

A Discourse Analysis of Writing Tutorials: with Reference to the Dominance in Nonnative Tutors and Nonnative Tutees

Yun Jung Kim
(Seoul National University)

Kim, Yun Jung. 2007. A Discourse Analysis of Writing Tutorials: with Reference to the Dominance in Nonnative Tutors and Nonnative Tutees. *SNU Working Papers in English Linguistics and Language* 6, 14-34. This study examines the writing tutorial discourse, analyzing its characteristics which show dominance. The current study situates itself with the line of research, i.e., examination of NNS-NNS tutorial discourse in EFL setting. It aims to provide a detailed description of the NNS-NNS EFL tutorial discourse, following the former studies on NS-NNS ESL tutoring sessions. This study tries to analyze the purely quantitative, topical and interactional dominance of the NNS tutor within the NNS-NNS tutorial discourse. Quantitative dominance is conducted by simply measuring the turn length of the tutor and the tutee. Topical dominance is investigated by analyzing how tutors take charge and hold the floor. Interactional dominance is deeply examined in three subjects: directiveness (mitigation), refusal of advice and small talk. After a thorough examination on these three different aspects of dominance in NNS-NNS EFL tutorial discourse, the result will be compared and contrasted with those of NS-NNS tutorial discourse.

Keywords: writing tutorial discourse, quantitative dominance, topical dominance, interactional dominance, NNS

1. Introduction

The writing center in the U.S. first appeared in the 1930s and thence it has become known for its important role in university education in aiding writing instruction across curriculum. First from writing laboratory to writing clinic, and again from writing clinic to writing center, the name of the writing center has changed, which in turn has made the role and the content of the session convert.

Thus, it was only recently that the number of tutorial data based on current collaboration-focused perspective has been used as an object of

the investigation and as we can presuppose from the frequent change of its name, most of the studies on writing tutorial session are considering how to define it (Boquet 1999, Kinkead and Harris 1993, Murphy and Law 1995, Trimbur 1987). How to deal with the relationship between the tutor and the tutee became their main interest. And they have concluded that the tutorial discourse between the NS tutor and the NS tutee is in a collaborative peer frame.

As the frame of writing center tutorials places emphasis on collaboration between the tutor and the tutee (Thonus 1999, Williams 2005), the tutor is expected and trained to be a peer rather than an authoritative figure. Consequently, the tutee is also expected to be an equal partner in the collaboration, one who has the ownership of the writing and thus is responsible for it.

However, actual writing tutorial discourse, especially between the NS tutor and the NNS tutee, seems to have conflict in setting the frame of the writing tutorials as a collaborative peer frame. Different from NS tutees, NNS tutees do not always seem to share the same writing tutorial frame as a collaborative one. They often expect tutors to have more authority than themselves as professors do. This mismatch can lead the NS-NNS tutoring discourse to be different from the NS-NS tutoring discourse.

This paper will consider the writing tutorial discourse between the NNS tutor and the NNS tutee, which has not been fully understood and investigated yet. The tutorial discourse between the NNS tutor and the NNS tutee has been scarcely an object of analysis, and it was only English as a Second Language (hereafter ESL) setting writing tutorial that has been focused of investigation. How English as a Foreign Language (hereafter EFL) setting writing center frames its shape and how the NNS tutor and the NNS tutee expect each other to interact have not yet been investigated. Without thoroughly examining the setting, the EFL writing tutorials have simply accepted the tutor preparation and practice program of the already existing program used in NS-NS setting.

2. Review of literature

As shown above, writing tutorial sessions were recently considered as

the research subject. Small in number of studies, but also limited number of framework used is the key characteristic of studies in writing tutorial discourse. Within those limited studies, most of them have scrutinized writing tutorials within the framework of interactional sociolinguistics (Kim 2001, Thonus 1999, 2004, Young 1992, Williams 2005). Among them, this section provides five renown works, three from the works of Thonus (1999, 2004) and the work of Williams (2005) and Young (1992). However, to view tutorial discourse in the view of dominance, one must define the concept "dominance".

Dominance is inherently a quantitative-oriented concept. It is a matter of "having a large proportion of the ground at one's disposal, of getting more of the goods and services available in the interaction (Linell, Gustavsson and Juvonen 1988: 415)."Dominance in dialogue can be analyzed in a number of different dimensions. Among them, the current study, following the work of Linell, Gustavsson and Juvonen (1988), distinguishes between the following three: quantitative dominance, topical dominance and interactional dominance.

Quantitative dominance is related to the amount of speech produced. The participant who dominates the dialogue is the one who says the most words or talks most of the time. Topical dominance could be understood in the matter of introduction of new content words. The individual who dominates dialogue is the one who tries to put the most content into the discourse, and the one who places the most topics and subtopics on the floor. Interactional dominance can be understood in terms of the communicative actions, initiatives, and responses taken by the interlocutors. The dominant participant is the one who manages to direct and control the other party's actions to the greatest extent. He also avoids being directed and controlled in his own interactive behavior (Linell, Gustavsson and Juvonen 1988).

Thonus is the leading figure in the literatures on the NS-NNS tutorial discourse. In her study in 2004, Thonus explores and describes the nature of interactions between writing center tutors and NS and NNS tutees. Thonus focuses on tutors' different structure of interaction and behaviour as well as that those of NNS tutees. What she has found in this article is that NS tutors have more dominated the discourse with NNS tutee than with NS tutee, due to the fact that "the expertise of tutors as NSs of English places the NNS tutee in a learner's, not a collaborator's, position (Thonus 2004)."

In her earlier work, Thonus (1999) investigates the tutor dominance in academic writing tutorials within the framework of institutional discourse. She considers the genders of the tutor and tutees, language proficiency (whether the tutee is native or non-native), and the interaction of the three as exponents of interactant dominance. By measuring the frequency of the directives, directive type, and mitigation strategies, she concludes that institutional context is the primary factor that determines participant roles and the tutor dominance behaviour. The dominance of the tutor is slight different between NS tutee and NNS tutee, which in turn questions peer-setting, collaboration frame of writing center tutoring discourse, which was accepted as normal.

Williams (2005) examines the structure of the tutoring discourse and contrasts NS-NS tutoring discourse with NS-NNS tutoring discourse. She has found out that some characteristics of tutor-tutee interaction are more prominent in sessions with NNS tutees: the diagnosis phase and tutor turn length tends to be longer in interaction with NNS tutees. In addition, the amount and the characteristic of tutor interruptions of NS and NNS writers differs, with tutors more likely to make supportive interruptions that rescue NNS tutees. The bulk of advice is far greater in NS tutee sessions than in NNS tutee sessions. Tutors in her study are generally more direct in their suggestions to NNS tutees than to NS tutees. From this, she argues that the notion of peer-ness becomes problematic in NS-NNS tutoring discourse and, by investigating interactional features, concludes that the native tutors' dominancy increased significantly in discourse with NNS tutees.

Young (1992) has videotaped 19 NS-NS and NS-NNS tutorials and then has interviewed each participant. Her research goals are (a) whether "comfortable" or "uncomfortable moments" in tutorials could be correlated with the tutor and student use of politeness strategies, and (b) which politeness strategies were successful with Asian tutees. She has discovered that NNSs want their tutors to be "wise, professional, and distant," equivalent to their cultural preference. These students favored direct speech acts, including unmitigated imperatives, from their tutors instead of the indirect, mitigated suggestions characteristic of the politeness in America culture. The NNS tutees feel a strong hatred to such expressions, which they said was confusing and makes them doubt on the validity of the tutor comment.

3. Data and methodology

3.1 Data description

The data presented in this study come from the writing center at Seoul National University (SNU), South Korea. Six tutoring sessions were conducted in English and recorded; and among them, the data used in this study consists of three sessions. As the topic of the current paper desires to see is the dominance in NNS-NNS tutoring discourse, possible variables were deleted. Gender differences surely influence the discourse in relation to dominance (Tannen 1993), accordingly this study only uses discourse data between the female tutor and the male tutee. Especially, the female tutor and the male tutee discourses were selected, because those tutorials were considered perfectly proper to judge the dominance in role differences, not the gender differences. Investigating tutorial sessions between the male tutor and the female tutee in the aspect of dominance might confuse the reason of the dominant pattern, whether the dominant pattern is due to gender difference or status difference.

The topic of the writing can also affect the dominance of the tutoring discourse. Familiarity with topic, comprising a certain amount of relevant knowledge has been reported to have significant influence on speaking or writing to second language learners (Details can be found in Selinker and Douglas 1985, Pulido 2003). Subjective descriptive and narrative writing was thought to be the best topic that the tutee might be familiar with, so tutoring on narrative and subjective descriptive writings were selected.

The sessions are given by 3 different tutors (A-C) and three different students. All the sessions were named after the writing materials: guard box #1, passport and Ilsan. All tutors but one (in tutoring session Ilsan) are nonnative speakers of English but have had experiences living in U.S. (more than 4 years). One tutor is a native speaker and is the only undergraduate tutor. All the other tutors are graduate students. Yet all tutors were younger than tutees, the tutor's studying in undergraduate did not affect the tutoring session. In retrospective participant interviews, even the tutee in session Ilsan did not recognized that the tutor was an undergraduate student. The students in these sessions are college undergraduates taking the College English programs. It was mandatory

for them to visit the writing center at least once during the semester in which they are taking the College English Course. All students are nonnative speakers of English, with an average TEPS score of 550-700. The tutoring session can be done in either Korean or English, and it was the students who had the choice. Most of the students choose Korean, as it is easier for them to understand and communicate in their mother tongue. As tutoring in English is rare, selected tutoring session in English shows high motivation of the tutee's participation. Through the retrospective participant interview, the tutee illuminated their purpose of the English tutoring session, which was to practice speaking English with fluent English speaking tutors.

Each of the data was separately audio-recorded by the tutors and was consent to use the recorded data for analysis. A colleague and I transcribed the collected material following the conventions in Conversation Analysis, a useful tool to use for detailed transcriptions (cf. Atkinson and Heritage 1984, Also see Appendix).

The participant retrospective interviews have also been conducted. Tutors and tutees were asked after listening the recorded data or seeing the transcript of their tutoring what was their intention when they said specific words or sequences.

3.2 Methodological procedure: interactional sociolinguistics

The methodology used in this study is an interactional sociolinguistics. Schiffrin (1996) explains this framework as "a methodology that combined the best of conversation analysis and ethnographic techniques and attempts to deal with the problem of intersubjectivity (Schiffrin 1996: 316)." Interactional sociolinguistics, "the study of the linguistic and social construction of interaction," provides "a framework within which to analyze social context and to incorporate participants' own understanding of context into the inferencing of meaning" (Ibid: 316). It links naturalistic data collection with narrow transcription and attention to details of the interaction, and checks of the analyst's interpretations with the participants themselves holding retrospective participant interview.

Interactional sociolinguistics provides an approach to discourse that focuses upon situated meanings. It views "discourse as a social interaction

in which the emergent construction and negotiation of meaning is facilitated by the use of language (Schiffrin 1994: 134)". We are able to communicate with other people in our everyday interaction. That is, we implicitly or explicitly know how language works in interaction and what it implies. The meaning of language and the works of language varies among different situations. So, understanding each others' language is only possible when we share the work of language in specific condition. What interactional sociolinguistics is trying to do is "uncover the knowledge that all of us already have (Schiffrin 1996: 322)".

The interactional sociolinguistic framework rejects the notion that a full understanding of an interaction can be established solely from the text. This is because an interactional sociolinguistic perspective fundamentally suggests as basic that the lexical items and the syntax where they occur always underdetermine the rich interpretation assigned to any interaction (Grice 1975, Gumperz 1982). Analysis of the text alone is insufficient for uncovering participants' inferences that are crucial elements of the interpretation and the emergent context.

The situated context considered to provide important norms. For instance, the situated context of the Korean university classroom provides norms for the participant roles of instructor and student. The situated Korean university classroom might be different from that of U.S.A. university classroom, so if we are to understand the discourse in Korean university classroom, the context 'Korean university' is the most prominent. Therefore, it is without question that to fully understand the discourse, one must comprehend beforehand the situated context of the discourse. In this respect, interactional sociolinguistics is ideally suited to not only NS-NNS interaction research but also NNS-NNS interaction research, in which multiple contexts of analysis must be considered.

As shown in section 2, various works connected to writing tutorials have been using interactional sociolinguistics for their framework. This is due to the fact that interactional sociolinguistics can not only show detailed analysis of discourse itself, but also deal with ongoing cross-linguistic and cross-cultural interaction. In line with these studies, the current study also uses interactional sociolinguistics as its framework. By doing this, this study hopes to help thorough understanding of the NNS-NNS EFL writing tutorials.

4. Analysis and discussion

This section consists of three subsections quantitative dominance, topical dominance and interactional dominance. NNS tutors constantly indicates overwhelming dominance whether it is quantitative, topical or interactional over NNS tutees.

4.1 Quantitative dominance

The quantitative dominant status of tutors in tutoring discourse has been found in numerous studies of NNS writers as we saw in section 2. The signal of quantitative dominance is a longer turn length. Table 1 below is the turn length in number of words in NNS-NNS tutoring discourse. Tutors talk on average 50% more than their tutees, in the same manner as the NS-NNS tutoring discourse. Considering that the tutee in English speaking tutoring session has strong motivation to speak English with the tutors, the turn length difference clearly shows the dominance of the tutor.

TABLE 1
Turn Length in Number of Words; NNS-NNS

Tutoring session	Writer mean turn length	Tutor mean turn length	Writer-tutor difference	Ratio
<i>Guard box #1</i>	4.57	9.5	4.93	2.07
<i>Passport</i>	4.00	12.11	8	3.02
<i>Ilsan</i>	7.85	18.7	10.85	2.38

In two writing tutorial sessions, guard box #1 and passport, the writer mean turn length is 4.57 and 4.00 each. If we analyze the actual token used in these sessions, we can easily find that tutees frequently use backchannels or minimal responses, such as *yeah*, *OK*, *uh huh* or *umm*. After removing all the backchannels and minimal responses, the writer

mean tutor length is much smaller than shown above. This clearly indicates the NNS tutor's quantitative dominance over that of the NNS tutee, which is far more overwhelming than NS tutor's quantitative dominance over that of NNS tutee.

4.2 Topical dominance

This section consists of two subsections; opening writing tutorial session and holding the floor. Opening writing tutorial session has been known as unique characteristic of NS-NNS writing tutorials. That is, there is no overtly shown dominance by the tutor in opening writing tutorial session when the writing tutorial is given by the NS tutor to the NS tutee.

4.2.1 Opening writing tutorial session

Opening the writing tutorial session might be demonstrated in various ways. However, the typical characteristic of the NS-NNS tutorial opening is that the tutor sets the goal of the tutoring session. In NS-NNS settings, the tutor frequently gives orders to his/her NNS tutee on how a tutorial should be handled, something that was not found in the NS session.

In NNS-NNS session, opening the writing tutorial session wholly belongs to the tutor. Despite the fact that the tutee's expectation or view of the tutoring session is questioned in survey carried out before the session, the tutoring session is likely to be conducted within the tutor's design. The excerpt below shows clear example of the tutor's topical dominance over the tutee. After conducting a survey, and finding out the tutee's aim of this writing tutorial session with the help of the survey, the tutor asks the tutee again what is his purpose or his aim of the visiting writing center.

(1) Passport

01 →T: what was the most important >you know< most difficult

02 thing for you (0.3) when write- writing

03 S: uh::

04 T: this short paragraph, short? ((laughing)) okay

05 →S: ah:: the ah:: (0.6) choose the vocabulary and=

- 06 T: =uh huh
 07 →S: (0.2) grammar which- how grammar >how how I express
 08 my feeling
 09 T: >uh huh< how to express your feeling
 10 S: um hum
 11 T: yeah
 12 S: yeah=
 13 T: =may be it is one of the most import- most uh >what
 14 ever< most difficult thing for Koreans,
 15 S: um
 16 T: because you're not used to express your express >you
 17 know< your feeling
 18 S: yeah
 19 T: and emotion, (0.2) so (0.4) that's one of thing that are
 20 → funny in your paragraph, actually ((laugh)) okay, and
 21 anything else? <so, (0.2) you think that you (led)
 22 vocabulary of expression (0.3) to express your feelings
 23 S: um
 24 T: did did you did it- did it take long (0.2) time
 25 S: yeah about (0.3) one hour maybe
 26 T: one hour I see
 27 S: yeah
 28 →T: okay um- do you know um how paragraph (0.2) is
 29 composed?

The excerpt above illustrates that the tutor starts the session by asking the tutee what was the most difficult thing for the tutee when he wrote the writing. The tutee answers through 05 and 07 that he had difficulty in choosing the vocabulary and grammar. The survey carried out beforehand also indicates that the tutee's expectation of the tutoring session was that of correcting vocabularies and grammar. Although the tutor has already known what the tutee wants to see through tutoring session, as the tutor was with the tutee when he carried out survey before writing tutorial session starts, she leads the session to the structure of the paragraph as we can inspect in line 20 and 28.

This hearing the voice of the tutee and ignoring that voice is frequently shown in NNS-NNS writing tutorials. The tutorial manual in writing center requests the main subject in writing tutorials should be about

the structure of the writing, not the grammar or vocabulary. However, most of the tutees visiting the writing center usually want to deal with the vocabularies or grammars. This collision between the tutor's aim and the tutee's aim of the writing tutorial frequently concludes into the tutor's dominance of the opening and holding the floor. This feature of the NNS-NNS writing tutorial is in some sense similar to that of NS-NNS writing tutorials (Thonus 2004).

4.2.2 Holding the floor

Holding the floor can be investigated in numerous ways. In the writing tutorial session, tutors' interruption and leading moves are frequently utilized ways to hold the floor. Interruptions and leading moves all introduce new topics to the ongoing discourse. However, there is a significant difference between the two, in that interruptions are done without demand or permission of the tutee, whereas leading moves are mostly done by the tutee's requirement or at least the tutee's indication of difficulty in maintaining the floor.

Usually, the tutor abruptly interrupts the tutee's discourse. This abruptness can be also seen in the transcription, with the transcription sign [, which indicates overlapping or simultaneous talk. In the excerpt (4) below, the tutee tries to explain what his feeling was when he lost his passport. Although the tutee was in the middle of this talk, the tutor interrupts in line 85 and introduces new topic.

(4) Passport

- 81 S: yeah (0.5) it's (0.4) uh (0.2) I- want to (0.2) express that
 82 situation. ((noise))
 83 T: uh huh
 84 S: so yeah (0.3) that day, the day was[
 85 T: [anyother feeling? you can indicate me
 86 S: (0.2) um:: when when you read (0.2) you finish:: (0.2)
 87 whey you finish to read this paragraph

The interruption shown above clearly indicates the tutor's dominance of the ongoing talk. The tutor uses interruptions as a dominative strategy, not as a strategy of solidarity.

Leading moves are also easily found within the NNS-NNS writing tutorials. Leading moves can be paraphrased as a topic suggestion. That is, the tutor suggests the next topic and leads the floor. The excerpt (5) presents the leading moves within the NNS-NNS tutoring discourse. In the excerpt below, the tutee directly declares his problem, his difficulties. The tutor and the tutee have been talking about some difficulties when writing in English. The tutor has asked in lines above that whether the tutee has written the draft after planning the whole writing. The excerpt below indicates the tutee's answers.

(5) Ilsan

67 T: you did?

68 S: no no no but no yes the first time I did, but the plan finished
69 → in the third sentence that was the problem

70 T: ((laughing))

71 S: because I- I (0.3) I don't know (0.4) what the (0.5)

72 →T: ok. So let's do a plan together - it's about Ilsan, right?

73 S: yes

74 →T: ok so there's positive things about Ilsan and negative things
75 about Ilsan ok?

The tutee uses the words 'problem' and the phrase 'I don't know' to indicate that he needs tutor's help. The tutor has detected the sign of the tutee and reacts to the tutee with the word ok in line 72. Thence, the tutor leads the floor and presents topics in line 72 and 74.

The excerpt below also displays leading moves. The tutor is trying to know why the tutee felt embarrassed when he lost his passport. To know the reason, the tutor plays a guessing game and leads the discourse by letting her guesses out as in line 210 and 215.

(6) Passport

210 →T: so okay (0.3) so maybe you are embarrassed with your friend

211 S: yeah

212 T: because your friend mig- may be (0.2) was waiting for you
213 to (0.4) get the passport

214 S: yeah

215 →T: o:h okay (0.3) and what about the embassy >you know<
216 Korean embassy problem? (0.4) Did this event (0.5) [made

614→T: you don't use the subject

615 S: uh huh

616→T: erase subject

617 S: uh huh

In line 614, we can find that the tutor utters 'don't use' to the tutee and in line 616 she even orders the tutee what to do. There is no mitigated expression used. This directive suggestion is the typical characteristic of the NNS-NNS tutorial discourse, unseen from other tutorial discourse, whether it is between NS-NS or even in NS-NNS.

The excerpt (8) below also demonstrates the tutor's directive suggestions with upgrader, have to. The tutor and the tutee are talking about the tutee's feeling when he lost his passport. Although the tutee felt that he wrote what his feelings were in the writing draft, the tutor continuously requests for other feelings.

(8) Passport

170 T: how di- when when you realized that you (0.3) lost your

171 → passport how did you feel? Because feeling is the most

172 impordant >you know< I (0.4) con- ideas that you have to

173 introduce here, (0.2) so, how did you feel?

174 S: (0.2) ah (0.4) It's velly ah (0.5) I don't know what (0.4) I have

175 to do (0.6) so=

176 T: =uh huh okay

The tutor is explaining to the tutee what should be in the topic sentence. She argues that as the feeling is the most important thing in descriptive writing on one's most embarrassment moment (which was the tutor's writing subject), it should be written on the topic sentence. Without using mitigations, the tutor bluntly utilize the upgrader, have to.

Excerpt (9) also indicates directive suggestion, with upgrader should. In the discourse below, the tutee asks a question to the tutor. This excerpt is also noteworthy in that there is almost none of the question-answer sequence, in which the tutee questions and the tutor answers in NNS-NNS writing tutorials. This indicates that the sequence below is extremely dispreferred one.

(9) Ilsan

121 S: but eh I have a question

122 T: uh-huh?

123 S: all of that eh I can it can be written in same paragraph, in
124 the one paragraph

125 T: yeah! Of course! You don't have to write an essay for each

126 → thing just mention and then it should be about that long.

Retrospective participant interviews offered in the current study also reveal that both the tutor and the tutee thought it right for tutors use directive suggestions. Tutees felt no mischief by receiving the directive advice, and tutors thought it reasonable for their position to use directive phase. However, to conclude that the NNS tutor uses directive advice as a strategy, further studies are required.

4.3.2 Refusal of advice

In NNS-NNS writing center setting, the NNS tutee usually accepts the tutor as a teacher. It was a common happening that the tutee calls the tutor as 'a teacher' or even 'a professor'. The survey conducted beforehand has a blank where the tutee should write their College English professor's name, and most of the tutees fill the tutor's name in that blank. This was so common that the writing center director had to rearrange the survey, putting the blank requiring College English professor's name on the middle of the survey. The change made the tutees to be less confused.

As the tutee accepts the tutor as his/her teacher, there is a unique characteristic of the NNS-NNS writing tutorials. When the tutee refuses the tutor's advice, he or she usually says 'sorry' to the tutor. The tutee not only carefully declines the tutor's advice, but also uses the exact word 'I'm sorry' to the tutor. The retrospective participant interview was done to find out why the tutee said 'sorry' to tutors. The result revealed that tutees used the word 'sorry' due to the fact that they thought it was not proper to decline tutors' advice. They thought it was 'a rude gesture' not to accept the advice tutors give.

In the excerpt below, the tutor and the tutee are discussing about the topic sentence of the writing. The tutee wrote "The guard box #1

gave me various feelings" as his topic sentence. The tutor points that the word 'various feelings' is too broad and general to be used in a topic sentence. Therefore, the tutor advises the tutee it would be better for him to use several specific perceptions instead of 'various feelings'.

(11) Guard box #1

- 86 T: but um (0.2) I just thought that (0.2) various feelings
 87 S: uh huh
 88 T: is (0.3) kind of ambiguous (0.2) it might be better if it's
 89 S: [ah
 90 T: [more (0.3) ah- discrete? like=
 91 S: =uh huh
 92 T: you can say various feelings (0.2) ah you can add various
 93 feelings like something and something
 94 S: something and something
 95 T: yes might be (0.3) two or=
 96 S: =sense of something and something (0.2) right?
 97 T: um (0.2) yes you might give an example you might give
 98 examples
 ...
 144 T: yeah so they were so so many
 145 S: yes so many
 146 T: you cannot take just one or two feelings
 147 S: yes y[es
 148 T: [so many
 149 S: yes
 150 T: okay then
 151→S: ((laughing)) sorry

After hearing the tutee's advice, the tutee says that he had too many feelings to say so could not write several specific impressions. As the tutee felt that it was rude to reject the advice the tutor offered, so he says sorry in line 151. Not accepting the advice the tutor provides is assumed to be extremely rude gesture to the tutee, so refusing advice is not a common situation in NNS-NNS tutoring discourse. However, when the refusing happens, the tutee apologizes to the tutor. The rare number of the refusing advice sequences and following apologizing sequence indicate how the tutee perceives the role of the tutor.

4.3.3 Small talk

The NNS-NNS tutorial discourse is similar to that of NS-NNS tutorial discourse in that it has short, almost no opening phase. Judging that it is hard for the NNS the tutor to start the writing session with the small talk, the survey was designed by the writing center director which must be done beforehand. It is the writing center's policy that the tutee must fill in the survey in the first part of the tutorial session. The survey conducted beforehand contains the name of the tutee, the major of the tutee, tutee's writing experience, the topic of the tutee's writing, some questions related to the College English class the tutee is attending to, and the aim of the tutee's visit to the writing center. The aim of the survey was to make the tutor and the tutee communicate and know each other when filling this survey, however, it is common that the tutee alone fills the survey and without knowing each other, the tutorial session jumps into evaluate-suggestion sequences. In two excerpts (12) and (13), the tutorial sessions all start without small talk. The tutor in excerpt (12) initiates the tutoring session with diagnosing the tutor's writing. Even considering the tutee's second visit, the abrupt starting the session with diagnosing may make the session just like service encounter rather than a conversation. (Fiksdal 1990)

(12) Guard box #1

01 →T: okay (0.3) so I will speaking in English again ((slight laughing))

02 your (0.2) writing is much better than your last (0.3) last one

03 S: really?

04 T: yeah well=

05 S: =thank you

06 T: oh yeah ((slight laughing)) I think it improved a lot

The excerpt (13) also presents tutorial session without small talk initiation. The tutorial session below starts with the tutor's question, what was the most difficult thing for the tutee to write in English. It is more like a medical consultation (Ten have 1989) rather than a peer tutoring discourse. Just like the doctor asks patients what is the problem they have, the tutor asks tutees what is the problem or difficulty tutees have.

(13) Passport

- 01 →T: what was the most important >you know< most difficult thing
 02 for you (0.3) when write- writing
 03 S: uh:
 04 T: this short paragraph, short? ((laughing)) okay
 05 →S: ah:: the ah:: (0.6) choose the vocabulary and=
 06 T: =uh huh

The small talk sequence is not limited in the opening phase. It can be inserted in the middle of the tutorial session or at the end of the session. The prominent characteristic of the NNS-NNS tutoring discourse is that it has almost no small talk in whole tutorial session. This makes the tutorial session more like service encounter or even a medical consultation rather than peer tutorial session.

As shown in this section, the NNS-NNS tutorial session has some uniqueness related to the interactional dominance. Different from other tutorial sessions, in NNS-NNS tutorial sessions, tutors use clear directive sentences, almost not using any mitigations. Tutees' refusal of the given advice indicates another distinctive feature of the NNS-NNS tutorial discourse. The tutee refuses the advices using the expression 'I'm sorry.' Directly showing regretting can be one of the features of NNS-NNS tutorial discourse. Last but not least, in NNS-NNS tutorial discourse, there was almost no small talk exchanged.

5. Conclusion

The current study has examined quantitative, topical and interactional dominance of the NNS tutor over the NNS tutee. By analysing three conversations between female NNS tutor and male NNS tutee, this study has tried to indicate that NNS-NNS tutorial discourse is in some sense similar to, and in some sense different from the tutorial discourse of NS-NNS.

Overall, the tutor's dominance over the tutee on quantitative and topical dimension has shown similarities between NS-NNS tutorial discourse and NNS-NNS tutorial discourse. Equal to the NS-NNS tutorial discourse, the tutor mean turn length was longer than that of the tutee. The exact amount of difference has indicated divergence, showing

overwhelming quantitative dominance of the tutor in NNS-NNS tutorial discourse. In the case of topical dominance, opening the tutorial sessions and holding the floor, there was no distinctive feature independently related to the NNS-NNS tutorial discourse.

However, the interactional discourse presents some unique characteristics of NNS-NNS tutorial discourse. The NNS-NNS tutorial discourse uses almost no mitigation, and frequently utilize directive utterances. The tutee's refusal of tutor's advice was another particular characteristic of NNS-NNS tutorial discourse. The tutee tells the exact phrase 'I'm sorry' to the tutor. The non-existence of small talk was another peculiarity.

References

- Blau, S., J. Hall, and T. Strauss. 1998. Exploring the tutor-client conversation: A linguistic analysis. *The Writing Center Journal* 19: 19-48.
- Boquet, E. H. 1999. "Our Little Secret": A History of writing centers, Pre- to Post-Open Admissions. *College Composition and Communication* 50: 462-483.
- Cumming, A. and S. So. 1996. Tutoring Second Language Text Revision: Does the Approach to Instruction or the Language of Communication Make a Difference? *Journal of Second Language Writing* 5(3): 197-226.
- Drew, P. and J. Heritage. 1992. *Talk at work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- He, A. 1994. Withholding academic advice: Institutional context and discourse practice. *Discourse Processes* 18: 297-316.
- Heritage, J. 2005. Conversation analysis and institutional talk. In K. L. Fitch and R. E. Sandler (eds.), *Handbook of Language and Social Interaction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kim, Y. K. 2001. *Frame analysis of NS-NS and NS-NNS discourse in university writing center tutorials: Volubility and questions*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University.
- Linell, P., L. Gustavsson, and P. Juvonen. 1988. Interactional Dominance in Dyadic Communication: A Presentation of Initiative-Response Analysis. *Linguistics* 26: 415-442.
- Schiffrin, D. 1994. *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell Press.
- Selinker, L. and D. Douglas. 1985. Wrestling with 'context' in interlanguage theory. *Applied Linguistics* 6(2): 190-204.
- Tannen, D. and C. Wallat. 1993. Interactive frames and knowledge schemas in interaction: Examples from a medical examination/interview. In D. Tannen (ed.),

Framing in discourse: 57-78. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Ten have, P. 1989. The Consultation as a Genre. In B. Torode (ed.), *Text and Talk as Social Practice: Discourse Difference and Division in Speech and Writing*: 115-133. Dordrecht: Foris.

Thonus, T. 1999. Dominance in academic writing tutorials: Gender, language proficiency, and the offering of suggestions. *Discourse and Society* 10: 225-248.

Thonus, T. 2004. What are the difference? Tutor interactions with first- and second-language writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13: 227-242.

Williams, J. 2005. Writing Center Interaction: Institutional Discourse and the Role of Peer Tutors. In K. Bardovi-Harlig and B. Hartford (eds.), *INTERLANGUAGE PRAGMATICS Exploring Institutional Talk*: 37-65. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Young, V. H. 1992. *Politeness phenomena in the university writing conference*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Chicago.

Yun Jung Kim
wppman3@gmail.com

Appendix

Transcription Conventions (by Atkinson and Heritage 1984)

[Overlapping or simultaneous talk
=	A "latch" sign is used when the second speaker follows the first with no discernible silence between them. It can also be used to link different parts of a single speaker's utterance when those parts constitute a continuous flow of speech that has been carried over to another line to accommodate an intervening interruption.
:	Colons indicate prolongation of the immediately prior sound. Multiple colons indicate a more prolonged sound.
:	Underscoring indicates some form of stress, via pitch and/or amplitude.
(0.5)	Length of pause
(.)	Micropause
.	A stopping fall in tone, not necessarily the end of a sentence
?	A rising intonation, not necessarily a question
,	A continuing intonation
↑	Marked rising shifts in intonation
↓	Marked falling shifts in intonation
-	A cut-off or self-interruption
<	The less than symbol indicates that the immediately following talk is jump-started, i.e., sounds like it starts with a rush
CAPITAL	Emphasis
> <	A passage of talk that is faster than surrounding talk
< >	A passage of talk that is slower than surrounding talk
hh	A audible inhalations
()	A problematic hearing that the transcriber is not certain about
(())	Transcriber's descriptions of events