in the process of acquiring writing skills, writing may involve appropriation of various aspects, including voice (Matsuda, 2001), text (Chiang &

37

Schmida, 1999), and ideas (Chandrasoma et al., 2004). Such appropriation, when framed from an identity perspective and seen as a site of struggle, releases multilingual writers from the yokes of being cast as deficit learners and writers (Cumming & Riazi, 2000). This reframing opens up new doors for portrayals of multilingual writers as intelligent beings capable of complex thought processes but limited by the ability to express themselves in a second, sometimes third or fourth, language (Rafoth, 2015). However, much research in L2 writing is still focused on linguistic accuracy and error correction (Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener & Knoch, 2010; Ferris, 2010), and this attention on form and accuracy tends to trap multilingual writers in the false binary debate of the native vs. non-native speaker (Cox, 2010; Cumming & Riazi, 2000; Firth & Wagner, 1997; Ortmeier-Hooper, 2008).

These identity issues in SLA and in writing may be addressed through explorations in interaction. In this respect, the work of Schiffrin (2006), Bucholtz (2003), Bucholtz and Hall (2004, 2005, 2008, 2010), and Heritage and Clayman (2010) have laid the foundations to use interactional sociolinguistics as a means of uncovering the nuances in the constantly ongoing constructions of identities in interaction. Specifically, the conversation analytic tool as demonstrated by Heritage and Clayman, along with the framework of identity analysis developed by Bucholtz and Hall (2004, 2005), allow for further explorations in the type of identity research that Norton and McKinney (2011) have challenged researchers to conduct. A. W. He (2004) has provided a model for how conversation analysis can be conducted in a Chinese language classroom, while Wong and Waring's (2010) volume uses conversation analysis as an entry point for L2 instructors to better understand and reflect on what they are doing in class. Through this interactional identity lens and with the tools that allow for identity analysis, I explore the identity

negotiations of multilingual tutors and student writers during writing center tutorial sessions in the writing center at UM.

Identity in SLA

A brief overview of identity explorations in SLA suggests that discussions of identity seem to lie on a continuum with two groups on opposite ends that have different epistemological orientations. One camp tends to see identity as one that is constituted in the group and manifested in static social categories such as class, gender, and race (Bendle, 2002; Edwards, 2009; Joseph, 2004). This approach tends to see language learning as neatly encased individual efforts with little influence from the surrounding social contexts. The other camp takes a poststructuralist view of identity and sees it as fluid, interactionally constructed, performed, multi-aspected, in flux, and contested (Blackledge & Pavlenko, 2002; Kubota & Lin, 2009; Llamas & Watt, 2010; Norton, 2000; Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004b).

In 1997, a special issue of *TESOL Quarterly* focused on various aspects of a language learner's social identity, including sexual, racial, and class identities. With this issue, SLA scholars began to problematize the categorization of language user identities, questioning their inadequacies when describing language learners at various stages and in different circumstances. By doing so, these researchers moved identity research from the periphery toward the core of SLA focus. Key articles in this issue included Norton's (1997) exploration of the connection between identity and the notion of ownership where language learners are concerned; Duff and Uchida's (1997) chronicling of English language teachers' negotiation of their teaching identities over time; Thesen's (1997) conclusion that the identification categories used by teachers on students thus far have been inadequate; and Leung, Harris, and Rampton's (1997) investigation of the effect of demographic changes in the United Kingdom on students' identity categories.

39

For the most part, broad social identity categories have dominated discussions of identity in early SLA research. Rooted in the structuralist framework, these social identity categories, while helpful in some generalizations about particular groups of people, can also lead to possible essentialism of the language learner, which Pennycook (2001), Pavlenko (2002), and Block (2007a, 2007b) have suggested were characteristic of earlier SLA research. As defined by Bucholtz (2003), essentialism is:

> The position that the attributes and behavior of socially defined groups can be determined and explained by reference to cultural and/or biological characteristics believed to be inherent to the group. As an ideology, essentialism rests on two assumptions: (1) that groups can be clearly delimited; and (2) that group members are more or less alike. (p. 400)

That is, while it is helpful at times to be able to categorize language users based on geography, gender, economic status, nationality, culture, and profession, doing so also leaves out discussions of identity as sites of contestation, because these occurrences typically happen at the individual level and may not lend themselves to easy generalizations. Methodologically, Pavlenko (2002) has argued that this approach of using broad social identity categories as the focal point of research can be problematic. Specifically, she posits that the overreliance on questionnaires and surveys limits the types of data that can be obtained. The underrepresentation of L2 users outside of English-dominant countries severely misrepresents the language acquisition process of most L2 learners as well as the multilingual reality experienced by most of the world. Many of the studies involving multilinguals have been based on a monolingual view of the world, make untrue assumptions about the L2 learner, and see constructs such as culture and motivation as static and stable entities. In essence, Pavlenko suggests that focusing on broad social identity

40

categories does not allow for the exploration of identity enactments by multilinguals. Using an identity lens, in contrast, allows researchers to take into consideration powerful ideologies that are in play where language learners are concerned.

Further, critics of structuralist labels of identity categories (Block, 2007a; Pavlenko, 2002; Pavlenko & Norton, 2007) argue that an emphasis on these broad social categories prevents individual struggles from being foregrounded. Identity, they posit, should be recognized as fluid, multivocalic, often contradictory, and changing. This poststructuralist view of identity, as advanced by Weedon (1997) and rooted in third-wave feminism (Bucholtz, Liang, & Sutton, 1999; Butler, 1990), provides opportunities for richer characterizations of the language user, characterizations that foreground the contextual influences rather than isolating a language user's internal state. As Block (2007b) suggests, early SLA works on learner acculturation, affect, and anxiety were all implicitly related to issues of identity. However, these notions of acculturation, affect, and anxiety tended to remain firmly grounded in the structuralist framework as the researchers sought to isolate and defined identity-related issues as measurable variables.

In proposing an identity approach to SLA research, Norton and McKinney (2011) agree with the contentions of various scholars— including Norton (1997, 2000); Pavlenko (2002, 2007); Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004a); Pavlenko and Lantolf (2000); Pavlenko and Norton (2007), among others—that language learning is a site of contestation and struggle. Citing the works of Bakhtin (1981), Weedon (1997), and Bourdieu (1977) as laying poststructuralist theoretical foundations of language and subjectivity, Norton and McKinney suggest that language learning must be understood through the identity enactments of language learners. Only by understanding the language learners' investment (Norton Peirce, 1995)—as opposed to motivation—in the process of language learning and situating learners in complex real and

41

imagined communities (Anderson, 2006) can researchers begin to explore the relationship between language learners and their social practices. According to Norton and McKinney, language "is not only a linguistic system of signs and symbols but also a complex social practice through which relationships are defined, negotiated, and resisted" (p. 77). The significance of this view of language is that a language learner's various identities (as understood in the larger social structures) and identity enactments (as understood in micro interactions) take center stage.

With an identity approach, the factors influencing an L2 speaker's language learning process are subsumed under the L2 speaker's various *identification* processes. Ivanič (2006) prefers the term identification instead of identity, suggesting that there are five dimensions of identity if identity is viewed through an activity theory lens. These five dimensions are: "identity is relational; identity is discoursally constructed; identity is not so much a state as a process of identification; identity is networked; and identity is continuously reconstructed" (p. 11). In particular, she uses the term identification to emphasize that it is a process rather than a state. As such, language learning is not only about the acquisition of a set of codes and structures but also about understanding the needs of the multilingual language user, the acts of negotiation, and the sites of contestation.

This review of poststructuralist identity-related research has revealed that rather than static entities and notions, identity should be seen as dynamic, multivocalic, complex, and fluid. Moreover, these analyses that focus on the moment-to-moment (Omoniyi, 2006) enactments of identity should not overlook the larger cultural, political, institutional, and historical factors that complicate, influence, and often direct these identity co-constructions (Bucholtz & Hall, 2008; Watson-Gegeo, 2004). These reminders caution researchers to carefully consider not only the types of questions they should be asking when conducting research but also where and how to

look for rich data. Specifically, researchers should look for instances of interaction between interlocutors that allow co-constructions of identity to be foregrounded.

Identity in L2 Writing

The scholarship generated by identity-focused research has extended to writing. Exemplified by the works of Ivanič (1998, 2006), Burgess and Ivanič (2010), Petrić (2006), and Hyland (2010), these scholars seek to extend the argument that writing and identity are intimately connected. Ivanič's (1998) work linking identity and writing draws from the works of Bakhtin (1981), Fairclough (1989), and Goffman (1959). Through her analysis of eight writers, Ivanič (1998) establishes the idea that writing is not only an expression of identity but also a form of social practice. Discussions of social practice also need to include issues of power and production. Through her analysis, Ivanič proposes that there are four layers of writer identity, including the "autobiographical self," "discoursal self," "self as author," and "possibilities for self-hood" (p. 23). Continuing with her work on writing and identity, Ivanič (2006) uses activity theory to frame her research on identity construction. Ivanič contends that identity construction should be seen as a fluid and ever-changing process, using Logan, a student taking a vocational course, as an example. Ivanič chronicles how his identity is shaped and reshaped by the choices he makes, who he interacts with, what he identifies with, and how he chooses to represent himself, among other factors.

Along similar lines, Burgess and Ivanič (2010) demonstrate that a writer's identity is constructed and reconstructed by the act of writing. Petrić's (2006) study shows students' perspectives of having to write in an interdisciplinary field. Petrić challenges Hyland's (2000) argument that a part of a writer's identity has to be attributed to the discipline in which the writer belongs by revealing how this identity attribution may change if a writer has to cater to more

than one discipline. Using corpus linguistics, Hyland (2010) demonstrates that authorship identity can be illustrated through word choice. These works show a variety of theoretical frameworks, research questions, and methods used to ground the idea that writing, as a form of language, cannot be separated from the identities of the writer.

In L2 writing, discussions relating to identity have centered on two main issues, that of voice and the notion of plagiarism. In 2001, a special issue of the *Journal of Second Language Writing* explored the connection between voice and identity. In this issue, scholars such as Matsuda (2001), Ivanič and Camps (2001), Hirvela and Belcher (2001), and Prior (2001) assert that all writers, regardless of whether they are writing in their first or second language, have voice. Matsuda illustrates the dangers of essentializing culture and language and offers an emic analysis of the presence of Japanese voice that would be more difficult for researchers who do not speak Japanese to understand. Matsuda's illustration of Japanese writers demonstrating their voice in writing not only adds to the body of knowledge on L2 writers and voice but also connects issues of voice to identity. Ivanič and Camps argue that every piece of writing contains the writer's voice and that L2 writers need to be empowered to know that they have a voice rather than admonished for not asserting it. In line with Matsuda and Ivanič and Camps, Hirvela and Belcher explore the voice of experienced L2 writers and suggest that there are no problems with these L2 writers asserting their own voice in their writing. Prior, drawing on Bakhtin (1981), posits that voice is heteroglossic and exists not only in the individual but also in the social. From Goffman (1981), Prior proposes that the individual and the social are connected in the ways in which individuals are socialized into adopting a social voice. With this special issue of the *Journal of Second Language Writing*, L2 writing scholars position voice and identity as key aspects to consider when exploring L2 writers.

Although the aforementioned scholars agree that all writers have voice, they may diverge on the extent to which L2 writers have the ability to assert their own voice or whether or not they are aware of the freedom to assert their own voice. The appropriation of voice by L2 writers sometimes results in the perception of plagiarism, and research on L2 writing has also challenged the academic discourse community's interpretations of plagiarism. Scollon (1995), drawing from Goffman (1981), posits that the notion of plagiarism is rooted in the way individuals are perceived in society and how that society interprets the ownership of ideas (Chiang & Schmida, 1999). In other words, how communication occurs is not universal but contextual, and plagiarism should not be viewed as an abstract, universal concept devoid of any social, cultural, and political value.

Scollon's (1995) examination of plagiarism lays the foundations for other scholars, such as Pennycook (1996), Chandrasoma et al. (2004), and Ouellette (2008) to discuss notions of identity as they relate to the appropriation of ideas. As Norton and McKinney (2011) suggest, from an identity approach, language learners, and thus L2 writers, "need to struggle to appropriate the voices of others" (p. 81). Pennycook follows Scollon's discussion of language ownership and suggests, based on Bakhtin (1981), that all language is borrowed from someone else. This postulation impacts the identities of L2 writers because it moves the discussion from one of penalty and guilt to one of epistemological understanding. Building on Pennycook, Chandrasoma et al. propose to not only challenge the use of the term *plagiarism* (as it suggests the idea that words can be owned and thus stolen) but also reframe the notion of plagiarism as *transgressive* and *nontransgressive intertextuality*, thereby placing the L2 writer's identity negotiations and appropriations at the center of discussion.

The notion of intertextuality warrants further explanation because it lies at the intersection of academic writing and an L2 writer's identity negotiations. Chandrasoma et al. (2004) define the term *intertextuality* as "multiple strands of knowledges within texts designed to produce desired meanings" (2004, p. 175). To allow for a deeper discussion of how a writer's text can be impacted by his/her political, social, and contextual worlds, Chandrasoma et al. further separate the concept of intertextuality into three different modes, including "conceptual, complementary, and metalinguistic intertextuality" (2004, p. 175). "Conceptual intertextuality" deals with the interplay of different texts while "complementary" and "metalinguistic intertextuality" involve texts mixed in with the writer's viewpoint through examples (complementary) or through linguistic strategies such as stance markers (metalinguistic). By explicating intertextuality in this manner, a fuller discussion of how a writer's words can be impacted by context is possible. In other words, an L2 writer's identity and voice appropriations as manifested in academic writing can be presented in a more profound manner.

Other scholars have continued to pursue the issue of intertextuality, as established by Chandrasoma et al. (2004), and how L2 writers negotiate not only between their own various identity enactments but also how to appropriately incorporate the voices of others. One example of such work is provided by Ouellette's (2008) study of an L2 writer whose identities are shaped by her discourse and vice versa as the writer works through various issues of intertextuality, voice, and agency. Another example highlights middle school L2 writers navigating between their different situational and cultural contexts (Bunch & Willett, 2013). Finally, Morton, Storch, and Thompson (2015) present case studies of three Australian freshmen L2 students dealing with how their social worlds impact their academic worlds.

Other scholars exploring the connection between identity and L2 writing have focused on race in research (E. Lee & Simon-Maeda, 2006), academic publishing (A. S. Canagarajah, 2002b; Englander, 2009; Flowerdew & Wang, 2016; Heng Hartse & Kubota, 2014; Hyland, 2016; Lillis & Curry, 2010), and L2 teacher identity (Aneja, 2016; Higgins & Ponte, 2017; Kubota & Lin, 2009; I. Lee, 2010; G. Park, 2012, 2013; Phan Le Ha, 2008; Phan Le Ha & Baurain, 2011; Trent, 2012; Tsui, 2007). Additionally, compositionists, who thus far have dealt mostly with L1 writers, have entered the identity conversation with an edited volume called *Reinventing Identities in Second Language Writing* (Cox, Jordan, Ortmeier-Hooper, & Schwartz, 2010b), further providing support that discussions of language and writing cannot be separated from the user and hence, the user's identities.

Although it appears that there is ample scholarship on investigations of L2 writer identity negotiations with voice, text, and audience, much more can be done. For example, Cox, Jordan, Ortmeier-Hooper, and Schwartz (2010a) call for more cross-disciplinary discussions involving applied linguists and compositionists. Kubota and Lin (2009) argue that there is little information available on the influences of the teacher's various social identities and how these social identities are constructed and negotiated in different contexts. The writing center arena is yet another context where L2 writer identities have not been explored. This dissertation investigates identity enactments in multilingual writing center tutor and multilingual student writer interactions.

Identity and Interaction

As Block (2003) and Ortega (2011) have argued, SLA research has made a social turn. In relation to identity research, the debate continues as to how to situate the knowledge that identity is a construct. In other words, this revelation about identity has prompted the proverbial *so what*

question. By categorically rejecting what they term a psychosocial approach of identity research, Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004b) have argued for a poststructuralist approach. In their critique, they discuss the role of interactional sociolinguistics in identity research and suggest that it, too, has limitations. For Pavlenko and Blackledge, interactional sociolinguistics is too limiting to be able to talk about the larger contexts that play into a person's identity construction process in his/her language acquisition processes. Citing Heller's (1992) study as an example, Pavlenko and Blackledge suggest that code-switching, which is a major focus of interactional sociolinguistics, should be subsumed under the category of linguistic practices and analyzed within larger political, social, historic, economic, and cultural contexts. However, Deckert and Vickers (2011) propose that interactional sociolinguistics can contribute both methodology and theory to identity construction and negotiation and should play a primary role in such research.

While these conversations between different methodological approaches to studying identity are on-going, another issue within the field which cannot be ignored is pragmatics and what these pragmatic choices imply about the users' identities as perceived by others. Specifically, Mendoza-Denton (1999) suggests that the notion of *stance* plays an important role in both micro- and macro-analyses. From her research, stance can be used to determine alignment with interlocutors, but stance can also have symbolic links to one's identity. How these identities are enacted is connected to the pragmatic strategies used by speakers. In the same volume, Liang (1999) focuses on how gay and lesbian speakers develop a specific pragmatic language of communication, a language that is only accessible by speakers who do not apply the dominant gender norms of heterosexuality to their speech content.

From these initial investigations of the connection between identity and pragmatics, identity scholars such as Hall and Bucholtz (2013) now suggest that identity work needs to take

pragmatics into account and vice versa. In their review of a special 2013 *Journal of Politeness Research* issue focusing on the intersection between face and identity, Hall and Bucholtz discuss the divergence in the interpretation of the meaning of *face* as originated by Goffman (1967) and reframed by Brown and Levinson (1978). Specifically, Hall and Bucholtz argue that Goffman's original definition of face placed heavy emphasis on its relation to the interlocutors. Brown and Levinson's definition of face suggested a universality of face enactments that emanate from within the individual. Moreover, Hall and Bucholtz contend that Goffman's definition allows for the consideration of identity co-construction because identity is performative and thus based on the changing social contexts.

Several studies have demonstrated how stance and identity enactments change in relation to pragmatics. One such study by Miller (2013) details the researcher's interview with a Vietnamese woman about her English language learning experience. According to Miller, as the researcher aligned herself more closely with the participant through pragmatic strategies, the stance that the participant took toward the researcher changed. Miller's study illustrates that the relational aspect of identity changes through pragmatics. Another study of a gatekeeping encounter (Kerekes, 2007) suggests that success or failure during recruitment interviews is co-constructed through pragmatics. Similarly, Reissner-Roubicek (2012) demonstrates how gender is highlighted and co-constructed in recruitment interviews of female engineers.

As both a theoretical approach and a methodological analytic tool, Conversation Analysis (CA) has played a central role in studies involving identity and interaction. According to Drew and Heritage (2013a), much of the work on CA provides opportunities for deeper understandings into the complexities of interactional identity. In a departure from researchers who tended to argue that identities are static categories, conversation analysts typically "began

with a multidimensional view of identity" (p. xxviii) which then allowed the analyst to explore

different identity enactments within interactions. In particular, conversational analytic methods

are effective in investigating identities which are inferred by interlocutors. For example, Oh's

(2010) study of the way interlocutors use quasi-pronouns in Korean conversations highlights the

importance of interaction in determining which of the interlocutors' identities become

foregrounded in conversation. Similarly, Richards's (2006) investigation of classroom discourse

using conversation analytic techniques revealed that when teachers enacted different identities in

a classroom setting, the interactional patterns they used also changed accordingly. The studies

undertaken by scholars such as Oh and Richards demonstrate the myriad of possibilities for

conversation analysis to unveil intricacies and complexities in human interaction, especially in

relation to identity.

The Rendering of Negotiation and Advice in Discourse

Within the arena of interactional identities, many scholars have sought to explore how

acts of negotiation occur within interactions and how these negotiations influence and shape the

identities of the interlocutors. Angouri (2012) posits that not only are identities co-constructed in

interaction but also the "process of negotiation and co-construction is salient to the participants'

mutual understanding of each other's roles and identities" (p. 123). Firth's (1995) edited volume

on workplace negotiation strategies laid a solid foundation for further exploration of how

negotiation strategies shape and are shaped by the interlocutors. In particular, Boden (1995)

argued that negotiation should not be conceived of as a singular event. In her study of business

meetings, she found that negotiation actually occurs in stages and that each stage is contingent

upon the result of the previous stage. Additionally, Boden demonstrated through her analysis of

meetings that negotiation is meaningful only to those who are engaged in the act and thus should be seen locally as "negotiation-as-interaction" (p. 99).

Negotiation and how it occurs within interactions also underpins much of the goal-oriented institutional talk (Drew & Heritage, 2013a; Heritage & Clayman, 2010) that take place in writing center tutorial sessions. It has yet to be discovered how interlocutor identities are influenced and changed based on the idea negotiations taking place in the tutorial sessions. A sampling of scholarly work focusing on how negotiation strategies influence identity enactments and vice versa have included investigations into how German L2 users utilized code-switching and repair as their negotiation strategies in conversation (Huth, 2006); inquiries into face negotiations in post-observation feedback meetings between a teacher trainer and pre-service teachers (Copland, 2011), and explorations of identity enactments in bilingual classrooms involving fourth grade boys as they negotiated their understanding of an unknown vocabulary word (Handsfield & Crumpler, 2013). These studies focusing on the intersection of negotiation-as-interaction and identity in interaction serve to illustrate how negotiation strategies are used as a means to an end. Whether the end is expected or not, the identities of the interlocutors change because of the way the negotiations take place.

Similarly, how advice is given and received in discourse hinges on how the information is negotiated between interlocutors. According to Locher and Limberg (2012), "Advice exchanges constitute a communicative act that is subject to negotiation between the speaker (or writer) and the addressee (or reader)" (p. 1). Certain advice exchanges are imbued with potential differential power dynamics between interlocutors, differential bases of knowledge between the interactants, the context through which the advice is given and sought, and whether or not the advice given is sought in the first place (Locher & Limberg, 2012). The complexities of advice

51

giving and advice receiving may also be on display in various ways in writing center tutorial sessions involving multilingual tutors and student writers as they work through a piece of text with the student writer seeking advice for improvement from a more capable peer.

Both Waring (2005, 2007a, 2007b, 2012) and I. Park (2014, 2017) have focused attention on the negotiation of advice in writing center tutorial sessions, in particular the nature of advice resistance (I. Park, 2014, 2017; Waring, 2005), how advice is given (Waring, 2007b), and how advice is accepted (Waring, 2007a). Both scholars use CA to capture and analyze the interactions taking place between writing center tutors and student writers. Waring's (2005) study illustrates how a graduate student writer resists advice using various strategies, depending on the types of advice the student received from the tutor. Of the five strategies that Waring found the graduate student to be using, "invoke authority" is particularly interesting because both the tutor and the graduate student engaged in this practice (p. 147). Specifically, Waring suggests that the graduate student used her instructor as the absent authorial voice to override the tutor's advice, and the tutor countered with an absent authorial voice of his own to assert his point. I. Park's (2017) investigation attends to how L2 student writers resist advice. Her findings show the L2 writers in her study employed question techniques often used by teachers to resist the advice of their tutors. That is, the student writers in her study couched their advice resistance in the form of a question or tried to propose suggestions different from the ones offered by the tutors. The scholarship of Waring and Park demonstrates not only the appropriateness of the use of conversation analytic methods to delve into the complexities of human interaction focusing on advice giving and receiving but also the opportunities that exist to extend the investigation into other contexts such as the one in Macao.

Through these types of interaction-based investigations, in conjunction with an identity approach, I explore how multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers might construct and co-construct each other's identities as they discuss a piece of writing. The studies referenced in this section have demonstrated that an interactional sociolinguistics approach can bring together both a micro and a macro perspective on identity construction, with the micro focusing on the moment-to-moment interactions and the macro centering on how the co-constructed identities connect to the larger social, historical, political, economic, and cultural contexts.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, I have explained the constructivist theoretical paradigm in which this study is based. Consistent with such a paradigm, I have outlined the historical, social, and political backgrounds of the research site to appropriately contextualize my findings. To this end, I have discussed how the University of Macau became a campus where English is used as the instructional medium even though the vast majority of the local population speaks Cantonese as their everyday language. I have also highlighted the more recent and ever-increasing presence of the use of Putonghua as the default Chinese in a community where Cantonese is now competing to occupy that same space. To connect between the macro contextual information with the micro context, I have discussed relevant writing center scholarship focusing on interactions between tutors and student writers. I have argued that writing center interactions should be seen as institutional talk and discussed the constraints on identity work that can occur in that context.

Once cast as institutional talk, discussions of identity work focusing on multilingual language users can be introduced. Along with those discussions, it is paradigmatically consistent and appropriate to review literature on sociocultural theory pertaining to identity work in SLA, writing, and the intersection of the two areas. Finally, as investigations into identity enactments

require appropriate analytic tools, I discuss how conversation analytic methods have been used to explore negotiation strategies within interactional identity creation and discursive advice within interactions.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This dissertation explores the layers of interaction between multilingual writing center tutors and multilingual student writers during their writing center tutorial sessions. The increase in the number of university writing centers with multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers signifies a need to describe how their views on writing influence their interactions and vice versa. More importantly, a rich description of such events may uncover the various identities that both the multilingual tutor and student writer enact when they discuss a piece of writing. I seek to answer Norton and McKinney's (2011) call to investigate multilingual language users from a perspective that sees them as "negotiating and renegotiating a sense of self in relation to the larger social world, and renegotiating that relationship in multiple dimensions of their lives" (p. 73). Focusing on interactions between multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers can provide a better understanding of how their identities intersect with the larger social structure of an English-language educational setting within a World Englishes context. Such an understanding can lead to not only a deeper appreciation of the challenges faced by multilingual student writers when they engage with a piece of writing but also how their relationship to a piece of text is mediated by their identities. A rich portrait of the thinking and negotiation processes lying underneath multilingual student writers' at-times limited written words can help the world to see the level of sophistication and complexity in thinking that these writers may not yet be able to express with their written words.

To this end, I have proposed the following primary research question and two secondary questions:

1. What are the interactional choices that multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers make during a writing center tutorial session?

    a. How do the participants feel about the choices that they made during the writing center tutorial session?

    b. What influences the interactional choices that they made during the writing center tutorial session?

To begin to answer these questions, I turn to a discussion of the ethical considerations that went into the research design. The chapter includes a description of the research setting, participants, data sources and collection procedures, and data analysis procedures and interpretation tools. The chapter ends with a discussion on issues of trustworthiness.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical considerations that all researchers need to address revolve around the overarching theme of participant protection. Simultaneously, the Institutional Review Board (IRB) oversees all research projects and works with researchers to ensure that study participants are not only protected but also that the potential for harm to the participants is reduced. This project received IRB approval (see Appendix A), but it is still worthwhile to engage in an ethical considerations discussion on the matter of participant protection. As part of obtaining IRB approval, I completed the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI), but the training only provides broad guidelines. Smith (2000) discusses principles to which all researchers should adhere, and these are: "respect for persons and their autonomy," "beneficence and nonmaleficence," "justice," "trust," and "fidelity and scientific integrity" (p. 5). I address each of these principles as they relate to my study.

The first step I took to ensure that I was following Smith's (2000) principles of "respect for persons and their autonomy" and "trust" was to safeguard the importance of choice in whether tutors and students wanted to participate in the study. Since the study site was a university writing center, I first introduced my study to the writing center coordinator and sought the coordinator's permission to approach the tutors under the coordinator's supervision. Once the coordinator gave permission (see Appendix B), I requested a time slot to introduce my study to the tutors during their regular staff meeting. At this meeting, I gave a brief overview of the study's purpose and answered questions. I then followed up with an email to individual tutors (see Appendix C) asking if they would be interested to participate in the study. Approached in this way, I felt that tutors had the maximum autonomy to decide whether or not they wanted to participate without feeling peer-pressured into doing so. They would also have time to think about the commitment they would be making if they were to get involved with the study. Before tutors signed the Informed Consent Form (see Appendix D), I met with each tutor individually to answer questions. Smith (2000) and Rubin and Rubin (2004) suggest that thorough explanation of the purposes of the study is part of the trust building process. Lastly, the time that I spent at the writing center volunteering should also contribute to trust building. I approached obtaining student participants in a similar manner even though the steps were different.

The principle of "beneficence and nonmaleficence" also discusses minimizing risk to participants (Smith, 2000). Creswell (2007) and Patton (2002) suggest that minimizing risk not only includes how the researcher interacts with participants during data collection but also the storage of the data once it has been collected. To help ensure anonymity and further reduce risk to participants, all data collected were assigned pseudonyms as soon as possible. Notably, I am not using a pseudonym for the University of Macau since the setting of Macao underpins much

of the context of this study. Because there is only one writing center in Macao, no purpose is served by providing a pseudonym for the university where the study is situated. Since there are relatively few writing center tutors, I have used other means of ensuring anonymity through providing composite background information on the tutors.

Smith's (2000) principle of "justice" includes issues of power differences between the researcher and her participants. I address this issue by adopting Denzin's (2009) feminist communitarian approach to research. Both Denzin (2009) and Christians (2011) argue that part of the reason researchers hold much more power than participants is the lack of dialogue as well as the manner in which researchers position themselves in their study. Giampapa's (2011) reflection of how her various identities (as researcher, as a multilingual, as a woman, as a heterosexual) shifted and were repositioned based on interactions with her participants demonstrates how power may not always reside with the researchers. What lies at the heart of these shifting positionalities and identities, however, is a constant dialogue with Giampapa's participants. The conversations illustrate one of the fundamental principles of the feminist communitarian model to approaching issues of power. By emphasizing mutuality, feminist communitarians reposition the concept of power into a "relationship not of domination but of intimacy and vulnerability" (p. 74).

Research Setting and Participants

At the time of the study, the University of Macau currently had around 9,000 undergraduate and graduate students (University of Macau, 2015), and the entire university relocated to a new campus built in China in 2014. The research study was conducted in the university's writing center, which was staffed by six multilingual graduate students, who each worked 12-18 hours a week, and one full-time English language teaching faculty who received a

58

one-course reduction to coordinate the center. The writing center averages more than 800 visitors per academic year, with around 280 students coming specifically for writing center tutorial sessions (M. Ma, personal communication, March 17, 2016). The vast majority of visitors to the writing center are undergraduate students from the university, whose student body is composed of mostly local Macao students (approximately 80%), followed by around 20% mainland Chinese students (H. G. Jin, personal communication, January 6, 2017). Most students visit the writing center to discuss assignments given by faculty, more than half of whom obtained their final degrees in Asia (University of Macau, 2011). Further, less than 25% of the faculty obtained their final degrees in North America, and faculty who received their education in Europe came in third at around 18% (University of Macau, 2011). The diversity of faculty background and education differs from that of the students.

Participants

All participants came from the University of Macau, and participants were obtained in two stages. In the first stage, I sought to find writing center tutors as participants. Purposeful random sampling was the method used to obtain the tutors as participants. Patton (2002) explains that using purposeful random sampling helps achieve credibility rather than representativeness. For the multilingual tutors, purposeful random sampling was done via a presentation of this dissertation study during one of the regular meetings held by the writing center coordinator with her tutors. Once I had a number of tutors who consented to participating in the study, I moved to the second stage of obtaining student writer participants.

For the multilingual student writers, the procedure of obtaining participants differed, but the same method of purposeful random sampling was applied. Specifically, the writing center coordinator granted me access to the writing center's appointment calendar. The appointment

calendar is set up to allow students to select a date, a time, and a tutor. On the appointment calendar, tutors are numbered rather than named, which means that first time visitors to the writing center may not know the name of the tutor with whom they would work. Based on my own availability and whether the tutor had already consented to participating in the study, I sent out email invitations (see Appendix E) to individual student writers who had made appointments with consenting tutors. Consent was obtained from the student writers prior to the start of their appointment (see Appendix F).

Data Sources and Collection Procedures

Data gathered included 1) brief participant background information, 2) researcher observation notes and journal, 3) tutorial session video recordings, 4) interviews of multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers using on video playback, and 5) texts from multilingual student writers.

Participant Background Information

A total of six multilingual tutors and a total of eight multilingual student writers participated in the study. Coincidentally, all of those who agreed to participate in the study were female. The following table presents the various dyad combinations of the eight tutorial sessions recorded (see Table 1). Because of the relative small number of tutors who have worked at the writing center, some of the biographical information and years of experience presented here have been altered to maintain participant anonymity (Lillis & Curry, 2010).

Table 1

Tutorial Session Dyads (all names are pseudonyms)

Session	Tutor	Student	Session Length	Language(s) Used
1	Marion	Cathy	30 minutes	English
2	Emma	Arizona	45 minutes	English, Putonghua
3	Christy	Paula	25 minutes	English, Putonghua
4	Abby	Kelly	45 minutes	English, Putonghua
5	Kaila	Laura	40 minutes	English, Putonghua
6	Abby	Ellen	45 minutes	English, Putonghua
7	Abby	Beth	40 minutes	English, Putonghua
8	Faye	Vicky	65 minutes	English

Tutors

Emma. At the time of the data collection, Emma was a graduate student majoring in Translation Studies. She had been tutoring at the writing center for 2.5 years. She considered her first and best language to be Cantonese, followed by Putonghua, then by English. Emma was born in China and received her undergraduate degree in English from a university located in Northern China.

Marion. Marion was an English Literature graduate student. She had a Bachelor's degree in English Education from a university in Southern China. She had two years of tutoring experience with the writing center. Marion considered her first and best language to be Cantonese, followed by Putonghua, then by English.

Abby. Abby was an English Studies graduate student. She had one year of tutoring experience with the writing center. Putonghua was her first and best language and English as her second language. Prior to her arrival at the University of Macau, Abby studied to become a teacher of Chinese language, majoring in Teaching Chinese as a Second Language at a university in Southwestern China.

Kaila. Unlike most of the tutors at the writing center, Kaila was not a graduate student in an English program. She was one of the few Chinese Education graduate tutors. She did, however, have a Bachelor's degree in English Studies from a university in Southern China. Kaila tutored in Cantonese (her first language), English, and Putonghua. She had 1.5 years of tutoring experience at the writing center.

Christy. A graduate student in Translation Studies, Christy has two years of tutoring experience. Putonghua was her first language and English her second, but she did not speak Cantonese. Christy had a Bachelor's degree, also in Translation Studies, from a university in Northern China.

Faye. Faye's primary languages were Cantonese and English, followed by Putonghua. She completed her Bachelor's degree in English Language and Literature from a university in Southern China and was currently a graduate student in English Studies. She had 1.5 years of tutoring experience.

Students

Cathy. Cathy was a year one student in the Faculty of Education. Cantonese and English were her operating languages. Based on her performance in the university's entrance examination, Cathy was placed into an advanced English language proficiency course focusing on academic English. Cathy was required to write a short research paper for one of her

assignments. She stated in the writing center's appointment system that she wanted to work on improving her essay organization as well as transitions. A first-time visitor to the writing center, Cathy indicated that she had brought her first draft to her appointment. Cathy's appointment was with Marion.

Arizona. A year one student majoring in Pre-primary Education, Arizona brought her first draft of a summary-response assignment to the writing center for her appointment with Emma. Arizona stated that she wanted to work on improving her focus for the assignment as well as organization. This visit was Arizona's fourth to the writing center, indicating that Arizona was a frequent user of the writing center's services. Arizona spoke Putonghua and English but said that she had been trying to learn and speak Cantonese with her local friends.

Paula. Paula was a first-year English Literature graduate student in the Faculty of Arts and Humanities. Putonghua and English were Paula's main languages. Paula was preparing to take a test called "Test for English Majors, Band 8" (TEM-8) at the time she made her appointment with tutor Christy. The TEM-8 is officially recognized by the Chinese government as an indicator of English language proficiency. Paula was working on answering one of the sample writing prompts in a test preparation book. A regular visitor at the writing center, Paula sought help on brainstorming, idea development, documentation/citation, and identifying grammar patterns.

Kelly. Kelly was one of the five undergraduate students who came to the writing center to seek help on crafting her personal statement and curriculum vitae for her application to Honours College. Honours College is a program at the University of Macau designed for high achievers. Those who are admitted into the program undergo leadership training and study abroad for one semester at a prestigious university in the United States or Portugal. They also complete a

63

capstone project in their fourth year. At the time of writing, the application period was March 1 to March 24, 2016. Applicants were required to submit a 300-word personal statement, along with a curriculum vitae (CV) and academic transcript.

The recorded visit occurred during the second week of March, and it was her fourth visit of the academic year. Kelly worked with tutor Abby for this particular visit. Kelly stated that the personal statement she brought in was her first draft, and she wanted help identifying grammar patterns. Kelly was a year one Finance major in the Faculty of Business Administration, and she spoke Putonghua and English. Kelly's English placement test scores indicated that she was a lower-intermediate user of English.

Laura. Another applicant to the Honours College was Laura, who brought in her 300-word personal statement and curriculum vitae for feedback with tutor Kaila during the third week of March. Laura's English placement test scores indicated that she was an upper-intermediate user of English. A year one Pre-primary Education major, Laura brought her revised statement to the appointment. She had two prior consultations with different tutors on the same personal statement before meeting with Kaila. Laura's main languages are Putonghua and English.

Ellen. Ellen met with tutor Abby in the third week of March to work on her personal statement and curriculum vitae for Honours College. Although Ellen indicated that her statement was a revised draft, she specifically sought help on brainstorming. Ellen was a year one Government and Public Policy major with the Faculty of Social Sciences. Ellen's English placement test scores indicated that she was an upper-intermediate user of English. Ellen's family immigrated to Macao when Ellen was a child, and she spoke Cantonese, Putonghua, and English.

Beth. In the third week of March, Beth made an appointment with tutor Abby to work on her Honours College application. Beth's English placement test scores indicated that she was an intermediate user of English. Beth was an English Education major in the Faculty of Education. Beth brought both her revised personal statement and her curriculum vitae to the writing center, and she had specific questions on thesis statements, documentation, and grammar patterns. Beth's main languages were Putonghua and English.

Vicky. Vicky was a year one Hospitality Management major with the Faculty of Business Administration, and she was applying to Honours College. She brought the first draft of her personal statement, along with her curriculum vitae, to her writing center appointment with tutor Faye in the fourth week of March. The recorded visit was Vicky's first visit to the writing center, and she requested help on the following issues: organization and identifying grammar patterns. Vicky spoke Cantonese, Putonghua, and English.

Tutorial Session Video Recordings and Observation Notes

Consistent with the ethnographic methods approach I used for this study, I video-recorded the writing center tutorial sessions and took observation notes of those sessions. According to Angrosino and Rosenberg (2011), the settings and the interactions that take place between human beings in those settings are what make up observations. Through observation, I saw how multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers interacted in a non-classroom setting with one another and with the text on which they were working, and I noted those interactions in my observation protocol (see Appendix G), which I created following the format recommended by Creswell (2007). The protocol included possible seating arrangements between the participants and notations on the various possibilities for the direction and level of interaction between participants.

A total of eight video recordings were made of the tutorial sessions conducted by the six tutors of eight students. Tutor Abby had three recorded sessions while Emma, Faye, Christy, Marion, and Kaila each had one. The sessions varied in length. The shortest was 25 minutes while the longest was 65 minutes. English was the language used to conduct the sessions in two instances, while English and Putonghua were used together to conduct the other six sessions.

All videos were recorded at each tutor's station at the writing center. In his study of turn-taking and back-channeling, Yngve (1970) discusses the rationale of videotaping participant conversations so as to allow the researcher to review these interactions to look for various turn signals. He suggests that the researcher has to be aware of camera placement and angle. I had discussed the issue of camera placement with the participating tutors and suggested moving to a quieter room next to the writing center that would have also given me a consistent camera angle. However, the participating tutors voiced concern that moving to another more isolated and quieter location may create additional anxiety for the students, who are accustomed to meeting in the writing center. This concern echoes Waring (2005), who mentions that changing the environmental dynamics of where tutorials are typically conducted "would change the authenticity of the interaction" (p. 145). In fact, the presence of the video camera was brought up by one of the tutors who mentioned a student's particular reaction as a possible reaction to her awareness of being video-taped. The tutors also expressed their own preference to be in the writing center, where there is ready access to computers in case they need to look up something for their students.

Video Playback Interviews

The technique of video-stimulated accounts has been used by a number of researchers who wanted to have the participants' perspective of their intentions behind their actions. Some of

these works include research that focus on interaction—including interview interactions between U.S. immigration officers and prospective permanent residents (Johnston, 2008), interactions between children at a playground (Theobald, 2012), interactions between married couples who sought counseling (Long, Angera, & Hakoyama, 2006), and interactions between teachers and students (D. J. Clarke, 1997). Video-stimulated accounts have also been used in studies focusing on student-to-student interactions (Vickers, 2004) and on reflection, including instructors' reflections on their teaching (Choppin, 2009). My use of the playback interviews should be considered as video-stimulated accounts which according to Theobald (2012) are events "co-constructed by the participants within a particular situation of interaction" (p. 33–34).

From a Sacksian (1984) perspective, no amount of video-stimulated recall would be sufficient to reconstruct an interaction, but that was not the aim of this study. The aim of including video playback interviews was to enrich the description of the interactions that take place between the multilingual writing center tutors, the multilingual student writers, and the artifacts on which they work. By using video playback interviews, participants were given more opportunities to provide their perspective of the recorded interactions, thereby allowing for a thick description of their interactions.

Video playback interviews were scheduled with tutors and student writers separately. Rubin and Rubin's (2004) responsive interview model served as the interview format during the video playback interview process. I chose this format for three reasons. First, it emphasizes the mutuality in an interview process and the relationship that is developed between all parties of the interview process. Second, the format aims for depth of information, which is "achieved by going after context" (p. 35). Third, the format allows for flexibility to make changes as themes emerge from different interviews.

To aid with the tutors' and students' memory recall, attempts were made to schedule the video playback interviews within two weeks of the tutorial sessions. A total of nine interviews were conducted within the two-week timeframe while the other seven interviews had to be rescheduled beyond the two-week timeframe due to various scheduling conflicts. Although less than ideal, three of the interviews had to be scheduled after a semester break. According to Gass and Mackey (2007), the more time that elapses between the event and the recall of that event, the more likely some type of interference or loss of memory of the event can occur. However, it should be noted that other researchers hold contrasting opinions on the use of video playback as a data collection method. Pomerantz (2005) also acknowledges that video stimulated accounts have their limitations but proposes that its use can enhance the richness of data. Thus, I did not aim for my participants to reconstruct the writing center tutorial session. Rather, I asked them to further elaborate on specific interactions that took place.

A total of 16 video playback interviews were audio-recorded. The recordings were done at the researcher's office. During the interviews, tutors and student writers watched specific segments of the tutorial session videos that the researcher had marked earlier, following the Video Playback Interview Protocol (see Appendix H). In other words, I watched each tutorial session video at least twice, once to look for instances where there were student-initiated interactions and once to look for instances where there were tutor-initiated interactions. Segments of the video where there was prolonged silence because either the tutor or the student was reading the text were skipped over to save the participants' time. The video playback interviews varied in length between 20 to 55 minutes. English was the language used to conduct the video playback interviews for 12 of the 16 interviews. A combination of English and Putonghua was used for the other four interviews.

Collection of Textual Data

Images of student writing and assignments were taken at the end of each writing center tutorial session. The assignments and drafts were photographed so that students could keep their original files with them. In instances where the student brought a soft copy of her work to the tutorial, those texts were emailed to me subsequent to the tutorial. The textual data served as an aid to assist participants in their recall of the writing center tutorial session during the playback interview process. The texts were particularly helpful pieces of information to the research questions as the conversation between the multilingual tutor and multilingual student writer revolved around the text in relation to themselves and the purpose of the writing center tutorial session. As Hodder (2003) cautions, it is difficult to arrive at a common understanding and meaning of documents and material culture because so much of the meaning is derived from the context in which the material is used. Textual data, in this study, mediated the discussion between the tutors and student writers during the writing center tutorial sessions and served to stimulate the participants' memories during the playback interviews.

Research Timeline

I began collecting data after my Institutional Review Board (IRB) application was approved on October 7, 2015 (see Appendix A). All data collection ended in April 2016. During this time, I video-recorded eight writing center tutorial sessions and collected the texts used in the sessions. I also audio-recorded 16 playback interviews. As Glaser and Strauss (1999) discuss, the use of a constant comparative method as I gathered data allowed me to make minor revisions (for improvement) to my data collection method since I did not have to wait until all data had been collected before beginning the analysis process. I needed to analyze the tutorial session videotapes before I could conduct the playback interviews. As such, I moved back and forth

between the recording of different tutorial sessions and the recording of different playback interviews.

The following table presents a timeline of data collection (see Table 2). As can be seen from the table, much more data was collected in March, which is typically a busy time of the semester for the writing center.

Table 2

Data Collection Timeline

Month	Data Collection Tasks
October 2015	• Received IRB approval; began recruiting participants via email
	• Collected informed consent forms and videotaped tutorial 1
	• Started researcher's journal and preliminary analysis
November 2015	• Videotaped tutorial 2
	• Maintained researcher's journal and continued with analysis
December 2015	• Audiotaped playback interviews 1 and 2 with tutors
	• Maintained researcher's journal and continued with analysis
January 2016	• Audiotaped playback interviews 1 and 2 with students
	• Maintained researcher's journal and continued with analysis
February 2016	• Videotaped tutorial 3
	• Maintained researcher's journal and continued with analysis
March 2016	• Audiotaped playback interviews 3 with tutor and student
	• Completed videotaping and audiotaping of tutorial 4
	• Videotaped tutorial 5, 6, 7, and 8

	- Audiotaped playback interviews 5, 6, and 7 with students
	- Maintained researcher's journal and continued with analysis
April 2016	- Audiotaped playback interviews 5, 6, 7, and 8 with tutors
	- Audiotaped playback interview 8 with student
	- Maintained researcher's journal and continued with analysis

Data Analysis and Interpretation Tools

As Glaser and Strauss (1999) discuss, constant comparative method (Glaser, 1978, 1992, 1998) is a means of generating theory that provides flexibility for the researcher to not have to wait until all data has been collected before analysis takes place. Constant comparative method was the primary method used to improve upon subsequent writing center tutorial video-recordings and playback interviews. The flexibility granted to the researcher allows for not only reflection but also revision of data collection tools to better answer this study's research questions.

To provide context and situate the data, I applied Heritage and Clayman's (2010) conversation analytic methods as they relate to institutional talk. Heritage and Clayman argue that Conversation Analysis (CA) should take into account institutional influences to situate the conversations. They propose that institutional talk is characterized by the following:

1 the interaction normally involves the participants in specific goal orientations *which are tied to their institution-relevant identities*: President-elect and Chief Justice, doctor and patient, teacher and student, etc.;

2 the interaction involves special constraints on what will be treated as allowable contributions to the business at hand; and

3 the interaction is associated with inferential frameworks and procedures that are

particular to specific institutional contexts. (Heritage & Clayman, 2010, p. 34)

Because the writing center tutorial sessions between the multilingual tutors and multilingual

student writers are taking place within an educational institution, it is possible to use Heritage

and Clayman's definition of institutional talk as a starting point to analyze the conversations that

take place between the tutor and student writer.

However, the interactions between this study's participants are further complicated by not

only their multilingual identities but also the fact that they come from non-Western societies

where hierarchical relationships that typically constitute institutional talk may not be the same as

those in Western societies (Heritage & Clayman, 2010). Heritage and Clayman also point to the

limited CA-based research available outside of industrialized contexts, and the participants'

cultural and linguistic backgrounds may be factors that serve as a point of departure to the four-

phase framework—"opening," "problem initiation," "disposal," and "closing," (p. 41)—they

propose.

After situating the data within institutional talk, I turned my focus to the interactions

between the multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers. These interactions were

analyzed through a constructivist lens. Specifically, I applied Bucholtz and Hall's (2005)

sociocultural linguistic approach to identity and interaction. Their framework argues that identity

"operates at multiple levels simultaneously" and so is suitable to describe the different identities

performed by the participants in the study (p. 586). I also applied Vygotsky's (1978, p. 86)

concept of the "zone of proximal development" in my analysis since the interactions between the

tutors and student writers is one where the tutors are helping the student writers to improve their

writing.

Transcription, Translation, and Coding

  Transcription. Many scholars have noted that transcriptions and the process of transcription seem to have been relatively unexamined (Jefferson, 1983; Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Ochs, 1979; Poland, 2003; Riessman, 2002). In particular, Ochs discusses how the layout of a transcript can influence not only the manner in which it is read but also the level of importance assigned to the information. Jefferson outlines the political and cultural ramifications of transcription decisions on the representation of pronunciation. Riessman argues that qualitative researchers often do not engage in enough reflexivity in terms of data representation and interpretation. She suggests that researchers conducting qualitative research must not present data as if there is only one way to do so. In other words, all data is interpretive, and the transcription process is part of a researcher's interpretation.

  Poland (2003) and Chamberlain (2000) contend that in general, method decisions, of which the transcription process belongs, need to be in concert with the researcher's epistemological, theoretical, and methodological orientation. While keeping these orientations in mind, Poland (2003) proposes a number of strategies that allow for both researcher reflexivity and improvements in transcription quality. Some of the strategies that I sought to incorporate include: ensuring the best possible recording conditions; deciding the level of detail needed in the transcription beforehand to answer research questions; providing justification whether to have participants confirm transcriptions; and using a combination of clarification strategies during interviews and field notes after interviews to clear up potential ambiguities.

  Tutorial session videos and video playback interview audios were transcribed by the researcher using adapted transcription conventions (see Appendix I) first developed by Jefferson (1984). Transcription decisions have a major impact in how the data is interpreted (Jefferson,

1983; Ochs, 1979). Based on Poland's (2003) and Jenks's (2011) suggestions, decisions on the level of transcription detail required to answer my research questions were made before the videos and audios were transcribed. That is, I decided to transcribe the videos at the interactional level (Jenks, 2011) so that information about the type of interactions that the multilingual tutors and student writers had could be presented. Additionally, I chose to transcribe only the video segments that I had marked for further commentary and reaction from the tutor and student participants. Because the focus of my research questions is on the interactional choices that my participants made during a writing center tutorial session, I chose not to transcribe the segments of time that were devoted to reading silently.

Much consideration was also given to how the transcriptions of multiple languages would be presented because, as Jefferson (1983) details, how words are presented on a page impacts how information is interpreted. Hepburn and Bolden (2013) outline some of the issues with which a transcriber of an non-English language has to contend, and these include how to represent the original language orthographically, how to represent the original language if it is a tonal language, and how to present information to an English-reading audience. Although Hepburn and Bolden suggest that a common practice is to present three lines of transcription—the first line being the original language represented in Roman alphabet, the second line being a "morpheme-by-morpheme English gloss of the original," and the third line being a translation that "attempts to capture the local, interactional meaning of the original"—this is not a practice adopted by all researchers/transcribers (p. 69). For instance, Gafaranga and Torras's (2002) presents several turns taken by the interlocutors followed by translations of these turns. Bailey (2000) shows his translations immediately following the transcription in the original language. K. H. Y. Chen (2008) prefers to translate Cantonese into English on an as-needed basis because

74

at times her participants spoke mostly in English and code-switched minimally while at other times, her participants reversed this pattern and spoke mostly in Cantonese and interspersed English words into their conversation. Whatever choices the scholars made, they took into account how the information can best be read by their audience.

I elected not to represent the original language in Roman alphabet for several reasons. First, providing the Roman alphabet of the original language does not necessarily help a non-speaker of the represented language understand the transcription. Second, even to an audience that can sound out Roman alphabet of Putonghua and/or Cantonese, there is still guesswork that has to be done to ascertain the meaning because of the tonal differences involved. Third, even if the tones have been worked out, the guesswork has not been completely removed because different characters with the same tone may be read into the transcript. Rather than deal with potential inconsistencies in the interpretation of the Roman alphabet of Putonghua/Cantonese, I chose to present them in their original forms followed by a line of translation in English, and this is a practice that W. Li (2011) used in his study of translanguaging space, criticality, and creativity.

For the playback interviews, the focus was on the tutors' and student writers' reflections and reactions to watching themselves on video. Thus, I decided to transcribe the audios at the orthographic level (Jenks, 2011). One of the benefits of conducting the playback interviews with tutors and student writers is that I had an opportunity to member check my interpretations of various verbal utterances and nonverbal reactions that I saw in the video and made notes of in my observation notes. In some instances, the tutors and student writers' clarifications of what they had meant by their utterances and reactions did not align with my interpretations.

Three languages were used by the participants in the videos and audios. As a fluent speaker and user of English and Mandarin, I transcribed recordings that took place in these two languages. As an advanced speaker of Cantonese, I can understand and converse in Cantonese but I cannot competently transcribe spoken Cantonese. I asked a Cantonese-speaking colleague to take the lead with the Cantonese written script for the few instances where Cantonese was used by participants. Snow (2004) explains that one of the challenges of transcribing Cantonese is that there is not a high degree of correlation between spoken and written Cantonese. Further complicating the transcription process is the fact that most colloquial Cantonese words do not have a corresponding written form. Snow's analysis of available written Cantonese suggests that writers of spoken Cantonese have utilized a combination of four different methods to represent spoken Cantonese in written form. Snow summarizes these four main methods as follows: 1) adopting standard written Chinese into the Cantonese grammatical system; 2) creating new characters that are only discernible to Cantonese speakers; 3) using Romanization to represent certain sounds; and 4) borrowing the sound of certain standard written Chinese characters. Further, I elected to represent the written form of Chinese as traditional rather than simplified characters. Although most of the participants in this study spoke Putonghua (which is typically rendered in simplified characters), to be consistent and to recognize the fact that the study was conducted in Macao, where Chinese characters are rendered in the traditional form, I chose the traditional representation.

Translation. Multiple languages were used during both the writing center tutorial sessions (see Table 1) and the video playback interviews. As a fluent speaker of Mandarin and advanced speaker of Cantonese, I used these languages to clarify my questions during the playback interviews with participants. Because this study is presented in English, it is important

to discuss ethical concerns related to translation (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). According to Marshall and Rossman, the researcher should understand that analysis begins at translation. Following this understanding, the researcher must be frank and honest about the process of translation, who is doing the translation, and how information is translated.

Translation from Putonghua to English or from Cantonese to English was handled in the following sequence. First, as the person closest to the data and as a fluent user of Mandarin, I generated a draft of the translation from Putonghua to English, and this translation was checked by a colleague for accuracy. As an advanced user of Cantonese, I also relied on Cantonese-speaking colleagues to assist with the verification of the translation accuracy.

Coding. All transcripts went through several rounds of coding, following Saldaña (2009) Corbin and Straus (2008) and using QSR International's (2016) NVivo 11 software for qualitative data analysis. Following the descriptive focus of my research questions, Saldaña suggested that as much as possible should be coded in the first round so as to allow the researcher to be open to all potential possibilities of what the data may be saying. Saldaña uses the term *initial coding* instead of the term *open coding*, which is more commonly used by researchers utilizing grounded theory. For this dissertation, I use these terms interchangeably. Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw (1995) offered these useful questions that coders should ask themselves, and I found them helpful in guiding the first stage of my coding process:

What are people doing? What are they trying to accomplish? How, exactly, do they do this? What specific means and/or strategies do they use? How do members talk about, characterize, and understand what is going on? What assumptions are they making? What do I see going on here? What did I learn from these notes? Why did I include them? (p. 146)

77

While keeping in mind my own research questions, I also used these guiding questions to begin my coding process.

After the initial holistic read-through of the data (Saldaña, 2009), I utilized a combination of descriptive, initial, and process coding for the first round. Because I was working with two different types of data, I employed descriptive coding as my initial coding process on both the writing center tutorial session transcripts and the playback interview transcripts, following Miles and Huberman (1994). I did this as part of the effort to take stock of the data I had gathered. Descriptive codes were defined, and all transcripts were then re-read and re-coded to reflect the latest defined codes. As advised by Holton (2007), Charmaz (2006), and Kelle (2007), I coded both the conference transcripts and playback interview transcripts line-by-line. Holton suggests that doing so helps to ensure that important information is not missed. Another grounded theory coding technique utilized in my first cycle coding procedure was process coding, which Corbin and Strauss (2008) advise can be particularly useful to code "ongoing action/interaction/emotion taken in response to situations, or problems, often with the purpose of reaching a goal or handling a problem" (p. 96-97).

In the second cycle of coding, I applied focused and axial coding as my main methods. Saldaña (2009) states that the main purpose of conducting a second cycle of coding is to "develop a sense of categorical, thematic, conceptual, and/or theoretical organization" from the first cycle of coding. In using focused coding, I compared, aggregated, and reorganized the data based on the similarities of the categories (Charmaz, 2006). In using axial coding, I streamlined my definitions for each of the categories that were compared and aggregated. Specifically, I focused on how the subcategories fit or did not fit together into my categories (Saldaña, 2009).

As the refining process continued, I was guided by the sociocultural theoretical framework that underlies this study, as advised by Glaser and Strauss (1999).

Different codes were developed for the video playback interview transcripts because of the different nature of the data (Weston et al., 2001). As the video playbacks were interviews based on the tutorial sessions, I consider this information to be more reflective in nature rather than occurring at the moment. The reflective data is not meant to serve as part of the data reconstruction process. Rather, it serves to enrich the description of the tutorial sessions. The same two cycles of the coding process were employed for this set of data.

Once the categories for the two different data sets were identified, segments of transcripts from the tutorial sessions and the tutor's and student writer's reactions to these specific segments were then analyzed together to allow for richer understanding of each particular segment. I first report the categories that were identified from the two data sets. Then I discuss the next phase of data re-organization that allowed for a deeper level of understanding of the two data sets.

Categories for the Tutorial Sessions

My primary research question served as a broad guiding focus on the interactional choices that student writers and tutors made during the tutorial sessions. As I read through the transcripts of each tutorial session, I was guided by not only Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw's (1995) questions, which then produced the procedures that I described, but also Heritage and Clayman's (2010) four-phase framework for analyzing conversations taking place within institutions: "opening," "problem initiation," "disposal," and "closing" (p. 41). From the various cycles of code aggregation and re-organization, specific categories arose from the data (Saldaña, 2009).

For the tutorial sessions, these categories have been organized into three broad areas: student-initiated interactions, tutor-initiated interactions, and co-constructed interactions.

Student-initiated codes. A total of 63 student-initiated codes were developed initially. Through the means of elimination of duplicate codes, aggregation of similar codes, and re-organization of these codes, they were then streamlined into three categories: affiliation and disaffiliation, functional engagement, and non-verbal reactions. Table 3 presents the three broad categories, along with their definitions.

Table 3

Categories for Student-Initiated Actions

Category	Category Definition
Affiliation and disaffiliation	Degrees along a continuum of student showing a positive connection or a negative connection with the tutor; the student aligns or disaligns with the tutor; the student moves to agree or disagree; the student accepts or resists the information given; the student shows enthusiasm or frustration
Functional engagement	Instances where the student demonstrates involvement in the discussion, through turn-taking, through back-channeling, through references to parts of the text, through responding to the tutor's prompts, and/or through question-raising
Non-verbal reactions	Instances of non-verbal reaction, including laughing, taking action, waiting

The category of "affiliation and disaffiliation" speaks to how the multilingual student writers took the initiative to agree with the tutor's suggestions as well as instances where they

actively or passively disagreed with the tutor's advice as well as the manners in which the student writer chose to align or disalign with the tutor. The category of "functional engagement" highlights instances where perhaps the student writers had not yet decided on a course of action to take based on the tutor's advice, and the student writers needed to perform various communicative acts to signal to their interlocutor that they were still engaged in the conversation. In other words, the student writers mostly engaged in back-channeling to indicate understanding or asked questions of their tutors. The category of "non-verbal reactions" served to indicate all the instances where student writers engaged in non-verbal tasks. Sometimes they were writing down notes; sometimes they nodded to indicate understanding; and other times they were simply waiting. It is important to note that these categories are not mutually exclusive. For example, it is highly possible that student writers indicated functional engagement and/or affiliation through non-verbal reactions. I decided that there were enough instances where the students' non-verbal reactions could not be easily categorized into the first two categories. Additionally, various instances of non-verbal reactions were identified and participant explanation and elaboration were sought during the playback interviews. I thus felt that these non-verbal reactions should merit its own category.

Within each broad category, further sub-categories elaborated on the type of actions that took place. Under the category of affiliation and disaffiliation are the sub-categories presented below, followed by the number of occurrences in parentheses:

- Affiliation
  - Student achieves understanding (14)
  - Student agrees (40)
  - Student code switches (39)

- o Student offers positive feedback (3)

- o Student makes joke (1)

- o Student moves to align (2)

- o Student repeats tutor suggestion (10)

- Disaffiliation

  - o Student counterargues or disagrees (14)

  - o Student shows frustration (7)

  - o Student hesitates (14)

  - o Student resists (8)

  - o Student expresses doubt, hedges, or qualifies response (59)

  - o Student redirects (10)

Under the broad category of functional engagement are the sub-categories below,

followed by the number of times each sub-category occurred:

- Functional engagement

  - o Student asks question (100)

  - o Student back-channels (68)

  - o Student discusses another teacher or tutor (6)

  - o Student discusses word choice (9)

  - o Student does not know for sure (26)

  - o Student explains (135)

  - o Student provides opinion/suggestion (89)

  - o Student refers to earlier discussion or action (7)

    o   Student engages in analysis (39)

    o   Student sets session goal (3)

Under the umbrella of student-initiated codes is the broad category of student non-verbal reactions, and it is further categorized as follows, with the number of instances in parentheses:

- Non-verbal reactions

    o   Student laughs (16)

    o   Student takes action (55)

    o   Student waits (4)

Tutor-initiated codes. A total of 83 tutor-initiated codes were developed. These codes were then streamlined into four categories: affiliation and disaffiliation, direct guidance and action, functional engagement, and non-verbal reactions. With the exception of one category, "direct guidance and action," the other three categories are the same as the student-initiated codes. For clarification purposes, I reiterate those definitions in Table 4 to reflect the reversal of agents and to refine some of the definitions to more clearly represent slight differences in the tutor-initiated codes.

Table 4

Categories for Tutor-Initiated Actions

Category	Category Definition
Affiliation and disaffiliation	Degrees along a continuum of the tutor showing a positive connection or a negative connection with the student; the tutor aligns or disaligns with the student; the tutor agrees or disagrees with student; the tutor accepts or resists the information given; the tutor shows enthusiasm or frustration
Functional engagement	Instances where the tutor demonstrates involvement in the discussion, through turn-taking, through references to parts of the text, and/or through responding to the student-initiated turns
Non-verbal reactions	Instances of non-verbal reaction, including laughing, taking action, waiting
Direct guidance and action	Instances where the tutor overtly asks the student (not) to do something to revise the document

The three identical categories were achieved after much prolonged reviewing of the conference transcripts. As such, their definitions are the highly similar to the categories for the student-initiated interactions. There was one new category for the tutor-initiated actions. That new category, "direct guidance and action," speaks to instances where the tutor provided more than advice or opinion. The information provided by the tutor constituted overt instruction-giving. In other words, these were instances where the tutor directly asked the student writer to do something or not to do something.

Under the broad category of tutor initiated affiliation and disaffiliation are the following categories with number of occurrences in parentheses:

- Affiliation
  - Tutor acknowledges (8)
  - Tutor agrees (22)
  - Tutor capitulates (7)
  - Tutor code-switches (128)
  - Tutor fronts critique with compliment (6)
  - Tutor makes joke (2)
  - Tutor moves to align (38)
  - Tutor offers positive feedback (33)
  - Tutor seeks agreement from student (21)
- Disaffiliation
  - Tutor counterargues or disagrees (10)
  - Tutor expresses confusion/doubt (5)
  - Tutor shows frustration (11)
  - Tutor offers critique (6)
  - Tutor questions authorship (1)

Because the goals of the student-initiated interactions and tutor-initiated interactions are different, the sub-categories placed into the categories for the student writers and tutors are different. Student writers come into the writing center as the less-informed peer, and they seek information; tutors serve as the more-informed peer, and they are expected to provide information. It may be helpful to see the similarities and differences in the categorization

between student-initiated interactions and tutor-initiated interactions under the broad category of affiliation and disaffiliation side-by-side, which is presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Comparison of Student-Initiated vs. Tutor-Initiated Affiliation and Disaffiliation

Category	Student-initiated	Tutor-initiated
Affiliation	**Student code switches (39)**	**Tutor code switches (128)**
	Student offers positive feedback (3)	**Tutor offers positive feedback (33)**
	Student makes joke (1)	**Tutor makes joke (2)**
	Student moves to align (2)	**Tutor moves to align (38)**
	Student agrees (40)	**Tutor agrees (22)**
	Student achieves understanding	Tutor fronts critique with compliment
	Student repeats tutor suggestion	Tutor capitulates
		Tutor acknowledges
		Tutor seeks agreement from student
Disaffiliation	**Student expresses doubt, hedges, or qualifies response (59)**	**Tutor expresses confusion/doubt (5)**
	Student shows frustration (7)	**Tutor shows frustration (11)**
	Student redirects (10)	**Tutor redirects (9)**
	Student counterargues or disagrees (14)	**Tutor counterargues or disagrees (10)**
	Student resists	Tutor questions authorship
	Student hesitates	Tutor offers critique

As Table 5 shows, certain actions were taken by both the student and the tutor. These included actions such as code-switching, offering positive feedback, joking, aligning, agreeing, expressing doubt, showing frustration, redirecting, and counterarguing as the focus of the discussion. Other actions were taken by either students or tutors.

Under the broad category of tutor-initiated functional engagement are the following sub-categories with number of instances in parentheses:

- Functional engagement

    o Tutor answers student query (40)

    o Tutor serves as reader (15)

    o Tutor asks question (135)

    o Tutor discusses another reader, writer, or text (19)

    o Tutor discusses global (higher order) concerns (32)

    o Tutor discuss local (lower order) concerns (19)

    o Tutor explains (117)

    o Tutor provides analysis (104)

    o Tutor provides justification (29)

    o Tutor provides opinion/suggestion (83)

    o Tutor repeats (25)

    o Tutor sets direction or session limit (8)

It helps to see the student-initiated and tutor-initiated functional engagement categories side-by-side. Table 6 shows the same sub-categories shared by the student and the tutor, which include: asking questions, explaining, analyzing, giving opinions, discussing lower order concerns such as word choice, setting goals, and discussing other readers or texts.

Table 6

Comparison of Student-Initiated vs. Tutor-Initiated Functional Engagement

Category	Student-initiated	Tutor-initiated
Functional Engagement	**Student asks question (100)**	**Tutor asks question (135)**
	Student explains (135)	**Tutor explains (117)**
	Student engages in analysis (39)	**Tutor provides analysis (104)**
	Student provides opinion/suggestion (89)	**Tutor provides opinion (83)**
	Student discusses word choice (9)	**Tutor discusses local (lower order) concerns such as word choice (19)**
	Student sets session goal (3)	**Tutor sets session limit (8)**
	Student discusses another teacher or tutor (6)	**Tutor discusses another reader, writer, or text (19)**
	Student back-channels	Tutor repeats
	Student does not know for sure	Tutor serves as reader
	Student refers to earlier discussion or action	Tutor discusses global (higher order) concerns
		Tutor answers student query
		Tutor provides justification

In the category of tutor-initiated non-verbal reactions, there was only one category in common with the student-initiated non-verbal reactions: laughing. Table 7 presents the categories side-by-side again for easy comparison.

Table 7

Comparison of Student-Initiated vs. Tutor-Initiated Non-Verbal Reactions

Category	Student-initiated	Tutor-initiated
Non-verbal	**Student laughs (16)**	**Tutor laughs (13)**
reactions	Student takes action	
	Student waits	

Finally, for the tutor-initiated actions, the coding results found one distinct category that differed when compared to the students writers. Again, since tutors' goals and objectives differ from students in a writing center tutorial session, this difference is not only reasonable but also expected. I present the categories that came under the heading of tutor "direct guidance and action," followed by the number of occurrences in parentheses:

- Tutor asks student not to do something (9)

- Tutor asks student to do something (34)

- Tutor directive (31)

- Tutor guides student to an answer (112)

- Tutor provides sample language (51)

- Tutor provides suggestion (149)

- Tutor shows sample (5)

- Tutor takes action (19)

These categorizations warrant further explanation since there may appear to be some discrepancies or inconsistencies when compared with the other categorizations. For the category of "tutor directive," these were instances where the tutor was less direct than issuing a command.

That is, the tutor may have employed a modal to mitigate or soften her message or instruction. In other words, the other categorizations involved the tutors employing direct requests or commands for the students to do something or not to do something, whereas the category of "tutor directive" contains mitigated requests or commands.

It should be noted that for the student-initiated codes, I placed "student provides opinion/suggestion" under the category of "functional engagement," but for tutor-initiated codes, I separated "tutor provides opinion" and "tutor provides suggestion." I placed "tutor provides opinion" under the category of "functional engagement," but I placed "tutor provides suggestion" under the category of "direct guidance and action." I did so because an argument can be made that there is a distinction between a tutor providing an opinion and a tutor providing a suggestion. When a tutor provides an opinion, the student writer can imply that the writer is the ultimate decision maker. A suggestion, however, has a much stronger push for the student writer to accept the tutor's recommendation. Data coded as suggestions often were followed by a tutor discussing the potential consequences of not following the tutor's suggestions.

Also of note is the distinction in the categorization of "tutor takes action" under "direct guidance and action" as opposed to the categorization of "student takes action" under "non-verbal reactions." For students, their actions mostly dealt with following the tutor's suggestions or deciding to revise something on the spot throughout the tutorial. For tutors, their actions often included making corrections on a student's paper or taking over control of the computer. Although the tutor's actions are non-verbal, I felt that these acts served more as "direct guidance" than simply non-verbal reactions.

Co-initiated actions. Compared to the student-initiated and tutor-initiated codes, there were far fewer co-initiated actions. Two major categories arose from the data, and they are:

"speaking over interlocutor" (60) and "working collaboratively" (10), with the number of occurrences provided in parentheses. The former category is defined as instances where both the interlocutors' talk overlap in some fashion. That is, they may start talking at the same time or they may talk in rapid succession with almost no pause in between. Instances where either interlocutor completed the other's turn are also included in this category. For the latter category, it is defined as instances where the tutor and the student complete something together, think of an idea simultaneously, or revise something together. In other words, they work in collaboration with one another and feed off of each other's ideas rather than the more one-sided guidance I mentioned under the tutor-initiated interaction of "direct guidance and action."

Categories for the Reflective Tutor Playback Interviews

The coding schemes for the reflective playback interviews differed from the coding schemes for the writing center tutorial sessions. Tutorials involved interactions between a tutor and a student, while in the reflective playback interviews, the participants interacted with the researcher. They reacted to questions posed by the researcher as well as video clips singled out by the researcher. Despite the differences in the nature of the data, I nonetheless went through similar processes in the coding phase. For the interviews, it may be helpful to consider them as participant reflections since some time elapsed between the writing center tutorial sessions and the interviews. Additionally, I was asking the participants to comment on a past action, to provide more information on why something was done or to elaborate on an action that I had noted was worthy of further exploration. The following major reflective categories arose from the tutor reflective interview data, with the number of instances in parentheses:

- Reflections of actions and strategies (339)

- Reflections of attitudes and feelings (12)

- Reflections on factors outside of the session that impacted the session (22)

- Reflections on student actions and expectations (118)

- Reflections on their role as a tutor (8)

Each of these categories were defined so that duplications and similarities can be streamlined. For "reflections of actions and strategies," these involved the tutors' decisions related to the more overt moves that they made in contrast to the category of "reflections of attitudes and feelings." This category included reflections of non-action oriented matters during a session, and they are the emotional states, attitudes, and stances of the tutors. Next, tutors also commented on issues that were not immediately related to the student writer or the writing but that nonetheless influenced how the session progressed. Some of these "reflections on factors outside of the session that impacted the session" included concerns such as grades, information given by other people about the text, assignment limitations, and the presence of the video-camera. The category of "reflections on student actions and expectations" contains the tutors' comments on what reactions the students had to the session. They include the level of student engagement, their English language proficiency, and their level of confidence. For the category of "reflections on their role as tutor," tutors commented on their work and on their own writing process. It should be noted, however, that the writing process question was one of the prepared ones that I asked the tutors as part of the interview protocol (see Appendix H).

Categories for the Reflective Student Playback Interviews

For the student reflective playback interviews, considerations similar to the tutor reflective playback interviews were given. That is, I deemed these interviews to be more reflection-oriented than action-oriented since all of the participants are discussing past events and being prompted by the researcher to provide further comments and explanations. Categories

similar to those of the tutor reflective playback interview arose from the data. They are as follows, with the number of instances presented in parentheses:

- Reflections on actions and strategies (228)

- Reflections on attitudes and feelings (253)

- Reflections on factors outside of the session that impacted the student (65)

- Reflections on expectations and reactions to tutor advice (82)

Again, it may be helpful to see these playback interview categories for the tutors and students presented side-by-side for easier comparison. Table 8 presents such a comparison. The definitions for the first three categories of student reflections are the same as the definitions for the first three categories of the tutor reflections. However, because the content of their reflections differ, the examples within each category should be different.

Table 8

Comparison of Reflective Tutor vs. Student Playback Interview Categories

Category	Tutor	Student
Reflections	**Actions and strategies (339)**	**Actions and strategies (228)**
	Attitudes and feelings (12)	**Attitudes and feelings (253)**
	Factors outside of the session that impacted the session (22)	**Factors outside of the session that impacted the student (65)**
	Student actions and expectations (118)	**Expectations and reactions to tutor advice (82)**
	Role as tutor	

For instance, in the category of "student reflections on actions and strategies," student participants discussed their level of willingness to accept the tutors' advice, their goals for the session, and their choices regarding the language they used for communication with the tutor, etc. For the category of "reflections on attitudes and feelings," students discussed their level of confidence, engagement, resistance, and frustration, among others. For the category of "reflections on factors outside of the session that impacted the student," the students discussed seeking multiple opinions on their writing, how grades influenced their perception of the usefulness of the tutorial, and how going to the writing center influenced their writing process. For the last category of "reflections on expectations and reactions to tutor advice," students commented on the various strategies that the tutors used during the session.

Situational Analysis

At this point in the data analysis, after I had conducted two cycles of coding, first with initial coding and next with fixed coding, I conducted a situational analysis, guided by the works of A. E. Clarke (2003, 2005) and A. E. Clarke and Friese (2007). I was drawn to situational analysis because I wrestled long and hard with the categories that I had arrived at after many rounds of coding, and at some level I still felt that these categories seemed inadequate to describe what I had seen in both the writing center tutorial sessions and in the playback interviews. At one level, the categories appeared to be somewhat binary and overgeneralized. As Clarke and Friese (2007) state:

> If modernism emphasized universality, generalization, simplification, permanence, stability, wholeness, rationality, regularity, homogeneity, and sufficiency, then postmodernism has shifted emphases to partialities, positionalities, complications,

tenuousness, instabilities, irregularities, contradictions, heterogeneities, situatedness, and

fragmentation. (p. 367)

In my data, I had observed the tutors and student writers engaging in multiple layers of

interaction simultaneously, and after following up with participants during the playback

interview, their reactions often surprised me. For example, in one turn a student (Vicky) code

switched from English to Putonghua while asking a question that challenged the tutor Faye's

prior answer. During the coding process, Vicky's turn was coded for "code-switching," "asking

question," and "challenging tutor." While breaking up data in this manner was helpful to see how

many different purposes the student writer could achieve with one turn, it could not explain why

Vicky performed two different tasks, "code-switch" and "ask question" to achieve the goal of

"challenging tutor." However, when I followed up on this turn with Vicky during the playback

interview, Vicky did not see the question as a way to challenge Faye. Vicky merely wanted to

get confirmation on a question that had been on her mind.

Thus, I found it useful to engage in situational analysis and specifically the map-making

exercise as guided by A. E. Clarke (2003) to deepen the understanding of my data. Mapping out

the different factors on situational and social worlds maps helped me situate the information

within the writing center and the university as institutional influences. As A. E. Clarke (2003)

states, "We cannot assume directionalities of influence; boundaries are open and porous;

negotiations are fluid and usually ongoing" (p. 560). Although I am skeptical of whether my

maps were done correctly, they nonetheless helped me to see my data from a different

perspective. For instance, I placed "importance of reaching goals" on the vertical axis of my

positional map because this is an issue of contention between the tutors and students as they may

have different goals for the tutorial. I placed on the horizontal axis "degree of interaction" since

95

this was a major point of interrogation in my data. Doing so helped me to question whether affiliative actions performed by students and tutors necessarily meant that these actions were more interactive. While Clarke's exemplar positional maps showed the significance of charting missing data as opportunities for further exploration, for me they were useful as a means of seeing "difference."

<div align="center">**Trustworthiness**</div>

Debate on the use of the term *validity* to assess rigor in qualitative research has been ongoing. While the term has been rejected by some who argue for the use of *trustworthiness*— which includes "credibility," "authenticity," "transferability," "dependability," and "confirmability" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 300), other scholars have suggested that the problem lies not with the use of the term validity but with how the term is interpreted for qualitative inquiry (Aguinaldo, 2004; Cho & Trent, 2006; Morse, Barret, Mayan, Olson, & Spiers, 2002). Still others contend that the term *validation* should be used instead of validity so that the process and intersubjectivity of research can be emphasized (Angen, 2000; Creswell, 2007).

At issue is whether there is alignment and congruity between the paradigmatic inquiry, the methods used to gather data, and what is done with the data in terms of interpretation and discussion. I have elected to adopt the term trustworthiness for this dissertation, and I have used various strategies suggested by Creswell (2007) to ensure rigor, robustness, and depth for this study. These strategies included (1) "prolonged engagement and persistent observation" (Creswell, 2007, p. 207); (2) "use of multiple and different sources" (p. 208); (3) explaining the researcher's own positionality and entry to the study; (6) member checking; and (7) thick description. Additionally, Aguinaldo (2004) and Angen (2000) discuss the importance of

researcher reflexivity "to trace how the researcher's original sense of the topic" evolves as the study is being conceptualized and carried out (p. 383).

For this study, I have addressed strategy (1) by volunteering my time to tutor at the writing center prior to the beginning of the study. The time that I have spent at the writing center helps to establish a sense of trust (Smith, 2000). For strategy (2) and (6), I employed the video-recordings of the tutorials to capture how the tutors and student writers interacted, and I also interviewed both the tutors and student writers so that they could elaborate on their interactions. The texts that were used in the tutorial sessions aided the participants' recall during the interview process. The interview served as a form of member checking because participants had the opportunity to comment on their actions during the tutorial, and they could also reject my interpretations of their actions. To address strategy (3), I have explained my positionality and entry to the study earlier in this chapter. The rendering of a thick description is done through my transcription choices, my observation notes, my researcher's journal, and my memoing during the coding process. The issue of "reflexivity" is addressed through the analytical exercises via map-making with A. E. Clarke's (2005) situational analysis.

Chapter Summary

I began this chapter by explaining the ethical consideration of this study. I provided an overview of the research setting and introduced the six multilingual tutors and eight multilingual student writers who participated in the study. My data sources included observations, video-recordings of the writing center tutorial sessions, audio-recordings of the individual playback interviews with each participant, textual data, and the researcher's journal. I explained my data collection procedures and described my transcription, translation, and coding processes. I

provided the categories that arose from the coding process. Finally, I addressed the issue of the

trustworthiness of my data.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION

This chapter presents the findings that emerged from analysis of the transcripts. To review, the study was carried out from October 2015 through April 2016 at the University of Macau's writing center. A total of eight writing center tutorial sessions were recorded, and eight different student writers participated in the study while six graduate student tutors were involved. Each distinct dataset also included reflective playback interviews with the participating multilingual tutor and multilingual student writer. Each reflective playback interview was conducted separately. English and Putonghua were the predominant languages used during all of the tutorials and interviews. This descriptive study was conducted to answer the following primary and secondary research questions:

1. What are the interactional choices that multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers make during a writing center tutorial session?

   a. How do the participants feel about the choices that they made during the writing center tutorial session?

   b. What influences the interactional choices that they made during the writing center tutorial session?

Through the rigorous coding process informed by grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006; A. E. Clarke, 2005; Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Glaser & Strauss, 1999), the tutors and student writers were found to have made three broad interactional choices during the writing center tutorials. They made moves of (dis)affiliation, functional engagement, and non-verbal reactions. During the reflective playback interviews, the tutors and student writers provided reasons for some of the actions that they took, the attitudes that they had, the expectations of the students and tutors

99

with whom they worked, and the insights from outside the realm of the tutorial session that they wished to include into the discussion.

Before presenting this data, it is important to bring some context into the manners in which the data should be viewed. In line with the constructivist tradition of inquiry (Guba & Lincoln, 1994; Lincoln & Guba, 2005) and a sociocultural theoretical framework (Vygotsky, 1978), participant data should be viewed in context. Doing so also helps to partially answer my primary research question, since the contexts within which the participants operate often serve to limit or restrain the types of interactional choices they can make. As such, I first situate the findings within Heritage and Clayman's (2010) concept of institutional talk, which I argue serves to delineate the goal-oriented purpose of the writing center tutorial sessions as well as control how those sessions begin and end. Next, I further situate the data within Postcolonial and Neocolonial discourses, since the very language choices that the participants have made in their writing center tutorial sessions reflect these two realities. Finally, I discuss the specific interactional choices that the participants have made given the two aforementioned constraints.

<div align="center">

Institutional Talk

</div>

To provide a fuller description of what the multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers are doing in a writing center tutorial session, the contexts within which the tutorial sessions take place warrants some discussion. Before addressing my research questions, I first situate the data as a form of institutional talk (Drew & Heritage, 1992; Heritage & Clayman, 2010). Doing so helps to put the data into social, historical, and political context, some of which I have described in my literature review. The eight writing center tutorial sessions I recorded all held the following three institutional talk features in common, and in this respect, the goal-oriented nature of the tutorial sessions superseded the languages used to conduct the sessions.

First, they were goal-oriented and goal-driven sessions that directly connect to their "institution-relevant identities" (p. 34). In other words, a writing center tutorial session takes place because a student is seeking advice to improve on a piece of her work with a peer tutor. Second, because of the nature of the goal-oriented session, discussion is expected to be limited to only certain topics, and discussion is expected to take place in a certain manner. In the case of the tutorials, the students expect to receive advice while the tutors perform the task of providing advice, and they discuss institutionally-related work (assignments, for example) brought in by the student. Third, the parties participating in the goal-oriented session should follow specific procedures. Applied to the tutorial sessions, both the tutors and students know how long a tutorial session should be. The tutors follow the procedures established by the writing center for how to conduct tutorial sessions. The students may or may not know the procedures, depending on whether they are first-time visitors or not.

Specifically, all eight writing center tutorial sessions recorded followed the institutional talk sequence that Heritage and Clayman (2010) outline as having four distinct components: "opening," "problem initiation," "disposal," and "closing" (p. 41). The purpose of the "opening" is to allow the interlocutors to "establish their identities for one another (Schegloff, 1986)" (p. 41). For the eight writing center tutorial sessions recorded, the opening moves were short but took place in different manners and in different languages. For the tutors, speaking first indicated that they were occupying the role of the giver of help, and all eight tutors spoke first. All but one asked their students how they could help them in English. Tutor Emma, however, asked to see the assignment (see Excerpt 8). Tutor Abby asked her students whether they preferred to work in English or Chinese. For the students, the presentation of their assignments was an indication of their role as the receiver of help in the session. The following exchange (Excerpt 1) between

tutor Abby and student Beth illustrates a typical "opening" that establishes the roles that both

interlocutors occupy, although they do so without formal or informal introductions.

Excerpt 1 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Abby and Student Beth)

```
 2   0:00 - 0:33
 3   Abby:     can you please fill in the form first?
 4   Beth:     oh okay.
 5   Abby:     and here about your basic information and
 6             also do you prefer to speak Chinese or
 7             English?
 8   Beth:     (0.5) mm:: Chinese ((laughs)) 好 {okay}
 9   Abby:     沒問題 {no problem}
10   0:33 - 1:44 ((form filling))
11   Beth:     好了 {done}
12   Abby:     thank you ((puts things away)) (3.0) um: I
13             have been browsing this ( ) so er before
14             we start do you have any specific
15             questions or something you really want to
16             er seek advice on (.) in this (.) p s
17   Beth:     um::
18   Abby:     oh↑ I am speaking English again sorry (.)
19             就有沒有什麼特別想要問的一些問題. {do you have
20             any specific questions you want to ask.}
21   Beth:     特別想要問? {specific questions?} mm: (1.0)
22   Abby:     就是比如說關於 er 結構啊或者是語言啊方面或者有一些
23             表達的語言= {for example like structure or
24             language or tone=}
25   Beth:     =語言吧語言表達還有我應該是: (.) 超字數了
26             {=probably language language expression
27             and I probably: (.) went over the word
28             limit}
```

The second phase of Heritage and Clayman's (2010) institutional talk is "problem

initiation," and in this phase, the interlocutors should begin discussing the purpose of the meeting

or the conversation. In lines 6 – 7, Abby offers Beth the choice of discussing the "problem" in

Chinese or English during the session. In lines 13 – 15, tutor Abby opens the session by asking

student Beth what questions Beth has regarding her personal statement. Abby's statement of

"before we start" suggests to Beth that even if Beth does not have any questions, Abby would

still offer her suggestions. This turn that Abby takes in lines 13 – 15 not only places Abby in the control of the problem initiation phase but also further solidifies Abby's role as the information provider in the opening sequence. When the student appears not to respond in line 17, Abby realizes that she was using English to communicate with the student even though student Beth had just indicated in in line 8 that she prefers to use Chinese. Although Abby provides a translation of her original question to Beth, Beth appears not to understand Abby's question by repeating the question back to Abby. Tutor Abby then offers some choices (lines 22 – 24) as to what the two of them can spend time discussing. These choices could be interpreted as Abby providing a sample list of issues that Beth can choose to discuss. The choices could also be interpreted as limiting Beth to what she can discuss. Given three choices, Beth selects "tone" and then realizes that she wanted to work on reducing the number of words she had written in her personal statement. Beth's response in lines 25 – 28 suggests that she selected one of Abby's options and drew up her own query. In lines 22 – 28, both Abby and Beth have established the general purpose of this session and set their goals for the meeting.

Heritage and Clayman (2010) describe the "disposal" phase of institutional talk as actions that should be taken to resolve the problem. These actions can be taken by all parties involved in the discussion. In Excerpt 2, tutor Abby and student Kelly discuss Kelly's curriculum vitae, which is part of her Honours College application. Excerpt 2 is an illustration of the "disposal" phase of institutional talk, where both parties agree on a course of action to take as a result of the discussion they had.

Excerpt 2 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Abby and Student Kelly)

```
126   Kelly:    應該算到這個裡面.還是 {((I)) should put it
127             here. or} work experience?
```

```
128   Abby:    嗯:那妳可以把: {oh: then you can put:} work
129            這個字去掉 {this word delete} ((points at
130            paper)) 就是 {so ((it)) becomes} experience
131   Kelly:   mm ((nods))
132   Abby:    然後呢這邊就是 {and this side will be}
133            activities ((looks at student))
134   Kelly:   mm ((nods))
135   Abby:    就不用寫 {then no need to write} (.) extra
136            (.) curricular
137   Kelly:   mm mm 那就 {then} ((nods and writes on
138            paper))=
139   Abby:    =然後我們這一邊的話(.)因為妳之前也來過 {then for
140            us here (.) because you have been here
141            before} ((looks briefly at student as
142            student continues to write on paper))
143   Kelly:   mm
144   Abby:    就是我們這邊是會提些(.)建議 {so here we will
145            provide some (.) suggestions}
146   Kelly:   mm
147   Abby:    然後那最後的決定 {then the final decision}
148            ((student finishes writing and both
149            looking at paper)) 可能還是 {may still be}
150            writer uh 來做 {to do} (.)
```

Although the exchange begins with student Kelly posing a question to tutor Abby, Kelly does not say much in the rest of this exchange other than back-channeling. Tutor Abby makes a series of direct suggestions (lines 128 – 130, 132 – 133, 135 – 136), all of which are responded to by Kelly with the back-channel "mm" followed by her nodding to the suggestion. Kelly does not actually explicitly agree to the suggestions but actively takes down notes on her paper. Perhaps seeing that Kelly does not have much of a reaction, tutor Abby emphasizes in lines 144 – 145 and 147 – 150 that the prior exchanges are only her suggestions and that Kelly is the ultimate decision maker on what should be revised. The "disposal" occurs with student Kelly noting all of tutor Abby's suggestions even though Abby attempts to mitigate the power of her suggestions with a caveat that these are only her suggestions.

Finally, the last phase of institutional talk, according to Heritage and Clayman (2010), is

the "closing," where the involved parties "exit from the conversation" (p. 41). The exits that I

have recorded in the eight sessions can be illustrated by Excerpt 3.

Excerpt 3 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Marion and Student Cathy)

```
709   Marion:    if you need another review you can come
710              back ((flips through student paper))
711   Cathy:     okay
712   Marion:    and oh so your reference (2.0) you don't
713              need to use ((points to paper))=
714   Cathy:     =oh=
715   Marion:    =these bulletin points here uh and (.)
716              what (.) what >style are you using?<
717   Cathy:     a p a style ((smiles))=
718   Marion:    =yes a p a okay and um (2.0) did you check
719              the formats?
720   Cathy:     mm↓ yes ((nods))
721   Marion:    okay that's great (2.0) okay
722   Cathy:     mm thank you
723   Marion:    you're $welcome$ no more questions?
724   Cathy:     mm. no
725   Marion:    are you sure?
726   Cathy:     ((laughs))
727   Marion:    ((laughs)) okay one second (1.5) could you
728              help me with this form? we are keeping a
729              record
730   Cathy:     oh
```

In Excerpt 3, the beginning of the exit is marked by tutor Marion's offer to student Cathy

to come back for another appointment if Cathy needs more feedback in line 709 – 710. This offer

is an indication that the tutorial is coming to an end. Cathy appears to be ready for the session to

come to a close as well as she says "okay" in line 711. However, before Marion could close the

session, she notices something else on Cathy's draft worthy of her comment. After the matter of

the APA style has been disposed of, Marion draws the session to a close in line 721, which is

met by Cathy's "thank you" in line 722. At this point, the participants are approximately 30

minutes into the session. It is difficult to speculate why tutor Marion did not seem to want to

close the session when she continued in lines 723 and 725 with another offer to take more questions from Cathy, but Cathy is the one who closes the session first with a firm "no" in line 724 but then with laughter in line 726.

Ritter (2002) contends that writing center conferences are not only literacy events but also instances of institutional talk. Her application of conversation analytic methods and categorization of writing center tutorial sessions as institutional talk helped me to see my data in a similar vein. In her study, Ritter divided the duration of a writing center conference into three phases "of institutional discourse: diagnosis (Agar, 1985), directive (Agar, 1985), and closing (Hartford & Bardovi-Harlig, 1992)" (p. 124). Ritter did not create a separate category for the "opening" in the way that Heritage and Clayman (2010) did. Also worthy of comparison, the tutors and students in the eight recorded tutorial sessions did not specifically greet each other or engage in an opening as described by Heritage and Clayman.

Postcolonial and Neocolonial Discourses at the Writing Center

Situating in the interaction between multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers as institutional talk brings into the discussion the larger social and historical context at work that leads the tutors and students to engage in such talk. Referring back to the literature review, I made reference to the postcolonial and neocolonial discourses that have helped to shape the extant discourse at the University of Macau. Specifically, the adoption of English as the medium of instruction in an otherwise Cantonese-speaking society (Bray & Koo, 2004; H. S. Yee & Kou, 2001) places various constraints, both visible and invisible, on a student body that is not typically accustomed to communicating in English. As it relates to the writing center tutorial sessions, the data showed one student writer struggling to communicate in English with her tutor while

106

another student writer basically forgot, when communication in English broke down, that she shared another common language with her tutor.

In addition to the postcolonial discourses present at the research site, neocolonial discourses have impacted the campus. Such impact can be seen not only in the writing center personnel but also in the student writers who participated in the study. In particular, the increase in the use of Putonghua as the default Chinese, supplanting Cantonese (H. S. Yee, 2001), along with a rise in the recruitment of mainland Chinese students, played a significant role in the writing center tutorial sessions and in the playback interviews. Notably, some student writers assumed—when tutors offered the use of Chinese for the tutorial discussion—that the tutors' offer of Chinese meant Putonghua instead of Cantonese. They further assumed that tutors would be able to speak Putonghua.

An example that can highlight some of the complexities of postcolonial discourse can be found in Excerpt 1. Specifically, tutor Abby asks student Beth to choose a language that Beth prefers to use during the tutorial (see Excerpt 1, lines 6 – 7). It is also interesting to note Beth's laughter (line 8) as a response before selecting Chinese as the medium of communication during the session. In the reflective playback interview with Beth, I followed up on this interaction and asked Beth why she opted to use Chinese. Beth stated, "I think use Chinese is better to understand and more fluently" (student Beth, working with tutor Abby, reflective playback interview, March 23, 2016). When pressed further for elaboration after asking what Beth thought about using English to talk about a piece of English writing, the participant clarified, "I think maybe some terms used to revise it I can't understand" (student Beth, working with tutor Abby, reflective playback interview, March 23, 2016). In a sense, Beth was suggesting that she would find the tutorial session more useful if she could understand all of the advice, and she preferred

using Chinese as she would stand a higher chance of understanding the advice. When I attempted

to clarify what Beth had meant by restating it in the following excerpt (lines 25 – 30), Beth did

not appear to understand my rephrasing (see Excerpt 4, line 31). Her lack of understanding led

me to switch into Mandarin to follow up on my original question (lines 32 – 36). Beth's answer,

lines 38 – 42, is interesting because she appeared to have a difficult time communicating in

English, as evidenced by her use of "try my best" (Excerpt 4, lines 39 – 40) and her hesitation in

line 17 of Excerpt 1.

Excerpt 4 (Reflective Playback Interview with Student Beth)

```
25   Alice:     ah okay so if your tutor is using English
26              then maybe you will misunderstand some of
27              the ((coughs)) revision suggestions I see
28              okay and so how did you react when your
29              tutor started in English anyway after you
30              said I want to use Mandarin
31   Beth:      uh well pardon
32   Alice:     就好像妳後來妳的 tutor 還是用英文跟妳講那妳好像就沒
33              有反應妳是在等她嗎還是 {it seemed that you did
34              not have much of a reaction even after
35              your tutor used English were you waiting
36              for her}
37   Beth:      如果她還是繼續用英文講的話我可能就盡力用英文和她說
38              但是她反應過來了那我就繼續用中文 {if she
39              continued to use English then I would try
40              my best to communicate with her in English
41              but she switched back so I continued to
42              use Chinese}
```

Tutor Abby's language preference in the three recorded sessions appears to be English, as

evidenced by Excerpt 5. In this excerpt, Abby has just initiated the session and asked student

Ellen what she would like to work on. Ellen brought with her two pieces of writing, and Abby

wanted to discuss the personal statement first. Before they began the discussion, however, Abby

asked to conduct the session in English (line 17), to which the student replied in the affirmative.

As if to assure Ellen that the use of English would not impede their communication, Abby

suggested to Ellen to use Chinese if necessary (lines 19 – 21).

Excerpt 5 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Abby and Student Ellen)

```
14   Abby:      okay (.) then we'll do the personal
15              statement first
16   Ellen:     okay thank you
17   Abby:      is it okay if we speak English.
18   Ellen:     >yes yes< that's okay=
19   Abby:      =just feel free to (.) speak Chinese if
20              you feel (.) hard to explain or something
21              (.) =okay?
22   Ellen:        =okay
```

I followed up with tutor Abby on this tendency for her to agree with her student on the

medium of communication before the start of a session. In the reflective playback interview with

Abby (on the tutorial session between Abby and student Kelly), Abby suggested that she could

be a more effective tutor (in terms of giving suggestions) if she operated in the language in

which the text appeared (see Excerpt 6). Specifically, as Abby states in lines 80 – 84, "Because

the writing is in English…so it's more of a consistent language thought." In the same excerpt,

Abby acknowledges that using English is something that her students try to do with her during

her tutorial sessions, but perhaps when students encounter a tight deadline or some type of time

constraint (in this case the deadline to send in the Honours College application was the last week

of March 2016, and the tutorial session was recorded on March 11, 2016), students are more

likely to want to operate in their most confident language, even if that language differs from the

language of the text they produced.

Excerpt 6 (Reflective Playback Interview with Tutor Abby, Session with Kelly)

```
66   Abby:      so you're asking why did I switch back to
67              English
68   Alice:     yeah or just your general use of language
```

```
69   Abby:      ah yeah because most of the situations
70              would be the student came here they would
71              let me or themselves would try their best
72              to speak English uh but sometimes like in
73              this case of the honor college special
74              event an application and they would try to
75              do it as efficient as possible so probably
76              some of them would prefer Chinese but
77              before that uh people would use English
78              like much more than they use Chinese so I
79              think it's a habitual thing most likely
80              and then and also it's because the writing
81              is in English so I just spend a sort of
82              longer time to read that to go through
83              that so it's more of a consistent language
84              thought I think
```

Another example of this complicated relationship between which language should be used in the writing center tutorial session and why the participants seem to think that there can only be one choice can be found in Excerpt 7. Excerpt 7 is my follow-up reflective playback interview with student Cathy. Before this exchange, I was asking Cathy about her hesitation to revise her draft when her tutor Marion stated her confusion over one sentence of Cathy's academic essay about the benefits of extracurricular activities. Cathy felt that her audience would be able to understand her point, so she did not see a need to revise that sentence. When asked for further comment, Cathy stated that she probably would have been better able to explain her rationale in Chinese to tutor Marion, but for some unknown reason, Cathy did not use Chinese (lines 192 – 200). Cathy's answer is interesting because it did not strike her to access all of her available languages to convey her thoughts, which runs contrary to some of Canagarajah's (2010) ideas of multilinguals' abilities of "shuttle" between languages. Instead of trying to explain, Cathy decided to move on to the next point. In the tutorial session, Cathy and Marion only used English during the session even though both Cathy and Marion spoke Cantonese.

Excerpt 7 (Reflective Playback Interview with Student Cathy)

```
189   Alice:    yeah I noticed that maybe you were not so
190             convinced so I wanted to ask you about
191             that yeah
192   Cathy:    eh because at that time eh ((laughs)) I
193             didn't know uh how to yeah I I I know that
194             in the tutorial I can use Chinese to speak
195             but I I don't know why I didn't use
196             Chinese to to to explain so uh when I'm
197             using English to explain and I find like I
198             cannot I I like I cannot um uh like I give
199             up explaining ((laughs)) so yes yes yes
200             like that
201   Alice:    oh I see okay
202   Cathy:    yes
203   Alice:    okay so do you think that you would have
204             been able to maybe just explain it more
205             clearly in Chinese in some parts of your
206             essay
207   Cathy:    mm
```

To further complicate the matter on the medium of communication during a writing center tutorial session, sometimes a tutor can identity correctly the language needs of the student but still misinterpret the student's desire. Excerpt 8 is the opening exchange between tutor Emma and student Arizona. When Emma asks to see Arizona's assignment sheet so that Emma can better understand the type of help that Arizona needs, Arizona appears not to understand what Emma is asking for (see lines 3 – 5). Emma interprets Arizona's rising intonation to mean that Arizona does not understand Emma's request, so Emma immediately switches to Putonghua, repeating a couple of times that she would like to see the assignment sheet. It is interesting to note that Arizona replies in Putonghua but switches to English when she gives the name of the assignment, which is a summary-response. Arizona's elaboration of her assignment continues in English, and in fact, for the rest of this Excerpt, Arizona only uses English. It takes Arizona from lines 16 – 27 to explain what her assignment is. Arizona makes a few false starts, but she also

engages in self correction. One place where there is potential for misunderstanding is when

Arizona says, "Use my word to re claim the outline," (lines 26 – 27). Specifically, it is not clear

what Arizona means with her use of the word "reclaim," but she ably describes the work that she

has done thus far on the assignment.

Excerpt 8 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Emma and Student Arizona)

```
 3   Emma:      first (.) I want to see: your assignment
 4              she:et
 5   Arizona:   signing?
 6   Emma:      eh 就是寫作要求 {that is the assignment
 7              sheet} (1.5) 就是寫什麼 {that is what needs
 8              to be written} (.) 要求怎麼寫 {what is
 9              required}
10   Arizona:   沒有帶但要寫 {did not bring but need to
11              write} response
12   Emma:      um [response
13   Arizona:      [uh she asked me to write the respond
14              of this but (.) first is (.) read the
15              article=
16   Emma:      =this article
17   Arizona:   and and the reading part (.) we need to
18              hand in an annotation and uh the screen
19              cast to explain the annotation (.) and
20              second the reading- the writing part is
21              writing a summary and respond
22   Emma:      of this article
23   Arizona:   yeah- and I I have already read- write
24              write an outline about it mainly mainly
25              from the comment and that is ( ) and the
26              summary is mainly from mainly uh from the
27              outline (.) just use another use my word
28              to re- claim the (.) outline mm=
29   Emma:      =okay (.) uh 如果妳想的話妳可以用中文我們可以用
30              中文的 {if you want to you can use Chinese
31              we can use Chinese}
32   Arizona:   ((smiles and nods)) mm
```

When Arizona's description of her work thus far is met with Emma's response in

Putonghua, Arizona acknowledges by smiling, nodding, and back-channeling. Emma's response,

ending with a stressed sentence, "We can use Chinese," can be suggestive to Arizona in a

number of ways. One way is that Emma is trying to put Arizona more at ease in the session by letting Arizona know that she can use Chinese. Another way might signal to Arizona that Emma did not understand Arizona's earlier utterances and is thus asking politely that Arizona use Chinese so that Emma can better understand how to help Arizona.

It is difficult to ascertain how Arizona interpreted Emma's response in Chinese. In my follow-up reflective playback interview with Arizona, I attempted to address this question with Arizona. Notice, however, that I began the interview, uncharacteristically, in Mandarin (see Excerpt 9). In retrospect, the notion that Arizona's English proficiency level was low as probably implanted in my head as I observed her tutorial session with Emma. Like Emma, I also wanted to put Arizona at ease for the interview. Arizona, however, responds to my Mandarin opening by requesting to use English (see line 9). Curiously, my response was still in Mandarin, partially because Arizona had made her request in Chinese.

Excerpt 9 (Reflective Playback Interview with Student Arizona, Part 1)

```
 1   Alice:     我會先請妳看差不多前三分鐘然後就是可以讓妳
 2              remember 一些妳的這個 meeting with your tutor
 3              基本上因為這個 video 有四十幾分所以我會在某一部分先
 4              停下來 {I will ask you to watch the first
 5              three minutes to help you remember your
 6              meeting with your tutor basically this
 7              video is around forty minutes so I will
 8              stop in certain places}
 9   Arizona:   能不能用英語 {can I use English}
10   Alice:     都可以都可以看妳自己 {sure of course as you
11              wish}
12   Arizona:   好 {okay}
```

After playing the first three minutes of the tutorial session for Arizona, I begin the interview in English (see Excerpt 10). However, Arizona's response is once again to ask whether she could use English. Curiously, Arizona repeats the last two words of my question first (see

lines 29 – 30). Her repetition of these two words leads me to suspect that perhaps Arizona did

not understand my question and may have thought that I was requesting her to use Chinese. Then

Arizona provides a comprehensive answer to my question about the tutor asking her questions in

Chinese. Arizona explicitly states her wishes to use English because that is a way for her to

improve her proficiency in English (see lines 40 – 41). It is not exactly clear whether there was a

misunderstanding of any kind in this exchange, but Excerpt 10 does show another aspect of the

complexity in the language choices that Arizona makes in addition to how she thinks she can

learn a second language best.

Excerpt 10 (Reflective Playback Interview with Student Arizona, Part 2)

```
26   Alice:     okay so um my first question for you is um
27              what did you think about the tutor asking
28              you questions in Chinese
29   Arizona:   in Chinese um (3.0) 我可以用英語嗎 {can I use
30              English}
31   Alice:     可以可以 {of course of course}
32   Arizona:   我還是想說英語 {I still want to speak in
33              English}
34   Alice:     好都可以隨便妳 {yes fine it's up to you}
35   Arizona:   it will be more easy for me to listen to
36              understand her if she speak Chinese but I
37              still think if I go to the English writing
38              center and maybe it's up to me but still I
39              want everyone in there speak English yeah
40              it's kind of make me improve force me to
41              speak English yeah
```

A little further into the interview (see Excerpt 11), I asked Arizona about Emma's offer

for Arizona to use Chinese to conduct the tutorial session. Arizona's answer aligns well with her

earlier answer that if she is forced to use English, her English will improve. To extend this

argument a little further, Arizona believes that it would be more efficient for her to work in one

language, and in this particular situation, the language required for the written assignment was

114

English. Doing so saves her time because she would not have to translate from Chinese to English.

Excerpt 11 (Reflective Playback Interview with Student Arizona, Part 3)

```
46   Alice:     okay good and uh okay so you answered my
47              second question which is why did you
48              choose to respond in English just now she
49              said you could use Chinese if you want and
50              you used English to answer her question
51   Arizona:   because the article and I was doing is all
52              about English and if he she answer me in
53              Chinese then I have to translate Chinese
54              from English and then write it
```

Through Excerpts 8 – 11, the picture of Arizona's language choices becomes clearer. Arizona prefers to use English as the medium of communication during the writing center tutorial session. She prefers to use English during the reflective playback interview as well and states so explicitly. Thus, when tutor Emma gives Arizona the option of using Chinese and repeats this option a second time in a more emphatic fashion, it is reasonable to suspect that Arizona's reaction of nodding, smiling, and back-channeling can be interpreted as some type of resignation that her wishes were not granted. However, the non-granting of Arizona's wish comes partly from Emma's interpretation of Arizona's low English proficiency, which probably adds to Arizona's frustration with herself. Further into the interview, Arizona provides a self-analysis of her state of confusion with having to negotiate between three languages (see Excerpt 11).

In Excerpt 12, Arizona reveals more information regarding the difficulties she has encountered with the transition process, not only from secondary school to tertiary but also with moving to a multilingual environment. In certain situations, Arizona does not know why she code switches even though she could have easily expressed what she wanted to express in

115

English. In lines 101 – 102, Arizona says that she is capable of expressing the same ideas in English, but what comes out of her mouth was Chinese. Arizona suggests that it is probably due to the lack of "self confidence," but it would be unfair to characterize this as an individual and internal concern.

Excerpt 12 (Reflective Playback Interview with Student Arizona, Part 4)

```
 91   Alice:     and then you switched into Chinese yeah do
 92              you remember why
 93   Arizona:   I just came here the first three months
 94              and Cantonese Mandarin and English is all
 95              around me and I was uh getting crazy
 96              ((laughs)) so sometime I feel like I can't
 97              let the one I'm talking to understand me
 98              in English so maybe in Chinese and she
 99              also can speak Chinese maybe in Chinese I
100              can ex- explain myself better yeah but I
101              still I think the the part I speak Chinese
102              is easy to speak English also I don't know
103              why I'm doing that
104   Alice:     okay that's okay
105   Arizona:   sorry
106   Alice:     no no no don't be sorry
107   Arizona:   it's just um lack of self 自信 ((laughs))
108   Alice:     okay yeah
109   Arizona:   self self what
110   Alice:     self confidence
```

If anything, Arizona's experience at the writing center tutorial session is an indication of the multiple factors that come into play regarding language choice. In addition to the matter of the use of English as the medium of communication on a campus where Cantonese is the dominant language, Arizona has to not only navigate multiple languages but also negotiate with others and with herself on how to communicate. On one level, it may appear that Arizona can choose which language she wants to use. However, with the way that the option of using Chinese is presented to her in the tutorial, it is unclear whether Arizona really has a choice in the matter.

The overall situation is of course complicated by Arizona's own stated confusion over not knowing what is happening to her linguistically.

The other issue that Arizona brings up during her reflective playback interview is Cantonese (line 94). To reiterate, Cantonese is the dominant and local language in Macao, and the default reference of Chinese should logically be Cantonese. However, in Excerpt 1, the Chinese that is referred to in line 6 is Putonghua rather than Cantonese as the words "no problem" are uttered in line 9 in Putonghua, and this is largely because tutor Abby speaks Putonghua but not Cantonese. Coincidentally, student Beth also speaks Putonghua and not Cantonese, so they are able to communicate with each other in Putonghua throughout the session.

Although tutors and most students used whichever languages were at their disposal to ensure effective communication, it should be pointed out that the use of Putonghua as the default Chinese can create additional complications to an already-complicated language choice matter. Depending on their place of education, tutors and students could be referring to different languages when they say the English word "Chinese." In the People's Republic of China, where all of the multilingual tutors completed their secondary education and bachelor's degrees, "Chinese" refers to Putonghua, even if they speak another home language/dialect as their first language because Mandarin (referred to as Putonghua in the People's Republic of China) is the official medium of instruction (M. Ma, personal communication, January 27, 2017). However, in Macao, "Chinese" refers to Cantonese. Thus, when tutors (for example tutors Abby and Emma, see Excerpts 1 and 8, respectively) offer students the choice of using Chinese, their students may be understanding something else.

At work in these tutorial sessions are not only the limitations placed upon multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers because of the nature of institutional talk but also some of the historical and political factors that influence the nature of their interactional choices. The goal-driven tutorial sessions help to narrow the nature of their interaction to helping each other achieve their goals. That is, the student's goal is to seek advice on how to improve the text brought into the writing center. The tutor's goal is to help the student better understand how to revise the text. In addition to the institutional talk constraints placed on the tutor and student, the postcolonial and neocolonial discourses playing out at the University of Macau complicate the participants' language choice in their writing center interactions. One conclusion that can be drawn from Excerpts 4 – 12 is that the participants' choice of language (English and/or Putonghua) not only is connected to maximizing the effectiveness of communication for a goal-driven interaction but also related to how some students wanted to be perceived by their interlocutors.

Having provided the appropriate contextualization necessary to understand the macro constraints to which the participants in the study are bounded, I now report the coded data from the eight tutorial sessions and sixteen reflective playback interviews. First, I present the relevant codes seen in the data that are shared by the multilingual tutors and student writers. Next, I highlight the codes for tutors that indicated their goal-oriented task of providing guidance. Finally, I show the relevant codes shared by tutors and students in their reflections. Table 9 shows the general sequence of the data presentation.

Table 9

Coding of Interaction Types and Reflections

Category	Coding
Affiliation	Code-switching
	Positive feedback
	Joking
	Alignment
	Agreement
Disaffiliation	Confusion
	Frustration
	Redirection
	Disagreement
Functional engagement	Questioning
	Explanation
	Analysis
	Opinion
Non-verbal reactions	Laughter
Reflections	Actions and strategies
	Attitudes and feelings
	Expectations of each other

Choices of (Dis)Affiliation

The discussion of (dis)affiliation aligns well with my selected definition of *identity* (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005). Many scholars have discussed the importance of the move to affiliate and/or disaffiliate in interactions. Such moves of (dis)affiliation are attempts to (dis)align oneself with the interlocutor for one purpose or another. Specifically relating to identity work and writing, Ivanič (2006) argues that the notion of affiliation is one of the three means in which identity is constructed. She defines affiliation as how people take on behaviors similar to those with whom they interact. In other words, (dis)affiliation moves either help to bring interlocutors closer together or pull them further apart. In her research in online advice-giving in Spanish, Placencia (2012) includes the notions of "seeking closeness," (p. 297) "conveying warm feelings" (p.298), "offering reassurance and encouragement," "conveying empathy" (p. 299), and "humor" (p. 300) into her categorization of affiliative strategies. What I have categorized as (dis)affiliation can be compared in a similar vein to these aforementioned descriptions. Specifically, when the participant student writers and tutors are code-switching, offering positive feedback, joking, aligning their ideas with each other, and agreeing, they are in effect engaging in affiliative moves. In this case, the interlocutors are making moves to be closer to one another for the purpose of achieving a goal in these writing center tutorial sessions.

Code-Switching

Connecting back to my discussion on postcolonial and neocolonial discourses, it can be seen in the data that the participants regularly code-switched during the writing center tutorial sessions. These code-switch moves are made as both the student writers and tutors negotiated between the English language task that the student writers brought to the session and the participants' attempts to better understand how improvements can be made to the task at hand.

The code-switch moves also varies from a tutor interpreting that a student writer did not understand enough English (and hence switching from English to Putonghua, see Excerpt 8, lines 28 – 30) to attempts by student writers to search for the exact expressions that they wanted to include in their task (and hence switching from Putonghua to English). In the former scenario, the code-switching occurs because tutor Emma deduces that student Arizona does not understand enough English to continue the session. Emma's move to code-switch is affiliative in that she is trying to let Arizona know that Arizona has access to another language to help accomplish the task. In other words, Emma makes the move to be closer to Arizona so that the discussion can continue.

Excerpt 13 shows an example of the latter situation, where a student writer is contemplating how to better express herself and her ideas in her Honours College personal statement. As student Laura explains her dilemma to tutor Kaila, Laura moves from using Putonghua when she wants to be specific about the nature of her dilemma to using English when she tries to connect her dilemma back to what she has written in her personal statement draft (lines 47 – 52). Tutor Kaila signals that she understands Laura's concerns and focuses on that section of the draft (lines 65 – 69). After six seconds of reading and thinking, Kaila provides a suggestion and uses Putonghua to serve as a bridge between Laura's earlier dilemma and what Laura has actually written in her draft (lines 73 – 74).

Excerpt 13 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Kaila and Student Laura)

```
47   Laura:    我覺得我在誇大 {I feel like I'm exaggerating}
48             ((points at computer screen)) >但是我又找不
49             到< {>but I also can't figure out<} 怎樣能連
50             接到我自己: {how to connect it back to
51             myself:} 然後萬一我想講很長 {and if I want to
52             elaborate on} I want to be in a big family
53             ((looks up)) 或者什麼 {or something like}
```

```
54              stage platform 又很籠統 {that feels too
55              general} ((looks at tutor and then looks
56              away and tutor looks at student as she
57              explains)) 我又不是很想- {I don't want to-}
58              就是說我覺得 h c 是個大家庭: {how to say I
59              feel like h c is a big family:} 在這裡我能
60              {in it I can do} °怎麼樣怎麼樣怎麼樣° {°what
61              what what°} 我覺得 {I feel} °什麼什麼什麼°
62              {°what what what°} 我又找不到一個比較細膩的 {I
63              can't find a more nuanced} ((looks at
64              tutor)) 表達方式: {way of expressing:}
65   Kaila:    mm ((nods)) 好: {okay:} 那我們就首先看一下
66              {then let's first look at} ((looks at
67              computer screen)) (6.0) ((looks at student
68              who looks at computer screen)) 妳可以用很多方
69              法: {you can use many ways:} 妳可以先- {you
70              can first-} 先說妳自己有哪一些特點 {first talk
71              about what special qualities you have}
72   Laura:    嗯: {mm:}
73   Kaila:    或說妳是有一個很強的 {or you have a strong}
74              strong sense of social awareness
75   Laura:    mm
```

As Excerpt 13 shows, student Laura engages in an explication of her dilemma where she has difficulty deciding the best path forward in her revision. Her whispered rambling with her uses of "what what what" (lines 60 – 62) lets tutor Kaila know that Laura is at an impasse, but Laura also analyzes her own writing (lines 47 – 51 and lines 62 – 64) to show not only how she feels about the result but also to reveal the depth of her thinking. Laura appears to be torn between writing about general ideas that can be more easily connected back to her own experiences and writing about more specific qualities that do not feel to her as exaggerations. In this instance, the code-switching moves that student Laura makes help her to explain the nature of her indecision while simultaneously staying focused on what she has written so far in her draft. By revealing the reasons behind her (in)decision-making, Laura is setting herself up to receive guidance from her more capable and experienced peer. The end of Laura's turn is

followed up by tutor Kaila trying to give Laura some assurance that together they can figure something out to solve this dilemma (lines 65 – 66) when Kaila uses the pronoun *us* in "let's" to indicate the uptake of Laura's predicament. Through Kaila's reassurance in Putonghua, the tutor can then move on to making suggestions on Laura's draft in English. Although Laura initiates the code-switch from Putonghua to English and back to Putonghua, Kaila's decision to conduct her uptake in Putonghua first serves to affiliate herself to Laura. Together then, Laura and Kaila have both made affiliative moves to be closer to each other. For Laura, it is her revelation that she does not know how to make certain connections in her writing, and this revelation is made in Putonghua. For Kaila, it is her move to comfort Laura in Putonghua and to include herself in this problem-solving exercise.

For the tutor, besides code-switching to minimize the communication gap and to offer reassurance, code-switching is also done to make the tutor's explanations for possible revision more convincing to the student writer. Excerpt 14 is a tutorial session between tutor Abby and student Kelly on Kelly's curriculum vitae (CV). Abby is trying to get Kelly to reconsider her verb choices. The excerpt begins with Abby using three different means of hesitation, including "under this situation," "it feels like," and two different Putonghua phrases to express "for example" (lines 396 – 399). Abby's multiple means of stalling before giving her answer allows Kelly to enter the conversation with a suggestion to use a noun, which is rejected by Abby. However, Abby immediately follows up her rejection of Kelly's suggestion with an explanation of where Abby is trying to lead Kelly for the revision of her CV heading (lines 403 – 410). During this sequence, Abby only says two English words, "title" and "participate," but it can be seen from the excerpt that Abby has a better understanding of the English CV genre than Kelly and is trying to tell Kelly about the types verbs that CV readers expect to see. Looking through

Kelly's CV for the types of verbs she used, I find verbs such as "participated," "joined," and "held." What Abby is attempting to convey to Kelly through Putonghua is to suggest that stronger verbs are needed to indicate to the reader that Kelly did much more than just being there.

Excerpt 14 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Abby and Student Kelly)

```
396   Abby:    然後呢：{and then:} 在這種情況下就是 title 的話
397            好像是：{under this situation for the title
398            it feels like:} 比如說：{for example:} 舉個例
399            子就是 {let me give an example which is:}
400            ((looking on computer with student)) mm
401   Kelly:   用不用名詞？{should use noun?} ((both return
402            to looking at paper))
403   Abby:    >也不是名詞< {>not a noun<} 就是一個給別人一種：
404            {more of a feeling:} 是在這個崗位上 {that
405            ((the writer)) has been in this position}
406            ((tutor and student hold each other's gaze
407            briefly)) 工作過的感覺 {has worked} (0.5) 而
408            不是妳只是 participate 了一下然後就出來了 {and
409            not that you have only participated for a
410            little bit and then left} ((smiles))
411   Kelly:   mm mm ((nods))
412   Abby:    對吧?就是這種感覺= {right? that's the
413            feeling=}
```

Although student Kelly requested that the tutorial session be conducted in Putonghua at the beginning of the session— and hence the overwhelming use of Putonghua by tutor Abby—it is nonetheless seen through Excerpt 14 that the number of stalling and hedging devices Abby used in a short turn helps to soften her message to Kelly that Kelly needs to use more dynamic verbs to showcase what she actually did for those organizations and activities. Through her employment of delaying and mitigating devices in Putonghua, Abby is able to convince Kelly that Kelly should use stronger verbs. After Kelly's ready acceptance in line 411, Abby confirms

Kelly's decision. Abby's affiliative moves to soften her message and to affirm Kelly's correct decision are done through code-switching to Putonghua.

Positive Feedback

On the use of positive feedback as a means of achieving affiliative moves, the multilingual tutor participants used this strategy more often than the multilingual student writers since that is one of their primary tutorial duties. Tutors, in fact, utilized several different types of positive feedback, including encouragement, compliments, and enthusiasm as part of their affiliative moves. For student writers, there were only a few instances in the data where this strategy was exhibited. Excerpt 15 is a short exchange between tutor Abby and student Ellen, and Ellen has brought in her personal statement for revision. Up to this point in the session, Ellen was quite active in bouncing ideas off of Abby. In the excerpt, Ellen is asking Abby to help with revising for conciseness. Ellen wants to replace "caring for people" (lines 248 – 249) with a different word or phrase that fits with another part of her topic sentence that begins with "I am enthusiastic" (see line 256).

Excerpt 15 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Abby and Student Ellen)

```
247   Ellen:    actually I'm thinking about mm wha- what
248             else I can use to instead of using caring
249             for people cuz I I=
250   Abby:     =considerate
251   Ellen:    OH considerate ((smiles and writes down
252             the word))
253   Abby:     maybe or you might disagree.
254   Ellen:    YEAH considerate ((student appears to be
255             happy with the suggestion))
256   Abby:     I am enthusiastic and considerate.
```

In Excerpt 15, student Ellen demonstrates her positive feedback of tutor Abby's suggestion through her loud speech, which I have interpreted as Ellen being happy with the suggestion since the loud speech came with a smile. In the first instance of loud speech, where

Ellen says "oh," (line 251), Ellen smiles as she writes down the word. Note that she does not ask Abby how to spell the word, signaling that Ellen knows the word but perhaps does not realize she can use it to replace "caring for people." In fact, when I followed up with Ellen on this point in the reflective playback interview, Ellen mentioned that she did indeed know the word "considerate" but had not realized that it could replace "caring for people" (student Ellen, working with tutor Abby, reflective playback interview, March 24, 2016). When Abby tries to take the pressure off of Ellen to accept Abby's suggestion, Ellen responds with another emphatic "yeah" before repeating the word "considerate" again (line 254). Although Ellen does not say much else in this excerpt, it is clear that she is providing Abby with positive feedback on Abby's suggestions. Not only does Ellen provide the positive feedback verbally, she does it non-verbally as well with her smiling at Abby's suggestion. With the employment of loud speech and non-verbal cues, Ellen provides the appropriate affiliative signals to Abby that helps to align them with each other.

Because of the nature of the writing center tutorial session, it is reasonable to expect the tutors to employ different means of positive feedback. The data reveals three different ways that the tutors in the study provided positive feedback. The first type, offering encouragement, is exemplified by Excerpt 16, a tutorial between tutor Kaila and student Laura. Up to this point, the tutorial was rather contentious, in the sense that Laura was not very willing to accept the suggestions that Kaila was making. Put in another way, Kaila was not successful in convincing Laura of the necessity to make certain revisions. Yet, at the very beginning of the session, Laura stated that she revised her personal statement draft at least two to three times before bringing it to the writing center for feedback, after which Laura made one more revision. Altogether then, the draft that Kaila was seeing was the third or fourth revision.

126

Excerpt 16 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Kaila and Student Laura)

```
434   Kaila:    mm ((student looks at tutor)) 因為在一個
435             {because in a } personal statement 裡面妳要
436             表現出妳自己的- {in it you need to show
437             your-} 對- {yes-} 就很有自信的哪一種 {a self-
438             confident way} ((student looks away then
439             at screen)) 就不要這樣說. {so don't say
440             this.} 無論結果是怎麼樣. {no matter what the
441             result is.} 我都會怎麼樣. {I will do that.}
442             就- {just-} 都不要說這些 {don't say these
443             things}
444   Laura:    ((laughs))
445   Kaila:    ((looks at student)) 因為 {because}
446             personal statement 只限三百字嘛. {is limited
447             to three hundred words.}
448   Laura:    ((nods))
449   Kaila:    所以這三百字. {so these three hundred
450             words.} 一定要每一句都用在點子上 {every
451             sentence must be on point}
452   Laura:    嗯 {mm} ((nods))
453   Kaila:    對吧. {right?} 這些很客套的話. {so these
454             platitudes} 我們就先不要說 {let's skip them
455             first}
456   Laura:    嗯 {mm} ((nods))
457             (0.5)
458   Kaila:    妳要對妳- {you should-} 最後妳要對妳很有信心-
459             {lastly you should be confident-} 就是說啊
460             {that is to say} (3.0) ((looks up at
461             ceiling)) mm 妳可以先想一想. {you can think
462             about it first.} ((looks at student))
```

By the number of revisions alone, student Laura is not particularly happy with the way

her draft is going. Three quarters of the way into the tutorial session, tutor Kaila is still trying to

convince Laura that the personal statement needs to exude confidence (line 434 – 438). After

Kaila's statement, however, Laura reacts by turning away for a moment before returning her

gaze to look at the screen. As Kaila continues to discuss what to delete in Laura's third or fourth

revision, Laura reacts by laughing (line 444). Different from the types of laughter that bring

people closer together, Kaila's further elaboration on the specifications of this particular personal statement helps to make clear that Laura's laughter is made out of frustration that her third or fourth revision still does not meet expectations. The helpless or frustrated laughter is what warrants Kaila to provide a more detailed explanation on why words cannot be wasted on platitudes and clichés (lines 453 – 455). Kaila follows up on Laura's affirmation with a small pep talk or encouragement, both to the person Kaila is talking to and the person that Laura has described on her personal statement. Although not captured in Excerpt 16, a few turns later, Laura finally accepts the tutor's advice and decides to discuss the opportunities that the Honours College can offer and how these opportunities can make Laura a better person. Thus, the affiliative moves that Kaila makes in this sequence, through detailed explanation and encouragement, help to move Laura closer to the decision that Kaila wants Laura to make.

Besides offering encouragement, giving compliments is another way of providing positive feedback that makes up the affiliative category. In Excerpt 17, tutor Abby and student Ellen are working on Ellen's personal statement. Ellen was one of the more proactive students who took more of a leading role in her own revision process. In this excerpt, Abby and Ellen are reading through the last part of Ellen's statement, and Ellen is seeking Abby's confirmation for specific word choice revisions that she wants to make. Ellen is the one making the revisions on her own paper. As Ellen bounces ideas off of Abby, Abby says "sure sounds perfect" and "that's very nice" (lines 446 – 447) as a way to not only compliment Ellen's own initiative and idea-generation but also to keep Ellen going. It is also interesting to note that Abby uses "we" during her complimentary turn (line 447), projecting the impression that she and Ellen are working on the draft together. As a response, Ellen also takes up Abby's use of "we" in line 448. Abby's demonstrative approval of Ellen's suggestions helps to create a sense of closeness during the

interaction that then allows Abby to include herself in the revision process. Ellen confirms her

appreciation of Abby's inclusion of herself in the process by repeating the use of "we" in her

response, which signals to Abby to continue to refer to the two of them as "we" working on the

draft together (line 450).

Excerpt 17 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Abby and Student Ellen)

```
443   Ellen:      mm oh can- can I I feel strongly
444               responsible for ((looks up at ceiling))
445               helping people in need↑
446   Abby:       yeah sure °sounds perfect° that's very
447               nice so we keep that sentence
448   Ellen:      ((crosses something out)) so we: don't use
449               give back to society
450   Abby:       yeah so we [avoid something
451   Ellen:                  [it overlap
452   Abby:       something overlapping okay ((reads)) in a
453               sense h c will be a- will be an ((points
454               to word on paper))
455   Ellen:      ((makes correction))
456   Abby:       excellent opportunity okay
```

Finally, the third way that tutors can demonstrate positive feedback toward their student

writers is through enthusiasm of the ideas that the student writers generate. One such example of

this demonstration of passion can be found in Excerpt 18, where tutor Faye and student Vicky

are brainstorming ideas of how to revise Vicky's personal statement to make it stand out among

the crowd of personal statements. Earlier in the session, Vicky mentioned that she saw the

sample personal statements used in a writing center workshop and was not particularly impressed

by the sample. Still, Vicky recognized that although she found the sample unimpressive, she is

nonetheless unable to produce something better. In the excerpt, Faye is asking Vicky somewhat

leading questions to help Vicky brainstorm potential ideas for inclusion in her personal

statement. As Vicky begins to elaborate on potential abilities, note Faye's increasing stress on

her uses of "yes" (lines 249, 252, and 254). As Vicky suggests one idea, Faye tries to show her

enthusiasm for each idea by being louder with her approval, even as Vicky continues to be

relatively unsure with her ideas as she raises her intonation combined with her whisper to signal

her lack of certainty. Each time Vicky utters her ideas with this lack of certainty, Faye responds

with louder certainty. In lines 260 – 261, Faye switches tactics. Instead of increasing the

loudness of her voice, she quickens the pace of her utterances of "yeah" as another way to show

her enthusiasm for Vicky's ideas.

Excerpt 18 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Faye and Student Vicky)

```
247    Faye:      yeah what kinds of [ability
248    Vicky:                        [knowledge
249    Faye:      yes exactly °knowledge° ability what kinds
250               of ability (1.0)
251    Vicky:     °interacting with people°?
252    Faye:      YES
253    Vicky:     °organizing activities°?
254    Faye:      YES
255    Vicky:     °leading groups°?
256    Faye:      YEah (.)
257    Vicky:     yeah:
258    Faye:      just- I mean=
259    Vicky:     =broaden my mind like [that
260    Faye:                            [>yeah yeah yeah
261               yeah yeah< why why [why why don't you
262    Vicky:                        [((laughs))
263    Faye:      put thi- put this I mean on the the
264               introduction↓
265    Vicky:     well?
266    Faye:      yeah
267    Vicky:     yeah. okay. I get it. maybe
268    Faye:      and can you write down a few keywords here
269               then maybe you can remind yourself later
270               when you improve it (1.0)
```

Although student Vicky responds by laughing (line 262), tutor Faye nonetheless forges

forward and asks Vicky to consider putting down the ideas Vicky just came up with in her

personal statement. Not being able to come up with any reasons to reject Faye's suggestion,

Vicky answers by hesitatingly saying "yeah okay I get it maybe" (line 267). Vicky's "maybe"

signals to Faye that Vicky is not wholly convinced that "interacting with people," "organizing activities," and "leading groups" are outstanding enough to be included in her introduction. However, when Faye prompts Vicky to write down the ideas first, Vicky follows this suggestion even as she continues to dispute those ideas later in the conversation.

As Excerpt 18 demonstrates, tutor Faye effectively employs her enthusiasm of Vicky's ideas to encourage Vicky to continue her brainstorming. This affiliative move occurs in two ways, one through an increasing loudness in Faye's voice and another through her quickened pace of utterance. As a result of her employment of these strategies, Faye succeeds in getting Vicky to at least write down her ideas for further consideration. Vicky's uptake of Faye's enthusiasm shows the development of a positive connection between the two interlocutors.

Through the use of compliments, encouragement, and the display of enthusiasm, the tutors in the study provided their student writers with positive feedback that allowed for a closer, if momentary, bond to form between the interlocutors. Although the student writers in the study did not demonstrate as many instances of positive feedback, student writer Ellen nonetheless found a way to show her appreciation of her tutor's suggestions. These strategies helped in the affiliation process of the interlocutors involved.

Joking

The third means of achieving affiliation between tutors and student writers is done through joke-making. In the data, there are only a few instances of attempts at joke-making. Nonetheless, humor has been shown to be an effective way to develop a positive connection with an interlocutor (Placencia, 2012). In Excerpt 19, tutor Abby and student Ellen are working on Ellen's personal statement. The session lasts around 45 minutes, and the excerpt shown is approximately 35 minutes into the session. Up to this point, Abby and Ellen were discussing

which qualities Ellen wanted to highlight in her statement and the reasons why Ellen wanted to

apply to Honours College.

Excerpt 19 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Abby and Student Ellen)

```
404   Abby:      you can (6.0) ((finishes putting on
405              jacket)) as a global citizen or as one
406              member of the global citizens um the
407              future is (3.0) okay ((smiles)) something
408              very general that says- sounds like the
409              future um falls on our shoulder ((laughs))
410   Ellen:     ((laughs))
411   Abby:      it's silly it's something huge but jut an
412              idea okay how about ( ) do you have any
413              idea on this or-
414   Ellen:     no
415   Abby:      if you don't have I- uh don't have the
416              exact sentence you can give some idea like
417              what you want to- what you want them to
418              understand (1.0)
```

Excerpt 19 begins with Abby providing Ellen with a suggestion to include something

about being "a global citizen" in her personal statement (line 405). Abby's train of thought is

interrupted by her association of "global citizen" with something akin to heavy responsibilities.

Abby finishes her turn by stating "sounds like the future um falls on our shoulder" and laughing

at what she feels is something funny (lines 408 – 409). Ellen responds by also laughing at

whatever Abby has just said (line 410). Abby continues to explain that her idea may not be

appropriate, but the general mood of this segment of the conversation remains light-hearted and

jovial. The exchange ends with Abby giving a rather general suggestion that no matter what

decision is made, Ellen should keep in mind the needs of her audience. Through this short

exchange where tutor Abby makes an attempt to say something funny, and through student

Ellen's uptake of that attempt, a positive atmosphere is created. Abby's affiliative move is

accepted by Ellen, which brings the two interlocutors closer together. Although this segment

does not capture a concrete action towards the improvement of Ellen's personal statement, Ellen seems to find it a satisfactory interaction and moves on to her next question.

Attempts at humor are also made by student writers to build a positive connection with her tutor. In Excerpt 20, tutor Abby and student Beth are discussing Beth's personal statement. Their session lasts around 40 minutes, and the excerpt occurs roughly 30 minutes into the tutorial. In the tutorial, Putonghua is the main language used since Beth indicated a preference to use Chinese at the beginning of the session (see Excerpt 1). Abby and Beth are discussing the conclusion paragraph of the personal statement. For reference, the original draft of the conclusion paragraph appears as follows:

> It was various HC promotion activities that helped me get a profound idea of it – HC is like a family, in which there is studious and positive environment created by a group of outstanding and outgoing members. I have been chasing my dream of HC since I came to the University of Macau, which actually has always been a direction and powerful motivation in my hard work and active participations. (student Beth's personal statement draft, March 18, 2016)

Excerpt 20 begins with tutor Abby discussing student Beth's choice to use the word "direction" (line 215) and Abby's indirect attempt at trying to get Beth to reconsider this word choice through analyzing the purpose of Honours College, here referred to as the letters *h* and *c* (line 216). During this sequence, Beth only provides back-channeling and a brief acknowledgement. Beth appears to understand Abby's point in lines 226 – 228 when Beth applies the meaning of the word *direction* literally to her potential for getting rejected by Honours College. Beth laughs at her own statement, and Abby joins her in this laughter (line 229), thereby confirming Beth's analysis of this double meaning of the word *direction*. The

133

excerpt ends with Abby moving on to the next aspect of Beth's personal statement, which focuses on motivation.

Excerpt 20 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Abby and Student Beth)

```
214   Abby:    這裡的話 {for this part} (.) 我覺得 {I feel}
215            direction 的話 (Weston et al.) (.) 會不會因為
216            h c 的話只是一個 {would it be because h c
217            wise is only a} (.) 平台 {platform}
218   Beth:    ((nods))
219   Abby:    它會讓妳去 {it will allow you to} hmm 譬如說
220            讓妳去怎麼樣. {for example allow you to.} 去:
221            {say.} >更好< {>better<} 有: {have:} 機會提升
222            自己 {((a)) chance to improve yourself}
223   Beth:    嗯 {mm}
224   Abby:    但是如果說是一個 {but if it is} direction 的話
225            - {wise-}
226   Beth:    好像沒上的話就迷失方向 (hh) {as if I don't get
227            in I will lose ((my)) way} 的感覺 {that
228            feeling of} ((laughs))
229   Abby:    ((laughs)) .hh 這樣說的話 {when ((you)) put
230            it like this} er 有一定 {it makes a
231            certain} (hh) 道理. {sense.} 然後 {then} er
232            所以我覺得這個 {so I think this ((use of))}
233            motivation 其實是完全可以的 {is completely
234            acceptable} (.) 但 {but} motivation 的話
235            (Weston et al.) >可能就不能用< {>probably
236            can't use<} 一個 {one} motivation 來形容 {to
237            describe}
238   Beth:    啊 {oh}
```

More specifically, lines 226 – 228 are where Beth's attempt at humor lies. Beth laughs at her own joke, and Abby joins her in sharing this laugh. To create this joke, Beth must first understand all of the indirect insinuations Abby makes at the beginning of the exchange as a way to hint to Beth that Abby does not think using the word "direction" (line 215) is appropriate. Abby hedges and hesitates several times, using words such as "wise" and "would it be" (lines 215, 216, and 224) and again in lines 219 – 221 where she employs a vocalized pause and

134

elongations of word-ending syllables. When Abby returns to focus on the word "direction" in line 224, Beth appears to pick up on all of Abby's previous clues and draws a conclusion before Abby finishes her thought. During Beth's turn in lines 226 – 228, Beth begins to laugh before she finishes her sentence, as if she realizes the folly of her use of the word *direction* to signal to the readers of her personal statement that she must be admitted to Honours College. Beth understands that the word *direction* has more than one meaning, and according to the online dictionary Merriam-Webster.com, it can mean "a guiding, governing, or motivating purpose,"[2] which is probably Beth's original intent in her draft. However, because Abby has highlighted this word and spent some time deliberating over it, Beth knows that Abby probably has interpreted the word to mean "the line or course on which something is moving or is aimed to move or along which something is pointing or facing." The opportunity for misunderstanding is what allows Beth's attempt at a joke to be successful.

Successful joke-making requires the interlocutor to pick up on all of the intended double or hidden meanings. Beth finishes her turn by laughing, and Abby joins Beth in laughter. As Abby continues with her laughter, she utters her next sentence, "When you put it like this er it makes a certain (hh) sense" (lines 229 – 231). Abby's response not only confirms to Beth that Abby understood the joke, but also Abby is able to use the joke as an opportunity to diffuse her earlier hedging and reluctance by doubling down on Beth's deliberate misapplication of the meaning of the word *direction* in her analysis.

---

[2] The two definitions of the word *direction* are retrieved from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/direction

Together these two instances of joke-making—one initiated by tutor Abby and one initiated by student Beth—demonstrate both the tutor's and the student writer's ability to make affiliative moves to bring their interactions with their interlocutors closer together. Although more complicated than the strategies of code-switching and providing positive feedback because humor requires the interlocutor's uptake, joke-making is an effective affiliative move (Placencia, 2012) that not only lightens the mood of the writing center tutorial for both parties but also allows a bond to be formed between the interlocutors.

Alignment

Alignment is another code that arose from the coding process, and it is part of the affiliative moves that both the multilingual tutors and student writers made. Alignment is the formation of a temporary alliance between two interlocutors, and the alignments I noticed in the data are exhibited primarily through the use of the subject pronoun *we* as well as the object pronoun *us*. There are quite a few instances of these particular pronoun uses, and they are mostly used by the tutors. Whether used by the tutors or the student writers, the pronouns refer to the two participants in the conversation, thereby signaling to the other interlocutor that they are in the revision endeavor together.

I have already mentioned instances of the use of the subject pronoun *we* in an earlier excerpt (see Excerpt 17) and the use of the object pronoun *us* in two other excerpts (see Excerpts 13 and 16), where tutor Abby and student Ellen both use these pronouns to refer to themselves in the exchange. I show another instance of this type of alignment but in Putonghua to illustrate that this use of the pronoun *we* is consistent in both English and Putonghua. Excerpt 21 is a short segment between tutor Christy and student Paula. Paula has brought the start of an essay that she

136

has written to practice for a timed essay examination. The segment occurs within the first five minutes of the tutorial session.

Excerpt 21 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Christy and Student Paula)

```
61   Christy:   那第一句話妳有說 {so in the first sentence
62              you have stated} recently 有一個 {there is
63              a} hot discussion on whether- whether
64              rising retirement age or not. 是誰在提高這個
65              {who is raising this} retirement age?
66   Paula:     肯定是那個 {it must be the} government
67   Christy:   mm 那這裡主語是不是: {so the subject is:}
68   Paula:     哦: {oh:}
69   Christy:   我們最好把它加上 {we had better add to it}
70              whether the government should rise
71              retirement age or not.
72   Paula:     哦: 對對對 {oh: right right right}
```

As tutor Christy begins her analysis of student Paula's writing, Christy uses "you" (line 61) to refer to Paula. Later in the segment, Christy asks Paula a leading question to get her to check that the subject of her sentence is clear. When Paula answers with "oh" (line 68), Christy interprets this back-channeling to mean that Paula may not understand what Christy is suggesting. For clarification, Christy tells Paula that the phrase "whether the government should rise retirement age or not" should be added to Paula's sentence so that the subject of the sentence is clear (lines 69 – 71). Although Christy is asking Paula to make a revision based on Christy's recommendation, Christy uses "we" (line 69) in Putonghua when she could have easily continued to use the second person singular. Perhaps to mitigate the force of her suggestion, Christy opts to use the first person plural. By including herself into the revision process even though she is not making the revision, Christy has aligned herself with the student writer, creating a space where both the tutor and the student writer are in this endeavor together. Altogether, Christy makes this affiliative move in Putonghua 11 times during her tutorial session

with Paula, and each time, Christy uses the pronoun *we* as if she and Paula are doing the revision together.

Agreement

Compared with the four other means of achieving affiliation discussed thus far, agreement is perhaps the most similar to positive feedback. Both agreement and positive feedback are response strategies in a conversation while code-switching, joking, and alignment strategies are initiated. On agreement, most of the instances documented show that students reacted to a multilingual tutor's suggestion and agreed to it while tutors reacted to a student's attempt at confirmation and agreed to it. Thus, the responses demonstrating agreement are typically very short answers. Excerpts 22 shows an extended example of agreement, with student Vicky agreeing with tutor Faye's suggestion.

Excerpt 22 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Faye and Student Vicky)

```
593   Faye:     =to demonstrate your communication skills
594             um but (0.5) yeah if you can give a little
595             bit more details of: what kinds of: [( )
596             and skills
597   Vicky:                                        [oh
598             because of the limitation of words (0.5)
599             it's hard to add anything else
600   Faye:     okay (1.0) ye:ah
601   Vicky:    I'll try hard to delete the: words in
602             order to keep it under three hundred (1.5)
603             yeah I I think so it sounds too general
604   Faye:     yeah
```

Excerpt 22 is a brief exchange between tutor Fay and student Vicky, approximately 20 minutes into the session. Faye suggests that Vicky needs to provide more information in her personal statement. Specifically, Faye asks Vicky to give examples of the types of skills that Vicky has (lines 594 – 595). Vicky hesitates before accepting this suggestion because of her concern that she will exceed the word limit specified in the Honours College application

138

instructions for personal statements (lines 597 – 599). When Faye appears to accept Vicky's

concern for not including more details, Vicky ends this section of the discussion by agreeing

with Faye's suggestion. Perhaps after re-reading this section of her personal statement, Vicky

states, "I think so it sounds too general" (line 603), thereby agreeing with Faye's original

suggestion that more details need to be added to her draft. In Vicky's signal of agreement, she

does not utter the words "I agree," but the same idea is represented by her use of "I think so."

Instead of echoing Faye's suggestion that more details need to be provided, Vicky demonstrates

that she understands the point of Faye's suggestion and agrees with it by paraphrasing Faye's

recommendation into "it sounds too general." The agreement move that Vicky makes is

somewhat more complicated than simply declaring her agreement. Vicky's acceptance of Faye's

suggestion brings this part of the conversation to a close. Vicky has not only made an affiliative

move of agreement but also paraphrased Faye's suggestion to signal that she fully understands it.

Out of all of the instances of student agreement, Vicky's utterance is one of the longer

ones where the student made a full statement of agreement ("I think so") and simultaneously

included a reason ("it sounds too general"). Most of the other instances of agreement comes in

the form of short one- or two-word answers such as the following exchange (Excerpt 23) that

occurs much later in the tutorial session between tutor Faye and student Vicky. In this segment,

both Faye and Vicky are quite involved in the revision process, with Faye not quite finished

uttering her suggestion and Vicky completing her turn, anticipating what Faye wants to say. This

common understanding allows Vicky to finish this segment with a fast-paced series of "yeah"

(line 903) to reconfirm her agreement that she needs to add more details. Vicky's quick move

toward affiliation is what allows this discussion on details to end so that they can both move on

to the next point.

139

Excerpt 23 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Faye and Student Vicky)

```
899   Faye:      yeah you can so maybe yeah give the
900              impressing=
901   Vicky:     =details
902   Faye:      impressive details here
903   Vicky:     >yeah yeah yeah< okay
```

Excerpt 24 is an example of a tutor demonstrating her explicit agreement on an idea discussed during a writing center tutorial session. Tutor Marion and student Cathy are working on Cathy's essay. In this segment, Cathy is explaining to Marion the rationale behind Cathy's decision to include the word "appropriate" in her thesis statement. For reference, Cathy's thesis statement from her essay is, "Hence, academic achievement, changes in personality and interpersonal relationship, and social dedication in young adulthood are three main reasons why teens should participate in appropriate amount of extracurricular activities" (student Cathy's academic essay draft, March 11, 2015). In the first half of Excerpt 24, student Cathy is the one doing most of the talking while tutor Marion mostly back-channels. As Cathy gets toward the end of the rationale of her decision, Marion explicitly says "yeah I agree that's a good point" (line 606) to signal that Marion understands and agrees with the rationale provided. Marion's agreement allows Cathy to continue explaining her choices in her draft, and Marion returns to her back-channeling to indicate to Cathy that Marion is listening. The explicit agreement strategy, as employed by Marion, serves as an effective means of achieving affiliation quickly with Cathy so that discussion of the draft can continue.

Excerpt 24 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Marion and Student Cathy)

```
323   Cathy:     because uh in my thesis statement. these
324              words. appropriate is also very important
325   Marion:    yes.
326   Cathy:     yes- because uh when people may think that
327              uh the more I participate in=
328   Marion:    =hmm mm
```

```
329   Cathy:     extracurricular activities=
330   Marion:    =hmm
331   Cathy:     the more I will gain=
332   Marion:    =hmm
333   Cathy:     but the result=
334   Marion:    =hmm mm
335   Cathy:     uh ( )
336   Marion:    yeah I agree that's a good point
337   Cathy:     yes so first I show I show evidence about
338              why↓ uh teens should take part in=
339   Marion:    =hmm mm
340   Cathy:     uh moderate amount=
341   Marion:    =hmm mm
342   Cathy:     of extracurricular activities=
343   Marion:    =hmm mm
```

Together, the brief exchange between tutor Marion and student Cathy, coupled with the

two examples of agreement in the session between tutor Faye and student Vicky, illustrate how

various types of uttering agreement can help achieve affiliation between two interlocutors. A

total of five different types of affiliation choices are exemplified, and they include: code-

switching, positive feedback, joking, alignment, and agreement.

The next section of the data presentation focuses on disaffiliative moves that the

multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers make in their writing center tutorial sessions.

Disaffiliative strategies, in contrast with affiliative strategies, are moves made by the interactants

that result in greater distance (as opposed to closeness) or a momentary negative connection (as

opposed to a positive one). From her online advice-giving data, Placencia (2012) categorized

disaffiliative moves as antagonistic and uncooperative responses. Perhaps because due to the

face-to-face nature of the writing center tutorial sessions, codes of such negativity did not arise

from the current study. From the data, disaffiliation is mostly achieved through indications of

confusion, frustration, redirection, and disagreement by both the tutors and student writers.

Compared with the results of affiliative moves, disaffiliative moves often end up with the interlocutor making detailed explanations to try to resolve the disaffiliation.

Confusion

Both the multilingual tutors and student writers experienced confusion throughout the eight recorded tutorial sessions. Confusion can be expressed explicitly (e.g. "I am confused.") and implicitly. The next excerpt captures a moment of implicit confusion that is felt by tutor Abby, and this confusion is actually expressed through her occupation of the reader's position. Excerpt 25 is a tutorial session between tutor Abby and student Ellen. It begins with Abby reading a part of Ellen's personal statement. Note lines 183 – 185, where Abby begins her setup to let Ellen know that Abby is confused. Abby does not explicitly state that she is confused. Instead, she mitigates the confusion by placing the blame on the "grammatical uh rules" (line 185), which can cause confusion. When Abby continues to explain what the confusion is, her explanation is not necessarily logical. If the listener accepts that grammatical rules can be confusing, such confusion would have no impact on the length of the personal statement (lines 187 – 188). As Abby's explanation progresses, she gets to the real point that she wants to make, which is that she is confused. However, Abby does not use "I" to represent herself; she uses "people" (line 189). The people to which Abby refers are the readers (i.e. the selection committee) of all of the Honours College applications.

Excerpt 25 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Abby and Student Ellen)

```
180   Abby:      ((reading starts)) whether I would be
181              qualified to be in charge of a committee
182              and to organize activities for students
183              ((reading ends)) uh jus- uh just so you
184              know. it's uh sometimes the sentence
185              patterns or the grammatical uh rules-
186   Ellen:     mm
```

```
187   Abby:      uh could be a little confusing. especially
188              in a very short uh statement like this so
189              people would be maybe extra picky about
190              that thing:
191   Ellen:     mm
192   Abby:      and especially when they have to
193              browse >tons and tons< of s- personal
194              statements.
195   Ellen:     ye:ah
196   Abby:      then they might be tired or they might be
197              dizzy.
198   Ellen:     mm
199   Abby:      and things might look less clear
200   Ellen:     [okay
201   Abby:      [for them
```

By temporarily occupying the space of an imagined third person, tutor Abby is able to not only make her disaffiliative move to let student Ellen know that Abby is confused but also mitigate that move to soften the blow of the message. In doing so, Abby disassociates herself from the confusion, thereby creating more distance between Ellen and herself. Note that as the interaction in Excerpt 25 continues, Abby sustains her use of the pronoun *they* and *them* (line 192, 196, 201) to maintain the signal that she is not confused but that the readers of these personal statements would be confused. As can be seen from the excerpt, once confusion is initiated by one party, it requires substantial time and space to clarify the meaning and/or the source of the confusion. Throughout this segment, Abby is the one doing most of the talking since she points out a source of confusion and thus has the responsibility to explain the confusion to her interlocutor.

An example of an explicit expression of confusion can be found in Excerpt 26. In this excerpt, tutor Marion and student Cathy are working on revising Cathy's essay on the benefits of extra-curricular activities. Prior to the exchange captured in Excerpt 26, Marion asks about the stance that Cathy has taken in her thesis statement. Marion's series of questions continues in

lines 184 – 185 and 187 – 188. While Marion's first question appears to be a leading question, the second functions as a rhetorical question. Cathy responds with an "ohh" (line 189) which might signal that she understands the mistake she has made. However, her utterance is followed up with "so I get a bit um confused" (line 191), indicating that she does not understand what Marion was trying to point out with her earlier questions.

Excerpt 26 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Marion and Student Cathy)

```
184    Marion:     so um go back to here. did you mention all
185                these three reasons in your examples here?
186    Cathy:      hmm no. no
187    Marion:     right and how how how could you conclude
188                that hence blah blah blah
189    Cathy:      ohh:.
190    Marion:     so-
191    Cathy:      so I get a bit um confused or I don't know
192                how to- yes connect well
193    Marion:     I think that's the connection you're
194                looking for
195    Cathy:      yeah.
196    Marion:     right.
197    Cathy:      mm:
198    Marion:     so how how does this example
199    Cathy:      [mm
200    Marion:     [lead to this conclusion right?
201    Cathy:      mm mm (3.0) mm (3.0) mm if I change this
202                part=
203    Marion:     =mm hmm
204    Cathy:      um however dah dah dah dah to this part
205    Marion:     mm mm
206    Cathy:      I'm talking about some um my-
```

As the exchange continues, tutor Marion appears to be providing an answer to student Cathy's confusion, but Cathy's utterances do not indicate understanding. Specifically, the number of back-channels (line 197, 199, 201) and one-word answers (line 195), coupled by the gaps of silence (line 201), together demonstrate that Cathy is having trouble processing how she is supposed to revise that part of her essay. Perhaps sensing that Cathy remains confused, Marion

144

tries to rephrase her question in lines 198 and 200, after which Cathy points to a specific sentence in her essay and begins to revise that sentence verbally. However, the confusion continues for many more turns, and it is not until line 228 (not shown) that Cathy finally says "I get it."

Similar to the implicit statement of confusion, the initiation of an explicit statement of confusion also leads to more time and space spent on meaning negotiation. Although the statements of confusion can manifest themselves in different ways and although the reactions to these statements of confusion can be different as well, in both of the instances shown in Excerpts 25 and 26, confusion leads to much more mediation by the interlocutors as compared with affiliative moves. It is because of the distancing effect of confusion that places its categorization as a disaffiliative move.

Frustration

Frustration is another code that I placed into the disaffiliative category. Excerpt 27 shows tutor Faye demonstrating a bit of frustration toward student Vicky's lack of willingness to engage. The excerpt is taken from approximately 55 minutes into the 65-minute long tutorial at the point when Faye and Vicky have moved on from working on Vicky's personal statement to Vicky's CV. Perhaps it is due to the length of the session, or perhaps it is due to some of their earlier disagreements about what types of information should go into a personal statement. It is clear, however, that Faye is somewhat frustrated with Vicky toward the end of this particular tutorial, and Faye's demonstrated frustration results in Vicky's negative response.

Excerpt 27 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Faye and Student Vicky)

```
1146   Faye:     can you specify what is the name of the
1147             group?
1148   Vicky:    jus- 字幕組 {subtitles group}
1149   Faye:     I- I KNOW they have a lot of=
```

```
1150   Vicky:    =north high- well well >we have name we
1151             have name<
1152   Faye:     and making subtitles for English films
1153             (.) where? online right?
1154   Vicky:    ok:ay ((slightly annoyed or resigned
1155             tone)) not really online we jus- well we
1156             are very small group and not very
1157             influential ((continues typing))
1158   Faye:     yeah
1159   Vicky:    anyway↓ ((typing)) (3.0) and for spoken
1160             English group let me see: do we have
1161             names?
```

In the beginning of the captured exchange between tutor Faye and student Vicky in

Excerpt 27, Faye asks Vicky to provide the name of the subtitling group with which Vicky was

involved (lines 1146 – 1147). Creative subtitling has become a popular student organization

activity in recent years in the People's Republic of China but to a lesser extent in Macao, so Faye

may have wanted more information on this activity out of consideration of Vicky's Macao

audience. On Vicky's CV, Vicky has a "Leadership Experience" heading, and one of the items

she has listed is "[English subtitle group/President]," under which she has the description,

"Making subtitle for English films" (student Vicky's CV, March 22, 2016).

Vicky responds to Faye in Putonghua (only the third time that Vicky has used Chinese

during the tutorial) to indicate that there is no name other than what Vicky has described on her

CV (line 1148). Vicky's response in Putonghua also happens to be a translation of what she had

written in English on her CV. Faye interprets Vicky's response to be an insinuation that Faye did

not read Vicky's CV carefully or did not understand what Vicky had written on her CV. As a

result, Faye raised her voice to highlight that she did in fact read and understand what Vicky

stated in her CV (line 1149), but Faye wanted more details. Before Faye can finish her turn,

Vicky sensed that she had made an interpretive error and cuts off the rest of Faye's turn by

quickly uttering the beginning of the name of the student organization to which she belonged. It

is likely that the name Vicky provides ("north high") is a translation because Vicky states on her CV that she attended "Guangdong Bei Jiang High School," of which "Bei Jiang" can be literally translated as "north river" (student Vicky's CV, March 22, 2016). Vicky does not finish saying the name of the student group and tries to move on to the next topic by stating "we have name we have name" (lines 1150 – 1151) without saying the rest of the group name.

Tutor Faye, however, continues to be frustrated over the issue of the subtitling group's name. Faye does not appear to want to drop the matter, so she presses on with another question regarding the nature of the subtitling group (lines 1152 – 1153). The lack of uptake by Faye on student Vicky's effort to de-escalate the intensity of the interaction leads Vicky to become annoyed. Vicky's prolonging of the word "yeah" (line 1154) signals that she, too, is frustrated with the ordeal of having to provide information that she deems unnecessary for her CV. Because Vicky thinks this level of detail is excessive, she reasons, "We are very small group and not very influential" (lines 1155 – 1156). Faye seems to finally capitulate on the issue and simply utters "yeah" (line 1158) in response. As Vicky moves on to the next item on her CV, she finishes off this interaction involving the subtitling group with the word "anyway" (line 1159) and indicates her resigned acceptance of Faye's suggestion by applying it to the very next item on Vicky's CV, "[Spoken English group/President]" (student Vicky's CV, March 22, 2016).

As a result of tutor Faye's increased volume in her utterance of "I know," a momentary tense situation has been established. Although her frustration partially stems from being misunderstood by student Vicky, nonetheless, the escalation in their interactional intensity continues for several more turns until Vicky successfully de-escalates the intensity of the moment by moving Faye off the issue through her implicit acceptance of Faye's suggestion that Vicky needs to be more specific with not only the names of the student associations that Vicky

147

was involved with but also what activities the associations organized. Disaffiliative moves such as showing frustration require more work on the part of the interlocutors to resolve the situation so that the next item of discussion can be introduced. In this case, Vicky notices Faye's frustration immediately and tries to rectify it, but the lack of uptake by Faye also pushes Vicky to her limit of annoyance. Perhaps this is where the three-second silence as Vicky types on her document can help calm both interlocutors down so that they are able to discuss the next item.

The next excerpt exemplifies a student writer's frustration. Excerpt 28 is a tutorial session between tutor Kaila and student Laura, and they are working on Laura's personal statement for her Honours College application. At the beginning of the tutorial, Laura mentions that this draft she brought to the writing center is already her third or fourth revision. Approximately ten minutes into the 40-minute session, Kaila points to the opening paragraph in Laura's statement and asks which specific part Laura is unhappy with (not shown in the excerpt).

Excerpt 28 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Kaila and Student Laura)

```
162   Laura:    嗯 {mm} ((looking at screen moving cursor))
163             (12.0) ((points at screen then scratches
164             her head)) 我就不知道- {I just don't know-}
165             其實妳剛剛提的那個問題我有一點點: {actually the
166             question that you just asked I have a
167             little:} 就猶豫要不要改: {hesitation on
168             whether or not to revise:} 然後我也不知道
169             {and then I also don't know} ° 怎麼樣去改它 °
170             {°how to revise it°}
171   Kaila:    嗯 {mm} 譬如說老師- {for example the
172             teacher-} 可能就說那些 {maybe for instance
173             those} professor ((student looks at tutor
174             briefly)) 可能會看很多很多的這一些 {may read
175             lots and lots of these} personal statement
176             然後妳要把最重要的東西給他看. {and then you
177             have to show the most important things for
178             him to see.} 第一句妳寫的- {the first
179             sentence that you wrote-} 妳給他看的是妳那一方
```

148

```
180                面 {that you want him to see is which
181                aspect}
182   Laura:   嗯= {mm=}
183   Kaila:   =的特質 {=of quality} I have uh strong
184                leadership skills 然後一句然後 {and then a
185                sentence and then} I um 然後時間 {and then
186                time} I: took up a project about 什麼什麼樣
187                {what what} in in high school 然後- {and
188                then-}
189   Laura:   °我就是有改了° {°I have made revisions°} uh
190                大概大概意思就是說從 {roughly roughly the
191                meaning is from} ((looks away from screen
192                and tutor)) 很多就是從很多 {a lot of that is
193                from a lot of} >什麼什麼< {>something
194                something<} 到現在從很多很多活動中發現和鍛煉了
195                {until now from many many activities ((I))
196                have discovered and trained} ((looks at
197                tutor briefly and returns to look at
198                screen)) 我的 {my} leadership skills 然後就
199                是 {and then} I I started to do the
200                project >什麼什麼什麼< {something something
201                something } in high school 然後就是 {and
202                then}
203   Kaila:   嗯嗯 {mm mm}
```

Student Laura's response in lines 162 – 170 indicates her hesitation and lack of direction for her revision. In other words, Laura is not satisfied with what she has written but simultaneously does not know how to make it better. Hearing this reluctance, tutor Kaila begins to ask some leading questions that hopefully spark an idea in Laura. Specifically, Kaila asks Laura to distill the qualities that Laura most wants to share with her readers into one sentence (lines 171 – 181). Note that in lines 178 – 179, Kaila is basically asking Laura to revise her topic sentence without saying those exact words. Kaila then provides a very general paragraph structure for Laura to follow (lines 183 – 188). In other words, first write the topic sentence, then provide the examples such as what activity was done, when the activity was done, etc. Before Kaila can finish outlining the sample structure, Laura interrupts Kaila. Laura quietly but

emphatically states, "I have made revisions" (line 189), which presumably fit the structure that Kaila did not finish describing. The act of Laura cutting off Kaila may be an indication of Laura's breaking point. The sentence that Laura utters signals her rejection of Laura's earlier suggestion.

However, what follows in the rest of student Laura's turn should also be noted. From lines 189 – 202, Laura takes an extended turn to explain and justify the revisions that she has made. A more in-depth analysis of her explanation reveals that her description actually does not follow the sample paragraph structure that tutor Kaila has outlined. Kaila suggests that Laura should put her topic sentence as her first sentence, but what Laura has described actually places her topic sentence in the middle of her paragraph. Additionally, Laura is unable to point to any specific details in her writing to support her description that she is following the structure that Kaila outlined. For reference, the original draft of the paragraph in question appears as follows:

Firstly, I started to develop leadership skills when I did the project about protecting local cultural heritage with my team in high school. Being selected to the National Leadership Competition, we represented our hometown to compete with other outstanding teams all around China. With limited time but high standard of the final plan, I organized efficient brainstorm sessions, assigned the work fairly, kept calm and eased all the potential conflicts as a leader, which has led to the brilliant teamwork eventually. This successful experience made me realize that leadership is not about being the best but making the team united enough to achieve the peak together. Being the best team player coordinator maximize each one's potential. (student Laura's personal statement draft, March 17, 2016)

From Laura's original draft of her paragraph, it appears that tutor Kaila and student Laura are talking about two separate matters, which may be what causes Laura's frustration. Kaila feels that Laura should highlight Laura's qualities in the first sentence, which means putting the "With limited time…" sentence as the topic sentence. After establishing that Laura has a certain set of skills, Laura can then give examples of how each skill was applied effectively to achieve the group's main goal. What Laura has done, however, is give a primarily chronological description based around her leadership skills. Laura believes that she should not change her first sentence because it introduces this paragraph as being about her leadership skills. Laura's frustration partially stems from her interpretation that Kaila keeps restating the same issue when Laura believes that the problem has been resolved. Laura's utterance of "I have made revisions" (Excerpt 28, line 189) is the culmination of her frustration of this misunderstanding, and it leads to several more minutes of Kaila asking leading questions and even providing sample sentences before they move on to the next paragraph. Similar to the display of frustration by tutor Faye in the previous example, Laura's frustration creates some tension between herself and Kaila. At the very least, it compels Kaila to take a much more directive approach with Laura.

Thus far, I have demonstrated how displays of frustration leads to disaffiliation between the multilingual tutors and student writers. I have shown that frustration intensifies the interaction between the interlocutors. In the first example with tutor Faye and student Vicky, the increase in intensity drives Vicky to attempt to de-escalate the situation by accepting Faye's advice even though Vicky is not wholly convinced. In the second example, the intensity builds up through repeated misunderstandings by student Laura, who thinks she is talking about the same thing as tutor Kaila when in fact she is not. Laura's display of frustration then compels

Kaila to use Laura's sentences as an example, thereby making highly directive rewrite suggestions to Laura.

Redirection

Besides displays of frustration, the multilingual tutors and student writers in the study utilized the strategy of redirection as a more nuanced disaffiliative strategy to move toward each interlocutor's goal. Excerpt 29 shows a series of interactions between tutor Marion and student Cathy as they work on revising Cathy's essay. At the beginning of the tutorial, Cathy explicitly stated that she wanted to work on linking words, specifically how she can establish better cohesion between sentences. Out of the eight tutorials recorded, Cathy is the most prepared with the most specific questions, partially because this is the area of weakness that her instructor recommended that she work on. Knowing that she already has her instructor's approval on the essay content and general organization, Cathy is eager for the session to focus on linking words. Proficiency-wise, Cathy's level 4 placement puts her in the top 10% of her cohort. Throughout her tutorial, Cathy stays focused on asking questions related to cohesion and makes seven distinct and separate efforts to remind tutor Marion of the session focus. Excerpt 29 captures Cathy's fifth and sixth attempts.

Excerpt 29 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Marion and Student Cathy)

```
408   Cathy:    hmm: and also eh: this is what I want to
409             ask uh: do I need to add uh: some
410             connecting evidence before going into the
411             uh concluding part? because I have shown
412             the- how these two
413   Marion:   [hmm mm
414   Cathy:    [research shows
415   Marion:   hmm mm
416   Cathy:    but uh I just have a doubt if I- whether I
417             need to add one or two sentence before
418             going to the concluding part because this
419             is the concluding part
```

```
420   Marion:    [yes
421   Cathy:     [of this paragraph
422   Marion:    um: so you write about the resear- the
423              result?
424   Cathy:     mm
425   Marion:    and then come to a conclusion.
426   Cathy:     mm mm
427   Marion:    um: I think it's alright
```

In Excerpt 29, tutor Marion and student Cathy are about half way through the tutorial session. Cathy begins her turn by asking about some type of a transitional device that would enable her to link her last body paragraph to her conclusion (lines 408 – 412). Cathy's question marks the fifth time that she has queried Marion on the issue of linking words or connective devices. In those previous times (not shown in the excerpt), Cathy pauses to ask Marion whether linking words or connective devices are needed in specific locations. After Cathy's question, Marion does not appear to be inclined to answer it. Marion back-channels twice (line 413 and 415), but the back-channeling does not address Cathy's question at all. Marion's apparent lack of engagement prompts Cathy to restate her question more clearly while simultaneously informing Marion that there are no more body paragraphs to come (lines 416 – 419). Cathy's restated question informs Marion that perhaps her attention was elsewhere, so Marion gives her affirmative answer of "yes" (line 420) even though Cathy has not finished her turn. As if to indicate to Cathy that Marion was paying attention, Marion makes two clarification attempts (lines 422 – 423 and 425) before providing Cathy with a more comprehensive affirmative answer (line 427).

Although subtle, student Cathy clearly makes an effort to redirect tutor Marion's attention back to Cathy's focal point of linking words and connective devices. In Excerpt 29, Cathy is asking about a more extended, sentence-level connections. While Cathy keeps her concentration on her instructor-directed query, Marion does not appear to be too engaged with

this query, thereby causing Cathy to ask the same question seven times during the session. The redirection move that Cathy makes in Excerpt 29 instantiates Marion's lack of engagement, hence widening the gap between the two interlocutors and establishing redirection as a disaffiliative move.

The strategy of redirection as a more nuanced disaffiliative move was also employed by the multilingual tutors in the study. The following example (Excerpt 30) shows tutor Faye working with student Vicky on her personal statement. The conversation occurs approximately 17 minutes into the 65-minute tutorial. Prior to the excerpt, Vicky asked Faye whether the word "qualifications" or the word "capabilities" should be used to go with the verb "prove" (tutorial between Faye and Vicky, March 22, 2016). Faye suggests that Vicky use the phrase "fulfill your potential" instead, but Vicky prefers "prove my capabilities" (tutorial between Faye and Vicky, March 22, 2016). As Faye continues to push for her point, she explains her rationale for the choice of using the verb "fulfill" rather than the verb "prove" (lines 580 – 581). Vicky appears to disagree with this verb choice as she interprets this verb to be a weak one when discussing one's leadership skills. Instead of giving this rationale, she reads out her original sentence, after having replaced it with Faye's suggestion, and raises her intonation throughout her reading (lines 583 – 587).

Excerpt 30 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Faye and Student Vicky)

```
580   Faye:     you- I mean just proving your capability I
581             mean (0.5) if you use fulfill it's a more
582             humble way to .hh express this
583   Vicky:    ((writing)) ful:fill my potential? (0.5)
584             just potential. just fulfill my potential
585             to be a member of a- I- I'm ready to
586             fulfill my leadership potential (1.0) to
587             make the community better?
588   Faye:     um: let's ignore the language first
589             because I'm I'm I just finished this (0.5)
```

```
590              I think you can still use your- your group
591              presentation experience=
592   Vicky:     =mm=
```

The uncertainty in student Vicky's voice is noticed by tutor Faye, who probably also sees

the same problem with the usage that Vicky does. Faye does not agree with Vicky, however.

Instead Faye makes four moves with her next turn; she hesitates, asks that they postpone the

word choice discussion, gives herself an excuse for not being able to suggest something better,

and redirects Vicky's attention to something else (lines 588 – 589). The conversation continues

in an earlier excerpt (see Excerpt 22), where Vicky ends up agreeing with Faye on a different

issue, but Faye's attempt at redirection is clearly established in Excerpt 30. Faye sets up her

redirection with the first three moves that she makes. The hesitation may indicate to Vicky that

Faye is thinking. The command gives Vicky a clear instruction. The "I just finished this" (line

589) provides an explanation for why Faye needs more time to think about the word choice

issue. Altogether, these three moves help set up Faye's redirection. As each of these moves do

not respond directly to Vicky's implicit query, they serve to increase the distance between the

two interlocutors. Faye's redirection move, then, serves the purpose of disaffiliation.

Disagreement

Thus far, I have discussed displays of confusion, demonstrations of frustration, and

strategies of redirection as examples of disaffiliative moves that both the multilingual tutors and

students have made in their interactions. Disagreement also arose as a code, and I have placed it

in the category of disaffiliation. Similar to the code of agreement, the code of disagreement is

different from the other codes in that disagreements are responses rather than initiations.

However, because disagreements are disaffiliative in nature, they require much more repair work

on the part of both interlocutors to reach a resolution.

Excerpt 31 shows an example of a tutor's extended disagreement with a student writer's question. The excerpt is a conversation between tutor Abby and student Kelly, and Kelly is asking whether her Honours College application will be reviewed in better light if she has more pages or more activities on her CV (lines 340 – 348). Abby responds with two hedges, the first of which appears in lines 349 – 350, where she says "I think it still depends" (line 350). When Kelly appears to only be back-channeling (line 352) rather than affirming Abby's answer, Abby gives her second but weaker hedge. Abby's second try at answering Kelly's question is "but I think not necessarily" (lines 353 – 354), and Abby continues by repeating Kelly's proposition. Because Abby does not disagree with Kelly's question directly, Kelly simply back-channels twice in the excerpt to signal that she is listening. Perhaps Abby interprets this back-channeling as Kelly not being convinced by Abby's answer, so Abby continues to provide justifications for her answer, which is shown in Excerpt 32.

Excerpt 31 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Abby and Student Kelly, Part 1)

```
340   Kelly:    會不會篇幅越多越有°競爭力° {will it be that
341             the more pages written the more
342             °competitive°} ((smiles and tutor smiles))
343             就比如說我寫了三樣他只寫了一樣 {so for example
344             I wrote three things ((but)) he only wrote
345             one thing} ((looks at tutor and tutor
346             returns gaze)) 然後就比他經驗多一點 {so that
347             shows ((I have)) more experience than he
348             does}
349   Abby:     這一個的話 {on that point} (.) 嗯: {mm:} 我覺
350             得還是看情況 {I think it still depends}
351             ((both look at each other then at paper))
352   Kelly:    嗯: 嗯 {mm: mm:}
353   Abby:     但是我覺得不一定, {but I think not
354             necessarily,} 不見得就是寫得多的就比較有競爭力
355             {it's not always that more ((words)) mean
356             more competitive} ((tutor looks at student
357             who looks at paper))
358   Kelly:    嗯: 嗯 {mm: mm:} ((nods))
```

156

Excerpt 32 shows an example of tutor Abby providing her extended rationale for disagreeing with student Kelly's query on whether quantity equals competitiveness on a CV. In lines 359 – 367, Abby starts to compare Kelly's experience with the experiences of other students at Kelly's age as one way of rationalizing her argument. Abby begins by stating that everyone around Kelly's age has certain experiences. By doing so, Abby makes an implicit comparison between Kelly and her peers. In lines 364 – 367, Abby introduces the idea of quality over quantity in terms of competition. When her statement is again only met with Kelly's silent nodding, Abby changes tactics somewhat by directly addressing the key point of Kelly's question (lines 369 – 372), which is about Kelly wanting to have more information on her CV to give the impression that she has more experience. Again, Abby compares Kelly's profile to an imagined "everyone" (line 371) and makes a claim that these imagined classmates can also produce a lot, quantity-wise. Kelly responds with more back-channeling (line 373), and Abby uses her next turn to provide the fullest justification of her answer (lines 374 – 377). Abby states that the reader, the "who" in this case (line 375), will most likely place in higher regard applicants with experiences of quality rather than quantity. Again, Abby's explanation is met with only a silent nod.

Excerpt 32 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Abby and Student Kelly, Part 2)

```
359   Abby:     對吧. {right.} 因為畢竟如果- {after all if-}
360             要是- {if-} >我覺得在妳們這個階段< 尤其是 <大家
361             同學的感覺或多或少> {>I feel that at your
362             stage< especially since <every classmate
363             ((I feel)) more or less>} 都是有經歷 {has
364             experience} (.) 只不過看誰: {but it just
365             depends on who:} ((both look at paper)) 這
366             個經歷會比較有競爭力一些 {((for whom)) these
367             experiences will be more competitive}
368   Kelly:    ((nods))
```

157

```
369    Abby:     妳要說寫的篇幅的話: {if you want to talk
370              about writing more:} (.) 我覺得好像大家都- {I
371              feel that everyone can-} 都可以寫很多 {can
372              write a lot}
373    Kelly:    mm mm ((nods))
374    Abby:     但是具體誰覺得會比較有競爭力的話: {but
375              specifically who would think doing that is
376              more competitive:} 還是看那個質量吧. {it
377              still depends on the quality.}
378    Kelly:    ((nods))
379    Abby:     反正我的建議呢還是一頁 {anyway my
380              recommendation is one page} ((student
381              looks at tutor)) 比較好一些, {is better,} 當
382              然我說的一頁是比較濃縮的 {but of course what I
383              mean by one page is a condensed}
384    Kelly:    ((nods))
385    Abby:     精華的一頁 {essential page}
386    Kelly:    ((nods))
```

Finally, tutor Abby answers student Kelly's question directly. After taking five turns to

mitigate and hedge her answer, Abby states, "Anyway my recommendation is one page is better"

(lines 379 – 381). Even after Abby gives this definitive answer to Kelly's question, Abby has to

qualify it with two additional hedges. That is, she hedges by adding that the one page should

only be filled with "condensed" (line 383) and "essential" (line 385) information. This long

sequence involving one student query and a tutor's extended and multiple attempts at

formulating her answer of disagreement shows how much more work is required in a

disaffiliative move. When Abby's first non-definitive answer is greeted without much reaction

from the student, Abby continues her implicit answer-giving, lacing her response with hedges

and mitigations and bringing in imagined classmates and readers. As these different tactics do

not yield a solid affirmative of agreement from Kelly, Abby is somewhat forced into providing a

more direct and specific answer so that the two interlocutors can move on to the next issue.

Altogether, it takes tutor Abby five turns to give her disagreement answer to student Kelly's question. Compared with confusion, frustration, and redirection, demonstrations of disagreement can be considered to be positive face-threatening acts (Brown & Levinson, 1987) because of the bluntness of the message. Perhaps that is why Abby tries quite hard to mitigate her opinion through different tactics before settling on her disagreement strategy. Even then, her disagreement does not directly answer Kelly's question, which begins with "Will it be…." (Excerpt 31, line 340), and Abby's answer of "my recommendation is one page" (Excerpt 32, line 379 – 380" does not directly answer Kelly's question. The potentially threatening nature of disagreements makes these displays of disagreement a disaffiliative move, and that is one possible reason that Abby tries to delay it as long as possible.

Besides the tactics of postponement and mitigation to avoid the use of disagreement, the transcripts reveal a student writer skipping over a disagreement opportunity and moving directly into rephrasing. Excerpt 33 captures a part of the conversation toward the end of a tutorial between tutor Faye and student Vicky. The excerpt begins with Vicky asking for an appropriate word to put into her CV. Vicky proposes the word "affiliations" (line 1278) but Faye suggests the word "membership" (line 1279). In her next turn, Vicky asks the question of whether or not she should provide details of what she did for her membership if she were to use the word (lines 1280 – 1282). When Faye responds with a simple "no" (line 1283), immediately Vicky demonstrates her disagreement with Faye's answer by rephrasing her earlier question into a statement. Vicky states, "Yeah so I want to explain what I've done" (line 1284 – 1285). Vicky's disagreement of Faye's suggestion is not explicitly stated but rather inferred.

Excerpt 33 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Faye and Student Vicky)

```
1277   Vicky:    I don't know what to really call this
1278             affil- affiliations or
1279   Faye:     yeah membership
1280   Vicky:    yeah but if I just write down membership?
1281             then should I still explain wha- I what
1282             I've done?
1283   Faye:     no
1284   Vicky:    yeah so: I want to explain what I've
1285             done.
1286   Faye:     okay yes. do you have any other kinds? of
1287             experience like=
1288   Vicky:    =anything to add? you mean?
1289   Faye:     yeah. (1.0)
1290   Vicky:    well (0.5) since those things that ( )
1291             well↓ >I have been taught< if I still
1292             want to add that >maybe something not
1293             important or what< (1.0) I've written
1294             down anything tha- that should be
1295             mentioned tha- that is valuable enough to
1296             be mentioned (.) yeah.
1297   Faye:     okay then. I think it's fine then (.) to
1298             just to (.) change the format because I-
1299             for other students they will include
1300             something like maybe oversea=
1301   Vicky:    =exchange
1302   Faye:     yeah
```

Clearly, student Vicky wants to include more information about her membership

activities but couches it in the form of a question at first. When her question is met with

immediate disapproval without any form of hedging or mitigation, rather than giving up or

giving in, Vicky persists by skipping over the part where she might say that she disagrees and

moves directly into a rephrasing. Vicky's move forces tutor Faye to accept Vicky's original

proposition because it is no longer a question but a demand. Although Faye says, "Okay yes,"

(line 1286) to Vicky's statement, Faye follows up with a specific question asking Vicky what

other pieces of information Vicky can put into this section. Vicky appears to be caught off guard

by Faye's redirection, and lines 1290 – 1296 capture Vicky in an apparent bind, where she

begins by hesitating slightly. As Vicky gathers her thoughts, she tries to suggest that she has more experiences to put down on her CV. After a series of false starts to her sentences, Vicky finally admits that she does not have anything else to add.

Tutor Faye's follow-up question in lines 1286 – 1287 seems to stem from student Vicky's statement of demand, which arose because of Faye's direct rejection of Vicky's proposition. It almost appears as if Faye feels like she needs to outmaneuver Vicky in the face of having to acquiesce to Vicky's demand. Questioning whether Vicky has any other experiences that can be put on her CV can be interpreted as a slight. This conjecture is to a certain extent supported by the fact that Faye brings up the topic of "overseas" exchange programs (line 1300), which is an experience that Vicky does not have.

Excerpt 33 has demonstrated how disruptive and disaffiliative disagreements can be. Student Vicky artfully skips over having to verbalize her disagreement and instead makes a demand that already has her disagreement embedded. Nonetheless, tutor Faye has received the message that Vicky disagrees, and it appears that Faye does not react well to the thinly-veiled disagreement. Faye takes the next several turns to challenge Vicky and to deflate the forcefulness of Vicky's demand.

Up to this point, the section of the data presentation has discussed moves of (dis)affiliation. Moves of affiliation include code-switching, positive feedback, joking, alignment, and agreement. Affiliative moves typically lead to the establishment of a momentary closer connection between the interlocutors, and they also help to move the discussion forward. Moves of disaffiliation include confusion, frustration, redirection, and disagreement. Disaffiliative moves typically lead to greater disruption in the line of discussion, and they take more time to repair. The next section of the data presentation discusses functional engagement.

For coding purposes, I have defined functional engagement as interactions that are made to signal the interlocutor's involvement in the discussion. In other words, they are mainly devices that help move the session forward toward the goals set by the interlocutors. The data is presented in the following sequence: questioning, explanation, analysis, and opinion, and where appropriate, I make reference to the excerpts already presented in this chapter.

Functional Engagement

Since the main purpose of the writing center tutorial sessions is to achieve the goals laid out by the interlocutors, most of the interactional functions the participants performed during their sessions are functional engagements that are typically found in goal-driven interactions. In other words, questions are raised by the interactants and explanations, analyses, and opinions are offered (mostly by tutors). These interactions fit the typical sequence of institutional talk, specifically the problem-initiation and disposal phases (Heritage & Clayman, 2010).

Questioning

Questioning is a strategy used by tutors to initiate the problem stage and to move the session along, and it is also a strategy that student writers use to raise their queries. Pertaining to this code, I have already highlighted some different uses of this function. Specifically, Excerpt 1 showcases how the problem-initiation was achieved by both the multilingual tutor and student writer involved in the session. Together, tutor Abby and student Beth help each other to understand the main purpose of Beth's writing center appointment. Once the problem has been introduced, both interactants can get down to the business of resolving the issue.

Other types of questions were also observed in the data, and I roughly categorize them into guiding/leading questions, clarification questions, and rhetorical questions. For the former, Excerpts 18, 21, 26, and 28 highlight how tutors Faye, Christy, Marion, and Kaila, respectively,

each utilize this strategy to guide their student writers to a resolution. Excerpt 18 exemplifies how tutor Faye asks a couple of guiding questions to spur on student Vicky's brainstorming for ideas to put into her personal statement. Excerpt 21 shows how tutor Christy asks student Paula to clarify the subject of the sentence that Paula has written. Excerpt 26 exhibits how Marion uses both leading and rhetorical questions to help student Cathy see that there is a missing piece of information in her essay. Excerpt 28 presents tutor Kaila utilizing the questioning strategy to point out that student Laura does not have an appropriate topic sentence in her personal statement.

On the student writer's side, the strategy of questioning is used by students Cathy, Kelly, and Vicky mainly for the purpose of raising a query. However, it should be noted that not all students came to the writing center with specific questions. Excerpt 1 captures student Beth not really knowing what she wants to ask her tutor Abby, and Abby has to give examples of what the writing center typically does, alternating between queries by Beth, for the both of them to figure out what it is that Beth wants to work on. For Cathy, she explicitly states her query on linking words very clearly and consistently throughout her session (see Excerpt 29). Kelly uses the questioning strategy to ask tutor Abby a leading question about gaining an advantage over her peers by putting down more items on her CV (see Excerpt 31). Finally, Vicky uses the questioning strategy to raise doubts about the effectiveness of tutor Faye's advice in Excerpt 33. These various existing examples illustrate the diversity of use with the strategy of questioning, and what they all have in common is that they are used to raise a proposition, whether in positive or negative manner.

Explanation

In a writing center tutorial session, it is not uncommon to see tutors explaining to their students why things are done in a certain manner. The data revealed that the multilingual tutors explained their answers to the student writers in different ways. On more than a few occasions, tutors occupied the space of an unspecified reader in order to explain to their students the concept of audience. For instance, in Excerpt 25 tutor Abby uses the words "people" (line 189), "they" (lines 192 and 196), and "them" (line 201) to refer to the unnamed Honours College applicant selection committee members. Referring to the specified committee members allows Abby to highlight for Ellen the importance of achieving parallel structure in Ellen's personal statement. By replacing herself with these other readers, Abby is able to shift the focus from the person reading the draft (Abby) to the people who will actually be the decision makers.

Additionally, tutor Abby sees that student Ellen has parallel structure in other parts of her personals statement. The appearance of parallel structures elsewhere in the statement can be a reason why Abby opts not to go into a detailed explanation of how to achieve parallel structure. Instead, Abby suggests to Ellen to check her own work more carefully. Specifically, Abby makes reference to "sentence patterns" (lines 184 – 185) as she reads out the corrected version of student Ellen's sentence, which is not parallel in structure. Ellen's original sentence reads, "In the beginning, I was nervous and uncertain whether I could be qualified to in charge of a committee and organize activities for students" (student Ellen's personal statement draft, March 18, 2016). The version that Abby reads aloud is, "Whether I would be qualified to be in charge of a committee and to organize activities for students" (Excerpt 25, lines 180 – 182). As Abby reads aloud, she inserts the verb "be" and also adds the infinitive marker "to" in front of the verb "organize" while changing the word "could" to "would."

Tutor Abby's muted explanation of a grammar point that she believes student Ellen already understands is one example of functional engagement in the dataset. Because Abby sees elsewhere in Ellen's draft that Ellen has parallel structure, Abby uses this moment to focus on reminding Ellen to engage in more careful editing, which Ellen can do on her own. Abby also uses this opportunity to discuss the importance of audience awareness, which, for novice writers, is a concept that is often neglected.

Besides channeling the voice of a third person to explain the importance of audience, the multilingual tutors engage with their student writers on genre awareness, and I have categorized discussions of this type as functional engagement as well. One example of genre-based discussions can be found in the tutorial session between tutor Christy and student Paula. Excerpt 34 shows Christy explaining to Paula that there is a regular template that can be followed for the sequence of information when writing for timed-essay examinations. As Paula describes what she wants to do to answer the essay question and what she has trouble with (lines 80 – 86), Christy introduces the idea that there is a "regular model that can be followed" (lines 89 – 90).

Excerpt 34 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Christy and Student Paula)

```
80   Paula:     但是: {but:} 然後- {then-} 就想轉折一下把它-
81              {((I)) just want to transition a little
82              into something-} 說它是那個- {claim that it
83              is that-} 是我支持的那個. {it is ((the
84              point)) I support.} 到這段寫的就是沒有說 {up
85              to this paragraph ((I)) didn't say it}
86              ° 太清楚 ° {°so clearly°}
87   Christy:   嗯: {mm:} <因為這個>: {<because this>:} 其實
88              它有一個很固定的模式可以遵循的. {actually
89              there is a regular model that can be
90              followed.}
91   Paula:     um: 嗯 {mm}
92   Christy:   像這種兩方描述- {like this type of two-sided
93              descriptions-} 兩方觀點然後說出妳自己的觀點的這
94              種文章, {two-sided opinions and then talk
```

```
95              about your own opinion this type of
96              essay,} 在開頭段的時候, {in the beginning of
97              the paragraph,} 首先我們有一句話是在表示這個
98              {first we have a sentence that states
99              this} discussion 或者是 {or} debate 或者是
100             {or} argument
101  Paula:    嗯 {mm} ((writing))
102  Christy:  它是關於什麼內容的. {((which)) is about the
103            content.} 像這裡 {like here} (.) 我們就有這
104            一個一句話了 {we have this this sentence}
105            ((reads from essay prompt)) whether
106            should the government raise retirement
107            age or not
108  Paula:    um: ((writing))
```

Tutor Christy's introduction of a template or a specific sequence of information presentation only garners a brief acknowledgement from student Paula. Christy continues to explain what goes into the beginning of this model. Specifically, Christy suggests that the writer needs to include a sentence about the "content" (line 102 – 103) and the type of question that the writer is answering (lines 98 – 100) in "beginning of the paragraph" (lines 96 – 97). As Paula back-channels, Christy carries on with the rest of her explanation of the information presentation sequence (not shown in excerpt).

I have categorized this type of information dissemination as functional engagement because of the purpose of discussion. In these types of situations, the tutor's goal is to clearly explain to the student writer how these types of essay prompts can be answered quickly by following a formula. As the tutor explains the process of what information to include and how it should be presented, there is not a specific affiliation or disaffiliation that results from this type of interaction. Although student Paula does not show that she is actively engaged in this discussion verbally, she is writing something down as Christy talks. In my follow-up reflective

playback interview, Paula speaks about the helpfulness of being shown a formula for tackling timed-essays. I discuss the reflective playback interviews in more detail later in the chapter.

Compared with tutors, the student writers also use the strategy of explanation in the tutorials. In Excerpts 13 and 28, student Laura uses many of her turns to explain what she feels is lacking in her personal statement draft and what revisions she has made in her draft, respectively. In Excerpt 24, student Cathy explains why she has qualified her thesis statement in the manner that appeared in her draft. These instances show the student writers answering the tutors' questions about the task. Detailed answers to the tutors' questions signal engagement in the discussion. I have coded these types of turns as functional engagement because of the focus on engagement.

Analysis

The code of analysis differs from explanation in that analysis focuses more on process and structure. In other words, there may be an imagined norm that the student writer or tutor has in mind. Students or tutors then try to relate their ideas to this imagined norm. Because effective analysis requires the breaking down of information, the code of analysis is categorized as functional engagement. In Excerpt 35, the tutorial between tutor Kaila and student Laura shows Kaila analyzing the importance of a topic sentence in Kaila's personal statement. In this exchange, Kaila does all of the talking as Laura just listens and back-channels. Kaila begins her turn by connecting it to a previous point that she has made earlier in their conversation (lines 284 – 288). As she continues, Kaila takes apart Laura's topic sentence for not meeting the needs of Kaila's imagined audience of the Honours College selection committee. Although Kaila does not specifically point out to Laura what information is missing, Kaila emphasizes that the reader must be able to understand the writer's main point in the first sentence of each body paragraph

(lines 304 – 309). To highlight the importance of a topic sentence to a reader, Kaila, like tutor

Abby in Excerpt 25, also invokes a third person, that of a "teacher" (line 294) as a reader.

Excerpt 35 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Kaila and Student Laura)

```
284   Kaila:    ((reading on screen)) (3.0) ((pointing at
285             screen)) 好然後妳看一下.{okay now take a
286             look.} 就是第二段它的問題同樣也是這一個{in the
287             second paragraph the problem is the same
288             as this}
289   Laura:    mm
290   Kaila:    妳要-{you must-} 對.{yes.} 一定要有一個
291             {((you)) must have a} topic sentence
292             (0.5) 因為我嗯妳:{because I mm you:}
293             ((student looks at tutor)) 不能夠保證每一個
294             老師:{can't guarantee every teacher:} 就他
295             們在第一遍 {in their first round ((of))}
296             shortlist candidate 的時候他們不一定每一個.
297             {at that time they may not every one.} 都
298             會仔細仔細去看那個 {look at in detail}
299             personal statement 他們只是要看 {they just
300             want to look at} .hh 妳要強調妳自己有哪一方面
301             的一個特質 {((which)) aspects of your
302             characteristics you want to emphasize}
303   Laura:    mm ((nods))
304   Kaila:    的那一些 {those} character 所以妳要. {so you
305             must.} 馬上在 {immediately in ((your))}
306             topic sentence 裡面就要告訴. {say.} 我要展現
307             {I want to show}
308   Laura:    mm ((nods))
309   Kaila:    我這些的那個= {my such and such=}
```

Tutor Kaila's analysis of what is missing in student Laura's personal statement is

effective topic sentences. By suggesting to Laura that her statement does not have a sentence that

summarizes Laura's strength and character, Kaila is indirectly telling Laura the components of a

topic sentence. Further, Kaila breaks down the function of a topic sentence by bringing into the

discussion the concept of audience. Kaila then reveals indirectly the appropriate position of a

topic sentence by telling Laura that the sentence should appear "immediately" (line 305).

168

Although tutor Kaila's analysis of the importance of a topic sentence is not given systematically, she nonetheless achieves her aim of informing student Laura of the important functions of a topic sentence. In Kaila's mind, there is an imagined norm for personal statement writing, and she is trying to convey her understanding of this norm to Laura. Throughout much of this excerpt, Laura remains silent. However, in Laura's next turn (not shown in transcript), she makes a lengthy suggestion for possible revision of her personal statement based on what Kaila has analyzed.

While Excerpt 35 does not show student Laura's engagement with tutor Kaila's point about the importance of topic sentences, Laura's later turns indicate that she was listening to Kaila and trying to figure out a way to incorporate the feedback into her writing. Similar to Kaila's analysis of the function of a topic sentence, Laura provides an analysis of one of the weaknesses of her own personal statement near the beginning of the same tutorial. In Excerpt 36, Laura begins by describing what she believes she has written in her personal statement. Laura gives this description in sequence. After this description, Laura proceeds to analyze the weakness of her statement, and it takes a few false starts before Laura is able to pinpoint where she is having trouble. In lines 38 – 45, Laura suggests that the connection between her reason for applying to Honours College and her own qualifications is not strong enough.

Excerpt 36 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Kaila and Student Laura)

```
27   Laura:   然後寫了 {then ((I)) wrote} (.) 兩個 {two}
28            quality 就是 {which is} >strong leadership
29            potential and social awareness<. 然後有時間
30            說明 {then ((I)) have the time frame}
31            ((looks at tutor then back at screen))
32   Kaila:   mm ((nods))
33   Laura:   然後, {then,} 現在有問題的, {the problem
34            that ((I have)),} 是我覺得- {is that I
35            feel-} 第一段我覺得 {in the first paragraph
```

```
36            I feel} (.) 有一點點就- {a little bit
37            that-} 我的意思就是這樣. {what I mean is
38            this.} ((points at screen)) 但我覺得 {but I
39            feel} (.) 表達就有一點點問題就是嗯:
40            {expressing ((the idea)) is a little
41            problematic which is mm:} 我 {I} (1.0) 為
42            什麼要申請 {why ((am I)) applying to} h c
43            我覺得這個跟我自己的聯繫 {I feel this and my
44            own connection} ((looks at tutor and back
45            at screen)) 不是很強 {is not very strong}
```

To determine if student Laura's analysis has merit, it is worthwhile to see how her personal statement begins. Laura's statement opens with the following two sentences:

I would like to be a member of the Honours College because I am motivated by its liberate, multi-disciplinary and community-based ideas to seek for excellence. With strong leadership potential and social awareness, I believe I am qualified for the big family. (student Laura's personal statement draft, March 18, 2016)

It can be seen from these two sentences that Laura is correct in her analysis. She begins by answering the question posed on the Honours College's application form. In her second sentence, she extols her own strengths. Yet, no cohesion is achieved with the introduction of new information in the subject position of the second sentence. Old information is not recycled until the end of the second sentence, if by "big family" Laura means Honours College.

Student Laura's astute analysis helps tutor Kaila understand the source of Laura's frustration (discussed in Excerpt 28). Because Kaila understands and probably agrees with Laura's analysis, Kaila can provide feedback on this shared basis (shown in Excerpt 13). Thus, through accurate analysis of her own work, Laura is able to keep Kaila engaged in the conversation and can also receive confirmation of the accuracy of her analysis as well as helpful feedback. Although the nature of student-provided analysis and tutor-provided analysis may be

different, they both serve the purpose of keeping each other engaged in the tutorial. Such engagement allows the conversation to move forward toward the session goal. From these two instances, it can be seen that analysis is a necessary component of goal-oriented encounters.

Opinion

Similar to explanation and analysis, opinion is considered to be a form of functional engagement. Opinions are offered by both the multilingual tutors and student writers in the tutorial after questions are posed or suggestions are made. Although opinions can have a more positive or negative leaning than explanation or analysis, the interactions coded as opinion in this dataset are not necessarily so. Rather, the opinions are expressed from a personal perspective. Take the example of Excerpt 37, where tutor Emma is working with student Arizona. Prior to this conversation segment, Arizona provides Emma with the necessary background information of her child labor article summary and response assignment so that Emma can understand the nature of the task. Arizona also explains her dilemma regarding the summary response task. Because Arizona's professor has provided some basic talking points on the issue of child labor, all of which Arizona agrees with, Arizona does not know what else she can contribute to this assignment. Specifically, for her response part, Arizona says, "So I don't have anything to say" (lines 174 – 175). Emma reacts to this statement with laughter but simultaneously leans toward Arizona to show affiliation. Emma begins her turn with an admission that her next statement is just her "personal viewpoint" (line 177). Emma finishes her turn by suggesting that Arizona can try to paraphrase either the professor's talking points or the child labor article's main ideas and not to worry too much about trying to bring out both the advantages and disadvantages of the issue.

Excerpt 37 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Emma and Student Arizona)

```
171   Arizona:   每一個 {every} agree disagree- both agree
172              and disagree 都有 p p t {has powerpoint}
173              然後 {and then} agree 只有兩條, {only has
174              two items,} 所以我也沒什麼可說. {so I don't
175              have anything to say.}
176   Emma:      um: ((laughs and leans toward student)) 但
177              是我個人觀點是: {but my personal viewpoint
178              is:} 妳覺得他說對的話, {if you feel what he
179              says is right,} 妳把它呈現出來 {you express
180              that idea} (.) 自然會對等 {naturally it
181              will be equal}
182   Arizona:   mm
```

In this short excerpt, it can be argued that tutor Emma hedges her suggestion by prefacing it with the words "my personal viewpoint" (line 177). However, a statement like Emma's can help to keep student Arizona engaged in the conversation. Emma's opinion statement encourages Arizona to express her agreement on the talking points provided to her. Although Arizona believes that it is unnecessary to restate something that she feels has already been stated, and stated better than anything she can do, Emma indirectly encourages Arizona to express those ideas in her own way. While Emma does not use academic terms, she has given Arizona information on how to complete a summary and response assignment. Emma's opinion, then, is one illustration of how functional engagement keeps the conversation moving forward.

Throughout the eight tutorials, the multilingual student writers also give their opinion on their own work, often quite openly. In Excerpt 38, opinion giving by student writers is exemplified by student Laura, who works with tutor Kaila. The segment of their conversation occurs in the first five minutes of their conversation. As Kaila provides direct guidance to Laura about how Laura can rewrite the first paragraph of her personal statement, Laura counters with a question. Laura asks Kaila to help her decide which of the two options Laura should go for (lines

102 – 104). Laura follows up her question immediately with her opinion on the different effect of each choice. While it is not entirely clear which two options are available to Laura, it can be surmised that one of the options is to discuss the competitive aspect of Honours College, which places the focus on Honours College (lines 108 – 110), and the other is to focus on the challenge aspect, which places the focus on Laura (line 111). Either way, Laura seems unable to choose but has offered her opinion of the possible effects of the decision that she has yet to make.

Excerpt 38 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Kaila and Student Laura)

```
 94   Kaila:    比如說妳- {for example you-} ((looks at
 95              computer screen then at student)) 妳-
 96              {you-} >妳就可以這樣子寫< {>you can write it
 97              like this<} 比如說- {for example-} 我是一個
 98              怎麼樣的人, {what kind of a person am I,}
 99              而 h c {and h c} (.) 就是有這一方面的氛圍
100              {has this kind of atmosphere} (.) 一個環境
101              所以妳 {an environment so you} (0.5)
102   Laura:    ((points at screen)) 這樣子寫跟這樣寫到底是哪
103              一個比較好 {writing it like this and
104              writing it like this which is better}
105              ((tutor looks at screen then at student
106              who looks away)) 我覺得, {I feel like,} 想
107              很簡單的說一下 {((I)) want to say it simply}
108              (.) >可是我覺得< {>but I feel like<} 如果妳
109              就說只要很多人在一塊兒競爭. {if you just say
110              that many people compete together.} 或者是
111              一個新的挑戰就變得很- {or a new challenge
112              then that makes it very-} 很- {very-} 就只
113              著重了 {focused on} ((looks at tutor)) 那一
114              個方面 {that aspect}
```

By offering opinions, both the multilingual tutors and student writers show that they are engaged in the writing center tutorial conversation. Opinions, in contrast to explanation and analysis, take on a more personal perspective, and both Excerpts 37 and 38 show this personal viewpoint from the tutor and student writer, respectively. Altogether, the codes of questioning,

explanation, analysis, and opinion comprise the category of functional engagement. All of these moves help the interlocutors to stay focused on the topic of discussion during the tutorial. The next section of the data presentation is the category of non-verbal reactions, of which only one reaction, laughter, is shared by both the tutors and student writers.

Non-Verbal Reactions

In this chapter, I have already shown many excerpts where laughter is indicated in the transcript. Whether the laughter comes from the multilingual student writers or the tutors or both, laughter serves various functions during a writing center tutorial session. In Zdrojkowski's (2007) dissertation, she found that the interlocutors in her study used laughter to achieve three main goals: to bond with each other momentarily, to decrease tension, and to show displeasure. Zdrojkowski also notes that while some instances of laughter in her data seemed to neither be affiliative nor disaffiliative, these instances of functional laughter stemmed from earlier positive or negative interactions. Because the focal point of my dissertation is to describe what the multilingual tutors and student writers are doing during a writing center tutorial session, I have documented these instances of laughter but have not categorized them to the extent that Zdrojkowski does in her dissertation. Further, I have placed all instances of laughter in the non-verbal reactions category, not because they are neither affiliative nor disaffiliative, but because it is important to recognize all of the non-verbal actions and reactions happening during a tutorial. Non-verbal actions constitute one of the interactional choices that the participants make in the course of a writing center session, and laughter is prominent in the category of non-verbal reactions because it is both initiated by student writers and tutors.

Similar to Zdrojkowski's (2007) findings, the participants in my study performed laughter to achieve (dis)affiliation and indicate engagement with the interlocutor. Excerpt 1

174

shows student Beth laughing (line 8) somewhat coyly because she prefers to use Chinese to conduct the tutorial session knowing full well that she has come to the English Writing and Communication Centre. Beth's laughter can be interpreted to have an affiliative motive. Excerpts 3, 19, and 20 contain instances of laughter that are initiated by one party and responded to by the other party, creating a joint moment of laughter that can be considered to be affiliative in nature. In Excerpt 3, tutor Marion asks student Cathy near the end of the session if Cathy has anymore questions on the essay draft, and Cathy responds to the question with laughter (line 726). Marion joins Cathy in this moment of slight awkwardness (line 727) because it is not the first time that Marion has posed this question to Cathy, and each time, Cathy has indicated that she has no more questions. It is not until the final time that Marion asks the same question—and Cathy has no more questions—that Cathy responds with laughter. Excerpts 19 and 20 illustrate the joke-making strategy utilized by both tutor Abby and student Beth, respectively. In Excerpt 19, Abby tries to say something funny and follows it up with laughter (line 409), and student Ellen catches on to the joke and responds with her own laughter (line 410). In Excerpt 20, student Beth initiates the joke and laughs (line 228); Abby feels an affinity toward both Beth and her joke and joins her in the moment (line 229). In both Excerpts 19 and 20, laughter is used for affiliative goals.

Laughter has also been documented to be used for disaffiliative moves in the dataset. Excerpts 16 and 18 illustrate how laughter can serve a disaffiliative purpose for students Laura and Vicky, respectively. A frustrated laughter (line 444) is demonstrated by Laura in Excerpt 16 when she is asked by tutor Kaila to delete quite a large portion of Laura's third draft (line 443). Excerpt 18 exemplifies Vicky's disaffiliative laughter when tutor Faye asks her, "Why don't you put this on the introduction?" (lines 261 – 264). This question is not interpreted by Vicky to be

175

an invitation to do something. Rather, Vicky construes it to be more like an accusation of neglect. Thus, Vicky responds with laughter because it is impossible for her to put unknown information into her introduction.

Finally, laughter has been used for neither affiliative nor disaffiliative goals. Excerpt 37 shows tutor Emma simultaneously laughing and leaning toward student Arizona as a reaction some of the frustration that Arizona displays as she relates the details of her assignment. In line 176, Emma's laughter might be interpreted as a moment of schadenfreude since she appears to be laughing at Arizona's frustration. However, Emma simultaneously leans toward Arizona as if to commiserate with Arizona's frustration. Together, the two non-verbal reactions to Arizona's apparent frustration might cancel each other out.

Co-Initiated Actions

The data presentation up to this point has focused on activities initiated by either the multilingual student writers or tutors. Co-initiated actions include instances where the participants are speaking over each other and working collaboratively. I have defined the code of "speaking over interlocutor" as instances where there is a series of speech overlap, and I have defined the code of "working collaboratively" as instances where the interlocutors brainstorm ideas and write together.

Excerpt 39 offers an example of the participants speaking over each other. This excerpt shows the very beginning of the tutorial session between tutor Faye and student Vicky and captures the two participants jostling for position to speak. As the interlocutors try to discover what each person knows and does not know, the pace of the conversation quickens, with many instances of speech overlap. The excerpt begins after Vicky has indicated that she would like to discuss her personal statement and CV. Faye asks whether Vicky has attended the writing

center's workshop on personal statement writing (line 3). With her opening question, Faye is trying to assess how she should start the session. Vicky, meanwhile, tries to establish the idea that she is not a complete novice on personal statement writing (line 12). Faye does not appear to accept this idea that Vicky can fully understand what has occurred in a personal statement writing workshop that Vicky did not attend, so Faye continues her train of thought by adding that samples and PowerPoint slides were distributed during the said workshop (lines 13 – 14). As Faye continues to establish her position, Vicky confirms that she has already looked at the distributed information (line 17), at which point Faye gives a (false?) compliment and asks to see Vicky's work (lines 18 – 19).

Excerpt 39 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Faye and Student Vicky)

```
3   Faye:     uh (2.5) did you? attend our workshop?
4   Vicky:    (1.0) uh kind of uh maybe:: a long time
5             ago las- las- last semester.
6   Faye:     no. I mean the workshop for h c
7   Vicky:    [ah
8   Faye:     [on personal statement [on Sunday
9   Vicky:    oh. I was sick          [that day but I: I
10            asked my friend to come and know=
11  Faye:     =okay
12  Vicky:    I basically know what they talk=
13  Faye:     =yeah an- and we have some some sample
14            [personal statement and p p t you
15  Vicky:    [>yeah yeah yeah yeah yeah yeah<=
16  Faye:     =have=
17  Vicky:    =I have watched (.) seen those materials
18  Faye:     >okay okay okay< so you have very good
19            ideas. shall we go over your c v?
20  Vicky:    okay
```

Co-initiated actions such as Excerpt 39 not only show a certain level of engagement between the two interlocutors but also the interlocutors' attempts to verbally establish their position. Tutor Faye needs to figure out at what point in the personal statement writing process she should start with student Vicky, and Vicky wants to give the impression that she knows more

177

than Faye assumes. Because of the jostling for position, the exchange in Excerpt 39 can be interpreted to lack a certain degree of affiliation.

Excerpt 40, however, is a conversation segment demonstrating an affiliative co-initiated action. Tutor Abby is working with student Ellen on revising Ellen's personal statement. Throughout the segment, there appears to be relatively equal participation in the oral composition process between the tutor and the student writer. There is speech overlap and latching, but the way that they occur seems much more affiliative. The sense of affiliation may come from Ellen's use of the pronoun *we* in line 460 to signal to Abby that they are engaged in this revision process together. In response to Ellen's question of whether the word "utilize" (line 460) should be replaced, Abby begins to make a suggestion with the word "make" (line 461) but is cut off by Ellen who completes Abby's suggestion of "make use of" (as a replacement for "utilize" in line 462.

Excerpt 40 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Abby and Student Ellen)

```
460   Ellen:    should we change the word utilize?
461   Abby:     uh: (0.5) make=
462   Ellen:    =make use of=
463   Abby:     =of my skills and talents ((reading))
464   Ellen:    ((writes on paper)) oh use of my
465   Abby:     [uh
466   Ellen:    [by making use of my skills and talent
467             comma ((makes comma gesture))
468   Abby:     yeah
```

As student Ellen writes down her revision, she realizes that she can apply a grammar point that tutor Abby introduced earlier. In line 466 of Excerpt 40, Ellen revises "make" into "making" because Abby previously discussed that the –ing form of the word should be used to achieve parallel structure (see Excerpt 25). Although the segment is relatively short, it can be seen that Ellen and Abby are working collaboratively on Ellen's personal statement, with Ellen

initiating ideas on the types of changes she would like to make and Abby supplying suggestions. Ultimately, however, Ellen is the one who makes the decision on what to revise.

Excerpts 39 and 40 illustrate two of the co-initiated actions that took place between some of the participants. Each excerpt shows differences in the level of affiliation between the interlocutors. What is clear, however, is that through speech overlapping and latching, the tutors and students demonstrate a certain level of intense interactional engagement.

Tutor Direct Guidance and Action

Because the goals for the multilingual tutors and student writers during a writing center tutorial session are different, the types of actions they take also differ. Based on the coding results, the data shows the tutors guiding—to varying degrees—the student writers to an ideal answer that the tutors have in mind during the tutorial. Because only the tutors initiated these actions and because the coding categories are quite different from the rest of the data, the results are reported in a separate section. Overall, the data that come under the category of "tutor direct guidance and action" fall into three general types, and they are: "tutor guides student to an answer," "tutor asks students to (not) do something," and "tutor provides sample language." All three codes illustrate tutors offering student writers some type of instruction. In writing center terminology, these types of instructions are called directives (Shamoon & Burns, 1995).

Except 41 exemplifies how some of the multilingual tutors in the study guided their student writers to an answer. The guidance offered is indirect; nonetheless, the line of questioning is leading and renders only a few possible answers that would satisfy the question. In the excerpt, tutor Marion discusses with student Cathy the possibility of revising Cathy's thesis statement for her essay. Marion begins with a request asking Cathy to "be more specific" with the wording in the thesis statement (lines 169 – 170). When there does not appear to be any

179

uptake from Cathy (line 171), Marion begins a short series of leading questions. In line 172, Marion asks a wh- question of "what changes." When Cathy still does not react as though she understands what Marion wants her to do, Marion continues, this time with a more specific yes/no question (line 174 – 175). Again, the yes/no question is met with only a brief acknowledgement from Cathy, so Marion gets even more specific with her second yes/no question (lines 177 – 178).

Excerpt 41 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Marion and Student Cathy)

```
169   Marion:    then here maybe you can be more (1.0)
170              specific.
171   Cathy:     ah.
172   Marion:    like clearer. like what changes.
173   Cathy:     mm
174   Marion:    is tha- this is why people should ah join
175              extracurricular activities?
176   Cathy:     mm
177   Marion:    you won't say that because it brings bad
178              [impact right?
179   Cathy:     [uh mm
```

Through a specific sequence of questioning moving from general wh- questions to more specific yes/no questions, tutor Marion is in effect leading student Cathy to an answer that Marion wants Cathy to have. In other words, Marion already has an idea in mind for Cathy's thesis statement revision, but Marion needs to find different ways to get Cathy to verbalize it. The exchange actually continues in Excerpt 26, with Cathy expressing confusion over what she should be doing for her thesis revision because she is unable to guess what Marion has in mind.

In addition to the type of leading questions that tutors asked their student writers, the tutors directly ask student writers to do something to their drafts or not to do something to their drafts. Examples of this type of directive tutoring have already been shown in Excerpts 16 and 38. Both examples show tutor Kaila working with student Laura on Laura's personal statement.

In Excerpt 16, Kaila specifically asks Laura to remove a section of Laura's draft. Specifically, in lines 439 – 440 and 442 – 443, Kaila instructs Laura not to use certain parts of Laura's statement. It is unclear which parts Kaila wants Laura to remove as the participants are looking at a computer screen, but judging by Laura's laughter reaction, Laura appears to be quite distressed. Earlier in the tutorial, Kaila instructs Laura to add something to Laura's statement. Excerpt 38 captures Kaila giving Laura examples of what Laura can add to her draft. Lines 96 – 97 begin with Kaila informing Laura that Kaila is about to tell Laura to do something with the words "for example" (line 97). Kaila follows this up not with the exact sentences that Laura should write, but with a generic sentence structure using specific key words that Laura should address. These words include "kind," (as in "what kind of a person am I), which is found in line 98, "atmosphere," (line 100), and "environment" (line 101).

Lastly, the multilingual tutors provided very explicit directive tutoring to some of the student writers when the tutors gave their student writers sample language. Different from the leading questions that some tutors asked or the instructions that other tutors gave, Excerpt 42 exemplifies how tutor Christy gives student Paula the exact words that Paula can use to answer a timed-essay question that Paula is using as a practice for her timed-essay examination.

Excerpt 42 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Christy and Student Paula)

```
130   Paula:    我已經不知道該怎樣寫進去 {I don't know how to
131             write it} (.) 我覺得這個應該是一個總結的. {I
132             feel like this should be a conclusion.}
133   Christy:  um 所以這些 {so these} officials 他們從政府的
134             角度來看 {from the government angle they}
135             (.) 這個啊 {er this} (.) raising retirement
136             age 這一個行為是非常明智的 {this kind of
137             behavior is a very smart} reform. 那我們可
138             以說- {so then we can say-} 可不可以說這些-
139             {can ((we)) say these-} 這個行為對於這些
140             {these behaviors for these} officials 來說
```

```
141              被看作 {are seen as} (.) 這個行為被看作是一個
142              {these behaviors are seen as a} reform?
143  Paula:      哦 {oh} (.) 這: {this:}
144  Christy:    it is considered to be a wise reform,
145  Paula:      嗯 {mm}
146  Christy:    to improve overall the level of the
147              country 可以加 {can be added} (.) 又可以不用
148              加. {can also not be added.} 這樣這一段就有
149              一個總結的角色了 {this way this paragraph
150              will have the role of a conclusion}
151  Paula:      就是: {so:} 啊: {er:} 在這段就寫 in
152              conclusion 嗎? {write in conclusion in
153              this paragraph?}
154  Christy:    um 不用寫 {no need to write} in conclusion
155              可以直接加一句話 {((you)) can directly add
156              one sentence}
157  Paula:      ((starts writing))
```

Excerpt 42 begins with Paula describing what she feels is appropriate for that particular section of her essay draft. Specifically, Paula says that she feels "like this should be a conclusion" (line 132). To confirm this feeling, Christy summarizes her understanding from Paula's writing thus far. In line 138, Christy begins the process of changing her summary statement into a question. Although Paula responds with some reluctance (line 143), Christy continues by giving the exact words that Paula can use for her summary statement. The exact statement appears in English in lines 144 and 146 – 147, followed by Christy's commentary in Putonghua. Christy ends her turn by informing Paula how Christy has solved Paula's dilemma by saying "this way this paragraph will have the role of a conclusion" (lines 149 – 150). Unfortunately, Paula does not appear to catch on to what has already happened. Instead, Paula asks whether she needs to add the words "in conclusion" in the paragraph they are working on (lines 152 – 153). To further solidify what Christy wants Paula to do, Christy gives Paula the instruction that Paula "can directly add one sentence," (lines 155 – 156), which is the sentence

that Christy just provided Paula. At that point, Paula begins writing presumably the sentence that Christy just dictated.

Together, the three codes and examples of "tutor guides student to an answer," "tutor asks student (not) to do something," and "tutor provides sample language" illustrate how the multilingual tutors in the study at times provides explicit and directive tutoring to their student writers. These interactions depart from the other types of interactions recorded but are nonetheless unsurprising because of the different roles played by the interactants in a tutorial session. In other words, tutors are expected to provide feedback, and that feedback can come in the form of helping students to flesh out their questions and to get them to answer their own questions on one end of the spectrum (Brooks, 1991). The other end of the spectrum is tutors occupying the role of an instructor, and the three codes exemplified demonstrate how the tutors in the study occupied that role to various degrees.

Participant Reflective Interviews

In addition to the eight writing center tutorial sessions, participants were interviewed individually after their tutorial. A total of 16 reflective playback interviews was conducted. The interviews were semi-structured (Rubin & Rubin, 2004) and conducted mostly in English. During each interview, participants reviewed previously identified sections of their tutorial and commented on each part. Three main categories arose from the data coding of the reflective interviews: "actions and strategies," "attitudes and feelings," and "expectations of each other." "Actions and strategies" can be defined as comments relating to what the participants did and why they think they did them. "Attitudes and feelings" include how the participants felt about what they did. Finally, under "expectations of each other," I have placed the tutors' comments on their student writers and vice versa.

Actions and Strategies

Both the multilingual tutors and student writers reflected on the actions that they took and the strategies that they used during the writing center tutorial sessions. The tutors' actions mostly fell into two main types: guiding students and making suggestions. The students' actions included (dis)agreeing with their tutors' suggestions and analyzing their own work. The strategies that both the tutors and student writers used comprised of the concept of authorship, code-switching, and interpreting silence. Each of these items are reported in detail.

In the reflective interviews, the tutors spoke about the types of guidance given to their student writers. The guidance varied depending on each tutor's experience as well as the knowledge base of the student each tutor worked with. In particular, two tutors—Christy and Abby—discussed how they guided the more passive students as well as the less knowledgeable students through giving them choices. For example, Christy said that when students really have no idea what to write or how to write something, she would provide "three or five expressions and uh tell them that [they] can decide afterwards" (tutor Christy, working with student Paula, reflective playback interview, March 8, 2016). In that way, she could cajole the more passive students to interact with her and to make a decision on their own writing. While both Christy and Abby recognize this is not an ideal situation, they both feel that this type of guidance is the best they can do under the circumstances. Additionally, Abby adjusted her feedback depending on how knowledgeable she believes the student writer to be. For instance, in her discussion with student Kelly regarding Kelly's CV, Abby reminded herself not to expect too much from a first-year student. Abby did not want to overwhelm Kelly with feedback because "that will put a lot of pressure on [Kelly]" (tutor Abby, working with student Kelly, reflective playback interview, March 21, 2016). Lastly, Abby was particularly cognizant of the number of questions she asked

the student writers at the beginning of a session. Although other tutors may ask questions as a way of leading or guiding a student, Abby felt that "[the students] will feel that they are answering questions in class (and) that will probably put more pressure as they are nervous in the first place already" since they are possibly meeting with a stranger to discuss their writing (tutor Abby, working with student Ellen, reflective playback interview, April 18, 2016). From these interviews, it can be seen that the types of guiding actions some of the tutors took were predicated on the specific needs of each student writer.

For the types of suggestions the tutors gave, their reflections varied more widely. To illustrate, tutor Kaila discussed her rationale for how she went about giving feedback to student Laura's lack of a topic sentence in Laura's personal statement (see Excerpt 35 for a segment of their conversation). Specifically, Kaila stated that after a few minutes of not being able to move forward in the tutorial, she gave Laura a sample topic sentence so that Laura can have a better idea of its purpose and function. However, Kaila did not "want to give a very good sample sentence" so that the student cannot simply copy it (tutor Kaila, working with student Laura, reflective playback interview, April 1, 2016). While Kaila appeared to be somewhat conflicted about giving students sample sentences, tutor Christy did not share the same reluctance. While tutoring student Paula, Christy spoke about the usefulness of letting students know of "certain kind of formula" so that the student can perhaps score higher on her timed-essay examination (tutor Christy, working with student Paula, reflective playback interview, March 8, 2016). Thus, the two tutors, Kaila and Christy, differed in their approach to providing their student writers with the types of suggestions they gave.

The multilingual student writers' reflective interviews revealed differences in the types of actions they took and the strategies they adopted during the tutorials. Since the student writers

185

were given guidance and suggestions most of the time, the actions they took varied between agreement and disagreement. However, because these agreements and disagreements were reflective in nature, they differed from the "agreement" coding I reported on earlier in this chapter. For instance, my reflective playback interview with student Vicky revealed how she went from originally disagreeing with tutor Faye to agreeing with Faye in the span of a few turns. None of her mindset change, however, was verbalized. Instead, the moment was captured through a smile as part of Vicky's reaction to Faye's explanation that the sample personal statement contained important key words. In Vicky's own words, she stated, "I don't know the change in my attitude just in the beginning I may doubt it well I don't think it is better than mine and after she point out I thought well yeah that's it" (student Vicky, working with tutor Faye, reflective playback interview, April 1, 2016). Despite her change of mind, Vicky did not overtly signal this reversal of opinion to Faye. Another instance of this type of (dis)agreement in hindsight can be seen in the reflective interview with student Arizona. In response to tutor Emma's claim that Arizona may have been off-topic with her response assignment, Arizona provided further explanation during the tutorial without overtly agreeing or disagreeing with Emma. However, during the reflective interview, Arizona was more adamant. Arizona not only gave a far more substantial defense of her response in Putonghua but also explicitly stated that she was not off-topic. Despite her disagreement with her tutor, Arizona deleted the part Emma had pointed out was off-topic because Arizona did not want to cause unnecessary confusion.

Another aspect of the actions that the multilingual student writers reflected upon was self-analysis of their work. These reflections relate specifically to the extent to which the student writers understood or did not understand their own work or assigned task. When I asked student Kelly what revisions she had made to her CV in response to her tutor Abby's suggestions, Kelly

186

stated that she did not make all of the changes because some of them were "a little bit difficult" (student Kelly, working with tutor Abby, reflective playback interview, March 23, 2016). Curiously, Abby had stated in her reflection of the same video segment that she had made a conscious effort to hold back on the amount of feedback she gave because she did not want Kelly to feel overwhelmed. Despite this conscious effort, Kelly probably still felt overwhelmed since she knowingly submitted a CV that she knew not to be her best possible work.

In contrast to Kelly consciously deciding not to revise something that she knew could be improved, student Paula appeared to be very grateful to be told about the "formula" of how to answer certain question types in timed-essay examinations. Additionally, Paula added that her major reason for going to the writing center was to receive help on certain grammatical errors. Referring to the sample language that Paula was given by her tutor Christy (see Excerpt 42), Paula states:

> Students like me always make some mistakes and they usually don't know what is right so they need to find one to tell her what is right what is wrong why you are wrong so about this part she tell me why you write a in- incorrect sentence and if you write like this it will be better and if she tell me I'll I think I'll remember about this part I won't make it wrong again. (student Paula, working with tutor Christy, reflective playback interview, March 4, 2016)

In Paula's case, she is aware of what she lacks, yet she does not have the knowledge to make the necessary corrections. Thus, Paula is quite appreciative of the sample language that Christy provided her during the tutorial. The two examples of students Kelly and Paula illustrate some of the self-negotiations the students enter into behind their decision-making process in relation to their own revision.

187

In addition to the reflections of the tutors' guidance and suggestion actions and the student writers' reactions, both the multilingual tutors and student writers reflected on some of the strategies they employed during the writing center tutorial sessions. These strategies can be summarized as how both the tutors and student writers viewed authorship, their use of code-switching, and their interpretation of silence. As I have already discussed code-switching in detail in the Postcolonial and Neocolonial Discourses at the Writing Center and in the Choices of (Dis)Affiliation sections earlier in this chapter, I now focus on authorship and the treatment of silence.

The blurry boundary between appropriation and intertextuality (Abasi, Akbari, & Graves, 2006; Chandrasoma et al., 2004) can be partially demonstrated through the tutors' and student writers' views of authorship in their reflective interviews. As defined by Chandrasoma et al. (2004), the concept of intertextuality can be usefully applied as part of the tutors and student writers' actions and strategies. Specifically, the "multiple strands of knowledges" can be interpreted as the meanings that the tutors and student writers negotiate during the tutorial sessions (p. 175). These acts of collaborative negotiation and meaning-building can be seen in how the tutors and student writers reacted to the acts of note-taking, the use of the pronoun *we*, and the practice of multiple revisions from different perspectives. Tutor Abby reacted differently to the practice of her student writers Ellen and Beth taking notes—and in some cases writing down word-for-word Abby's sample language. For Ellen, who was more proactive and came to the writing center with questions on her personal statement, Abby commented, "Ellen has her own ideas of this thing and she knows when things sound a little strange or need to be revised" (tutor Abby, working with student Ellen, reflective playback interview, April 18, 2016). Thus, Abby thought that Ellen would filter out incongruent ideas in her notes and choose only the

relevant points for her revision. Abby hedged more when reacting to student Beth's note-taking practice. Beth had come to her writing center appointment without any questions on her personal statement. When asked for comment, Abby pivoted and suggested that Beth's note-taking practice could be explained as a general habit in student-to-teacher or student-to-tutor interactions. Specifically, Abby stated, "I think it's more of a habitual thing than really acceptance of something" (tutor Abby, working with student Beth, reflective playback interview, April 5, 2016).

When asked about their note-taking actions during the writing center sessions, two of the student writers explained what they did. Student Ellen's comment on her note-taking behavior seems to corroborate tutor Abby's speculation. Ellen said that she wanted to write down the tutor's suggestions before she forgot them and added that she does not have a good memory. To offer further explanation on my apparent innuendo on authorship, Ellen clarified, "I rewrite this in my own words but um but use his but use her suggestions but in my own words actually I'm not just copying down all this sentence she just say she just said" (student Ellen, working with tutor Abby, reflective playback interview, March 24, 2016). Student Beth said that she tried to write down word-for-word what tutor Abby said, but that it was for the purpose of allowing her to deliberate the appropriateness of Abby's suggestions. Beth pointed out that she used Abby's suggestions as a reference. However, when I pushed her on the point and asked how much of Abby's sample language made it into Beth's personal statement, Beth said, "有一些有有一些沒有改," which translates into, "Some I did and some I didn't revise" (student Beth, working with tutor Abby, reflective playback interview, March 23, 2016). As I do not have access to the revised personal statement draft, it is unclear to what extent Beth incorporated Abby's suggested sample language.

The tutors and student writers reacted similarly to their use of the pronoun *we* in the tutorials. Because the texts brought into the sessions were written by the student writers, I found it interesting that some of the tutors and the student writers used this pronoun sometimes when announcing that they were going to take an action. Tutor Abby used the first person plural with all three of her student writers. When I asked her about such use during her tutorial with student Beth, Abby said that for suggestions, she usually tried to say phrase such as "personally I think," but other times when she wanted to build rapport with the students, she would use *we*. In particular, Abby wanted to create a clear distinction to the student that Abby does not function in the role of a teacher. Abby added, "It's not like that I am trying to be your teacher that I'm trying to offer like trying to like give you instructions on things it's like we're working this together we're discussing a better of way of writing this idea" (tutor Abby, working with student Beth, reflective playback interview, April 5, 2016). Abby had a similar but perhaps less rapport-building explanation of her use of the first personal plural during her tutorial session with student Ellen, which is interesting because Abby appeared to have built much better rapport with Ellen than with Beth. This time, Abby commented that her use of "we" was more of a convenient tool to avoid the impression that she was too aggressive with her suggestions. Abby found the use of "we" to be "a milder version" of the first person singular (tutor Abby, working with student Ellen, reflective playback interview, April 18, 2016). For tutor Abby, her use of the first person plural in discussions of texts not authored by her blurs the line of authorship, at least verbally.

Out of the eight student writers, Ellen was the only one to use the pronoun *we* in the tutorial. When I asked her to comment on her use of this word, Ellen clarified that she did not mean "we" as if she and Abby were a team. Instead, Ellen said, "We work on this paper is like more more maybe intimate" (student Ellen, working with tutor Abby, reflective playback

190

interview, March 24, 2016). Thus, Ellen appeared to have used the first person plural to create a sense of connection with her tutor. The use of "we" to announce an action on a single-author text renders the boundary between appropriation and intertextuality somewhat fluid.

Before moving on to the interpretations of silence, I would like to add two more student writers' reflections on authorship. In particular, students Kelly and Laura both made interesting comments about the number of revisions that they had made to their CV and personal statement drafts. Kelly explained how she added the words "work" and "extracurricular" into her CV because of an earlier session with a different tutor even though she did not feel like these words were needed. However, after the session with tutor Abby, Kelly removed those words, keeping the original headings she had on her CV. In both cases, Kelly cited tutor experience as the reason why she made those back-and-forth changes. I then asked Kelly if she feels that she is in control of her own writing, to which Kelly hedged, "Uh maybe sometimes I think so" (student Kelly, working with tutor Abby, reflective playback interview, March 23, 2016). Student Laura shared Kelly's lack of ownership over her own writing during our interview. Toward the end of the interview, I asked Laura my prepared interview question: Do you think this consultation helped to better understand your own writing process? Laura responded in Putonghua, stating, "嗯因為這篇稿子實在改了太多次我也不知道哪個是我原來的意見哪一個部分是跟這個的意見過後改的我有一點點不太確定," which translates into, "Because this draft has been revised so many times I can no longer be sure of which opinions came from me and which revisions are based on this [tutor's] opinions" (student Laura, working with tutor Kaila, reflective playback interview, March 22, 2016). Before the interview ended, Laura added that she had just finished another writing center appointment with a different tutor. That tutor had complimented Laura on Laura's personal statement conclusion. After receiving this compliment, Laura said that she thought to

191

herself, "不是我寫的." Translated into English, she stated, "I didn't write it" (student Laura,

working with tutor Kaila, reflective playback interview, March 22, 2016). Based on these two

student comments on the numerous revisions they had made to their drafts, it can be seen that

both Kelly and Laura deferred to their tutors on what should be written in their draft while

keeping a mental tab on what the students actually wrote.

Silence is a common occurrence in writing center tutorial sessions. When both the tutor

and student writer are reading to themselves, there is silence. Silence in conversation, however,

"carries interactional meaning" (Wong & Waring, 2010, p. 5). It is thus interesting to see how

the tutors and student writers in this study interpreted some of the silences during the tutorial

sessions. Tutor Christy, one of the more experienced tutors at the writing center, stated that

silence does not bother her if it is clear to both parties that she is reading a draft. She added, "If I

was asking the student some questions but the student was like uh I don't know how to answer

this and uh she wouldn't like give me feedback or stuff like that I would feel weird" (tutor

Christy, working with student Paula, reflective playback interview, March 8, 2016). For a less

experienced tutor like Abby, however, the distinction between the silence needed to read a draft

and the silence that occurs in conversation is less clear. When I asked Abby to comment on the

long period of silence at the beginning of her tutorial with student Kelly, Abby commented, "I

mean silence for a long time it's not good in this situation so I try to avoid doing that uh

afterwards" (tutor Abby, working with student Kelly, reflective playback interview, March 21,

2016). Tutors Christy and Abby reacted to the silence at the beginning of their tutorial sessions

differently, with Christy feeling that silence was expected while Abby felt the pressure to not

have so much silence.

192

Silence for the student writers during a tutorial carries different meanings. In the tutorial session between tutor Marion and student Cathy, there was a long segment of silence lasting approximately 20 seconds in the middle of their conversation where neither person was reading and after Marion had asked Cathy a question. Because of this extended period of silence, I asked Cathy for her comment. Cathy stated, "When I was silent I I hope that the tutor will give us some hints in writing so yes I didn't say much because I was thinking how to do" (student Cathy, working with tutor Marion, reflective playback interview, January 18, 2016). For student Paula, I asked her about the silence at the beginning of her tutorial with tutor Christy when Christy was reading Paula's draft. Paula commented, "I was thinking if she finished those paragraphs if she checked my essay how can I explain I didn't finish that or I should give her a brief summary of my my my essay" (student Paula, working with tutor Christy, reflective playback interview, March 4, 2016). From these two comments on their treatment of silence, it can be seen that Cathy actively used silence as a strategy to elicit an answer from her tutor while Paula needed that time to anticipate possible questions from her tutor and think of appropriate responses.

Attitudes and Feelings

The reflective interview results found that more student writers in the study expressed their attitudes and feelings about the tutorials than the tutors did. While speculative, it can be reasonable to expect that the receiver of feedback in a tutorial session would have more emotional reactions than the giver of feedback. That said, the student writers' attitudes and feelings ranged on a continuum from frustration to elation, while the tutors' attitudes and feelings were the strongest when they dealt with resistant student writers. The participants' feelings and attitudes should be separated from the coding of positive feedback, confusion, and

frustration. Rather, the information gathered in the reflective interviews supplemented how or why the student participants might have felt a certain way during their tutorial sessions.

How the student writers felt about different aspects of their tutorial sessions hinged on how much progress they felt they were able to make on their drafts. For students such as Ellen, who was proactive in asking questions and making revisions on her own, she came away from the session feeling quite positive about her experience. Throughout the session, Ellen consistently demonstrated this positive vibe. For example, Ellen spoke about how her tutor Abby helped her to gain confidence in her grammar by showing her how to rearrange some of the words she had written in her personal statement. After Abby took the same words that Ellen had written and rearranged them so that they made sense grammatically, Ellen said, "So when the tutor gave me the suggestion I think wow that's what I want so I'm really happy" (student Ellen, working with tutor Abby, reflective playback interview, March 24, 2016). When I urged Ellen for further comment, she contrasted her experience at the writing center with her experience working with teachers. Ellen added, "It's not only she is thinking but she also you know guide me to think … my teacher used to tell me … you just do the one two three but they never gave me the time or opportunity for us to thinking" (student Ellen, working with tutor Abby, reflective playback interview, March 24, 2016). Near the end of the interview, Ellen reiterated the sense of bonding that she felt she had with her tutor. Ellen concluded, "That makes me feel like we are friend and not like I'm teacher and you're a student you have to listen to me … they care about uh they care about what you think" (student Ellen, working with tutor Abby, reflective playback interview, March 24, 2016).

On the other end of the spectrum, student Laura, who had a difficult session with tutor Kaila, expressed more negative feelings and attitudes in her reflection. No doubt Laura was

194

frustrated by the lack of progress she was making on her personal statement, and this sense of

frustration was exacerbated by her intense desire to get into Honours College. When I asked for

Laura's comment on why she was rather blunt in responding to Kaila, Laura said, "I want to …

combine all points perfectly so uh I mean I shouldn't do that but I can't do that it's impossible

but at that time I just want it to be like that" (student Laura, working with tutor Kaila, reflective

playback interview, March 22, 2016). There were multiple sources helping to create Laura's

frustration. First, she wanted her personal statement to be unique, and she felt that Kaila's

suggestions were too ordinary. Second, Laura was not accustomed to writing topic sentences.

She explained, "因為之前一直寫中文作文寫得很文藝的那種不習慣 topic sentences," which

translates into "Because earlier I mostly wrote Chinese literary writing and I was not used to

topic sentences" (student Laura, working with tutor Kaila, reflective playback interview, March

22, 2016). Third, and perhaps most importantly, through out the tutorial session and the

reflective interview, Laura seemed obsessed with the word limit of her personal statement. She

used the word limit issue as a way to resist change during the session, and in the interview, she

explained:

> I'm worried about the word limit before I come and she suggest me that I should write
>
> two more sentences ... I haven't figured out the better way to express these two sentences
>
> but I should I think it sounds good her idea is good and I just can't do that. (student
>
> Laura, working with tutor Kaila, reflective playback interview, March 22, 2016)

While other student writers shared Laura's concern on the word limit issue (see Excerpt 22), no

one resisted change to the extent that Laura did.

Although students Ellen and Laura were on opposite ends of the emotional spectrum,

other students' attitudes changed from negative to positive. For Cathy, she struggled through her

195

essay writing process. Specific to her consultation, she felt confused by the feedback her tutor Marion gave her. Cathy commented:

> After the tutoring I changed my thesis and the thesis became longer and when I give my thesis to my classmate to help me to um review eh she said that why don't you use the thesis you wrote before I think that that is that was better than what you wrote just now so uh I don't know uh yes I got a little bit confused yes. (student Cathy, working with tutor Marion, reflective playback interview, January 18, 2016)

Despite this confusion, Cathy nonetheless found the experience worthwhile. Cathy added, "When I look back now I think it is still a good experience and the process is quite memorable" (student Cathy, working with tutor Marion, reflective playback interview, January 18, 2016). While Cathy reflected on her overall essay writing process, which included moments of confusion during her tutorial, student Vicky's reflection focused on a moment during the tutorial that made her change her attitude. Vicky stated, "At the beginning I thought those words like opportunities like knowledge ... doesn't make sense ... but after I explained my idea and she retell it again ... these words does do have meaning yeah and they can be convincing" (student Vicky, working with tutor Faye, reflective playback interview, April 1, 2016).

Besides feeling that she was convinced by her tutor and changing her mind as a result, Vicky also reflected on another matter that affected the overall tone of her session with tutor Faye. During her tutorial, Vicky mentioned attending a mock interview organized by an Honours College professor. During the mock interview, the professor gave negative comments to one of Vicky's answers. At an opportune moment in the tutorial, Vicky mentioned this mock interview and specifically reiterated the professor's opinion to counterargue against Faye's suggestion.

After a few exchanges, it was clear that Faye disagreed with this professor's opinion. I asked

Vicky for her reflection on Faye's disagreement with the professor, and Vicky commented:

> I think the weight [of the professor's opinion] is lessened yeah just maybe before that I
>
> was totally uh convinced by the [Honour's College professor] but later I will think well
>
> maybe it's just his personal style maybe not everybody thinks like him maybe it's also
>
> okay if I said I want to develop myself if I can express it in a good way if I can express it
>
> not sounds that selfish yeah so after I hear the different ideas I will think it again and
>
> yeah I will change a little bit. (student Vicky, working with tutor Faye, reflective
>
> playback interview, April 1, 2016)

During the tutorial, Vicky actually argued in favor of the professor's opinion, which contrasted

against her original stance. Thus, it was surprisingly to hear in Vicky's reflection the impact that

Faye's disagreement with the professor's opinion had on Vicky. In effect, Faye was arguing

Vicky's original point, and because Faye was able to flesh out the argument better than Vicky

could, Vicky no longer felt the pressure or the weight from the professor's opinion.

Compared to the student writers, the tutors in the study did not share much of their

feelings and attitudes in their reflections. Instead, they mostly focused on the efficiency of the

communication with their student writers and whether or not the goals established at the

beginning of the session were reached. Tutor Abby corroborated with student Ellen's feeling that

the session overall went very positively. Specifically, Abby cited that she felt she and Ellen were

engaged in a dialogue. She stated:

> In writing center we give you ideas and suggestions but it's only suggestions and you are
>
> the writer you get to decide what should be written in here eventually so we're solving
>
> this problem together so that's one of the thing related to this because when she used

197

"should we" it's very polite and it shows her cooperative attitude so I think I like that.

(tutor Abby, working with student Ellen, reflective playback interview, April 18, 2016)

On the other hand, tutor Kaila talked about her frustrations with student Laura's resistance. While trying to stay positive and focus on the fact that Kaila accomplished her goal of helping Laura to understand how to write a personal statement, Kaila nonetheless stated, "For me it wasn't the most successful consultation I have because she … was the kind of student that seemed not that accepting and responsive but I think generally at least I can manage to give her some useful suggestions" (tutor Kaila, working with student Laura, reflective playback interview, April 1, 2016). These two comments from Abby and Laura indicate that at the very least, the way that their student writers respond to the tutors' feedback has an effect on how the tutors feel about the effectiveness of the session.

Expectations of Each Other

The last salient code from the reflective interviews conducted with the multilingual tutors and student writers are the expectations that the tutors had of the student writers and vice versa. The tutors' expectations of their student writers depended highly on their perception of each student writer's English language proficiency. The students' limited exposure to writing center tutorial sessions meant that many of them expressed surprise at the level of freedom they were given to make their own decisions about their writing.

A student writer's perceived English proficiency impacted what the tutor expected from her student. If a tutor misjudges a student's English proficiency, then the tutor may attempt to conduct the entire tutorial session in Chinese, which was what happened in the session between tutor Emma and student Arizona (see Excerpts 8 – 12). In her reflection of her tutorial with Arizona, Emma commented that typically the lower the student proficiency level, the more the

198

student tended to rely on the tutor to dictate what the student should write. However, Emma found that the situation with Arizona differed from her expectation. Emma stated, "She's very open um she can take suggestions and friendly and nice so it was an easygoing consultation" (tutor Emma, working with student Arizona, reflective playback interview, December 15, 2015). In fact, Arizona's proficiency level was much higher than Emma had thought. Additionally, in her reflection of her tutorial with student Beth, tutor Abby found that she typically was more strict with students who demonstrated better writing abilities. Abby complimented students with weaker writing abilities because she wanted to give them more encouragement. Abby added:

> Some students like her they would have very good ideas but the expression might not be
> the same level with the ideas so in that case even if they have some grammar mistakes
> then I will still give compliment and then I will be like this is a very nice idea we'll try to
> work on the language and to make it more presentable and things like that. (tutor Abby,
> working with student Beth, reflective playback interview, April 5, 2016)

In fact, this strategy appeared to have worked when I asked student Beth her thoughts of having received a compliment. Beth commented, "It made me more confident about my personal statement" (student Beth, working with tutor Abby, reflective playback interview, March 23, 2016).

For Abby, working with higher proficient students meant raising her expectations. When Abby worked with Ellen, Abby stated, "Since her level of English is relatively higher so that means we will probably ask for a little more like a i plus one strategy again uh like we'll try to make something prettier uh other than just make things right" (tutor Abby, working with student Ellen, reflective playback interview, April 18, 2016). Additionally, Abby tended to not only expect but also enjoy more questions from higher proficient students like Ellen. In Abby's

199

reflection on her tutorial with Ellen, Abby stated that questions from student writers indicate higher ability and overall made her feel more involved in the revision process. In particular, Abby commented, "Sometimes they they have doubts on my revision … it's very good … it's like we're trying to do a group project instead of I am the teacher who push something into their head" (tutor Abby, working with student Ellen, reflective playback interview, April 18, 2016).

Besides the tutors managing their expectations of the student writers, some student writers expressed their expectations of the tutors implicitly, and the tutors had to manage these expectations as well. For example, tutor Christy stated that many students expect tutors to play the role of a teacher, and when she encountered these types of situations, she would emphasize her role as a peer reviewer and a provider of a different perspective. Additionally, students may employ different strategies with the end game of trying to get the tutor to appropriate the students' writing. In these types of situations, Marion's stance is perhaps more firm than the other tutors, stating, "I don't want to feed them with all my ideas" (tutor Marion, working with student Cathy, reflective playback interview, December 14, 2015). However, Marion also added situations where she encountered students who were reluctant to make any suggested revisions to their drafts. Marion commented, "Some students they don't take advices that well so when you try to reason with them they will find the better way to reason with you but which is good it means that they are taking ownership of their writing" (tutor Marion, working with student Cathy, reflective playback interview, December 14, 2015).

Student expectations of the tutors varied across the eight student writer participants. While some were very focused about their goals for the sessions and what they expected from their tutors, others reflected on their tutorials as relatively new and different experiences. Students such as Kelly and Beth expected to receive grammar help from their tutors. Although

Beth did not indicate this wish to her tutor Abby in their tutorial, in her reflective playback interview, Beth commented that it is difficult for her to know what she does not know, and that was why she did not ask Abby any questions. In other words, Beth needed Abby to help her "find [her] question about grammar" (student Beth, working with tutor Abby, reflective playback interview, March 23, 2016). Kelly, on the other hand, was very clear about her expectations. She stated, "I hope [the tutor] can help me to revise some grammar mistakes and also can help me to change my structure and give me more advice about this" (student Kelly, working with tutor Abby, reflective playback interview, March 23, 2016).

Students who mentioned the writing center sessions as new experiences included Cathy and Ellen. Cathy was unsure what to expect from her tutorial session, and wondered whether the tutor would tell her what to write. Instead, she stated, "The tutor just guide me and I should think how to write it instead of being told how to write it" (student Cathy, working with tutor Marion, reflective playback interview, January 18, 2016). Ellen, on the other hand, expressed more trepidation about her session with Abby. Ellen commented, "I'm afraid this consultation may be solemn just like [talking to a] professor … but then I realize um that is that is not true we we we were really just like friends we were discussing uh on our project" (student Ellen, working with tutor Abby, reflective playback interview, March 24, 2016).

Lastly, students Paula and Ellen discussed what they did not expect from their tutors. In particular, Paula talked about how incredible it was for her tutor to multi-task during a tutorial. She said that prior to coming to the writing center to get feedback, she had already spent a week writing and revising. Tutors like Christy, however, "will uh help any subject any major and they need to think in five minutes or three minutes and they need to finish this problem in within forty minutes" (student Paula, working with tutor Christy, reflective playback interview, March 4,

2016). Similarly, Ellen expressed amazement that her tutor Abby seemed to be a mind reader.

Ellen talked about knowing what she wanted to say but not being able to put all the words

together. After talking to Abby, Ellen felt Abby's suggestions were "just like mm she really

understand what I'm thinking" (student Ellen, working with tutor Abby, reflective playback

interview, March 24, 2016). Although student writers' expectations of their tutors and vice versa

differed because their session goals were different, nonetheless, there is a sense that both the

tutors and student writers were able to find ways to appreciate each other's effort during the

tutorial.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, I sought to establish the writing center tutorial sessions captured in my

data set as part of institutional talk. I explained how the tutorial sequences follow the patterns as

explicated by Heritage and Clayman (2010). Additionally, I couched the institutional talk within

the larger geopolitical and social contexts that permeate the writing center setting. After

establishing the necessary context for the tutorial sessions, I reported the salient categorization

and codes that arose from the data, first from the writing center tutorial sessions, then from the

reflective playback interviews. Categories arising from the tutorial sessions included: choices of

(dis)affiliation, functional engagement, non-verbal reactions, co-initiated actions, and tutor direct

guidance and action. Within the category of (dis)affiliation, the data was further separated into

different codes, including: code-switching, positive feedback, joking, alignment, agreement,

confusion, frustration, redirection, and disagreement. For functional engagement, the participants

were found to have used questioning, explanation, analysis, and opinion to interact with each

other and to move the conversation forward. In the reflective playback interviews, the data were

coded into three categories: actions and strategies, attitudes and feelings, and expectations of

each other.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Following a social constructivist paradigm and using ethnographic methods such as observation and interviews, this dissertation focuses on eight writing center tutorial sessions between multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers and 16 individual reflective interviews. Located in Macao, a linguistic confluence of Chineses, Portuguese, and English, the University of Macau's writing center is not only the site of the study but also the location where multilingual participants enacted various identity performances as they negotiated with each other to improve a piece of writing.

Data was gathered from October 2015 through April 2016, and the gathered data went through several rounds of coding as informed by grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006; A. E. Clarke, 2005; Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Presented in detail in this work, the codes for the tutorial sessions broadly fall into the categories of (dis)affiliation, functional engagement, non-verbal reactions, co-initiated actions, and tutor direct guidance and action. The codes for the reflective playback interviews generally fall into the categories of actions and strategies, attitudes and feelings, and expectations of each other.

In this final chapter, I revisit the purposes of conducting this study and establish identity not only as sites of contestation but also acts of negotiation. I reference sociocultural theory in my discussion and specifically re-present the data using Bucholtz and Hall's (2005) work on identity and interaction. In the arena of writing center scholarship, I discuss how the study's findings broaden the knowledge base on writing center tutorial sessions involving the interactions of multilingual tutors and student writers. In the arena of language learning, I highlight how the participants' acts of negotiation showcase their investment (Norton, 1995). I

conclude with a discussion of the limitations of the study and provide suggestions for future research.

Revisiting the Study Purpose and the Research Questions

A review of my primary and secondary research questions can help bring the discussion back to the focal point of my study:

1. What are the interactional choices that multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers make during a writing center tutorial session?

    a. How do the participants feel about the choices that they made during the writing center tutorial session?

    b. What influences the interactional choices that they made during the writing center tutorial session?

The answer to these questions is obviously complicated and can also vary according to many different perspectives. I have chosen to use a constructivist lens and a sociocultural theoretical framework (Vygotsky, 1978) to answer these questions. Still, many conceptual and analytical frameworks fall within sociocultural theory, as do Heritage and Clayman's (2010) work on institutional talk and Bucholtz and Hall's (2005) work on identity and interaction. Through the key phrase of "interactional choices" in my research question, I discuss the data as a "slice of life" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2008, p. 160). That is, the data captures the various identity enactments and positionings by the participants as they occur from moment-to-moment. Doing so hopefully allows me to describe some of the complexities in decision-making (what is discussed and what is eventually written down) as multilingual tutors and student writers negotiate their ideas on a piece of writing. As important as these micro perspectives are, Norton

and McKinney (2011) caution that the influences of the social world also need to be taken into account in order to make more comprehensive sense of the participants' interactions.

My primary goal for this dissertation was to seek to describe various identity enactments performed by multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers. Through a sociocultural theoretical framework and the application of Bucholtz and Hall's (2005) sociocultural linguistic approach to identity and interaction as well as Heritage and Clayman's (2010) work on institutional talk, I have contextualized the writing center talk and exemplified some of the complexities exhibited by the participants of a writing center tutorial session. The study was conducted in part to answer the call by Canagarajah (2010) to have multilingual researchers study multilingual writers. The methodological inspiration came from the four-fold call by Bucholtz and Hall (2008) to portray less documented interactions (as is this case with multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers), to illustrate how various discursive and relational strategies are used in interaction, to discuss the significance of different identity positionings, and to connect identity enactments to larger institutionalized power structures. I have sought to describe and explain in-depth how some identity position shifts occur by engaging in *looking at* my data. However, I also touched on explaining why some of these identity position shifts occur through the presentation of the reflective interview data. In other words, I briefly *looked for* explanations so as to situate the tutorial interactions within their appropriate geopolitical and social contexts.

Through these in-depth descriptions of multilingual tutors and student writers engaging in talk-in-interaction, I hope to advance the portrayal of multilinguals not as deficit learners but as engaging, complex, and sophisticated interactants who have at their disposal many more strategies beyond language alone to communicate their message. Some of these strategies

involve invoking powerful ideologies, while other strategies are used as a result of having powerful ideologies applied to the participants. From the detailed descriptions presented in the data presentation chapter, I now address the primary themes that arose from the data as they relate to my research questions. In short, I assert that the interactional choices the participants made comprise of complicated acts of negotiation, and these acts of negotiation can be exemplified through the following themes.

The L2 Writer and Her Social World

As I have demonstrated in this work, the interactional-level engagement taking place between the participants in the study needs to be properly contextualized so that the engagements can be viewed with the appropriate lens. For the multilingual student writers in the study, in other words the language learners, Norton and McKinney (2011) argue that their language learning interactions should take into account the social, historical, and economic influences affecting their interactions. For this study, I argue that academic influences also affect their language learning interactions. Some of the academic influences at play in this study that ultimately shaped the participants' identity enactments included (1) the use of English as the instructional language at the University of Macau, (2) the assignment tasks that the student writers brought to their tutorial sessions, and (3) the advice the student writers received on their assignment tasks prior to their sessions. These academic influences are not only molded by the University of Macau's extant postcolonial discourse through the adoption of English as the medium of instruction for a majority Cantonese-speaking population (Bray & Koo, 2004; H. S. Yee & Kou, 2001) but also by its neocolonial discourse through an increase in the hiring of Putonghua-speaking academic staff as well as an increase in the recruitment of mainland Chinese students (H. S. Yee, 2001).

In placing the study site within the appropriate context of postcolonial and neocolonial discourses, I highlighted how student writer Arizona was impacted by her new surroundings. As a speaker of Putonghua, Arizona had trouble adjusting to the English and Cantonese that was suddenly all around her. A change in her larger social world also meant a change in the ways that she would have to communicate with others (Blommaert, 2012). On a smaller scale, even within the writing center interaction, Arizona had to deal with her tutor Emma's misevaluation of Arizona's English speaking abilities. As Excerpts 8 – 12 illustrate, Arizona interpreted Emma's misjudgment as a face-threatening act (Brown & Levinson, 1987), and it influenced not only the rest of her tutorial session with Emma but also the reflective interview process upon the opportunity to view various segments of that session.

To summarize part of Arizona and Emma's session, at the end of Arizona's explanation of her assignment during the session, Emma code-switched from English to Putonghua to offer Arizona the choice of conducting the session in Putonghua. This offer was made after Arizona's extensive turn explaining what her assignment was in English. Emma stated in Putonghua, "If you want to you can use Chinese <u>we can use Chinese</u>" (Excerpt 8, lines 29 – 31). The offer was couched as a hypothetical and thus appears on the surface to be a choice for Arizona. What Scollon, Scollon, and Jones (2012) have shown, however, is that the discrepancy between the message intended by Emma and the message received by Arizona may have created a space that enables Arizona to interpret Emma's offer as a face-threatening act. To apply the work of Scollon, Scollon, and Jones, by making this offer, tutor Emma was giving student Arizona "independence" to operate at the same time that Arizona demonstrated she wanted "involvement" through her choice to use English (p. 48). The imbalance between what is offered (by the tutor) and what is desired (by the student) creates opportunities for miscommunication.

Besides the conscious decision not to divorce a language learner from her social world and all of the influences that come with that world, it is worthwhile to view the identity enactments of these multilingual student writers and tutors from the perspective of Bucholtz and Hall's (2005) identity framework. In particular, their positionality principle, which suggests that a person's various identities cannot be easily compartmentalized into different categories, and their indexicality principle, which refers to the influences of "ideological structures," (p. 594) are especially pertinent to describe Arizona's situation. For Arizona, her individual identity is contrasted against the larger social world with which she does not immediately identify. As a sudden minority in the oral world (Arizona speaks Putonghua whereas the vast majority of the University of Macau population speaks Cantonese) who is still literate in the written world (Arizona reads simplified characters but should be able to guess the meaning of traditional characters), Arizona finds some of her identities in conflict with each other before she even steps into the writing center (see Excerpt 12). Once in the writing center, Arizona still has to contend with a tutor who questions her English language ability. In that moment, many of her identities are contested. In that moment, Arizona's symbolic power as a speaker is taken away (Bourdieu, 1977). She cannot understand what people are saying to her, and when she tries to speak what she believes to be a common language to her tutor, she cannot be understood. The linguistic ideological structures that Arizona has aligned herself with all of her life are simultaneously not only challenged but also cannot be relied upon for basic communication.

For language learners on a social level, any interaction, even seemingly innocuous ones with a peer in the writing center, can bring additional pressure and stress. For student writers Ellen and Cathy, writing center consultations were a new experience. As such, they both spoke about not knowing what to expect. Before her session with tutor Abby, Ellen was worried that

the consultation would be more like interacting with a professor, with the professor telling her what to do and her accepting the suggestions without any choice in the matter. Even silences during tutorial sessions can be stressful for the student writer. For example, student writer Paula spoke about using the long silences during her tutorial session with tutor Christy to prepare answers to Christy's possible questions. Language learners need more time to process information and to conceive of a response (Norton & McKinney, 2011). Even in front of a peer, the language learner does not want to lose face (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Scollon, Scollon, & Jones, 2012).

Entry into a new community, even if that community consists of short interactions lasting between 30 – 45 minutes—as is the case with writing center tutorial sessions—requires not only preparation but also adjustment on the part of the student writer. Both Ellen and Cathy mentioned in their reflective playback interviews that their tutors Abby and Marion, respectively, acted as guides who led Ellen and Cathy toward asserting their own agency rather than as teachers who instructed them what to do. In the Attitudes and Feelings section of this work, Ellen mentioned, "It's not only she is thinking but she also you know guide me to think … my teacher used to tell me … you just do the one two three but they never gave me the time or opportunity for us to thinking" (student Ellen, working with tutor Abby, reflective playback interview, March 24, 2016). In the Expectations of Each Other section of this work, Cathy added, "The tutor just guide me and I should think how to write it instead of being told how to write it" (student Cathy, working with tutor Marion, reflective playback interview, January 18, 2016). Ellen and Cathy's reflections on their entry to this new community can be partially explained by the concept of *legitimate peripheral participation* (Lave & Wenger, 1991). In a way, the "more capable peers" (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86), Marion and Abby, show the inexperienced new members of the writing

center discourse community, Cathy and Ellen, the types of practices that are found in that particular writing center.

Even in the case of Cathy, a much stronger writer with a higher English language proficiency, the challenges she encountered during the tutorial session are nonetheless influenced by her social world. In her reflective interview (see Excerpt 7), Cathy spoke about how it did not cross her mind that she could use another common language she had with her tutor Marion when there was a communication breakdown between the two of them. Speculatively, it is not far-fetched to suggest that because the University of Macau is an English medium university, because the name of the writing center is called the "English Writing and Communication Center," and because her essay is written in English, contextually, institutionally, and academically, Cathy felt that she should be using English to conduct her tutorial. This type of deeply ingrained use-English policy may have pressured Cathy to miss her opportunity to use Cantonese to clear up her earlier miscommunication with Marion. This missed opportunity can be argued to be an accumulation of the historical and academic constraints implicitly placed on Cathy. This socialization (Watson-Gegeo, 2004) that Cathy experienced over time (Norton, 2000) manifested itself in that session when Cathy did not think to access her other language to communicate meaning.

In relation to the social and economic impact on the language learner, student writer Vicky was quite candid in expressing the reason for her desire to be admitted to Honours College. When tutor Faye asked why Vicky wanted to get into Honours College so that they can begin the personal statement revision process, Vicky asked Faye which answer Faye wanted to hear. Excerpt 43 shows how Vicky maneuvers her answer to Faye's innocuous question. Note that in lines 284 – 285, Vicky asks if she should give her real answer or the one that she is

preparing to give at the interview. As exemplified by this short excerpt, Vicky feels that she has

to keep her true reasons (the economic benefit of having an international exchange opportunity)

hidden because she perceives that she needs to sound much more socially responsible to gain

traction with her imagined audience. Even with Faye, who is not a factor in the admission

process, Vicky remains somewhat guarded and reluctant to reveal her perceived selfish reasons.

Yet, Vicky is ever so conscious about how this imagined interviewer might react.

Excerpt 43 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Faye and Student Vicky)

```
284   Vicky:    I should be honest? or I'm facing the
285             interviewee.
286   Faye:     or jus just- just tell me anything about
287             (.) what do you want- why do you want to
288             join. I mean.
289   Vicky:    sound attractive.
290   Faye:     sounds attractive (.) in what way?
291   Vicky:    ((laughs)) about the exchange yeah.
292   Faye:     exchange.
293   Vicky:    yeah.
294   Faye:     just the exchange? or yeah
295   Vicky:    .hh more than exchange but that's the main
296             point
297   Faye:     that's the main point
298   Vicky:    yeah. (.) to be honest
```

In fact, later in the conversation between Vicky and Faye (see Excerpt 44), Vicky begins

to recast this imagined interviewer's arguments against Faye, who is encouraging Vicky to write

more about individual growth and development in Vicky's personal statement. In other words,

Faye is arguing Vicky's original position. In lines 366 – 367, Vicky reveals the reasons for her

reluctance to be truthful about wanting to be a member of Honours College. In a preparation

interview with an Honours College professor, Vicky gave her real reasons for wanting to be in

the College, stating, "I want to let my talent shine" (line 366). However, this reason was flatly

rejected by this professor. Carrying that earlier conversation into the tutorial session, Vicky has

now adopted this professor's position on why students should seek to be admitted to the College.

Excerpt 44 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Faye and Student Vicky)

```
357   Vicky:     but I don't think it sounds very good to
358              write that I come here people say I want
359              to develop myself
360   Faye:      no:: develop yourself is one of the (0.5)
361              biggest=
362   Vicky:     =because I have ever meet with the tutor
363              of h c and we have uh (.) some kind of
364              interview? and when he asked why- why do
365              you think you can enter h c (.) I said
366              that I want to let my talent shine (.) and
367              he (.) dislike disliked this- answer
368              because (.) uh he thinks that people comes
369              to h c not to let their own talent shine
370              or .hh make their own make themselves
371              better (.) they should serve (.) others
372              and that's what I get [from
373   Faye:                            [mm
```

Student writer Vicky's fluid movement between her original position to the occupation of

the College professor's position occurs over time. Nonetheless, this College professor's position

not only influences but dictates the direction of the tutorial session. Tutor Faye spends time

during the tutorial trying to get Vicky to re-adopt Vicky's original position. While Waring's

(2005) study showed that the writing center tutee in her study invoked an authority to resist the

tutor's suggestion, what is happening between Faye and Vicky in Excerpts 43 and 44 appears to

be more complicated. In effect, Vicky is invoking the authority of the College professor, which is

the symbolic representative of institutional power (Bourdieu, 1991). However, by doing so,

Vicky argues against her original position. As I described in this work, when I asked student

Vicky to reflect on this segment of her conversation with tutor Faye, Vicky suggested that after

listening to Faye argue for Vicky's original position, "the weight [of the professor's opinion] is

lessened" (student Vicky, working with tutor Faye, reflective playback interview, April 1, 2016).

Vicky added, "Maybe it's also okay if I said I want to develop myself if I can express it in a good way" (student Vicky, working with tutor Faye, reflective playback interview, April 1, 2016).

To sum up, student Vicky asserted her own identity position ("I want to let my talent shine") during the preparation interview. This position was rejected by a more powerful figure (the professor). Vicky then moves to adopt the position of this more powerful figure, and brings this new position into her tutorial session with tutor Faye. When Faye argues for Vicky's original position ("develop yourself," line 360, Excerpt 44), Vicky echoes the position ("serve others," line 371, Excerpt 44) of this more powerful figure. Although Vicky does not appear to be convinced by Faye's arguments during the session, in the reflective interview, Vicky seems to have changed her mind after the session.

Such fluid and yet contested movements of identity enactments not only demonstrate that the language learner should not be separated from her social worlds but also that these identity enactments are much more complicated than at first glance. If a person only reads student Vicky's personal statement drafts, that person would not see the contrasting moves Vicky made as well as the agonizing decision-making process behind each move, because in the end, the "I want to let my talent shine" part of the statement did not change. Bucholtz and Hall's (2005) relationality principle is helpful to describe the complicated shifting of identity positions. They define this principle as follows:

> Identities are intersubjectively constructed through several, often overlapping,
> complementary relations, including similarity/difference, genuineness/artifice, and
> authority/delegitimacy. (p. 598)

This principle allows for the idea that identity is enacted through discourse, and there are various push-pull and complementary factors that instantiate identity. As the exchange between Vicky and Faye illustrates, Vicky tries to be both similar to and different from herself.

Lastly, the academic constraints placed on the participants should not be overlooked because in many ways, these constraints dictated how the student writers thought about their writing. In addition to the academic socialization felt by Cathy over time, all of the student writers except Cathy and Kelly talked about having to write within the word limit. The word limit is one of the reasons that student Beth wanted to make an appointment with the writing center (see Excerpt 1). The word limit is one of the reasons student Vicky gives tutor Faye for not being able to add any more ideas into her personal statement. The word limit is the primary reason student Laura resisted tutor Kaila's suggested revisions. It is not only the student writers who feel constrained by the word limit. Tutors over time have also been socialized into asking about the assignment's word limit as way to guide the student writer's revision. Tutors Emma and Abby both asked about the word limit issue, and tutor Kaila even used it as a strategy to get Laura to revise (see Excerpt 16).

Through these examples of how the multilingual student writers' social, historical, economic, and academic worlds collide and intersect with their identity enactments before and during the writing center tutorial sessions, it is not difficult to see how the language learners in this study can try to adopt different identity positions to complete their desired task. From an identity perspective, "learners who struggle to speak from one identity position can reframe their relationship with their interlocutors and reclaim alternative, more powerful identities from which to speak," and no matter which identity position the learner speaks from, each position is intimately connected to the learner's social world (Norton & McKinney, 2011, p. 74).

215

A Full Repertoire of Negotiation Strategies

The multilingual tutors and student writers in the study have a full repertoire of negotiation strategies during their writing center tutorial sessions. As a goal-oriented interaction, with the goal being improvement on the text, the communication strategies that the tutors and student writers used ultimately serve this improvement purpose. Whether the sessions generally had a positive tone (e.g. tutor Abby and student Ellen) or a contentious atmosphere (e.g. tutor Kaila and student Laura), the negotiation strategies on display in the eight recorded tutorial sessions can also be seen from an identity lens. Because I have already demonstrated the extent to which the study's participants can negotiate meaning through their (dis)affiliative and functional engagement strategies in this work, I highlight here how these moves show the participants' level of ownership (Norton, 1997) and investment (Norton Peirce, 1995).

Goal-oriented communication. The participants in the study made interaction choices that were driven by the goals they had made for the tutorial session. Exemplified by most of the code-switching moves that both the multilingual tutors and student writers made (e.g. tutor Abby and students Kelly, Ellen, and Beth; tutor Christy and student Paula; tutor Kaila and student Laura), these choices helped both interlocutors communicate their ideas more effectively. Simultaneously, the code-switching moves demonstrated the occasionally complicated decision-making process and rationale behind each sentence or word that ultimately made it on the page. Specifically, Excerpts 13 (exchange between Kaila and Laura, where Laura fretted about her inability to express a more nuanced idea) and 14 (exchange between Abby and Kelly, where Kelly tried to engage in a correct word form discussion) show how much deliberation went into choosing the right word to express the feeling and tone that the student writer wanted. In using the multiple languages at the interlocutors' disposal to communicate meaning before words are

216

written down (A. S. Canagarajah, 2002a, 2006; S. Canagarajah, 2011), the participants in the study have shown not only an awareness of their target audience but also have made conscious decisions about how they wish to be portrayed in writing (A. S. Canagarajah, 2010).

Along with accessing linguistic resources at their disposal to drive the conversation forward, the participants used a variety of strategies to engage with each other. These functional engagement moves include: questioning, explanation, analysis, and opinion. These moves form the backbone of each and every tutorial session captured in this study. Some questioning moves (see Excerpt 1) are made for the problem-initiation stage of institutional talk (Heritage & Clayman, 2010). Other questioning moves are made by tutors to guide their student writers toward a certain way of thinking (see Excerpts 18, 21, 26, and 28). The student writers similarly used the questioning move to raise their queries and to ask leading questions in hopes that the tutor agrees with their stance (see Excerpt 31, where student Kelly asks tutor Abby whether having more pages on Kelly's CV gives Kelly an advantage).

In response to the questions raised, the interlocutors provided explanations, analyses, and opinions. These moves function as justifications for certain suggestions and rationale for certain word choices. They also function as teachable moments where tutors might reinforce the need to cater to the target audience (see Excerpt 25, where tutor Abby informs student Ellen that the readers of Ellen's personal statement will be confused) and where tutors can explain why topic sentences in a personal statement can help readers going through the applications (see Excerpt 35, line 294, where tutor Kaila depicts a nonspecific teacher skimming through such applications and the benefit topic sentences can have in helping this reader scan for specific information).

Stance-making tactics. The participants in the study also made a number of affiliative moves that drove the discussion forward. These moves of affiliation can also be analyzed

through the concept of stance. In his article "The Stance Triangle," Du Bois (2007) defines *stance* as "I evaluate something, and thereby position myself, and thereby align with you" (p. 163) and depicts stance in an interaction as a two-way channel of communication between two interlocutors relating to an object. Through joke-making by the tutor (exchange between tutor Abby and student Ellen, Excerpt 19) and by the student (exchange between tutor Abby and student Beth, Excerpt 20), these particular participants showed that they can use humor in multiple languages to create a positive bond, thereby achieving affiliation with each other (Mendoza-Denton, 1999; Placencia, 2012).

Other striking moves of affiliation and therefore the creation of a positive stance include the participants mutual use of the pronouns *we* and *us*. In Excerpts 13 and 16, the object pronoun *us* is used by tutor Kaila to rally student Laura to make Kaila's suggested revisions. In Excerpt 21, tutor Christy uses the subject pronoun *we* to generate the feeling that she and student Paula are working together on the draft improvement process. In Excerpt 17, student Ellen uses the subject pronoun *we* to create a collaborative atmosphere between her and her tutor Abby. All of these examples illustrate how the active use of a particular pronoun can not only represent the interlocutor's stance and wish for alignment with another person but also showcase the "similarity" aspect of Bucholtz and Hall's (2005, p. 598) relationality principle.

Besides the affiliative moves made in the tutorial sessions, the participants' disaffiliative moves can also demonstrate their stance and hence, their repertoire of negotiation strategies. The exemplar segments showing the participants' confusion, frustration, and redirection highlight not only their voice and opinions but also how they worked together to either resolve the matter or pivot to another topic. In Excerpt 25, tutor Abby uses different hedging techniques to neutralize her confusion toward a sentence on student Ellen's draft. In Excerpt 27, student Vicky pivots to

another topic to de-escalate the frustration she was showing over the name argument with tutor Faye. In Excerpt 28, student Laura tries to explain her way out of her own frustration at not wanting to revise her personal statement to include generic topic sentences. All of these moves show that the participants are not only capable of establishing disaffiliation but also finding some strategy to move forward from the negative stance. In sum, stance-making tactics illustrate Bucholtz and Hall's (2005) positionality principle with the way the interlocutors make moves to align or disalign with each other to assert their identity positions, thereby demonstrating the fluidity of movement in the identity construction process.

Assertions of the student writers' discoursal voice. Another demonstration of the student writer participants' repertoire of negotiation tactics is how the student writers asserted their discoursal voice during the tutorial sessions regardless of their level of English language proficiency. Higher proficient students writers such as Cathy were singularly focused on getting help on connectives, which her instructor had informed her was something she needed to improve on. Although her tutor Marion tried to point out that there are other areas in Cathy's essay that can be improved and reconsidered, Cathy's questions and comments almost always diverted her tutor's attention back to the topic of connectives. In other words, Cathy knows exactly what she wants and is quite persistent in trying to get it.

Student Vicky noted that she wanted to make a writing center appointment because there were certain expressions that she was accustomed to using from her high school English learning experience. Since she went to a high school in the People's Republic of China, she wanted to be sure that the terms she used in her personal statement catered to the local population. Case in point is how long of a discussion Vicky had with tutor Faye over the use of the term *gaokao* during her session. Excerpt 45 captures this long exchange over the use of this term.

Excerpt 45 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Faye and Student Vicky)

```
31   Vicky:    especially this part (.) I'm not sure how
32             to name this so I finally write leadership
33             experience
34   Faye:     yes! yes yeah but here mm according to the
35             instruction you need to give your- your
36             gaokao score
37   Vicky:    ohh:::
38   Faye:     yeah you forgot (.) that
39   Vicky:    okay (2.0) how to say gaokao in English
40             just [gaokao?
41   Faye:          [use the pinyin gaokao $score$ that's
42             how $they:$ $how they:$ uh:=
43   Vicky:    =I I I remember I can either submit the
44             gaokao score↑ or the score since (.) since
45             year six to (.) year nine (.) the-
46   Faye:     >yeah yeah yeah yeah yeah<
47   Vicky:    yeah
48   Faye:     but I mean on the c v they ask you to do
49             that
50   Vicky:    okay.
51   Faye:     yeah. to- put it here (1.0) and then mm
52             the format maybe (2.0) this (.) you you
53             can align
54   Vicky:    okay (2.0)
55   Faye:     >yeah yeah yeah< ((coughs))
56   Vicky:    gaokao is c e e right? college entrance
57             examination.
58   Faye:     .hh just use gaokao that's how they-
59   Vicky:    ((laughs))
60   Faye:     yeah that's how they write it on their
61             website so it's okay it's fine ((reads))
```

The exchange between tutor Faye and student Vicky begins with Vicky asking Faye a

question about one of the headings Vicky has used in her CV (lines 31 – 33). Faye provides an

answer and redirects Vicky's attention to something that is missing in her document. The

missing piece of information is a national college entrance examination score known in the

Chinese higher education system as *gaokao* (lines 34 – 38). Vicky acknowledges this omission

and asks Faye how to present this information on her CV in English (lines 39 – 40). Faye tells

Vicky that putting down the pinyin word (pinyin is the name given to the transliteral

Romanization system of Chinese characters) *gaokao* is sufficient and redirects Vicky's attention to the formatting of her document. Several turns later, Vicky returns to the topic of *gaokao* and asks Faye if *gaokao* should be translated as "college entrance examination" (lines 56 – 57). Faye repeats her earlier recommendation, which garners a laugh from Vicky, to which Faye responds with a reference to the sample CV on the Honours College website as an exemplar (lines 60 – 61).

At the heart of this long exchange between student Vicky and tutor Faye on the use of the term *gaokao* is not only Vicky's unwillingness to represent herself as a mainland Chinese student but also her awareness of the potential needs of her local audience. *Gaokao* is a term that only a mainland Chinese audience understands; on its own, the term carries no meaning to a World Englishes audience. Vicky's insistence on using the term college entrance examination is suggestive of her alignment to her imagined general English language speaking audience at the University of Macau and therefore her disalignment to her other imagined mainland Chinese English language speaking audience. One may speculate that Vicky's insistence is a more nuanced indication of her preference for the American English variety (D. He & Li, 2009), but it is certainly not a stretch to suggest that Vicky is aware that she needs to tailor her CV for the preference of her imagined English reading audience. In Vicky's mind, it is certainly possible that this imagined reader does not know the meaning of *gaokao*. Hence, she uses quite some time to get clarification from Faye on the use of this term. When I followed up with Vicky on this topic, she stated, "I'm not sure in English expression which one is more local which one is more accept acceptable so I'm just check it is acceptable to use *gaokao* because I think maybe c e e is better" (student Vicky, working with tutor Faye, reflective playback interview, April 1, 2016). In other words, Vicky was trying to assert her discoursal self (Ivanič, 1998, 2006) during the

221

tutorial session to make sure that she is represented on paper the way she wants to be perceived by her imagined audience.

Lower proficient student writers such as Beth and Laura, who opted to have their tutorial sessions in Putonghua, demonstrated a similarly high level of their discoursal voice by focusing on word choice with their tutors. Beth's discussion with tutor Abby included trying to decide whether the word "progress" or the word "development" emphasized the concept of time better (tutorial session between tutor Abby and student Beth, March 18, 2016). Laura asked her tutor Kaila whether there was a more sophisticated way of saying "achieve a better me" (tutorial session between tutor Kaila and student Laura, March 17, 2016). Although tutor Abby described student Ellen as a higher proficient writer, Ellen spent quite some time engaging Abby in word choice questions. Excerpt 15 captured Ellen asking Abby what was a better way of saying "caring for people" (line 248 – 249). Whether the student writers were describing themselves or talking about their aspirations for wanting to be a part of Honours College, they were asserting their discoursal selves (Ivanič, 1998, 2006) because they wanted to be seen in a certain way, and they understood the importance of word choice. The student writers understood how their voice was represented through their word choice (Prior, 2001). As Hyland (2010) suggests, though his study involved scholarly academic identity, word choice matters a great deal in the projection of the author's identity to the reader.

The Fluidity of Intertextuality

In the Actions and Strategies section of chapter four, I made brief reference to the fluid movement between appropriation and intertextuality in some of the recorded tutorial sessions. Here I broaden the definition of intertextuality employed by Chandrasoma et al. (2004) to include oral discussions that may eventually end up in a text. I also ask for the suspension of the

222

concept of textual ownership so that the idea negotiations made by the participants in this study can be unraveled and understood in a language learning context (Morton, Storch, & Thompson, 2015; Ouellette, 2008). The instances included student Ellen's use of the pronoun *we* when talking about the revisions that she and her tutor Abby made together on Ellen's personal statement; student Beth's strategy of verbatim note-taking when listening to tutor Abby's suggestions on sentential revisions; student Kelly's indecisiveness on which heading words to use on her CV; and student Laura's admission that she did not write the sentence that received another tutor's compliment. According to Norton and McKinney (2011), "Language learners need to struggle to appropriate the voices of others; they need to learn to command the attention of their listeners" (p. 81). Applied broadly, Norton and McKinney's assertions help deepen the understanding of the student writer participants' self negotiations and negotiations with others in the struggle to find their own voice. As Chandrasoma et al. (2004) have demonstrated, removing the concept of text ownership allows for a more complicated picture of the at-times collaborative writing process from idea generation to idea negotiation to note-taking to the eventual version that appears on a written document. The data in this study reveal that the fluid movement of idea exchange between tutor and student writer is part of the process of how tutors help student writers find their own voice.

In student Ellen's case, the use of the pronoun *we* could be interpreted as an alignment strategy for the purpose of establishing a positive stance, but it could also be a way for Ellen to appropriate parts of tutor Abby's voice to gain confidence through Abby's better English abilities. In other words, Ellen may have used the pronoun *we* to "command the attention" of her listener (Norton & McKinney, 2011, p. 81). When I followed up with Ellen on this notion, she was quite adamant to emphasize that she was not just copying Abby's words. Twice she said that

223

she rewrote Abby's suggestions in her own words after the tutorial session, which signaled to me

that Ellen was aware of the potential danger of plagiarism, even if it occurred orally.

Nonetheless, Ellen still needed Abby's help to rearrange some of the sentences in Ellen's

personal statement so that the communication of meaning is not impeded. Ellen's example could

be an illustration of nontransgressive intertextuality (Chandrasoma et al., 2004) as Ellen works to

negotiate not only with the various layers of her writer identity but also with her more capable

peers (Ivanič, 1998).

Student Beth's example calls for a broader interpretation of intertextuality and is perhaps

a clearer case of appropriation on the part of tutor Abby. As Beth recalled, she dutifully noted all

the words that tutor Abby suggested and went home to further contemplate whether or not to

accept these suggestions. When I asked Beth about the revisions that she made, Beth was rather

evasive, stating that she had made some revisions based on Abby's suggestions while rejecting

other suggestions. When I asked for examples, Beth smiled sheepishly and said that she could

not remember. Similar to Ellen's situation, the suggestions Beth received from Abby were oral.

In contrast to Ellen's situation, Beth put herself in the information receiver position while Ellen

negotiated much of the meaning she wanted to express during her tutorial session with Abby. It

is entirely possible that because Beth's language proficiency is much lower than Ellen's, Beth

was much more reliant on Abby and appropriated much more of Abby's voice in Beth's revision

process. It is less clear whether Beth's example would be considered transgressive or

nontransgressive intertextuality (Chandrasoma et al., 2004). As Chandrasoma et al. argue, the

context of the situation must be the primary factor in decisions of transgressive intertextuality. In

Beth's case, I interpreted Beth's sheepish smile to mean that Beth felt perhaps she used mostly

Abby's words in her revision but was unwilling to inform me about it. Regardless of how I may

have interpreted Beth's smile, Chandrasoma et al. caution that acts of transgressive intertextuality need to take into account not only a writer's language ability but also issues of "student development, writing strategies, authorial selves, common knowledge, interdiscursivity, and interdisciplinarity" (p. 172).

Student Kelly's situation may illustrate Norton and McKinney's (2011) argument that the appropriation of other voices is a necessary process for language learners. Kelly referenced a template to create her CV. After a first tutorial session with a writing center tutor who recommended that Kelly revise two of the headings on her CV, Kelly accepted that recommendation since she did not know any better. Kelly made a second appointment at the writing center with a different tutor after she revised her CV and personal statement. This second time, her tutor was Abby. When Abby showed her own CV to provide Kelly more concrete suggestions, Kelly was immediately impressed not only by the sophisticated layout of Abby's CV but also by its clarity and density. Thus, when Abby recommended that Kelly change the same two headings on Kelly's CV, Kelly followed this advice. During the revision process, it appeared that Kelly did not have an opinion one way or another on how she wanted her CV to look. Instead of the suggestions of only one tutor, Kelly relied on the contrasting suggestions of two tutors and made her decision based on whoever happened to be the last tutor Kelly met with. Perhaps Kelly did not feel a sense of ownership over her CV (Norton, 1997). Perhaps Kelly was not as invested (Norton Peirce, 1995) in the idea of getting into Honours College, which is unlikely because Kelly made several appointments at the writing center in her attempts to improve her application. Perhaps Kelly's English language proficiency was too low, and the demands of the Honours College application were too high.

Although CV heading revisions are minor, the matter called attention to student Kelly's lack of engagement, and she seemed perfectly willing to let her tutors make all of the decisions due to her lack of experience. As Duff (2002) points out, silence or the lack of engagement may not necessarily signal a lack of interest on the part of the language learner. Rather, it may signal that the interaction is happening on a level that renders the language learner unable to engage in a meaningful way. Kelly may have stated a similar sentiment herself when after her tutorial session with Abby, Kelly commented that tutor Abby's suggested revisions were "a little bit difficult and so I don't change it" (student Kelly, working with tutor Abby, reflective playback interview, March 23, 2016). Additionally, Vygotsky's (1978, p. 86) "zone of proximal development" may be used to explain what happened with Kelly's decision-making process on her CV. When Kelly decided not to make the suggested changes because they were too difficult for her to make, it may be argued that perhaps Abby did not provide sufficient scaffolding for Kelly or perhaps Abby's suggested revisions were out of the zone where Kelly could not only understand but also process the information. Kelly's lack of engagement, coupled with Abby's suggestions being out of Kelly's zone, led to the resulting CV being interpreted as a work that blurs the boundary between appropriation and intertextuality.

Lastly, student Laura's numerous visits to the writing center and appointments with different tutors to work on her personal statement revisions may illustrate the confluence of voice appropriation (Ivanič & Camps, 2001; Norton & McKinney, 2011), investment (Norton Peirce, 1995), the multiple layers of writer identity (Ivanič, 1998, 2006; Ouellette, 2008), and transgressive vs. nontransgressive intertextuality (Chandrasoma et al., 2004). The last portion of my follow-up playback interview with Laura resonated with me long after the interview finished. In her effort to produce the best possible personal statement, Laura made at least four visits to the

writing center over the course of one month. The session Laura had with tutor Kaila was one of the four visits. Just based on the sheer number of visits alone, it was not difficult to see that Laura was invested in this piece of writing. Like student Vicky, perhaps Laura saw admission into Honours College as an economic benefit because she also stated that the exchange opportunities offered by the College were what attracted her the most. Additionally, Honours College students get to work with the best and most accomplished professors at the University of Macau.

When I asked student Laura to what extent the consultation helped her better understand her own writing process (see Appendix H, question 3), Laura responded in Putonghua, "嗯因為這篇稿子實在改了太多次我也不知道哪個是我原來的意見哪一個部分是跟這個的意見過後改的我有一點點不太確定," which translates into, "Because this draft has been revised so many times I can no longer be sure of which opinions came from me and which revisions are based on this [tutor's] opinions" (student Laura, working with tutor Kaila, reflective playback interview, March 22, 2016). I asked Laura if she felt confused in English, and she replied in English, "A little." When I asked if she had any last comments that she wanted to add, she stated in Putonghua, "好像還好我就覺得把我的 topic sentences 還有每一段的最後句尾改得特別好現在就我剛剛去見完那個 appointment 那個 tutor 誇我是說那個最後一段寫的特別好但我心想說不是我寫的," which translates into:

> It's okay I feel I did a good job revising the topic sentences and the last sentence of each paragraph and just now the appointment I finished the tutor complimented me on the last paragraph but I thought to myself I didn't write it. (student Laura, working with tutor Kaila, reflective playback interview, March 22, 2016).

Why would student Laura say that she did not write the last paragraph? She may have felt that she had appropriated it from one or more of her numerous visits to the writing center. While this supposition is speculative, it is clear that Laura no longer feels ownership over the last paragraph of her personal statement. If focus is placed on "this draft has been revised so many times" instead of "I didn't write it," Laura's multiple writer identities could be clashing with each other, along with the appropriation of the tutors' voices. That is, in addition to the tutors, her "autobiographical self" could be clashing with her "discoursal self" and her "self as author" (Ivanič, 1998, p. 23).

As student Laura's interview parting words demonstrate, she may have been very invested in her personal statement because of the time she spent on this piece of writing. Laura may have imagined it as a gateway to future opportunities (Norton & McKinney, 2011) that were only exclusively available to Honours College students. Since Honours College admits the best of the best, students in the college receive various privileges. To Laura, the personal statement was one document that was going to help her achieve her "imagined identity," which is attached and ascribed to her imagination of the idealized exchange student who travels abroad to have unforgettable experiences and comes back a learned person (Darvin & Norton, 2015, p. 47). Laura can see clearly the potential "benefits of her investment," which is why she visited the writing center four different times to improve her personal statement (Darvin & Norton, 2015, p. 47). Simultaneously, her commitment to this investment is driven by the "prevailing ideologies" marketed to students such as Laura (Darvin & Norton, 2015, p. 47). Those students who can go on all-expenses-paid exchange programs must be privileged in certain ways and must also have achieved a certain higher status from the rest of the student body. As much ownership as Laura took of her writing (note her earlier resistance to revision when Laura met with tutor Kaila), she

may have been willing to let go of this ownership over her writing if she believed that letting go could increase her chances of being admitted to Honours College. In the face of all of the potential benefits, it is not a surprise that Laura made the decision to incorporate much more of tutor Kaila's advice after Kaila temporarily occupied the space of a selection committee member of the Honours College (Waring, 2005) in an attempt to convince Laura to present a more concise message (see Excerpt 28, lines 172 – 173, for Kaila's use of the terms "teacher" and "professor" and Excerpt 35, line 294, for Kaila's use of the term "teacher"). It is entirely possible that Laura's goal to get into Honours College superseded her desire to retain her voice in her writing.

The issue Laura raised regarding ownership of her writing can also be connected to the topic of intertextuality. What Laura experienced with her personal statement might be called *appropriation* in a writing center context, but as Laura admitted, there had been so many revisions to her draft that she could no longer keep track of whose ideas were whose. In the end, assuming that Laura was a full participant in the conversations regarding her personal statement, what might be a better way to describe Laura's experience is transgressive vs. nontransgressive intertextuality (Chandrasoma et al., 2004). In Laura's case, she was an equal partner in the discussions involving her personal statement, and she made the decisions on what to incorporate as well as which advice to follow and which to ignore (Waring, 2007a). Although Laura does not characterize the last paragraph as belonging to her, overall, it would be reductionist to suggest that her writing was appropriated without considering the other factors weighing on Laura's mind. It may be more useful to see Laura's situation as one of a developmental writer struggling to assert her voice while simultaneously navigating many different consequential factors. It is much more conducive to help language learners consider transgressive intertextuality as a

"developmental perspective that takes identity construction as central to any discussion of language proficiency" (Ouellette, 2008, p. 269).

Thus far, my discussion has centered mostly around the multilingual student writers in the study, as I described some of the larger social world complexities that influence their identity enactments and the interactional choices they made during their tutorial sessions. I also synthesized the range of negotiation tactics, including affiliative moves, disaffiliative moves, and engagement strategies, that the study participants displayed. Finally, I highlighted various intertextual interpretations of the participants' oral discussions that became written texts. In the next section, I discuss the secondary goal of my dissertation, which was to describe how the multilingual tutors and student writers in the University of Macau's writing center converse with each other about writing in English.

A Meshing of Tutorial Practices

Ronesi (2009) made a call for scholars to add to writing center research through different approaches and to investigate writing centers in different contexts. Up to this point, investigations of writing center work in contexts outside of the United States have been limited to Santa's (2002) reporting from Bulgaria, Harbord's (2003) discussion from Hungary, Turner's (2006) introduction of a writing center in a Korean university, Archer's (2007) work in South Africa, Bräuer's (2009) comparison of the writing centers in the United States to those in Germany, Chen's (2010) overview of a writing center in Taiwan, Eleftheriou's (2011) dissertation on tutoring strategies used in the writing center at the University of Sharjah, and Q. Chen's (2012) case study of tutor-tutee interactions in a Southern Chinese university. The variety of contexts, geographical and temporal, indicates the popularity of writing centers across the globe and suggests that there is a wealth of opportunity to investigate interactions based on

collaborative learning and peer tutoring (Bruffee, 1984a, 1984b). As Rafoth (2015) details, part

of the reason for the growing popularity for writing center emanates from the transnational

movement of students in higher education. As more international students (from the perspective

of institutions in the United States) visit writing centers, they are more likely to bring the idea of

a writing center with them when they return to their home countries.

The popularity of writing centers means more opportunities for research that takes place

within them. In this vein, many scholars have sought to add to writing center scholarship through

various methodological approaches. The work of Babcock and Thonus (2012) has shed light on a

different approach to improving tutoring strategies. Their call for evidence-based practice echoes

the same call in SLA practice, and aligns well with the general "social turn" in the field of SLA

(Block, 2003; Ortega, 2011). Additionally, the work of J. Mackiewicz and Thompson (2015) has

informed the field of the benefits of combining both quantitative and qualitative approaches to

analyzing writing center tutorial sessions. Waring's (2005, 2012) and I. Park's (2014, 2017)

conversation analytic approach to the interactions between writing center tutors and students

unveiled how advice is given as well as how advice is resisted.

As I have demonstrated through my coding of data in this work, some of the tutors in the

tutorial interactions engaged in what might be termed tutor directives, and this is a strategy often

contrasted with the concept of Socratic questioning (Brooks, 1991; Gillespie & Lerner, 2008; J.

Mackiewicz & Thompson, 2015). In other words, the tutors explicitly told the student writers

what to do or what to write. In other instances, the tutors provided choices and asked their

students to select what they thought was the one most appropriate for them. While there are

sound explanations for the use of these strategies with multilingual student writers—for instance,

Myers (2003) argues that directive tutoring helps students in situations when the student does not

231

have the answer and will not be able to brainstorm one—Myers' suggestion may not be applicable to all multilingual student writers. Much in the way that Eleftheriou (2011) found that the multilingual tutors and students in her study at the University of Sharjah in general preferred Socratic questioning—which is also recommended by Staben and Nordhaus (2009)—to directive tutoring, the strategies that tutors should use should be based on situational contexts. J. Mackiewicz and Thompson point to the work by Brown and Levinson (1987) on face-threatening acts as a prime example of how relational differences in identity (Weedon, 1997) influence the types of politeness strategies interactants use. A synthesis of the multilingual tutors' and student writers' interactions in the writing center in this study revealed that in general, (1) the tutors relied on their multilingual intuition to shape their tutorial strategies, (2) the tutors see their suggestions as one of many other suggestions that the student writer may seek, and (3) the tutors engaged more with student writers who took more ownership of their writing.

The tutors' multilingual intuition shapes their tutorial strategy. There were quite a few instances that demonstrate the tutor using her own language learning experience to guide her student in the tutorial session. On the positive end of the spectrum, tutors Abby, Marion, and Emma made an immediate evaluation of their student writer's English language proficiency and then tailored their feedback based on this initial evaluation. Abby spoke about using the *i + 1* strategy when she worked with student Ellen. In doing so, Abby reinterpreted Krashen's (1982) work on comprehensible input. As previously mentioned in the Expectations of Each Other section of chapter four, Abby stated, "Since her level of English is relatively higher so that means we will probably ask for a little more like a i plus one strategy again uh like we'll try to make something prettier uh other than just make things right" (tutor Abby, working with student

Ellen, reflective playback interview, April 18, 2016). In other words, Abby was not trying to grade her response to Ellen so that Ellen can understand Abby. Abby felt that Ellen's proficiency level was at a point where Ellen would appreciate more sentential constructions that were not only grammatically correct but also more sophisticated. Viewed in this way, Vygotsky's (1978) "zone of proximal development" might be a more appropriate description of the strategy that Abby used with Ellen (p. 86). Based on Ellen's reflective playback interview, she really appreciated Abby's effort in this area.

While most of the tutors' intuitions were applied in a way that helped the student writer, one distinct example showed the consequences of an incorrect intuition. Tutor Emma's consultation with student Arizona illustrated that a mishandling or misevaluation of a student writer's English language proficiency can undermine the entire session. Once Emma made that preliminary assessment of Arizona's proficiency level, Arizona gave no further indication that Emma should re-evaluate Arizona's language skills. As I have already mentioned, Arizona probably perceived Emma's misevaluation as a slight and a face-threatening act (Brown & Levinson, 1987; J. Mackiewicz & Thompson, 2015). In fact, Arizona felt somewhat dejected after her consultation. I asked Arizona if she felt that the consultation helped her improve her writing process (see Appendix H, question 3), and Arizona responded, "I have to practice myself … she's a tutor she has her own stuff to do and she- I'm very grateful to her for helping me anyway and I will come to the professor next time yes check with the professor" (student Arizona, working with tutor Emma, reflective playback interview, January 19, 2016). Thus, rather than feeling as if she got the answers she needed, Arizona's solution was to seek assistance from her professor in the future.

233

The tutors' suggestions are one of many. Based on my observations of the tutorial sessions, I asked some of the tutors what they thought about the suggestions they gave to their student writers to get the tutors' thoughts on potential issues of appropriation. In that regard, tutors Marion and Abby provided insights indicating that they believe their suggestions are just one perspective. They believe that their student writers have a choice and will make some choices that run counter to their suggestions. Tutor Marion told student Cathy in the session, "You can think about the suggestion I made" as one of the ways to conclude the consultation (tutorial session between tutor Marion and student Cathy, November 3, 2015). Tutor Abby, working with student Kelly, gave her the following information shown in Excerpt 46.

Excerpt 46 (Tutorial Session Between Tutor Abby and Student Kelly)

```
144   Abby:     就是我們這邊是會提些 {so here we will provide
145             some} (.)建議 {suggestions} (.)
146   Kelly:    mm
147   Abby:     然後那最後的決定, {then the final decision,}
148             ((student finishes writing and both
149             looking at paper)) 可能還是 {may still be
150             ((for the))} writer uh 來做 {to make} (.)
151             所以就是 >妳們可以決定要不要< {so >you can
152             decide whether ((you)) want to<} (.) 吸取這
153             個建議或者是 >只是參考一下< 也可以都沒問題的
154             {accept this suggestion or >just think
155             about it< that's no problem too} (.)
```

In Excerpt 46, tutor Abby reiterates the writing center's policy that the tutors only provide suggestions, and that ultimately, it is the student writer who has to make the final decision. In my follow-up reflective playback interview with Abby, she commented on this segment of the video, "I don't think I was trying to convince her on this thing because as I just said in here it's like because we only give suggestions and we're actually discussing this together" (tutor Abby, working with student Kelly, reflective playback interview, March 21,

234

2016). In both the examples of tutors Marion and Abby, the tutors are quite consistent in relaying this message that their task is only to give suggestions. Tutor Faye sums up this sentiment quite succinctly in her reflective playback interview when she stated, "My advice is also a suggestion" (tutor Faye, working with student Vicky, reflective playback interview, April 1, 2016).

In addition to the tutors' firm belief that their suggestions were only meant for further consideration by the student writers, the fact that they may often see the same student writer making multiple appointments with different tutors further solidify their belief that the student writers seek multiple opinions on one piece of writing. For instance, student writers Laura, Beth, and Kelly made more than one appointment at the writing center, each time seeing a different tutor. Student Cathy confirmed this practice of seeking multiple opinions during her interview, adding, "I asked my classmates and also my teachers for some help" in connection to her academic essay revision (student Cathy, working with tutor Marion, reflective playback interview, January 18, 2016).

Perhaps due to this firm belief that the tutors' advice are mere suggestions, the tutors did not see the provision of sample sentences or helping their student writers to rearrange word order on a sentential level as directive tutoring (Waring, 2012). Instead, the tutors saw these strategies as ways of engaging lower proficient student writers, some of whom had ideas written down but perhaps did not have the skills to communicate meaning without impediments. For instance, tutor Christy discussed her strategy for working with student writers who could not provide their own ideas. Christy stated, "When I uh give some suggestions they end up writing them so sometimes I give them several suggestions and make them decide" (tutor Christy, working with student Paula, reflective playback interview, March 8, 2016). Thus, in situations where the tutor might suspect that the student writer is not as active in the revision process, Christy's strategy is

235

to give multiple suggestions so that ultimately, the student writer has to make a choice. The issue of student choice and tutor suggestion speaks to the complicated nature of voice assertion (Matsuda, 2001) and text appropriation (Chiang & Schmida, 1999). Again, it may be more helpful for the language learner to be viewed from a developmental perspective in terms of the learning path towards finding their voice (Norton & McKinney, 2011) and finding their writer identity (Ivanič, 1998; Ouellette, 2008).

Tutor engagement and student ownership. Unsurprisingly, the level of tutor engagement increased the more the student writers demonstrated their ownership over their writing. Note that engagement does not necessarily imply or signal affiliation, as student ownership can be expressed through resistance to change (e.g. student Laura's unwillingness to change her writing style from a more literary one to a more academic one) and through the direct expression of their desires (e.g. student Vicky informing tutor Faye what Vicky wanted to convey on her CV, see Excerpt 33). The tutors in the study also tended to refer to the student writers as a team and the interaction as a collaboration. Specifically, tutors Christy, Abby, and Kaila all used the pronoun *we* in their conversations with their tutors. Although this particular use can be interpreted to be a less forceful suggestion, which Abby mentioned, it can also be a way to rally the student writer and simultaneously lend the tutor's voice to the student writer for that moment. In other words, seeing that the student writers may be struggling to find their voice, the tutors may lend the student writers their voice (Norton & McKinney, 2011).

Although tutor Kaila used the pronoun *we* in reference to herself and her student writer Laura, Kaila also invoked an authority during her tutorial session when she inferenced the Honours College selection committee professor/teacher (Waring, 2005). Such invocations of power can tip the balance in an already fragile equilibrium of power in a tutorial session, as

Mackiewicz (2001) demonstrated. Nonetheless, instead of invoking an institutional and symbolic power such as a professor or a teacher (Bourdieu, 1991), several tutors (see Excerpts 14 and 25 for tutor Abby, see Excerpt 35 for tutor Kaila) cast themselves as readers (Staben & Nordhaus, 2009), which can help to mitigate the force of that power. Rafoth (2015) offers guiding approaches such as "negotiated interaction" that can be more appropriate for the types of situations encountered by Kaila (p. 48).

While not all student writers demonstrated the same enthusiasm for their writing or took the same level of ownership over their own work, all of them needed help on lower-order concerns such as sentence-level problems, word order, and word choice. On this issue, Myers (2003) is correct in that the students cannot give answers to what they do not know. Put in another way, the student writers in this study asked questions on weaknesses that they knew about (Herb, 2014), and typically they only considered grammatical accuracy as their first priority. Thus, the student writers tended to focus on word choice and grammar. If these are the weaknesses that the student writers have identified and are seeking help on, then the writing center tutors should not refuse to help (Herb, 2014; Williams, 2004). Even for the relatively higher proficient student writer Ellen, her tutorial session mainly centered around word choice and grammar because these are the two issues with which she has familiarity. For student writer Laura, the issue is more complicated. In her reflective playback interview, Laura recalled not being as familiar with academic writing and topic sentences. She added that she was more accustomed to doing Chinese literary writing, emphasizing that these two writing styles did not mesh. Thus, when tutor Kaila tried various different strategies to convince Laura to adopt the writing of topic sentences, Laura was quite resistant. Laura's resistance may have stemmed from

her lack of familiarity with topic sentences. In the end, Laura did revise her personal statement to include topic sentences.

Lastly, the queries that the student writers in the study made during their tutorial sessions are in line with Mackiewicz's (2001) findings. Her dissertation results showed that whether the tutors enacted the role of a collaborator or team member, the student writers tended to see their tutors as experts and not peers. Mackiewicz's conclusions complicate this study's tutors' belief that their suggestions are only meant for the student's further consideration. Whether the tutors know it or not, their suggestions are seen by the student writers as the advice of one of many experts.

Implications of the Study

This study contributes to the growing body of knowledge that uses a poststructural identity approach to investigate multilingual interactions and language learning. Further, the study applies this approach to a postcolonial and neocolonial writing center context where more proficient multilingual tutors work with less proficient multilingual student writers. Through rich descriptions of the range of acts of negotiation the study's participants engaged in, through the highlighting of complexity in those interactions, and through the discussion of how the larger social world impacts the moment-to-moment interactions, this study illustrates Bakhtin's (1981) call that "language needs to be investigated in situated utterances in which speakers, in dialogue with others, struggle to create meanings" (p. 77). Additionally, in the poststructuralist tradition, the study highlights the subjectivity (Weedon, 1997) of the participants in the study, focusing not only on their acts of negotiation and interactional choices (Schiffrin, 2006) but also on their relational identity enactments.

238

The study adopted a sociocultural perspective to identity and interaction (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005) as well as a sociocultural perspective to learning (Vygotsky, 1978). Through the application of these theoretical frameworks, the study found that the identities of the multilingual tutors and student writers in the study are dynamic, negotiated, and enacted, thus contributing to the body of knowledge that portrays the language learners' complex identity negotiations with themselves and more capable peers. As Norton and McKinney (2011) suggest, "Postcolonial multilingual contexts have much to contribute to our thinking on processes of identity and language learning" (p. 89), and this study enriches the discussion.

Methodologically, this study combined ethnographic methods of observation and interviewing with conversation analytic methods to arrive at both a macro and a micro perspective of the study's participants. Although the study's primary data source was the writing center tutorial conversations, obtained through observation and recording, the conversation analytic methods were instrumental in seeing how the participants constructed and co-constructed each other's identities as they discussed a text. Through an interactional sociolinguistic approach, the moment-to-moment happenings can be viewed in relation to the participants' larger social worlds. Norton and McKinney (2011) point out that "an identity approach aims to include an emic understanding, which aims to access participants' own understandings of their experiences; in line with this, self-reported and reflective data are highly valued" (p. 87). The findings of this study, with the 16 supplementary reflective playback interviews, confirm Norton and McKinney's call not to omit the participants' own voices in interpreting their own interactions. As shown in this study, their reflections greatly enhanced the richness of the tutorial session data through their own explanations about the choices they made and discuss the influence(s) to those choices.

Although I had planned on a specific table arrangement that aided the video-recording of the tutorial sessions, this plan did not work out because some of the tutors shared their concern that they and the student writers were being put in an awkward position. To ensure that the participants felt comfortable being video-taped, I placed the camera in less conspicuous places. This resulted in different placement areas as each tutor had a different work station. At times, I was only able to capture the tutorial session from the back. In addition, since the writing center where the study took place consisted of only one large room, background noise affected the quality of some of the recordings. Other studies utilizing the same data capturing methods should take these factors into account.

This study aimed to capture instances of multilingual speakers working in goal-oriented situations. It aimed for alternative portrayals of multilingual language users. The decision to foreground multilingual interaction is in itself a practical implication of this study. Just as the questions that researchers ask indicate their epistemological orientation, the study design that they choose reveals what they believe to be important. I set out to contribute to the body of knowledge on how multilinguals negotiate with each other to create meaning, and selecting opportunities where these negotiations can be seen has practical implications for language learning and for writing center practice.

Applications to the Multilingual Language Learning Classroom

With full effort not to generalize the findings of this qualitative study, it is reasonable to suggest that some the findings might be applicable to the second language learning classroom. First, the student writer participants in this study demonstrated that when they stepped into the writing center, they brought with them all of the influences of their immediate and distant social worlds. Even for a relatively brief interaction with a multilingual graduate student peer tutor, the

240

undergraduate student writers had to give many considerations to the conversations they participated in before their tutorial session, and often unbeknownst to the tutor, these conversations can dictate the focus of the session. For instance, student Vicky carried with her the words uttered by the Honours College professor. Student Cathy focused singularly on connectives because her professor mentioned it as a weakness in her writing. Thus, it would be reductionist to claim that the student writers only wanted to improve the draft they brought into the writing center. It would be more nuanced to ask the follow-up question of who the student writers want to please with their revisions. In other words, the student writers in the study did not walk into the writing center without being invested in the revision. Similarly, language learners do not walk into the language learning classroom without being invested in the process. The challenge for tutors and teachers alike is to find out how their student writers and students, respectively, are invested in their learning (Darvin & Norton, 2015).

Methodologically, scholars such as Lightbown and Spada (2006) have long advocated for various forms of conversation analytic methods as a means for teachers-in-training to analyze not only their students learning but also reflect on their teaching. Wong and Waring (2010) advanced this approach with a much more detailed application of Conversation Analysis for practicing instructors of English a second or foreign language. To reiterate, with the field of SLA taking a "social turn" (Block, 2003; Ortega, 2011), much more emphasis has been placed not only on communicative competence for different contexts (Kumaravadivelu, 2001, 2003), but also on what Saville-Troike (2006) calls a "microsocial focus" in which the "social contexts of interaction" predominate (p. 191).

Utilizing research methodologies such as conversation analysis that get at the "microsocial," I can relate some of the findings in this study to the classroom and make the

241

argument that the findings in this study align well with Norton and McKinney's (2011) identity approach to SLA. In particular, I highlight the potential ramifications of the invocation of power. In the classroom, of course, the teacher is the symbolic representative of institutional power (Bourdieu, 1991). The teacher does not have to invoke another person to access that power in the way that tutor Kaila or student Vicky did. Even in the context of a writing center, where power is relatively mitigated through the highlighting of peers providing feedback, power can be easily invoked and thus accessed. Words have power on their own, but who utters those words can make an exponential difference in terms of power. My findings suggest that teachers in language learning classrooms should be more cognizant of the power that they wield. Language learners already place themselves in a vulnerable position when they step into a language learning classroom (Duff, 2002), and from the examples of students Arizona and Vicky, the denaturalization process (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005) they experienced may have long-lasting impact.

In greater detail, the highlighting of the similarity/difference continuum for student Vicky, the denaturalization process illustrated by student Arizona's experience, and the illegitimation process that Vicky suffered all contribute to a general negative experience (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005). It might even be fair to characterize their experiences as traumatizing. However, such a characterization would be reductionist. Through conversation analytic methods and through the application of Bucholtz and Hall's sociocultural linguistic approach, it is possible to identify the source of trauma, as I have demonstrated. To take this argument further, instead of characterizing a language learner as unmotivated or having a high affective filter (Krashen, 1982), it might be more useful to recast these experiences in the framework proposed by Bucholtz and Hall and Darvin and Norton (2015).

Applications to Writing Center Practice

Based on the eight captured tutorial sessions and the 16 reflective playback interviews, some considerations to writing center practice can be given. First, writing center practice, particularly in multilingual settings where the sessions can be considered to be language learning opportunities, should be contextually grounded (Kumaravadivelu, 2001). As previous studies focusing on tutorial strategies in different geographical locales around the world have shown (Q. Chen, 2012; Eleftheriou, 2011), preferred tutorial practices vary from institution to institution, depending on the epistemological understandings of the various stakeholders and institutional policy. As the multilingual tutors' own voices in the tutorial sessions and in the reflective interviews demonstrate, some of them very much see a tutorial session as a work of collaboration. Whether or not these types of collaborations are seen as appropriate or inappropriate is decided upon by individual institutions of higher learning (Rafoth, 2015), and these policies often drive the strategies employed by the writing center tutors.

Second, the multilingual tutors in this study not only used their multilingual intuition to shape their tutorial strategies but also have their own ideas of the impact of their suggestions on the multilingual student writers. There is plenty of scholarly work in SLA that can help the tutors systematically understand where their intuitions come from and how to better apply them. Although the intuitions of a multilingual tutor did not always result in accurate evaluations of a student writer's English language proficiency, having access to multiple common languages with the student writers aided the communication of meaning as well as the negotiation of more nuanced ideas. The tutor-student pairs—Abby and Beth, Christy and Paula, Emma and Arizona, Abby and Kelly, Kaila and Laura—used English and Putonghua to communicate their concerns and desires. Through the use of multiple languages, the student writers can express their

243

considerations for the audience as well as their rationale for their decisions. Likewise, the tutors can provide justification for their suggestions and analyze for the student writer why something is written the way it is. In other words, the tutors used their additional languages as resources to aid discussion. Access to multiple languages is an immeasurable benefit, not only to the tutors who feel that they are needed for their skill set but also for the student writers who feel that their needs are being met. As Rafoth (2015) suggests, writing centers should be encouraged to hire more multilingual tutors to work with multilingual student writers.

Third, the matter of closing the knowledge gap between the student writers and tutors is a complicated one. The student writers in this study mostly asked sentential-level questions because they can only ask questions on what they know and have learned to ask about. If in their prior educational experiences they never learned about academic writing, it would be next to impossible for the student writers to ask questions on global concerns. As far as I am aware, the secondary school English language education in Macao does not typically focus on the basics of academic writing or multiple drafting as a practice (M. Ma, personal communication, June 11, 2016). Thus, it is easy to see why the student writers in the tutorial sessions focused so much on word choice and grammar since they have not had much exposure to higher order concerns. In this regard, Rafoth (2015) suggests that the concept of "negotiated interaction" can help tutors not only become more aware of how to assist the student writers on word choice matters but also improve their feedback strategies (p. 125).

Applications to Composition

The volume *Pluralizing Plagiarism* edited by Howard and Robillard (2008) expanded the conversation on plagiarism to include a sociocultural understanding of identities and contexts. The fluidity of intertextuality illustrated by the discussions between the multilingual tutors and

244

multilingual student writers in this study should stimulate further conversation in the composition classroom on matters of textual ownership for multilingual writers (Abasi & Graves, 2008). The conversation crossover between composition and SLA appeared in the "Intertextuality in the Transcultural Zone" chapter by C. Thompson and Pennycook (2008) of the *Pluralizing Plagiarism* volume, and this conversation should continue. In this study, the similarity vs. difference between the earlier tutorial conversations and the subsequent revised drafts blur the boundary between appropriation and intertextuality. In particular, as the composition classroom in the United States sees ever-faster changes in its demographics, with increasing numbers of multilingual student writers and generation 1.5 students (Harklau, Losey, & Siegal, 1999), perhaps a more useful perspective to take on textual ownership is transgressive vs. nontransgressive intertextuality (Chandrasoma et al., 2004). While a developmental perspective (Ouellette, 2008) moving from transgressive to nontransgressive intertextuality still assumes that texts and ideas can be owned, which runs contrary to the ideas espoused by Bakhtin (1981), this perspective at least begins to see the language learner's "struggle to appropriate the voices of others" (Norton & McKinney, 2011, p. 81) as they strive to create meaning and establish their own identities.

Reflections on the Study Purpose and the Research Process

From describing multilingual tutors and student writers interactions with one another to situating their interactions within larger geopolitical and social contexts, from analyzing the participants' identity enactments to framing these identity enactments within various ideological and symbolic factors, this study has sought to demonstrate complexity in the actions of the participants. Identity positions have been illustrated to emerge through discursive interaction,

and some of those positions have been shown to be impacted by factors beyond the discursive interaction.

These study purposes have not come about without struggle. My original intention for this study was to use critical applied linguistics (Pennycook, 2001) as a theoretical framework. I felt that doing so would allow me to discuss the macro factors impacting the choices the participants in this study were making. With my background in community organizing, my default position was to discuss injustice and inequality. I saw no reason why the study's participants should have to be educated in a language that was neither their best language nor the language of the local community. I saw no reason why their learning should have unnecessary obstacles, and I wanted to talk about the (perceived) injustice the study's participants were suffering. In other words, I came into this dissertation with preconceived notions of what I wanted to find. I felt that my years of experience teaching on this campus granted me this insight, and I had already decided for the participants how they should be framed. But through the focused coding process as informed by grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006; A. E. Clarke, 2005; Corbin & Strauss, 2008), and through the meticulous memoing of the participants' interactions, I was truly able to see how the participants' identities emerged through their interactions. I was able to see the complexity and fluidity of their identity enactments. I was able to make some connections between their identity enactments and their milieu. These were my "lightbulb" moments.

Methodologically, I found the follow-up reflective playback interviews to be especially helpful to providing additional context to the writing center tutorial sessions. The participants explained their rationale for doing various activities and gave me the necessary background information for why they made certain choices. For instance, my conversation with student

246

writer Arizona was particularly enlightening because she volunteered much more information than I was expecting. Although in the beginning of the interview I wanted to follow my interview protocol and focus on my prepared questions, I found her discussion of her English language choices in and out of the classroom relevant to why she came to the writing center. Arizona was also highly forthcoming with information. It was almost as if she relished her opportunity to use English extensively for an extended period of time. My interview with Arizona was an instance where I found Rubin and Rubin's (2004) responsive interview model a helpful guide.

Throughout the research process, I worked through the transcripts and memos as I struggled to make sense of the data. There were so many sub-categories and categories to contend with. They dominated the data, and yet they could not seem to answer my research questions to my satisfaction even though I kept my research questions in mind as I coded through the data. I tried to foreground my analytical framework with the principles of analysis offered by Bucholtz and Hall (2005). It was not until I applied A. E. Clarke's (2005) situational analysis that I finally felt the data was freed from the coding process. I thus set about to re-orient myself to the data. Through this perspective, I saw the data in a new light.

As I presented the data and discussed them using the various aforementioned frameworks, I found myself re-analyzing my own entry into this dissertation. While I cannot disregard my own prior experiences that have brought me to this particular point in my life with this particular perspective on language learning, on higher education, and on identity, getting the participants' perspectives on their interactions helped me see their rationale and gave me insight into why they said certain things or acted in certain ways. Although a complete picture can never be painted (Sacks, 1984), the videotaped interactions, supplemented with individual participants'

commentary and reflections on their own actions, certainly helped make a richer descriptive study.

Future Research

This study's participants contributed much more than can be addressed in this dissertation. Briefly, I did not have an opportunity to discuss the nonverbal action sequences of the participants in the eight tutorial sessions. Levinson (2013) has suggested that more work can be done in the area of nonverbal action sequences within conversation analysis and Heath, Hindmarsh, and Luff (2010) have provided guidelines for how visible conduct can be transcribed. Two topics of nonverbal action sequences that can be further investigated from the existing data include silence and gaze.

Both the multilingual tutors and multilingual student writers utilized silence differently. For the most part in conversation analysis, the focus is on what is said and what is *done*. While silence is *doing* not talking, silence is timed in transcripts and can be considered, together with delays, as a mechanism for retaining control of a turn within the practice of repair (Kitzinger, 2013). But as Duff's (2002) study showed, silence can mean so much more. Silence was used by the language learners in Duffy's study as a shield that protected them from the possibility of being embarrassed. In other words, silence can be "an event in its own right" (Schegloff, 2007, p. 21). I found the length of some silences during the writing center tutorial sessions to be immensely interesting, and I had an opportunity to ask each participant for comment during the playback interviews. Some participants, such as student Cathy, suggested that they used the silence as a delay strategy so that they would be given the answer, while others, such as tutor Christy, felt silence was a very natural occurrence within a session because people needed time

248

to think. Silence as an event can be a topic of further investigation because of the playback interview data.

Another visible conduct that did not receive the attention it deserves is in the area of gaze. Through an overview on advancements of investigations in this area, Rossano (2013) suggests that more work can be done to explore the connections between how and why people gaze in the way that they do to achieve their aims. In this vein, the manners in which the participants in the tutorial sessions engaged in gazing should be studied. In this study, I came across this topic while asking about the student writers' note-taking habits during the tutorial sessions. In the playback interview, student writer Arizona explained that she did not take notes because it would have been disrespectful to withdraw her gaze. While Arizona desperately wanted to take notes on what she felt was useful advice from the tutor, she chose at that moment to foreground politeness (Brown & Levinson, 1987) and keep her gaze on the tutor. Arizona waited for a later opportunity to write down some words to help her remember the tutor's advice.

Last but not least, much more work can be done specifically focusing on the goal-oriented nature of the writing center tutorial interactions. Some topics worthy of further investigation include how laughter is used in the tutorials (Glenn, 2003; Zdrojkowski, 2007), the different types of directives given in the tutorials (J. Mackiewicz & Thompson, 2015), how advice is given and received in the tutorials (I. Park, 2014, 2017; Waring, 2005, 2012), and how different types of scaffolding can be done to help student writers learn more effectively (Rafoth, 2015).

Concluding Thoughts

Words matter. How words are uttered matters. Who the words are said to matters. Who hears the words matters. I found myself repeating these four sentences almost like my mantra on

a daily basis as I worked to complete this dissertation. It has been difficult to complete this dissertation under the current geopolitical conditions in the United States of America. Although I have not resided in the United States for more than a decade now, I do and forever will imagine myself to belong to my adopted homeland (Anderson, 2006). Every day as I wade through one piece of bad news after another, it has been challenging trying to see the purpose of focusing on the minutiae of analyzing the conversations of people who are so geographically far away from the United States. As I read and re-read transcripts, analyzed and re-analyzed interactions, saw the data from a different perspective, I kept coming back to this: Words matter. If there can only be one take-home message from my endeavor, it is that words matter. As I have demonstrated, through Bucholtz and Hall's (2005) sociocultural linguistic approach to identity and interaction, how words are conveyed matters a great deal as well. Within each captured interaction, no matter how simple it appears to be on the surface, multiple layers of identity enactments are occurring. The participants in this study demonstrated their capability to acknowledge, strategize, and react to words and actions, at lightning speed, and it is a testament to their level of sophistication in interaction. Regardless of the language(s) they were using, their interactional abilities are both nuanced and imaginative, even though they were operating within the constraints of institutional power structures.

Beyond the writing center tutorial sessions and the playback interviews captured in this dissertation, it is not hard to imagine the same levels of human ingenuity occurring in typical day-to-day interactions. In this era of big data, it might give us cause to pause and reflect on how the moment-to-moment interactions are what make us human.

References

Abasi, A. R., Akbari, N., & Graves, B. (2006). Discourse appropriation, construction of

identities, and the complex issue of plagiarism: ESL students writing in graduate school.

Journal of Second Language Writing, 15(2), 102-117.

doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2006.05.001

Abasi, A. R., & Graves, B. (2008). Academic literacy and plagiarism: Conversations with

international graduate students and disciplinary professors. *Journal of English for

Academic Purposes, 7*(4), 221-233. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2008.10.010

Aguinaldo, J. P. (2004). Rethinking validity in qualitative research from a social constructionist

perspective: From "Is this valid research?" to "What is this research valid for?". *The

Qualitative Report, 9*(1), 127-136.

Althusser, L. (1972). *Lenin and philosophy, and other essays* (B. Brewster, Trans.). New York,

NY: Monthly Review Press.

Anchimbe, E. A. (2009). Revisiting the notion of maturation in new Englishes. *World Englishes,

28*(3), 336-351. doi:10.1111/j.1467-971X.2009.01596.x

Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined communities* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Verso.

Aneja, G. A. (2016). (Non)native speakered: Rethinking (non)nativeness and teacher identity in

TESOL teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly, 50*(3), 572-596. doi:10.1002/tesq.315

Anfara Jr., V. A., & Mertz, N. T. (Eds.). (2006). *Theoretical frameworks in qualitative research*.

Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Angen, M. J. (2000). Evaluating interpretive inquiry: Reviewing the validity debate and opening

the dialogue. *Qualitative Health Research, 10*(3), 378-395.

doi:10.1177/104973230001000308

Angouri, J. (2012). 'Yes that's a good idea': Peer advice in academic discourse at a UK

    university. In H. Limberg & M. A. Locher (Eds.), *Advice in discourse* (pp. 119-143).

    Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Angrosino, M. V., & Rosenberg, J. (2011). Observations on observation: Continuities and

    challenges. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative*

    research (4th ed., pp. 467-478). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Antaki, C. (Ed.) (2013). *Applied conversational analysis: Intervention and change in*

    institutional talk. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Archer, A. (2007). Critical access to higher education: Challenges and goals for South African

    writing centres. *Writing Lab Newsletter, 32*(3), 1-6. Retrieved from

    http://writinglabnewsletter.org/archives/v32/32.3.pdf

Babcock, R. D., & Thonus, T. (2012). *Researching the writing center: Towards an evidence-*

    based practice. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.

Bailey, B. (2000). Language and negotiation of ethnic/racial identity among Dominican

    Americans. *Language in Society, 29*(4), 555-582.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist,

    Trans. M. Holquist, Ed.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Bawarshi, A., & Pelkowski, S. (1999). Postcolonialism and the idea of a writing center. *Writing*

    Center Journal, 19(2), 41-58.

Ben-Rafael, E. (2009). A sociological approach to the study of linguistic landscapes. In E.

    Shohamy & D. Gorter (Eds.), *Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery* (pp. 40-54).

    New York, NY: Routledge.

Bendle, M. F. (2002). The crisis of 'identity' in high modernity. *The British Journal of Sociology, 53*(1), 1-18.

Bhatt, R. M. (2001). World Englishes. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 30*(1), 527-550. doi:doi:10.1146/annurev.anthro.30.1.527

Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*(2), 102-118. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.11.004

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). Raising the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers with written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 19*(4), 207-217. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2010.10.002

Blackledge, A., & Pavlenko, A. (2002). Introduction. *Multilingua, 21*(2/3), 121-140.

Blau, S., Hall, J., & Sparks, S. (2002). Guilt-free tutoring: Rethinking how we tutor non-native-English-speaking students. *Writing Center Journal, 23*(1), 23-44.

Block, D. (2003). *The social turn in second language acquisition*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Block, D. (2007a). The rise of identity in SLA research, post Firth and Wagner (1997). *The Modern Language Journal, 91*, 863-876. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00674.x

Block, D. (2007b). *Second language identities*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Blommaert, J. (2012). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Boden, D. (1995). Agendas and arrangements: Everyday negotiations in meetings. In A. Firth (Ed.), *The discourse of negotiation: Studies of language in the workplace* (pp. 83-99). Oxford, UK: Pergamon.

Bolton, K. (2000). The sociolinguistics of Hong Kong and the space for Hong Kong English. *World Englishes, 19*(3), 265-285. doi:10.1111/1467-971x.00179

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power* (G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans. J. B. Thompson Ed.). Oxford, UK: Polity.

Bräuer, G. (2006). The U.S. writing center model for high schools goes to Germany: And what is coming back? *Clearing House, 80*(2), 95-100.

Bräuer, G. (2009). The role of writing in higher education in Germany. In S. Bruce & B. Rafoth (Eds.), *ESL writers: A guide for writing center tutors* (2nd ed., pp. 186-194). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Bray, M., & Koo, R. (2004). Postcolonial patterns and paradoxes: Language and education in Hong Kong and Macao. *Comparative Education, 40*(2), 215-239.

Breuch, L.-A. M. K. (2003). Post-process "pedagogy": A philosophical exercise. In V. Villanueva (Ed.), *Cross-talk in comp theory* (2nd ed., pp. 97-125). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English. (Reprinted from: *JAC 22*(1), pp. 119-150, 2002).

Brooks, J. (1991). Minimalist tutoring: Making the student do all the work. *Writing Lab Newsletter, 15*(6), 1-4. Retrieved from http://writinglabnewsletter.org/archives/v15/15-6.pdf

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1978). Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In E. N. Goody (Ed.), *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction* (pp. 56-311). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals of language usage*.

    Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bruffee, K. A. (1984a). Collaborative learning and the "conversation of mankind". *College*

    English, 46(7), 635-652.

Bruffee, K. A. (1984b). Peer tutoring and the "conversation of mankind". In G. A. Olson (Ed.),

    Writing centers: Theory and administration (pp. 3-15). Urbana, IL: National Council of

    Teachers of English.

Bucholtz, M. (2003). Sociolinguistic nostalgia and authentification of identity. *Journal of*

    Sociolinguistics, 7(3), 398-416. doi:10.1111/1467-9481.00232

Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2004). Theorizing identity in language and sexuality research.

    Language in Society, 33, 469-515. doi:10.10170S004740450044021

Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach.

    Discourse Studies, 7(4-5), 585-614. doi:10.1177/1461445605054407

Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2008). Finding identity: Theory and data. *Multilingua, 27*, 151-163.

Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2010). Locating identity in language. In C. Llamas & D. Watt (Eds.),

    Language and identities (pp. 18-28). Edinburgh, UK: University of Edinburgh.

Bucholtz, M., Liang, A. C., & Sutton, L. A. (Eds.). (1999). *Reinventing identities: The gendered*

    self in discourse. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Bunch, G. C., & Willett, K. (2013). Writing to mean in middle school: Understanding how

    second language writers negotiate textually-rich content-area instruction. *Journal of*

    Second Language Writing, 22(2), 141-160. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2013.03.007

Burgess, A., & Ivanič, R. (2010). Writing and being written: Issues of identity across timescales.

    Written Communication, 27(2), 228-255. doi:10.1177/0741088310363447

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2002a). *Critical academic writing and multilingual students*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2002b). *A geopolitics of academic writing*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). The place of World Englishes in composition: Pluralization continued. *College Composition and Communication, 57*(4), 586-619.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2010). A rhetoric of shuttling between languages. In B. Horner, M.-Z. Lu, & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *Cross-language relations in composition* (pp. 158-179). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*(3), 401-417. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x

Carino, P. J. (1995). Theorizing the writing center: An uneasy task. *Dialogue: A Journal for Writing Specialists, 2*(1), 23-27.

Carroll, M. (2008). Identities in dialogue: Patterns in the chaos. *Writing Center Journal, 28*(1), 43-62.

Casanave, C. P. (2003). Looking ahead to more sociopolitically-oriented case study research in L2 writing scholarship (But should it be called "post-process"?). *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*, 85-102.

Casanave, C. P. (2004). *Controversies in second language writing: Dilemmas and decisions in research and instruction*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Chamberlain, K. (2000). Methodolatry and qualitative health research. *Journal of Health Psychology, 5*(3), 285-296. doi:10.1177/135910530000500306

Chandrasoma, R., Thompson, C., & Pennycook, A. (2004). Beyond plagiarism: Transgressive and nontransgressive intertextuality. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 3*(3), 171-193. doi:10.1207/s15327701jlie0303_1

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Chen, C. W.-y. (2010). Graduate students' self-reported perspectives regarding peer feedback and feedback from writing consultants. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 11*(2), 151-158.

Chen, K. H. Y. (2008). Positioning and repositioning: Linguistic practices and identity negotiation of overseas returning bilinguals in Hong Kong. *Multilingua, 27*(1/2), 57-75. doi:10.1515/MULTI.2008.004

Chen, Q. (2012). *Tutor-tutee interactions in the writing center: A case study at a college in South China.* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from http://hub.hku.hk/handle/10722/183358

Cheng, W. (2008). Co-constructing prejudiced talk: Ethnic stereotyping in intercultural communication between Hong Kong Chinese and English-speaking westerners. In A. M. Y. Lin (Ed.), *Problematizing identity: Everyday struggles in language, culture, and education* (pp. 171-191). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.

Chiang, Y.-S. D., & Schmida, M. (1999). Language identity and language ownership: Linguistic conflicts of first-year university writing students. In L. Harklau, K. M. Losey, & M. Siegal (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 meets college composition: Issues in the teaching of writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL* (pp. 81-96). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

257

Cho, J., & Trent, A. (2006). Validity in qualitative research revisited. *Qualitative Research, 6*(3), 319-340. doi:10.1177/1468794106065006

Choppin, J. M. (2009). Curriculum-context knowledge: Teacher learning from successive enactments of a standards-based mathematics curriculum. *Curriculum Inquiry, 39*(2), 287-320. doi:10.1111/j.1467-873X.2009.00444.x

Christians, C. G. (2011). Ethics and politics in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed., pp. 61-80). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Clark, R., & Gieve, S. N. (2006). On the discursive construction of "the Chinese learner". *Language, Culture & Curriculum, 19*(1), 54-73.

Clarke, A. E. (2003). Situational analyses: Grounded theory mapping after the postmodern turn. *Symbolic Interaction, 26*(4), 553-576. doi:10.1525/si.2003.26.4.553

Clarke, A. E. (2005). *Situational analysis: Grounded theory after the postmodern turn*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Clarke, A. E., & Friese, C. (2007). Grounded theorizing using situational analysis. In A. Bryant & K. Charmaz (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of grounded theory* (pp. 363-397). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Clarke, D. J. (1997). Studying the classroom negotiation of meaning: Complementary accounts methodology. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education. Monograph, 9*, 98-111, 164-177. doi:10.2307/749949

Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(2), 185-209.

Copland, F. (2011). Negotiating face in feedback conferences: A linguistic ethnographic

    analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*(15), 3832-3843.

    doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.09.014

Corbin, J. M., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures*

    for developing grounded theory (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Cox, M. (2010). Identity, second language writers, and the learning of workplace writing. In M.

    Cox, J. Jordan, C. Ortmeier-Hooper, & G. G. Schwartz (Eds.), *Reinventing identities in*

    second language writing (pp. 75-92). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of

    English.

Cox, M., Jordan, J., Ortmeier-Hooper, C., & Schwartz, G. G. (2010a). Introduction. In M. Cox, J.

    Jordan, C. Ortmeier-Hooper, & G. G. Schwartz (Eds.), *Reinventing identities in second*

    language writing (pp. xv-xxviii). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Cox, M., Jordan, J., Ortmeier-Hooper, C., & Schwartz, G. G. (Eds.). (2010b). *Reinventing*

    identities in second language writing. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of

    English.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five*

    approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Cumming, A., & Riazi, A. (2000). Building models of adult second-language writing instruction.

    Learning and Instruction, 10(1), 55-71. doi:10.1016/s0959-4752(99)00018-3

Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2015). Identity and a model of investment in applied linguistics.

    Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 35, 36-56. doi:doi:10.1017/S0267190514000191

Davis, K. M., Hayward, N., Hunter, K. R., & Wallace, D. L. (1988). The function of talk in the

writing conference: A study of tutorial conversation. *Writing Center Journal, 30*(1), 27-

35.

de Robertis, C., & Morrison, K. (2009). Catholic schooling, identity and social justice in Macau.

International Studies in Catholic Education, 1(2), 152-169.

doi:10.1080/19422530903138044

Deckert, S. K., & Vickers, C. H. (2011). *An introduction to sociolinguistics: Society and identity*.

New York, NY: Continuum.

Denzin, N. K. (2009). *Qualitative inquiry under fire: Toward a new paradigm dialogue*. Walnut

Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2003). *The landscape of qualitative research: Theories and

issues* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992a). Analyzing talk at work: An introduction. In P. Drew & J.

Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings* (pp. 3-65). Cambridge,

UK: Cambridge University Press.

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (2013a). Editors' introduction: Contemporary studies in conversation

analysis. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Contemporary studies in conversation

analysis: Social action and epistemics (Volume I)* (pp. xxi-xxxi). Los Angeles, CA:

SAGE.

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1992b). *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*.

Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (2013b). *Contemporary studies in conversation analysis:

Identities in interaction (Volume III)*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (2013c). *Contemporary studies in conversation analysis: Institutions and applications (Volume IV)*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Du Bois, J. W. (2007). The stance triangle. In R. Englebretson (Ed.), *Stancetaking in discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction* (pp. 139-182). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Duff, P. A. (2002). The discursive co-construction of knowledge, identity, and difference: An ethnography of communication in the high school mainstream. *Applied Linguistics, 23*(3), 289-322. doi:10.1093/applin/23.3.289

Duff, P. A., & Uchida, Y. (1997). The negotiation of teachers' sociocultural identities and practices in postsecondary EFL classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(3), 451-486.

Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (1995). Constructing meaning, constructing selves. In K. Hall & M. Bucholtz (Eds.), *Gender articulated: Language and the socially constructed self* (pp. 469-507). New York, NY: Routledge.

Edwards, J. (2009). *Language and identity: Key topics in sociolinguistics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Eleftheriou, M. (2006). Negotiating the spaces between facilitative and directive strategies in a Middle Eastern writing centre. *TESOL Arabia Perspectives, 13*(3), 4-9.

Eleftheriou, M. (2011). *An exploratory study of a Middle Eastern writing center: The perceptions of tutors and tutees.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/2381/10263

Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (1995). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Englander, K. (2009). Transformation of the identities of nonnative English-speaking scientists as a consequence of the social construction of revision. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 8*(1), 35-53. doi:10.1080/15348450802619979

Faez, F. (2011). Reconceptualizing the native/nonnative speaker dichotomy. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 10*(4), 231-249. doi:10.1080/15348458.2011.598127

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London, UK: Longman.

Fallon, B. (2010). *The perceived, conceived, and lived experiences of 21st century peer writing tutors.* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3433440)

Ferris, D. R. (2010). Second language writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32*(Special Issue 02), 181-201. doi:doi:10.1017/S0272263109990490

Firth, A. (Ed.) (1995). *The discourse of negotiation: Studies of language in the workplace*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal, 81*(3), 285-300. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.1997.tb05480.x

Flowerdew, J., Li, D., & Miller, L. (1998). Attitudes towards English and Cantonese among Hong Kong Chinese university lecturers. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*(2), 201-231. doi:10.2307/3587582

Flowerdew, J., & Wang, S. H. (2016). Author's editor revisions to manuscripts published in international journals. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 32*, 39-52. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2016.03.004

Fuss, D. (1989). *Essentially speaking: Feminism, nature & difference*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Gafaranga, J., & Torras, M.-C. (2002). Interactional otherness: Towards a redefinition of codeswitching. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 6*(1), 1-22. doi:10.1177/13670069020060010101

Gao, X. A. (2010). To be or not to be "part of them": Micropolitical challenges in mainland Chinese students' learning of English in a multilingual university. *TESOL Quarterly, 44*(2), 274-294. doi:10.5054/tq.2010.219944

Gass, S., & Mackey, A. (2007). *Data elicitation for second and foreign language research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gee, J. P. (1991). What is literacy? In C. Mitchell & K. Weiler (Eds.), *Rewriting literacy: Culture and the discourse of the other* (pp. 3-11). New York, NY: Bergin & Garvey.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Giampapa, F. (2011). The politics of "being and becoming" a researcher: Identity, power, and negotiating the field. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 10*(3), 132-144. doi:10.1080/15348458.2011.585304

Gillespie, P., & Lerner, N. (2008). *The Longman guide to peer tutoring* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Longman.

Glaser, B. G. (1978). *Theoretical sensitivity: Advances in the methodology of grounded theory*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. G. (1992). *Basics of grounded theory analysis*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. G. (1998). *Doing grounded theory: Issues and discussions*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1999). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New Brunswick, NJ: Aldine Transaction.

Glenn, P. (2003). Laughter in interaction.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York, NY: Anchor Books.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behaviour*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Government of Macao Special Administrative Region Statistics and Census Service. (2016). 2016 population by-census.   Retrieved from http://www.dsec.gov.mo/getAttachment/E20C6BAB-ADA4-4F83-9349-E72605674A42/E_ICEN_PUB_2016_Y.aspx

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Hall, K., & Bucholtz, M. (2013). Epilogue: Facing identity. *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behavior, Culture, 9*(1), 123-132. doi:10.1515/pr-2013-0006

Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1995). *Ethnography: Principles in practice* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Handsfield, L. J., & Crumpler, T. P. (2013). "Dude, it's not a appropriate word": Negotiating word meanings, language ideologies, and identities in a literature discussion group. *Linguistics and Education, 24*(2), 112-130. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2012.12.004

Harbord, J. (2003). Minimalist tutoring - an exportable model? *Writing Lab Newsletter, 28*(4), 1-5. Retrieved from http://www.writinglabnewsletter.org/archives/v28/28.4.pdf

Harklau, L., Losey, K. M., & Siegal, M. (1999). Generation 1.5 meets college composition: Issues in the teaching of writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL.

Harris, M. (1990). What's up and what's in: Trends and traditions in writing centers. *Writing Center Journal, 11*(1), 15-25.

He, A. W. (2004). CA for SLA: Arguments from the Chinese language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 88*(4), 568-582. doi:10.1111/j.0026-7902.2004.t01-19-.x

He, D., & Li, D. C. S. (2009). Language attitudes and linguistic features in the 'China English' debate. *World Englishes, 28*(1), 70-89. doi:10.1111/j.1467-971X.2008.01570.x

Heath, C., Hindmarsh, J., & Luff, P. (2010). *Video in qualitative research: Analysing social interaction in everday life*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Hellawell, D. (2006). Inside-out: Analysis of the insider-outsider concept as a heuristic device to develop reflexivity in students doing qualitative research. *Teaching in Higher Education, 11*(4), 483-494.

Heller, M. (1992). The politics of codeswitching and language choice. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 13*(1/2), 123-142.

Heng Hartse, J., & Kubota, R. (2014). Pluralizing English? Variation in high-stakes academic texts and challenges of copyediting. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 24*, 71-82. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.04.001

Hepburn, A., & Bolden, G. B. (2013). The conversation analytic approach to transcription. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 57-76). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Herb, M. M. (2014). *Reimagining the dominant narratives of peer tutoring: A study of tutors'
and writers' stories.* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations &
Theses Global database. (UMI No. 3633079)

Heritage, J., & Clayman, S. (2010). *Talk in action: Interactions, identities, and institutions*.
Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Heritage, J., & Sefi, S. (1992). Dilemmas of advice: Aspects of the delivery and reception of
advice in interactions between health visitors and first-time mothers. In P. Drew & J.
Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings* (pp. 359-417).
Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Higgins, C., & Ponte, E. (2017). Legitimating multilingual teacher identities in the mainstream
classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 101*(S1), 15-28. doi:10.1111/modl.12372

Hirvela, A., & Belcher, D. (2001). Coming back to voice: The multiple voices and identities of
mature multilingual writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*(1–2), 83-106.
doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(00)00038-2

Hodder, I. (2003). The interpretation of documents and material culture. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S.
Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (2nd ed., pp. 155-175).
Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Holliday, A. (1999). Small cultures. *Applied Linguistics, 20*(2), 237-264.
doi:10.1093/applin/20.2.237

Holton, J. A. (2007). The coding process and its challenges. In A. Bryant & K. Charmaz (Eds.),
The SAGE handbook of grounded theory (pp. 265-289). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Howard, R. M., & Robillard, A. E. (2008). *Pluralizing plagiarism: Identities, contexts,
pedagogies*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

266

Hui, P. K.-F. (1998). *A comparative historical analysis of higher education development in Macau and Hong Kong: State intervention, Portuguese and British imperialism and colonialism.* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9931490)

Hutchings, C. (2006). Reaching students: Lessons from a writing centre. *Higher Education Research & Development, 25*(3), 247-261. doi:10.1080/07294360600793002

Huth, T. (2006). Negotiating structure and culture: L2 learners' realization of L2 compliment-response sequences in talk-in-interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics, 38*(12), 2025-2050. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2006.04.010

Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. London, UK: Longman.

Hyland, K. (2010). Community and individuality: Performing identity in applied linguistics. *Written Communication, 27*(2), 159-188. doi:10.1177/0741088309357846

Hyland, K. (2016). Academic publishing and the myth of linguistic injustice. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 31*, 58-69. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2016.01.005

Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and identity: The discoursal construction of identity in academic writing*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing.

Ivanič, R. (2006). Language, learning and identification. In R. Kiely, P. Rea-Dickins, H. Woodfield, & G. Clibbon (Eds.), *Language, culture and identity in applied linguistics* (pp. 7-29). London, UK: Equinox Publishing.

Ivanič, R., & Camps, D. (2001). I am how I sound: Voice as self-representation in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*(1–2), 3-33. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00034-0

Jefferson, G. (1983). Issues in the transcription of naturally-occurring talk: Caricature versus capturing pronunciational particulars. *Tilburg Papers in Language and Literature, 34*, 1-12.

Jefferson, G. (1984). Transcript notation. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. ix-xvi). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching World Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(1), 157-181.

Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Jenks, C. J. (2011). *Transcribing talk and interaction: Issues in the representation of communication data*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Johnson, R. K. (1997). The Hong Kong education system: Late immersion under stress. In R. K. Johnson & M. Swain (Eds.), *Immersion education: International perspectives* (pp. 171-189). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, R. K., & Swain, M. (Eds.). (1997). *Immersion education: International perspectives*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Johnston, A. M. (2008). Co-membership in immigration gatekeeping interviews: Construction, ratification and refutation. *Discourse & Society, 19*(1), 21-41.

Jones, C. (2001). The relationship between writing centers and improvement in writing ability: An assessment of the literature. *Education, 122*(1), 3-20.

Jordan, K. S. (2003). *Power and empowerment in writing center conferences.* (Doctoral

dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No.

3085681)

Joseph, J. E. (2004). *Language and identity: National, ethnic, religious*. New York, NY:

Palgrave Macmillan.

Kachru, B. (Ed.) (1992). *The other tongue: English across cultures* (2nd ed.). Urbana, IL:

University of Illinois Press.

Kachru, B. B. (2006). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism. In K. Bolton & B. B.

Kachru (Eds.), *World Englishes: Critical concepts in linguistics* (pp. 241-269). London,

UK: Routledge. (Reprinted from: *English in the world: Teaching and learning the

language and literatures*, Quirk, R., & Widdowson, H. G. (Eds), Cambridge, UK:

Cambridge University Press, 1985, pp. 11-30).

Kelle, U. (2007). The development of categories: Different approaches in grounded theory. In A.

Bryant & K. Charmaz (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of grounded theory* (pp. 191-213).

Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Kerekes, J. (2007). The co-construction of a gatekeeping encounter: An inventory of verbal

actions. *Journal of Pragmatics, 39*(11), 1942-1973. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2007.07.008

Kitzinger, C. (2013). Repair. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of Conversation

Analysis* (pp. 229-256). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Kock, C., & Rienecker, L. (1996). A writing lab in Copenhagen, Denmark. *Writing Lab

Newsletter, 20*(9), 4-6, 8. Retrieved from http://writinglabnewsletter.org/archives/v20/20-

9.pdf

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practices in second language acquisition*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon.

Kubota, R., & Lin, A. (Eds.). (2009). *Race, culture, and identities in second language education: Exploring critically engaged practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Kuhn, T. S. (1996). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (3rd ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2001). Toward a postmethod pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*, 537-560.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). A postmethod perspective on English language teaching. *World Englishes, 22*(4), 539-550. doi:10.1111/j.1467-971X.2003.00317.x

Kurpaska, M. (2010). *Chinese language(s): A look through the prism of The Great Dictionary of Modern Chinese Dialects*. Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter Mouton.

Lai, M.-L. (2005). Language attitudes of the first postcolonial generation in Hong Kong secondary schools. *Language in Society, 34*(3), 363-388.

Lantolf, J. P. (2011). The sociocultural approach to second language acquisition. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 24-47). New York, NY: Routledge.

Lantolf, J. P. (Ed.) (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Lau, C. M. D., & Yuen, P. K. (2010). Development of private higher education in Macau: Exploring the relationship between government and private sector. *Frontiers of Education in China, 5*(3), 450-463. doi:10.1007/s11516-010-0110-2

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, E., & Simon-Maeda, A. (2006). Racialized research identities in ESL/EFL research. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(3), 573-594. doi:10.2307/40264544

Lee, I. (2010). Writing teacher education and teacher learning: Testimonies of four EFL teachers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 19*(3), 143-157. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2010.05.001

Leki, I. (2009). Before the conversation: A sketch of some possible backgrounds, experiences, and attitudes among ESL students visiting a writing center. In S. Bruce & B. Rafoth (Eds.), *ESL writers: A guide for writing center tutors* (2nd ed., pp. 1-17). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Leung, C., Harris, R., & Rampton, B. (1997). The idealised native speaker, reified ethnicities, and classroom realities. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(3), 543-560.

Levinson, S. C. (2013). Action formation and ascription. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 104-130). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Li, D. (2002). Hong Kong parents' preference for English-medium education: Passive victims of imperialism or active agents of pragmatism? In A. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *Englishes in Asia: Communication, identity, power and education* (pp. 29-62). Melbourne, Australia: Language Australia.

Li, W. (2011). Moment Analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*(5), 1222-1235. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.07.035

Liang, A. C. (1999). Conversationally implicating lesbian and gay identity. In M. Bucholtz, A. C. Liang, & L. A. Sutton (Eds.), *Reinventing identities: The gendered self in discourse* (pp. 293-310). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. M. (2006). *How languages are learned*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2010). *Academic writing in a global context: The politics and practices of publishing in English*. London, UK: Routledge.

Lin, A. M. Y. (1999). Doing-English-lessons in the reproduction or transformation of social worlds? *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(3), 393-412. doi:10.2307/3587671

Lin, A. M. Y. (2005). Critical, trans-disciplinary perspectives on language-in-education policy and practice in postcolonial contexts: The case of Hong Kong. In A. M. Y. Lin & P. W. Martin (Eds.), *Decolonisation, globalisation: Language-in-education policy and practice* (pp. 38-54). Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Lin, A. M. Y. (2006a). Beyond linguistic purism in language-in-education policy and practice: Exploring bilingual pedagogies in a Hong Kong science classroom. *Language and Education, 20*(4), 287-305. doi:10.2167/le643.0

Lin, A. M. Y. (2006b). Contexts of English-in-education policy and practice in postcolonial Hong Kong. *Asian Journal of English Language Learning, 16*, 25-44.

Lin, A. M. Y., & Martin, P. W. (2005). From a critical deconstruction paradigm to a critical construction paradigm: An introduction to decolonisation, globalisation and language-in-education policy and practice. In A. M. Y. Lin & P. W. Martin (Eds.), *Decolonisation, globalisation: Language-in-education policy and practice* (pp. 1-19). Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Lin, A. M. Y., Wang, W., Akamatsu, N., & Riazi, A. M. (2002). Appropriating English, expanding identities, and re-visioning the field: From TESOL to teaching English for glocalized communication (TEGCOM). *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 1*(4), 295-316. doi:10.1207/S15327701JLIE0104_4

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 191-216). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lincoln, Y. S., Lynham, S. A., & Guba, E. G. (2011). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences, revisited. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 97-128). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Llamas, C., & Watt, D. (Eds.). (2010). *Language and identities*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.

Locher, M. A., & Limberg, H. (2012). Introduction to advice in discourse. In H. Limberg & M. A. Locher (Eds.), *Advice in discourse* (pp. 1-27). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Long, E. C. J., Angera, J. J., & Hakoyama, M. (2006). Using videotaped feedback during intervention with married couples: A qualitative assessment. *Family Relations, 55*(4), 428-438. doi:10.2307/40005338

Luk, J. (2002). Communication behaviours of EFL learners in a native English-speaker teacher's class: A case in Hong Kong. In A. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *Englishes in Asia: Communication, identity, power and education* (pp. 289-302). Melbourne, Australia: Language Australia.

Mackiewicz, J., & Thompson, I. K. (2015). *Talk about writing: The tutoring strategies of experienced writing center tutors*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Mackiewicz, J. M. (2001). *The co-construction of social relationships in writing center tutoring interactions: An analysis of politeness strategies in discourse activity frames.* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database.

Mackiewicz, J. M. (2005). Hinting at what they mean: Indirect suggestions in writing tutors' interactions with engineering students. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication, 48*(4), 365-376. doi:10.1109/TPC.2005.859727

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2011). *Designing qualitative research* (5th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Matsuda, P. K. (2001). Voice in Japanese written discourse: Implications for second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*, 35-53.

Matsuda, P. K. (2003). Process and post-process: A discursive history. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*(1), 65-83. doi:10.1016/s1060-3743(02)00127-3

McMillan, P. (1986). Tadpoles and topic sentences: A writing center in Asia. *Writing Lab Newsletter, 11*(3), 1-3. Retrieved from http://writinglabnewsletter.org/archives/v11/11-3.pdf

Mehra, B. (2001). Research or personal quest? Dilemma in studying my own kind. In B. M. Merchant & A. I. Willis (Eds.), *Multiple and intersecting identities in qualitative research* (pp. 69-82). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.

Mendoza-Denton, N. (1999). Turn-initial *No*: Collaborative opposition among Latina adolescents. In M. Bucholtz, A. C. Liang, & L. A. Sutton (Eds.), *Reinventing identities: The gendered self in discourse* (pp. 273-292). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Merchant, B. M., & Willis, A. I. (Eds.). (2001). *Multiple and intersecting identities in qualitative research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Miller, A. (2002). Culture and composition: Starting a writing center in East Africa. *Writing Lab Newsletter, 27*(4), 6-8. Retrieved from http://writinglabnewsletter.org/archives/v27/27.4.pdf

Miller, E. R. (2013). Positioning selves, doing relational work and constructing identities in interview talk. *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behavior, Culture, 9*(1), 75-95. doi:10.1515/pr-2013-0004

Morse, J. M., Barret, M., Mayan, M., Olson, K., & Spiers, J. (2002). Verification strategies for establishing reliability and validity in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 1*(2). Retrieved from www.ualberta.ca/~ijqm/

Morton, J., Storch, N., & Thompson, C. (2015). What our students tell us: Perceptions of three multilingual students on their academic writing in first year. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 30*(Supplement C), 1-13. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2015.06.007

Murray, D. (1982). Teaching the other self: The writer's first reader. *College Composition and Communication, 33*(2), 140-147.

Murray, D. (2003). Teaching writing as a process, not product. In V. Villanueva (Ed.), *Cross-talk in comp theory* (2nd ed., pp. 3-6). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English. (Reprinted from: *The Leaflet*, 1972).

Myers, S. A. (2003). Reassessing the "proofreading trap": ESL tutoring and writing instruction. *Writing Center Journal, 24*(1), 51-70.

Norton, B. (1997). Language, identity, and the ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(3), 409-429.

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Harlow, UK: Longman.

Norton, B., & McKinney, C. (2011). An identity approach to second language acquisition. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 73-94). New York, NY: Routledge.

Norton Peirce, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*(1), 9-31.

Ochs, E. (1979). Transcription as theory. In E. Ochs & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Developmental pragmatics* (pp. 43-72). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Oh, S.-Y. (2010). Invoking categories through co-present person reference: The case of Korean conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 42*(5), 1219-1242. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2009.09.019

Omoniyi, T. (2006). Hierarchy of identities. In T. Omoniyi & G. White (Eds.), *The sociolinguistics of identity* (pp. 11-33). London, UK: Continuum.

Ortega, L. (2011). SLA after the social turn: Where cognitivism and its alternatives stand. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 167-180). New York, NY: Routledge.

Ortmeier-Hooper, C. (2008). "English may be my second language, but I'm not 'ESL'". *College Composition & Communication, 59*(3), 389-419.

Ouellette, M. A. (2008). Weaving strands of writer identity: Self as author and the NNES

    "plagiarist". *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*(4), 255-273.

    doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2008.05.002

Park, G. (2012). "I am never afraid of being recognized as an NNES": One teacher's journey in

    claiming and embracing her nonnative-speaker identity. *TESOL Quarterly, 46*(1), 127-

    151. doi:10.1002/tesq.4

Park, G. (2013). Situating the discourses of privilege and marginalization in the lives of two East

    Asian women teachers of English. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 18*(1), 108-133.

    doi:10.1080/13613324.2012.759924

Park, I. (2014). Stepwise advice negotiation in writing center peer tutoring. *Language and*

    Education, 28(4), 362-382. doi:10.1080/09500782.2013.873805

Park, I. (2017). Questioning as advice resistance: writing tutorial interactions with L2 writers.

    Classroom Discourse, 1-18. doi:10.1080/19463014.2017.1307125

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA:

    Sage Publications.

Pavlenko, A. (2002). Poststructuralist approaches to the study of social factors in second

    language learning and use. In V. Cook (Ed.), *Portraits of the L2 user* (pp. 277-302).

    Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Pavlenko, A. (2007). Autobiographic narratives as data in applied linguistics. *Applied*

    Linguistics, 28(2), 163-188.

Pavlenko, A., & Blackledge, A. (2004a). Introduction: New theoretical approaches to the study of negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts. In A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts* (pp. 1-33). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Pavlenko, A., & Blackledge, A. (Eds.). (2004b). *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Pavlenko, A., & Lantolf, J. P. (2000). Second language learning as participation and the (re)construction of selves. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 155-177). NY: Oxford University Press.

Pavlenko, A., & Norton, B. (2007). Imagined communities, identity, and English language learning. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 669-680). London, UK: Springer.

Pennycook, A. (1996). Borrowing others' words: Text, ownership, memory, and plagiarism. *TESOL Quarterly, 30*(2), 201-230.

Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the discourses of colonialism*. London, UK: Routledge.

Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Petrić, B. (2006). Interdisciplinarity and writer identity: Students' views and experiences. In R. Kiely, P. Rea-Dickins, H. Woodfield, & G. Clibbon (Eds.), *Language, culture and identity in applied linguistics* (pp. 119–131). London, UK: Equinox Publishing.

Phan Le Ha. (2008). *Teaching English as an international language: Identity, resistance and negotiation*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Phan Le Ha, & Baurain, B. (Eds.). (2011). *Voices, identities, negotiations, and conflicts: Writing academic English across cultures*. Bingley, UK: Emerald Group.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Phillipson, R. (2009). *Linguistic imperialism continued*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Placencia, M. E. (2012). Online peer-to-peer advice in Spanish *Yahoo!Respuestas*. In H. Limberg & M. A. Locher (Eds.), *Advice in discourse* (pp. 281-305). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Poland, B. D. (2003). Transcription quality. In J. A. Holstein & J. F. Gubrium (Eds.), *Inside interviewing: New lenses, new concerns* (pp. 267-287). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Pomerantz, A. (2005). Using participants' video-stimulated comments to complement analyses of interactional practices. In H. te Molder & J. Potter (Eds.), *Conversation and cognition* (pp. 93-113). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Powers, J. K. (1993). Rethinking writing center conferencing strategies for the ESL writer. *Writing Center Journal, 13*(2), 39-48.

Powers, J. K., & Nelson, J. V. (1995). L2 writers and the writing center: A national survey of writing center conferencing at graduate institutions. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 4*(2), 113-138. doi:10.1016/1060-3743(95)90003-9

Prior, L. (2003). *Using documents in social research*. London, UK: SAGE.

Prior, P. (2001). Voices in text, mind, and society: Sociohistoric accounts of discourse acquisition and use. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*(1–2), 55-81. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(00)00037-0

QSR International. (2016). NVivo qualitative data analysis software (Version 11). Retrieved

      from http://www.qsrinternational.com/products_nvivo.aspx

Radwanska-Williams, J. (2008). The "native speaker" as a metaphorical construct. In E. A.

      Berendt (Ed.), *Metaphors for learning: cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 139-156).

      Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Rafoth, B. A. (2015). *Multilingual writers and writing centers*. Boulder, CO: Utah State

      University Press.

Ramsey, B. (2005). Re-seeing the writing center's position of service. *Writing Lab Newsletter,*

      29(6), 1-4. Retrieved from http://writinglabnewsletter.org/archives/v29/29.6.pdf

Ramsey, B. (2008). *Composition programs and practices in Sweden: Possibilities for cross-*

      fertilization with the United States. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest

      Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3326719)

Reissner-Roubicek, S. (2012). "The guys would like to have a lady:" The co-construction of

      gender and professional identity in interviews between employers and female engineering

      students. *Pragmatics, 22*(2), 231-254.

Richards, K. (2006). "Being the teacher": Identity and classroom conversation. *Applied*

      Linguistics, 27(1), 51-77.

Riessman, C. K. (2002). Narrative analysis. In A. M. Huberman & M. B. Miles (Eds.), *The*

      qualitative researcher's companion (pp. 217-270). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

      Publications.

Ritter, J. J. (2002). *Negotiating the center: An analysis of writing tutorial interactions between*

      ESL learners and native-English speaking writing center tutors. (Doctoral dissertation).

      Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3056649)

Ronesi, L. (2009). Multilingual tutors supporting multilingual peers: A peer-tutor training course in the Arabian Gulf. *Writing Center Journal, 29*(2), 75-94.

Rossano, F. (2013). Gaze in conversation. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 308-329). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2004). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Sacks, H. (1984). Notes on methodology. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 21-27). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Santa, T. (2002). Writing center orthodoxies as Damocles' sword: An international perspective. *Writing Center Journal, 22*(2), 29-38.

Saville-Troike, M. (2006). *Introducing second language acquisition*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis* (Vol. I). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Schiffrin, D. (1996). Narrative as self-portrait: Sociolinguistic constructions of identity. *Language in Society, 25*(2), 167-203.

Schiffrin, D. (2006). From linguistic reference to social reality. In A. de Fina, D. Schiffrin, & M. Bamberg (Eds.), *Discourse and Identity* (pp. 103-131). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Scollon, R. (1995). Plagiarism and ideology: Identity in intercultural discourse. *Language in Society, 24*, 1-28.

Scollon, R., Scollon, S. W., & Jones, R. H. (2012). *Intercultural communication: A discourse approach* (3rd ed.). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Seidlhofer, B. (2009). Common ground and different realities: World Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *World Englishes, 28*(2), 236-245. doi:10.1111/j.1467-971X.2009.01592.x

Shamoon, L. K., & Burns, D. H. (1995). A critique of peer tutoring. *Writing Center Journal, 15*(2), 134-151.

Smith, M. B. (2000). Moral foundations of research with human participants. In B. D. Sales & S. Folkman (Eds.), *Ethics in research with human participants* (pp. 3-10). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Snow, D. B. (2004). *Cantonese as written language: The growth of a written Chinese vernacular*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Staben, J. E., & Nordhaus, K. D. (2009). Looking at the whole text. In S. Bruce & B. A. Rafoth (Eds.), *ESL writers: A guide for writing center tutors* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Stachera, S. A. (2003). *Tongue tied: Coming to terms with our writing center practice.* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3115670)

Sweeting, A., & Vickers, E. (2005). On colonizing 'colonialism': The discourses of the history of English in Hong Kong. *World Englishes, 24*(2), 113-130. doi:10.1111/j.1467-971X.2005.00397.x

Theobald, M. (2012). Video-stimulated accounts: Young children accounting for interactional matters in front of peers. *Journal of Early Childhood Research, 10*(1), 32-50.

Thesen, L. (1997). Voices, discourse, and transition: In search of new categories in EAP. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(3), 487-511.

Thompson, C., & Pennycook, A. (2008). Intertextuality in the transcultural zone. In R. M. Howard & A. E. Robillard (Eds.), *Pluralizing plagiarism: Identities, contexts, pedagogies* (pp. 124-139). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

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. doi:10.1177/0741088309342364

Thonus, T. (2004). What are the differences?: Tutor interactions with first- and second-language writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*(3), 227-242. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.012

Thonus, T. (2008). Acquaintanceship, familiarity, and coordinated laughter in writing tutorials. *Linguistics and Education, 19*(4), 333-350. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2008.06.006

Thonus, T. (2014). Tutoring multilingual students: Shattering the myths. *Journal of College Reading and Learning, 44*(2), 200-213. doi:10.1080/10790195.2014.906233

Trent, J. (2012). The discursive positioning of teachers: Native-speaking English teachers and educational discourse in Hong Kong. *TESOL Quarterly, 46*(1), 104-126. doi:10.1002/tesq.1

Tsui, A. B. M. (2007). Complexities of identity formation: A narrative inquiry of an EFL teacher. *TESOL Quarterly, 41*(4), 657-680. doi:10.1002/j.1545-7249.2007.tb00098.x

Turner, A. (2006). Re-engineering the North American writing center model in East Asia. *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal, 3*(2). Retrieved from http://projects.uwc.utexas.edu/praxis/?q=node/84

University of Macau. (2011). *University of Macau annual report*. Macao: University of Macau.

University of Macau. (2014a). About the University of Macau.   Retrieved from http://www.umac.mo/about_UM.html

University of Macau. (2014b). Rector's office.   Retrieved from http://www.umac.mo/about_UM_history.html

University of Macau. (2015). *University of Macau annual report*. Macao: University of Macau.

Vickers, C. H. (2004). *Interactional accommodation and the construction of social roles among culturally diverse undergraduates.* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3145144)

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wang, L. (2012). *Behind the curtain: A critical view of theory and practice of tutoring international English language learners at university writing centers.* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3505110)

Waring, H. Z. (2005). Peer tutoring in a graduate writing centre: Identity, expertise, and advice resisting. *Applied Linguistics, 26*(2), 141-168.

Waring, H. Z. (2007a). Complex advice acceptance as a resource for managing asymmetries. *Text & Talk, 27*(1), 107-137. doi:10.1515/TEXT.2007.005

Waring, H. Z. (2007b). The multi-functionality of accounts in advice giving. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 11*(3), 367-391. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9841.2007.00328.x

Waring, H. Z. (2012). The advising sequence and its preference structures in graduate peer tutoring at an American university. In H. Limberg & M. A. Locher (Eds.), *Advice in discourse* (pp. 97-117). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Watson-Gegeo, K. A. (2004). Mind, language, and epistemology: Toward a language socialization paradigm for SLA. *Modern Language Journal, 88*(3), 331-350. doi:10.1111/j.0026-7902.2004.00233.x

Weedon, C. (1997). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory* (2nd ed.). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.

Weston, C., Gandell, T., Beauchamp, J., McAlpine, L., Wiseman, C., & Beauchamp, C. (2001). Analyzing interview data: The development and evolution of a coding system. *Qualitative Sociology, 24*(3), 381-400.

Williams, J. (2004). Tutoring and revision: Second language writers in the writing center. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*(3), 173-201. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.009

Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2010). *Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy: A guide for ESL/EFL teachers*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Yano, Y. (2009). English as an international lingua franca: from societal to individual. *World Englishes, 28*(2), 246-255. doi:10.1111/j.1467-971X.2009.01587.x

Yee, A. H. (1990). A comparative study of Macau's education system: Changing colonial patronage and native self-reliance. *Comparative Education, 26*(1), 61-71.

Yee, H. S. (2001). *Macau in transition: From colony to autonomous region*. New York, NY: Palgrave.

Yee, H. S., & Kou, M. (2001). Government intervention in higher education in Macau. *Higher Education Management, 13*(1), 75-91.

Yngve, V. H. (1970). On getting a word in edgewise. *Papers from the Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society*, 567-578.

Young, M. Y. C. (2006). Macao students' attitudes toward English: a post-1999 survey. *World Englishes, 25*(3-4), 479-490. doi:10.1111/j.1467-971X.2006.00468.x

Young, M. Y. C. (2009). Multilingual education in Macao. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 6*(4), 412-425. doi:10.1080/14790710802152438

Zdrojkowski, M. R. T. (2007). *Laughter in interaction: The discourse function of laughter in writing tutorials.* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 304851183)

Appendix A

IUP IRB Approval Letter

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
www.iup.edu

Institutional Review Board for the
Protection of Human Subjects
School of Graduate Studies and Research
Stright Hall, Room 113
210 South Tenth Street
Indiana, Pennsylvania 15705-1048

P 724-357-7730
F 724-357-2715
irb-research@iup.edu
www.iup.edu/irb

October 7, 2015

Alice Shu-Ju Lee
E7-202, Central Teaching Building
English Language Center
University of Macau
Avenida da Universidade
Taipa, Macao SAR

Dear Ms. Lee:

Your proposed research project, "Exploring the Identity Construction of Multilingual Writers in a World Englishes Writing Center in Macao," (Log No. 15-230) has been reviewed by the IRB and is approved. In accordance with 45CFR46.101 and IUP Policy, your project is exempt from continuing review.

You should read all of this letter, as it contains important information about conducting your study.

Now that your project has been approved by the IRB, there are elements of the Federal Regulations to which you must attend. IUP adheres to these regulations strictly:

1. You must conduct your study exactly as it was approved by the IRB.

2. Any additions or changes in procedures must be approved by the IRB before they are implemented.

3. You must notify the IRB promptly of any events that affect the safety or well-being of subjects.

4. You must notify the IRB promptly of any modifications of your study or other responses that are necessitated by any events reported in items 2 or 3.

The IRB may review or audit your project at random or for cause. In accordance with IUP Policy and Federal Regulation (45CFR46.113), the Board may suspend or terminate your project if your project has not been conducted as approved or if other difficulties are detected

Although your human subjects review process is complete, the School of Graduate Studies and Research requires submission and approval of a Research Topic Approval Form (RTAF) before you can begin your research. If you have not yet submitted your RTAF, the form can be found at http://www.iup.edu/page.aspx?id=91683 .

While not under the purview of the IRB, researchers are responsible for adhering to US copyright law when using existing scales, survey items, or other works in the conduct of research. Information regarding copyright law and compliance at IUP, including links to sample permission request letters, can be found at http://www.iup.edu/page.aspx?id=165526.

I wish you success as you pursue this important endeavor.

Sincerely,

Jen Roberts

Jennifer Roberts, Ph.D.
Chairperson, Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects
Professor of Criminology

JLR:jeb

Cc: Dr. Sharon Deckert, Dissertation Advisor
        Ms. Brenda Boal, Secretary

Appendix B

Letter of Consent from Study Site

English Writing and Communication Centre

Tel: 8822 2588　　　　Office: E7-1022　　　　Email: ewcc@umac.mo

September 1, 2015

I, Sin I Miranda Ma, Coordinator of the University of Macau's English Writing and Communication Centre (EWCC), give my consent to Ms. Alice Shu-Ju Lee, principal investigator of the study "Exploring the Identity Construction of Multilingual Writers in a World Englishes Writing Center in Macao," to conduct her study at the EWCC. This consent includes the following:

- access to the EWCC's writing conference appointment system,
- the collection of student and tutor background information, provided that the student and tutor consent to participating in the study,
- the videotaping of writing conferences between students and tutors, provided that the student and tutor consent to participating in the study,
- the duplication of the written texts that are brought into EWCC for discussion, provided that the student consents to participating in the study, and
- the interviewing of students and tutors, with a focus on the writing conference, provided that the student and tutor consent to participating in the study.

The above consent is valid from September 25, 2015 to September 25, 2016.

Any questions regarding this above consent can be directed to me using the following contact information:

Sin I Miranda Ma
E7-2004 Central Teaching Building
English Language Centre
University of Macau
Av. da Universidade
Taipa, Macao SAR
+853 8822-8124
mirandama@umac.mo

_____　　　　_____
Signature of Sin I Miranda Ma　　　　Signature of Witness

Date: ___10 / 06 / 2015___

Central Teaching Building, E7-1022, University of Macau
Avenida da Universidade, Taipa, Macau S.A.R.
http://ewcc.elc.umac.mo

289

Appendix C

Email Invitation to Participate (Tutors)

Dear [Name],

I am writing to follow up on the conversation we had earlier regarding the study I would like to conduct at EWCC.

To recap, I would like to observe and videotape a total of 10 writing conference sessions at EWCC. I would also like to get your reaction to parts of the conference by asking you to watch parts of the videotape.

Participation in this study will likely involve 1.5 hours of your time for each videotaped session.

If you are interested to participate, please reply to this email so that I may schedule a time to meet with you in person to give you more details about my study and to answer any questions you may have. This project has been approved by the Indiana University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (phone: +1-724-357-7730).

Best,

Alice Lee

Appendix D

Informed Consent for Participants (Tutors)

You are invited to participate in this low-risk research study. My name is Alice Lee, and I am a PhD candidate at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. The following information is given to help you make an informed decision about whether or not to participate in this study. If you have any questions now or during the study, please ask.

The purpose of this study is to describe how multilingual student writers talk about their writing with writing center tutors. You are invited to participate because you are a multilingual tutor. Participation will involve approximately 1.5 hours of your time, not including the time spent for your writing conference, which is between 30 – 45 minutes. Your participation involves the following:

1. You will be video-recorded during your writing conference with a student writer;
2. A copy of the writing conference text, which may contain your handwriting, will be made and retained by me;
3. A follow-up interview will be conducted with you and the student writer after I have analyzed the video-recording.

The information gained from this study will help writing tutors and writing teachers better understand how multilingual student writers talk about their writing. Additionally, you may learn more about your tutoring strategies by reflecting on them and become more aware of the effectiveness of your communication with student writers.

Participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose to participate, your identity will be protected through the use of a pseudonym. If you choose not to participate, your decision will not negatively affect any benefits that you are allowed to use at this University. If at any time you no longer wish to participate, you may do so by contacting Alice or her dissertation committee chair, Dr. Sharon Deckert (see contact information below). At that time, any information collected about you will be permanently destroyed. All information related to you will be kept confidential and will have no impact on your academic standing at this University. The information obtained in this study may be published in educational journals or presented at educational conferences, but your identity will be kept confidential through the use of a pseudonym.

Researcher:
Alice Lee
English Language Center
E7-2002, CTB
Av. da Universidade
University of Macau
Taipa, Macao SAR
+853 6612-3624
a.s.lee2@iup.edu

Research Supervisor:
Dr. Sharon Deckert
English Department, IUP
Indiana, PA 15705
+1 724-357-2263
sharon.deckert@iup.edu

291

VOLUNTARY CONSENT FORM:

I have read and understand the information on the form and I consent to volunteer to be a participant in this study. I understand that my responses are completely confidential and that I have the right to withdraw at any time. I have received a copy of this Informed Consent Form to keep in my possession.

Name (Please print)   _____

Signature   _____

Phone number where you can be reached   _____

Best days and times to reach you   _____

Email   _____

I certify that I have explained to the above individual the nature and purpose, the potential benefits, and possible risks associated with participating in this research study, have answered any questions that have been raised, and have witnessed the above signature.

Researcher's signature   _____

Date   _____

This project has been approved by the Indiana University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (Phone: (+1 724-357-7730).

Appendix E

Email Invitation to Participate (Students)

Dear [Student Name],

You have received this email because you have made an appointment with the writing center. I am writing to ask if you might be interested to participate in a study about multilingual student writers and how they think and talk about their English writing.

I am looking for students who would like to share their thoughts on their English writing. I hope that this reflection will be useful in your writing process. If you find this project interesting and would like to share your thoughts, please reply so I can schedule a short meeting with you to give you more information about the study and answer any questions you may have. This project has been approved by the Indiana University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (phone: +1-724-357-7730).

Best,

Alice Lee
Researcher
a.s.lee2@iup.edu

Appendix F

Informed Consent for Participants (Students)

You are invited to participate in this low-risk research study. My name is Alice Lee, and I am a PhD candidate at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. The following information is given to help you make an informed decision about whether or not to participate in this study. If you have any questions now or during the study, please ask.

The purpose of this study is to describe how multilingual student writers talk about their writing with writing center tutors. You are invited to participate because you are a multilingual student writer. Participation will involve approximately 1.5 hours of your time, not including the time spent for your writing conference, which is between 30 – 45 minutes. Your participation involves the following:

1. You will be video-recorded during your writing conference with a tutor;
2. A copy of your writing conference text will be made and retained by me;
3. A follow-up interview will be conducted with you and your tutor after I have analyzed the video-recording.

The information gained from this study will help writing tutors and writing teachers better understand how multilingual student writers talk about their writing. Additionally, you may learn more about your writing process, how you think about your writing, and how you discuss your ideas with another person. You may gain information regarding the degree of ownership you feel toward your writing.

Participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose to participate, your identity will be protected through the use of a pseudonym. If you choose not to participate, your decision will not negatively affect any benefits that you are allowed to use at this University. If at any time you no longer wish to participate, you may do so by contacting Alice or her dissertation committee chair, Dr. Sharon Deckert (see contact information below). At that time, any information collected about you will be permanently destroyed. All information related to you will be kept confidential and will have no impact on your academic standing at this University. The information obtained in this study may be published in educational journals or presented at educational conferences, but your identity will be kept confidential through the use of a pseudonym.

Researcher: Research Supervisor:
Alice Lee   Dr. Sharon Deckert
English Language Center   English Department, IUP
E7-2002, CTB   Indiana, PA 15705
Av. da Universidade   +1 724-357-2263
University of Macau   sharon.deckert@iup.edu
Taipa, Macao SAR
+853 6612-3624
a.s.lee2@iup.edu

VOLUNTARY CONSENT FORM:

I have read and understand the information on the form and I consent to volunteer to be a participant in this study. I understand that my responses are completely confidential and that I have the right to withdraw at any time. I have received a copy of this Informed Consent Form to keep in my possession.

Name (Please print)   _____

Signature   _____

Phone number where you can be reached   _____

Best days and times to reach you   _____

Email   _____

I certify that I have explained to the above individual the nature and purpose, the potential benefits, and possible risks associated with participating in this research study, have answered any questions that have been raised, and have witnessed the above signature.

Researcher's signature   _____

Date   _____

This project has been approved by the Indiana University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (Phone: (+1 724-357-7730).

Writing Center Conference Observation Protocol

Writing center conferences typically run between 30 – 45 minutes. I will observe and record 10 writing center conferences in 2015. During these conferences, I will use the following protocol to guide my observation.

(Briefly explain the project.)

Setting and Background Information	
Session Date:	
Start time:	End time:
Conference objective:	

Tutor: Undergraduate   Graduate
 	
        Year:
 	
        Male   Female
 	
Major: English / Translation / Euro. Stud.
 	
        Other:
	Ss W: Undergraduate Graduate
	
	        Year:
	
	        Male Female
	
	Major:

Language(s) used: English Cantonese Mandarin Other:	
Artifact: Hard copy Soft copy Class: Written: Speaking: Other:	

Personal:	Cover Letter	Personal Statement	CV
Other:			

Seating arrangement:

Large table   Individual desk   Other:

Next to each other   Across from each other   Other:

Comments:

Writing Conference		
Descriptive Comments/Notes		Reflective Comments/Notes
Direction of Interactions Researcher Artifact Other Tutor Ss Writer		
Talk time Researcher Artifact Other Tutor Ss Writer		
References to roles SW: mainland local experienced new other:	Artifact Other Researcher	

T: mainland local experienced new other:	Tutor Ss writer	
References to purposes SW: teach learn peer review correct comment share other: T: teach learn peer review correct comment share other:	Artifact Other Researcher Tutor Ss writer	

Appendix H

Video Playback Interview Protocol

After the writing conference, video playback interviews will be conducted using the following

protocol.

Date:

Start time:

End time:

(Briefly explain the project.)

Instructions:

1. Please watch the video and tell me what you were thinking about your interaction
   with each other.

2. I will stop the videotape when you tell me so you can have time to explain your
   thoughts.

Possible questions for multilingual student writers and multilingual tutors:

1. Overall, what did you think about your interaction with each other?

2. What kind of help were you expecting to give / receive?

3. To what extent did the consultation help you better understand your own writing process?

4. Is there anything else you would like to add about the consultation?

Appendix I

Transcription Conventions

(Adapted from Jefferson, 1984)

```
.            (period) falling intonation
?            (question mark) rising intonation
,            (comma) continuing intonation
-            (hyphen) abrupt cut-off
::           (colon(s)) prolonging of sound
word         (underlining) stress
word         the more underlining, the greater the stress
WORD         (all caps) loud speech
°word°       (degree symbols) quiet speech
↑word        (upward arrow) raised pitch
↓word        (downward arrow) lowered pitch
>word<       (more than and less than) quicker speech
<word>       (less than and more than) slower speech
hh           (series of h's) aspiration or laughter
.hh          (h's preceded by dot) inhalation
,hh          (comma before h's) out-breath
(hh)         (h's in parentheses) aspiration or laughter inside
             word boundaries
[word]       (set of lined-up brackets) beginning and ending of
             simultaneous or overlapping speech
=            (equal sign) latch or continuing speech with no break
             in between
(0.4)        (number in parentheses) length of a silence in tenths
             of a second
(.)          (period in parentheses) micropause 1 tenth of a second
             or less
( )          (empty parentheses) inaudible talk
(word)       (word or phrase in parentheses) transcriptionist doubt
((word))     (double parentheses) non-speech activity or
             transcriptionist comment
$word$       (dollar sign) smiley voice
wo(h)rd      (h in parentheses) is a try at showing that the word
             has "laughter" bubbling within it
{word}       (braces) English translations
```