

# Locating and Solving Repairs in EFL Tutorial Discourse: Comparative Study of NS and NNS Tutors

Hanbyul Jung

## 1. Introduction

In the history of diverse research on institutional discourse, the study of writing tutorials is a genre that has caught the attention of many researchers recently. Studies in this area have discussed the topics of various interactions between the tutor and tutee (Thonus, 2004), the various sequential interaction and discourse patterns adopted in the tutorials (Park 2007, Jung 2007) and the sociolinguistic aspects involved in such interactions (Thonus 2004, Weigle & Nelson 2004). These studies have shown the diverse aspects in the interactional sequences of the tutorials that occur in ESL and EFL settings. They also have noted the pedagogical implications as to how such studies could help improve the context and environment of the tutorials and also enhance better learning for the tutees involved in the tutorials.

With this background, this study will examine the ways in which native speaker (NS) tutors and nonnative speaker (NNS) tutors locate and solve repairs in the NS-NNS and NNS-NNS tutorial discourse in an EFL setting. There are many factors to be considered in studying the two different genre of writing tutorials even within the same context of an EFL tutorial setting. The fact that the English proficiencies of each group of the tutors differ and also the fact that one group has been trained to tutor in a specific way while the other group have had no training or instructions at all attribute to the differences shown in each of the interactions. This study, however, does not focus on the outstanding differences of the two different sets of data but rather focuses on the

development of certain interactional issue in each of the tutorials which will help in better understanding of both groups of tutorial discourse and hopefully will propose important methods in which to further develop the efficient role of the writing center in an EFL environment. The study will also suggest some ideas as to how both groups of tutors can be trained appropriately in order to increase the effects of the tutorials.

## 2. Previous Literature

### 2.1 Repair Sequences

Many of the earlier studies on discourse have covered the issue of repair in discourse (Schegloff 2007, 2000, 1992; Schegloff, E., G. Jefferson & H. Sacks, 1977, Wong 1999). Although most of such research are based on the repair sequences in ordinary conversation, they do present basic ideas as to how the study of repair sequences can be applied to the genre of institutional discourse.

According to CA terms, repair is an orderly independent organization of conversational practices within the sequence of ongoing conversation. Repair is the system we use in conversation to "fix" our talk so that we can continue to talk, and it can be signaled by disfluencies, such as pauses and apparent errors on the part of the speaker which can be viewed as markers of incipient repair. First, repair practices can be analyzed in terms of which participant initiates, the self (self-initiation) or other (other-initiation). In the case of self-initiation, the speaker of the problematic talk, known as the trouble-source, initiates the repair. Next, the position relative to initial trouble source is considered in relation to the trouble-source. Repair is initiated around the trouble-source and in the same turn as the trouble-source, or right after it, in the next turn, or in the turn after that. Schegloff(2000) went on to emphasize the relationship between initiation and position, pointing out that other-initiated repair was initiated in the next turn after the trouble source, referred to as next turn repair initiators (NTRI's). Self-initiated repair occurred in all other positions. Self-initiated repair was initiated by the speaker of the trouble-source and completed in the same turn. However, other-initiated repair was initiated by a recipient of the problematic talk. After initiating the repair, the recipient left it to the

speaker of the trouble-source to complete the repair in the next turn, involving a sequential organization of action. Depending on the initiator of the repair and the actual person doing the repair, repair can be divided into four different types: self-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair, other-initiated self-repair, and other-initiated other repair. Each of these types holds an important place within the sequential turn-taking that goes on between the speakers and is considered to be included in the ongoing sequence as a form of expansions (Schegloff, 2007) within the interaction.

Repair in CA includes but does not limit to correction of a grammatical or lexical error and a major conceptual break concerning this occurred when Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977) introduced the notion of repair that was not limited to correction or errors, but could include word searches such as a name search, problems due to noise, or uncertain understandings that require confirmation. Another main aspect of their study was in showing that the analysis of repair in ordinary conversation showed strong empirical skewing in which self-repair predominates over other-repair, and an operation of a preference for self-repair in the organization of repair.

The tutorial data used in this study shows the opposite phenomena where other-repair may not be preferred in particular but does appear to be more dominant than self-repair in the tutor-tutee talk. The issue of locating disfluencies or errors and the various methods of doing the repair in the tutorial discourse is one of the main research quests of this paper. Another important aspect of this study is in studying the repair sequences in each of the two very different types of the writing tutorial discourse within the same EFL context. The study on the different appearances of repair sequence in each of the NS and NNS tutorial data will provide insight into the different pedagogical approaches of the NS and NNS tutors respectively, and will also allow ideas for future studies on improving the learning of students involved in the various types of tutorial discourse in EFL situations.

## 2.2 Writing Tutorials

Research on writing tutorials until now has addressed diverse issues, such as the role of tutors, the usage of certain sequential interaction within the tutorials

and the pedagogical implications that these studies lead to. Among them, Thonus (2004) and Weigle & Nelson (2004) discussed the tutor roles and their perceptions of the interaction with the tutees in tutorial sessions in an ESL environment. While these studies are based on the writing tutorials in the ESL contexts involving NS tutors, the study of Park (2007) and Jung (2007) discusses the tutorial sessions in an EFL context involving NNS tutors in their native language, Korean, and English respectively. These two papers differ in the aspect that the former uses the Korean data of the English writing tutorials while the latter uses the English data of the same group of Korean tutors, thus represented as NNS tutors in the latter study. Both analyses were conducted within the framework of conversation analysis (CA).

Park's (2007) study examines the use of tutor's questions in these tutorials. Her analysis shows that the tutor's questions play various roles in openings and closings, and also the main body of the tutorial. The study shows that in openings, questions are mainly used to estimate the tutee's writing difficulties, writing procedures, and previous writing experiences. In closings, they are used for preclosings or reminding the tutees of the remaining procedures that they must complete after the tutorial in order to receive his / her grades for the tutorial. Park's (2007) study also shows that in the main part of the tutorials, questions are closely related to the pedagogical nature of the tutorial, and the main functions include locating issues to be dealt with, clarifying unclear parts, confirming what is mentioned and suggested, and expressing doubts. Such results of the analysis show that questions in writing tutorials play a critical role for the tutor to accomplish interactional and pedagogical goals.

On the other hand, Jung (2007) focuses her study on the third turns of the NNS tutors holding the tutorials in English. Her study categorizes different functions of the third turns produced by NNS tutors and goes on to discuss the contingencies that appear in the third turns of tutor talk. The analysis of the data show that the tutor's third turns can be largely divided into two categories which is determined by the success or relevance of the tutee's second turn in response to the initial question given by the tutor. In the first case, where the tutee's response is successful, the third turn of the tutor acts as either a closing third, closing off the sequence, or an expansion of the sequence using multiple

questions. In the case where the student fails to give a relevant response, the tutor's third turn shows three diverse characteristics: first, the third turn redoes the initial questions; second, it recapitulates the second turn; or third, the third turn provides the initially intended response. In her study, she finds that some of the characteristics of tutor talk are induced by the nonnativeness of the tutor, which is a comparatively new area of study, and implications that such effects may have is also adapted within the current study.

### 3. Data

The data used in this paper consists of 7 tutorial data. They were all recorded from the Writing Center of the College English Program in Seoul National University. The aim of the writing center is to guide college students in writing properly structured English paragraphs. While having started with such aims, the center has now expanded to accommodate all students with any types of English writing, and in order to do so, the center recently employed native speakers (NS) of English as tutors. The NS tutors are there to accommodate undergraduates and graduate students with their variety of writing samples while the nonnative speaker (NNS) tutors continue to accommodate college English students with their English paragraphs. While it is mandatory for the College English students to visit the center at least once during the semester

**Table 1: Characteristics of the NS and NNS tutor discourse.**

	Nonnative Tutor (4)	Native Tutor (3)
Tutor	Advanced speakers of English, all native speakers of Korean - all pre-trained for the tutorials - graduate students	Native speakers of English, American(2), Korean-American - no pre-training, - both undergraduates
Tutee	CEP students (intermediate)	all students (advanced) no CEP students (not for grades)
Genre of Writing	paragraphs on given topics	free (letter, final paper, letter)
Length of Tutorial	±25 minutes	20-55 minutes

they are taking the College English course, it is only an option for other students who make the visit on their own need. The data used in this paper consists of 4 of the NNS tutor discourse dealing with students with the College English course requirement, and 3 of NS tutor discourse with free-written essays. The certain characteristics of the two different types of tutorials are shown in the following table.

As the table shows, the two types of tutorials show a great deal of difference. And in the following section, these different data will be analyzed in the ways of which the interaction of repair occurs in each of the data. The repair and correction discussed in this paper is on both the interactional discourse of the tutorial itself and the corrections done on the writing of the tutees.

#### 4. Analysis and Discussion

##### 4.1 Locating the trouble source

The two groups of data show different ways in which the tutors located the trouble source. While the data of NNS tutors show that most times the tutors used the method of asking questions in locating the trouble source, NS tutors show more tendencies to locate the trouble source directly. Also in the case of NNS discourse, the data show that some trouble sources were not located and were instead simply passed by in the process of the interaction.

##### 4.1.1 Using questions

The following two excerpts show examples of NNS tutors locating the trouble source by posing questions with an intention to solve the error. The first excerpt is an interaction between NNS tutor and NNS tutee and they are currently discussing the writing brought in by the tutee by reading through the passage line by line.

Ex. 1 Public Embarrassment (NNS; T: tutor, S: tutee)

- 1 T: I had a pork cutlet with friend. (.) a I as a as I ate for sometime. friend?
- 2 S: friend and I
- 3 T: okay, you've mentioned friend first,
- 4 S: yeah

- 5 T: then how about this, just ei friend? just a friend? A friend? THE friend?  
MY friend?
- 6 S: ah:: the friend
- 7 T: THE friend? Yeah ((checking sounds)) That might be better, because,  
(0.2) uh- is friend
- 8 countable (.) or uncountable?

In line 1, after the tutor detects a trouble source while reading through the writing of the tutee, she stops to locate the trouble source and make it aware to the tutee as well. The tutor repeats the word "friend" as a question letting the tutee know that she suspects use of such wording as an error in the sentence. In response, the tutee suggests a repair which is not what has been intended by the tutor and in line 3 and 5, the tutor attempts once again to get the correct response from the tutee by giving several suggestions to the tutee, and through this, they come to a solution which they agree on together. The second excerpt shows a similar method of locating the trouble source with a question posed by the tutor.

Ex. 2 The Navy (NNS; T: tutor, S: tutee)

- 1 T: (.) okay it locates in a bank (0.2) okay why is this (.) in a capital letter?  
hhh
- 2 ((sounds from outside))
- 3 S: .hh I'm sorry?
- 4 T: why is this in a capital letter?
- 5 S: uh
- 6 T: that was just a mistake?
- 7 S: yeah it was mistake hehahahhh-

In this excerpt, the tutor is making a comment on the section of the tutee's writing that she has just read aloud from. Then in line 1, the tutor poses a question about the error she has located in the writing. As in the first excerpt (Ex.1), rather than simply making the correction herself and "teaching" the student about the error, the tutor locates the trouble source by asking a question. By asking this question, the tutor and tutee arrive at the conclusion together in line 6 and 7 that the trouble source was a mistake and continues the talk from there on.

Locating the trouble source in this way shows that the tutor acknowledges her own status as the tutor as a helper rather than a teacher. While this way of tutoring does seem to take up more time than simply locating the problem and directly solving it, it does seem to hold the possibility of a more effective learning on the part of the tutee by giving them the chance to think about the trouble source once again and come up with the correct alternative in negotiation with the tutor rather than be simply "informed" by the tutor. The following section shows a somewhat different tendency of locating the trouble source of the NS tutors.

#### 4.1.2 Direct location

Unlike the data of NNS tutor discourse, the NS tutor discourse shows that they choose to locate the trouble source directly and also solve the problem directly without much discussion or negotiation with the tutee. While the issue of direct solving of the trouble source will be discussed later, the following excerpt shows an example of direct locating of the trouble source.

##### Ex. 4 Writing Emails (NS; J: tutor, S: tutee)

- 1 J: .hh Additionally, (0.4) UH:::m (.) (a) growing number of (abandoned) pet  
is- a is one of
- 2 social issues in Korea, (.) .hh okay, so- (.) gro:wing numBERS make it  
plural right there,
- 3 (.) a, abandoned PETS, (.) i:::s, (0.2) u:::hm, (0.2)

The tutor is reading through the essay brought in by the tutee, and after the reading of the sentence with the trouble source, the tutor pauses a while before making a direct reference to the trouble source found in the sentence read. Instead of posing a question on the matter or making indirect references to it allowing the tutee to think it over, the tutor rather chooses to point out the trouble source directly and also makes the correction at the same time.

The following is an excerpt from another NS tutorial discourse where the tutor, once again, makes a direct location of the trouble source found in the tutee's writing.

Ex. 5 Veterinarian (NS; C: tutor, S: tutee)

- 1 C: ((starts reading)) I was a vet student- (0.2) a::hhh to me? Vet student sounds kind of weird,
- 2 Ve-te-ri-na-ri-an ((says it loud as he writes)) is right
- 3 S: yeah? okay

In this excerpt, the tutor does not even get to the end of the sentence holding the trouble source before he locates the problem. He stops mid-sentence to locate the problematic area in the writing. Before giving the correct alternative of the trouble source, he first explains why he has made the stop and points out the trouble source at the same time. This is similar and yet slightly different from the NS tutor in Ex. 5, in that while he is still making a direct location of the problem, the tutor in Ex. 6 gives an explanation which should allow the tutee to think of the problem a while, before the actual correct form is given by the tutor.

The two sections just covered showed the different cases of problem locating by the NNS and NS tutors. Before addressing the matter of making the actual repair of the trouble sources that were found, the following subsection notes another type of handling of problematic areas; continued interaction while leaving the trouble source unattended.

4.1.3 Passing by the trouble source

This section deals with a certain aspect of dealing with trouble sources that appears only in the NNS tutor discourse. The excerpts in this section show that sometimes the trouble source is ignored while the interaction continues between the tutor and tutee without making note of an apparent problem in the produced talk. The data show that such "ignoring" of the problem mainly occurs in the conversation about the writing rather than in the process of reading and editing of the writing itself.

Ex. 6 Embarrassing Moment (NNS; T: tutor, S: tutee)

- 1 S: okay um (0.4) I was (.) on (0.5) traveling (.)
- 2 T: uh huh=
- 3 S: =Europe (0.4) so ha I (0.3) losing my passport (.)
- 4 T: mmmhm
- 5 S: I mean I'm- um losing passport is-

## 6 T: losing

In the above excerpt, the tutee shows apparent difficulty in producing the talk that appears in line 1. The pauses that appear between the words support this idea. Even with all the pauses in between, the tutee makes a grammatical mistake on the preposition “on” in line 1 which is passed on by the tutor who acknowledges the tutee’s speech with the acknowledgment token, ‘uh huh’. Then, in line 3, the tutee makes another mistake which he tries to make a repair of in line 5 without any prompting from the tutor but ends up producing another trouble source to which the tutor finally responds and makes a repair. The following excerpt shows another similar example.

Ex. 7 Public Embarrassment (NNS; T: tutor; S: tutee)

- 1 T: ending of the paragraph. And yang-gwal-sik<sup>1)</sup>?
- 2 S: both sentences is topic sentence
- 3 T: yes. topic sentence is up here above in the beginning and at the
- 4 ending right?
- 5 S: yeah

In this excerpt, the tutor is explaining the various ways of including topic sentences into a paragraph. In the process of replying to the question asked by the tutor, the tutee makes an apparent grammatical mistake in line 2. But rather than locating or correcting this mistake, the tutor accepts the response and continues with her explanation. The two excerpts in this section, which shows similar and yet slightly different forms of passing by apparent trouble sources leaves one to wonder the reasons for doing so. The fact that such “ignoring” of the trouble source did not appear anywhere, at all, in the NS discourse indicates that this is characteristic of the NNS tutor alone of which the reasons could be speculated in various ways. First of all, it may be due to the fact that the tutors choose not to make a special note of smaller errors in order to allow the interaction to flow smoothly. Errors which they do not deem especially essential in the process of their interaction may be lightly ignored in

---

1) A Korean phrase for paragraphs with topic sentences in two places; at the beginning and at the end.

order to help the flow of the interaction. Another factor may be that, although the errors can be clearly seen after it has been transcribed like in the above, it may not catch the attention of the tutor during the interaction, or at least until the same mistake is made again (Ex.1). On the other hand, the NS tutor data showed that the tutor located every little grammatical error in both the tutee's speech and writing which may indicate that such passing by of the NNS tutors may result from the difference in the language proficiencies of the two groups of tutors. Or, it may indicate the different tutorials goals of each group of tutors. Yet, once again, this issue is another one to be discussed within a different scope of study.

#### 4.2 Doing repair: solving the problem

##### 4.2.1 Direct repair: on the spot correction

The two excerpts used here are the same ones used to represent the excerpts in the previous section of direct location of the trouble source. It can be seen in the NS data that most of the time the tutors make a direct correction on the trouble source they have located and the following excerpts show this well.

Ex. 4-1 Writing Emails (NS; J: tutor, S: tutee)

- 1 J: .hh Additionally, (0.4) UH:::m (.) (a) growing number of (abandoned) pet  
is- a is one of
- 2 social issues in Korea,(.) .hh okay, so- (.) grow:ing numBERS make it  
plural right there,
- 3 (.) a, abandoned PETS, (.) i:::s, (0.2) u:::hm, (0.2)
- 4 S: a, are? Is that- (0.2) should be (are?)
- 5 J: (0.2) .hh YEAH yeah it should cus' (that's just how) (.) you're talking  
about PETS is general,
- 6 S: mm mm

As the above excerpt shows, the tutor locates the problem in the tutee's writing and thus, makes a short pause at the end of the sentence instead of carrying on in the middle of line 2. And then in the following sentence, the tutor makes a direct repair on the two trouble sources that was located while reading through the sentence. Another interesting point is that following the correction of the one section suggested by the tutor, the tutee is able to pick up on the

stalling pause of the tutor at the end of his turn in line 3 and make a suggestion as to what she thinks is the answer that the tutor has in mind. The tutor then gives an explanation as to why it is correct to make the changes that he did. This is an interesting factor in that such instances did not show to appear in the NNS tutor discourse. Not only does the NNS tutor rarely make a direct correction on the errors of the tutees, even in the case of correcting their grammar,<sup>2)</sup> but also there were no cases in NNS tutorials where tutees took an active stance as the tutee in the above excerpt (line 4) and made suggestions for a repair or correction themselves. The following excerpt shows another example of direction correction done by the tutor.

Ex. 5-1 Veterinarian (NS; C: tutor, S: tutee)

- 1 C: ((starts reading)) I was a vet student- (0.2) a::hhh to me? Vet student sounds kind of weird,
- 2 Ve-te-ri-na-ri-an ((says it loud as he writes)) is right
- 3 S: yeah? okay

In this excerpt, it is not the grammar but the choice of vocabulary that has become the trouble source in the tutee's writing. In locating this trouble source, the tutor goes on to make a direct repair by giving the better alternative for the

---

2) In many of the cases in NNS tutorial discourse, even the correction on grammatical aspects showed interaction such as the following:

My Hometown (NNS; A: tutor, S: tutee)

- 1 A: a::nd (0.2) these (are) your your memories, so it should be in the past tense (0.2)
- 2 do you know past tense?
- 3 S: (past tense?)
- 4 A: PAsT tense um
- 5 S: Oh (past tense)
- 6 A: ((writing sounds)) wa::s
- 7 S: a:h yes wa:l:s

Rather than just doing the repair or correcting it on the spot, the tutor uses the form of questions in inducing certain aspects of grammar that should be changed in the tutee's writing. Obviously, this is not the case in all NNS tutorials and there are some cases where short, direct corrections were made, but majority of the time, even the corrections on grammar were mitigated like this.

word used by the tutee in her writing (lines 1-2), and this repair is accepted by the tutee in her next turn.

#### 4.2.2 Mitigated Repair

Unlike the NS tutor discourse where most repairs are initiated and solved by the tutor within one turn, the NNS tutor discourse showed otherwise. Not only in the first part where the tutor and tutee discuss the structure of paragraphs, but also in the second part of the tutorials where they read through the paragraph together and made grammatical corrections, did the tutor mostly mitigate the initiation and the resolving of the repairs. The following excerpt is an interaction about the paragraph structure between a NNS tutor and tutee. In the talk just preceding this excerpt, the tutor and tutee have been looking for the topic of the paragraph and this is the extended talk on that topic.

Ex. 8 My Hometown (NNS; A: tutor, S: tutee)

- 1 A: okay then you're talking about there are t- there are your cherished (.) place?
- 2 S: um
- 3 A: in childhood and cherished friends, right?
- 4 S: ye:s
- 5 A: so:: (0.3) o::h ma::ybe (.) uh, it's better to
- 6 S: ((sniffing sound))
- 7 A: uh;; (0.2) write this paragraph more longer? (.) a:nd (.) if you want to focus (.) the PLACE here
- 8 then you have to give us more example about the Gwangju (.2) well maybe in Seoul, it was hard
- 9 for you-(.) ah? (0.2)
- 10 S: Gwangjin

In the case of this example, the tutor is suggesting a repair in the structure of the tutee's writing. It's not a direct correction on the actual sentence or wording of the writing but an attempted repair on the general structure of the paragraph. After checking the intended topic of the tutee's writing by stating the tutor's own understanding of it in lines 1 and 3, she starts making a suggestion for the repair in line 3. And rather than just suggesting a repaired version or telling the tutee to make the repair, the tutor gives a mitigated version of the

repair by saying "o:h ma::ybe (.) uh, it's better to write this paragraph more longer?" Similar mitigation of the repair can be found again in the following excerpt.

Ex. 9 Public Embarrassment (NNS; T: tutor, S: tutee)

- 1 S: in a high school=  
 2 T: =in a high school, in my high school, (.) when I was second grader second  
 year student  
 3 (0.2) in my high school, in MY high school it might be better (.) I think  
 4 S: in MY?  
 5 T: (yea-) in MY high school  
 6 S: o:h, (0.3) when I was in the second grade in my high school=  
 7 T: = o:r (0.2) how about this, when I was the second year grad-,I mean,  
 HIGH school student?  
 8 S: (0.4) ah::  
 9 T: yeah  
 10 S: in my second grade HIGH school  
 11 T: second second year, second grade, in the second grade right? But- (0.2)  
 what I'm-what I said  
 12 is when I was the second year (.) high school student  
 13 S: a::h  
 14 T: yes  
 15 (0.6)  
 16 T: well:: think about it for yourself and then choose it okay?  
 17 S: hhhh hehe yea-

In this excerpt, the student is reading aloud the paragraph she has brought in for tutoring. While she is still reading, the tutor detects a problem and interrupts the tutee's reading by repeating the problematic phrase. After repeating the problematic phrase, the tutor makes a repair and produces the repaired version. But rather than enforce the repair directly to the tutee, the tutor reads the entire sentence containing the trouble source once again with the repaired version and uses mitigation to suggest the repair to the tutee. Then, as the tutee accepts the repair and re-reads the sentence with the repaired version, the tutor cuts her off again with yet another version. This time, it is not entirely mitigated, but is still done in the form of a suggestion. The tutee picks this up but her turn in line 10 shows that the actual repair intended by the

tutor has not been correctly integrated within the tutee's version of the repair. In line 11-12, the tutor attempts another try at the repair by giving her originally intended version, "when I was a second year high school student" to which the tutee does respond (line 13) but also which the long pause in line 15 shows that the tutee did not entirely grasp the idea. In the following turn, instead of continually pursuing her version of the repair, the tutor subsides and leaves the tutee to make the final choice between the two variations of repair that she suggested. In this case, it seems that the buffering and mitigation of the tutor brought on further confusion to the tutee, which suggests that it might have been better if the repair had been made directly by the tutor from the beginning. The repeated utterances of the tutor in making the repair also suggests that mitigation on the part of the tutor is not always the result of wanting to lessen the force of the corrections but rather that the tutors themselves are sometimes not perfectly sure of the repair to be made. In other words, the mitigated repairs may be produced in order to lessen the effect of a repair that may be not grammatically correct either.

#### 4.2.3 Enhancing learning: offering explanations and examples

It was noted in the previous section that NS tutors tend to locate and solve the trouble sources in the tutee's spoken and written products while NNS tutors' data showed that they used the questions and mitigations in doing so. It was also noted that the NNS tutors made use of the questions in locating the trouble sources as a way to enhance the tutees' learning in some aspects, i.e., giving them a chance to think over the trouble source themselves or search for the correct form together with the tutor. Whether this enhanced learning was intended by the tutors or happened by chance in the process taken by the NNS tutors is another issue to be studied separately. In the case of NS tutorial data, such instances could not be found. However, the interaction following the direct location and correction of the trouble sources showed that they used a different method of using post-expansions following their repair sequences in making further elaborations or explanations of the correcting or repair they did. The following excerpt is a longer version of Ex. 5.

Ex. 10 Veterinarian (NS; C: tutor, S: tutee)

- 1 C: ((starts reading)) I was a vet student (0.2) a::hhh to me? Vet student sounds kind of weird,  
 2 Ve-te-ri-na-ri-an ((says it loud as he writes)) is right  
 3 S: yeah?  
 4 C: yea- 'cause VET itself sounds like an occupation  
 5 S: oh,  
 6 C: It's like saying, I'm a doctor student  
 7 S: ehehhehe (.) okay

As it has already been discussed in previous sections, the tutor locates the trouble source and solves it within his same turn in line 1 and 2. To this repair, the tutee responds with a "yeah?" which acknowledges the change and questions it at the same time. In the turn that follows, the tutor elaborates on his reason for repair and goes on to give the example of "doctor student" which illustrates the reason as to why the changes he suggested need be made and this is accepted by the tutee. The following excerpt is an example where the tutor does a post-expansion to explain the particular grammatical error made by the tutee.

Ex. 11 Writing Emails (NS; J: tutor, S: tutee)

- 1 J: .hh ((resumes reading)), unfortunately, each vet- has every, (.) ha::s every different answers to  
 2 those questions, they sometimes give old fashioned, wrong answers (.)hh cause behavioral  
 3 medicine is not yet established in Korea this is good- u::m, (.) okay, .hhh ha (0.2) .hhhhh  
 4 cus-, (.) cus each vet has (0.2) uh- n-NOT? (0.3) every different answer?  
 5 S: mm hmm  
 6 J: (.) cus- (.) EVERY corresponds to:: (.) uh::m, a- a group, that, a, (that's) simil- or  
 7 different things, (.) or a group of .hh separate- (but) similar things,?=  
 8 S: =hhh [uhheha ha  
 9 J: [ahhuh, so- it- it kinda doesn't- (.) these don' go wel-, these don' go-  
 10 these don't match up at ALL  
 11 S: uh huh,  
 12 J: so:: every, EACH vet, a: ha:s HA:S a different answer, (.)OH; it's b'cus you have each vet,  
 13 S: (ah:::)  
 14 J: so it's a singular

- 15 S: uh huh  
 16 J: so it has a:: (it has to follow) a: singular singular?  
 17 S: oh (.) ah- right=  
 18 J: =and then, let's see-

This example differs from other NS tutorials in that the tutor offers the explanation for the repair before actually doing the repair. While reading through the essay, the tutor locates two trouble sources which he addresses by repeating the problematic parts with a questioning form. In response, the tutee produces a continuer, "mm hmm" to which the tutor continues to give his explanation of the error. The tutee's laughter in line 8 indicates that she understands the explanation and also realizes the mistake in her writing. In line 12, the tutor makes the repair and further elaborates on the grammatical explanation based on the tutee's mistake which is accepted by the tutee and then, the tutor tracks back to the original sequence.

## 5. Conclusion

The current study examined the different ways of locating and solving repairs in the EFL writing center tutorials involving native speaker tutors and nonnative speaker tutors. The analysis showed that the repair sequences in this particular institutional discourse differed from that of the ordinary discourse in that other-repair is predominant over self-repair. Also, it showed a vast difference between the ways in which NS tutor and NNS tutors carried out the locating and solving of the problematic areas within the discourse. While the NS tutors showed preference to directly locate the trouble source and do the repair themselves directly, NNS tutors showed a different preference as to "go around" the trouble source in using questions to locate the trouble source and mitigating the correction they made on the trouble source. The NNS tutor data also showed some instances where the tutors chose to overlook the trouble source and continue with the ongoing interaction. Both the NS and NNS tutors used the trouble source area to enhance the tutee's learning: former by the way of added explanations and examples and latter by the way of using questions and

reaffirming during the entire process of doing the repair.

This study also showed that apart from the English proficiency of the tutors, the issue of tutor-training may be of greater effect than was considered. While most of the direct locating and repairs done by the NS tutors seemed to be based on the intuitive, "on the spot" tutoring methods, the NNS tutor discourse showed, as less fluent as they seem, that more thought and preparation has effected the ways the tutors process their tutorials. This leads to the implication of the findings that tutor-training is needed for both the NS and NNS tutors in some extent. And despite the difference in genres of writing brought in by the tutees, there is a need for certain amount of decided protocol on the tutorial proceedings to be followed by all tutors.

There are limitations to this study in that further research into the sociolinguistic effects of the two different types of tutors have not been included and that a larger range of tutorials may prove otherwise from the assumptions made in this current study. I do hope, however, that the findings in this study will contribute to a better understanding of the different types of tutor discourse and the various ways in which interaction in the different tutorials are carried out; and hopefully will be of use in improving the awareness and effects of tutor training.

## References

- Heritage, J. & A. Roth (1995). Grammar and institution: Questions and questioning in the broadcast news interview. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 28: 1, 1-60.
- Jung, H. (2007). The study of third-turns in EFL writing tutorial discourse. MA thesis. Seoul National University.
- Kim, Y. (2008). Advice-giving in EFL writing tutorial sessions: the initiation and the reception of advice in the interaction between the nonnative tutor and the nonnative tutee. MA thesis, Seoul National University.
- Lee, Y-A. (2007). Third turn position in teacher talk: Contingency and the work of teaching. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39, 180-222.
- Park, Y. (2007). The use of questions in EFL writing tutorial discourse. *담화와*

인지, 14, 73-98.

- Schegloff, E. (2007). *Sequence Organization in Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. (2000). When "others" initiate repair. *Applied Linguistics*, 21, 205-243.
- Schegloff, E. (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology* 98, 1296-1345.
- Schegloff, E., G. Jefferson & H. Sacks (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language* 53, 361-382.
- Thonus, T. (2004). What are the differences? Tutor interaction with first- and second-language writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13, 227-242.
- Weigle, S. & G. Nelson (2004). Novice tutors and their ESL tutees: Three case studies of tutor roles and perceptions of tutorial success. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13, 203-225.
- Wong, J. (1999). Delayed next turn repair initiation in native/non-native speaker English Conversation. *Applied Linguistics*, 21 (1), 244-267.

**ABSTRACT**

**Locating and Solving Repairs  
in EFL Tutorial Discourse:  
Comparative Study of NS and NNS Tutors**

Hanbyul Jung

Jung, Hanbyul. 2009. *Locating and solving repairs in EFL tutorial discourse: comparative study of NS and NNS tutors*. 영학논집. This study investigates the difference in the ways of native speaker tutors and nonnative speaker tutors in locating and solving repairs in an EFL writing tutorial discourse, within the framework of Conversation Analysis (CA). Based on two previous studies (Park 2007, Jung 2007) which studied the tutor discourse of nonnative tutees in the same context, the current study focuses on the comparative forms of dealing with repairs of the native tutors and nonnative tutors. The analysis consists of two parts, location of the trouble source and the act of doing the repairs, and further breaks each of the two parts down to three subsections: using questions, direct location and passing by the trouble source in the first part of the analysis; and direct repair, mitigated repair and learning enhancement in the second part of the analysis each concerning the location of the repair and solving of the repair respectively. This study further discusses the development of interactional issues in each of the respective tutorials and hopes to better the understanding of tutorial discourse through this study.

*Key Words* Writing Center, tutorial discourse, native speaker and nonnative speaker discourse, repair, Conversation Analysis