

## Use of L1 Translation During Writing Center Appointments: Case Studies of Two Korean Tutors\*

**Sookyung Cho\*\***

Hankuk University of Foreign Studies

**Suyeon Kim**

Anyang University

**Cho, Sookyung & Kim, Suyeon. (2014). Use of L1 translation during writing center appointments: Case studies of two Korean tutors. *Modern English Education*, 15(2), 1-20.**

Most studies investigating writing center interactions have focused on native speaker tutors and non-native speaker tutees, with only a few studies exploring interactions between non-native tutors and tutees. In the few studies that have been done, the role of the first language (L1) has not yet been explored. To this end, this study examines how the L1 is used to facilitate tutor-tutee interactions between two Korean tutors and their tutees as well as whether the use of the L1 makes a difference in the tutees' revisions by using qualitative analyses. The results reveal that the two tutors use the L1 differently: Ms. Kim for eliciting corrections from her tutees, but Ms. Lee for confirming the intentions of her tutees. These different uses of the L1 lead to different types of feedback: Ms. Kim utilizes tutor-initiated but tutee-identifying feedback more frequently, while Ms. Lee uses tutor-initiated and tutor-identifying feedback more frequently. Moreover, while almost all of Ms. Kim's feedback was incorporated into her tutees' revisions, Ms. Lee's feedback was not reflected in tutees' revisions to as great an extent. This study implies that the use of L1 translation can serve as a medium to elicit tutees' participation during writing center appointments.

[writing center/tutor-tutee interaction/L1 translation/ feedback/  
글쓰기 센터/튜터와 튜티 상호작용/모국어 번역/피드백]

---

\* This work was supported by Hankuk University of Foreign Studies Research Fund of 2013.

\*\* First author: Sookyung Cho, Corresponding author: Suyeon Kim

## I. INTRODUCTION

Writing centers have been widely used in the United States based on the belief that tutor talk, talk specifically tailored to a single tutee, provides individualized scaffolding to learners (Weissberg, 2006b). However, tutor talk in interactions with second language (L2) learners has been reported to work differently from interactions with L2 learners. In a comparison of tutor interactions with first- and second-language learners, Thonus (2004) found that tutors used more directives with non-native tutees than with native tutees and were involved in less extended negotiation sequences with non-native tutees. Some scholars have even argued that tutors working with L2 writers should take a more directive role, such as the “role of informant rather than collaborator” (Powers, 1993, p. 238), while tutors working with L1 writers can take on a more collaborative role so that tutees can be independent editors. While these studies have focused on differences between tutor interactions with L1 and L2 learners, to date no study in English composition has investigated interactions between non-native tutors and non-native tutees, particularly the use of L1 translation in tutor talk when they share the same first language in English composition. This study aims to explore this gap by examining interactions between two Korean tutors, who are teachers of English helping students with English writing, and their tutees by focusing on the use of Korean during the tutor talk.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 1. Tutor Interaction with First Language Learners

Writing centers have served important roles in teaching writing to college students in the United States. One of their greatest strengths is providing tailored instruction to individual students, an outcome that cannot be obtained from classroom teaching (North, 1984). As North (1984) states, “the essence of the writing center method, then, is this talking. . . . we find that the best breaker of old rhythms, the best creator of new ones, is our style of live intervention, our talk in all its forms” (p. 443). Tutor talk is also viewed positively by students. In his study of student evaluations of writing center visits, Harris (1995) shows that students who experienced tutorial interaction claimed that collaborative talk at the writing center helped encourage independence, acquire strategic knowledge, assist with affective concerns, and interpret the meaning of academic language.

However, L1 scholars have different perspectives not only on the kind of talk a tutor should pursue during a tutorial, but also the type of outcome that is desired. Brooks (1995) has argued for minimalist tutoring:

A writing teacher or tutor cannot and should not expect to make student papers “better”: that is neither our obligation nor is it a realistic goal. The moment we consider it our duty to improve the paper, we automatically relegate ourselves to the role of editor. (p. 84)

While Brooks (1995) emphasizes that the goal of the writing center is to improve the writer, not the paper, Clark (1995) adopts a more collaborative approach. According to her, what tutees want from the writing center is not much different from the editorial advice most scholars expect to receive from their colleagues. She claims that to avoid giving directive feedback is against the very nature of the learning that occurs between skilled and less-skilled writers.

## 2. Tutor Interaction with Second Language Learners

Unlike L1 scholars, who seem to struggle between these two different approaches, scholars who have studied the role of tutor talk with L2 learners seem to agree that a more collaborative approach is necessary by arguing that tutor talk should provide scaffolding to L2 learners (Thonus, 1999; Weissberg, 2006b; Williams, 2002, 2006) within a sociocultural framework. According to Donato (1994), scaffolding refers to “social interaction [in which] a knowledgeable participant can create, by means of speech, supportive conditions in which the novice can participate in, and extend current skills and knowledge to higher levels of competence” (p. 40). Weissberg (2006b) states that scaffolding is essential to the writing tutorial and that it serves as “a highly individualized, negotiated means of delivering oral feedback to L2 students on their writing” (p. 247).

Differences have been shown to exist between tutor talk with L1 learners and L2 learners (Powers, 1993; Ritter, 2002; Thonus, 1999, 2004; Weissberg, 2006a, 2006b; Williams, 2004). First, tutors are more likely to take a more directive role with non-native tutees than with native tutees (Powers, 1993; Thonus, 1999; Weissberg, 2006a), partly due to the limited proficiency of L2 learners (Powers, 1993). Second, through his comparison of tutor talk with L1 and L2 learners, Thonus (2004) discovered that tutors are likely to be less engaged in conversations with L2 learners than with their L1 counterparts. According to Thonus, tutors usually have 50% longer turns than their tutees in a typical writing tutorial, and they are taking turns even longer than 50% when the tutees are non-native speakers of English. In addition, tutors were found to be involved in less extended negotiation with their non-native tutees than with their native ones, tutors did not give the floor to their non-native tutees as often as to their native tutees nor pursue the topics nominated by non-native tutees, and non-native tutees showed fewer overlaps and less laughter than native tutees.

In comparison with the amount of studies that have investigated native tutor and non-native tutee interactions, there is a paucity of studies exploring interactions between non-native tutors and tutees, particularly how their L1 functions in their interactions. By analyzing the interactions of two Korean tutors, Ms. Kim and Ms. Lee, this study aims to investigate how non-native tutors interact with non-native tutees and how L1 translation facilitates tutor-tutee interactions. Additionally, this study explores how the differences in feedback affect the tutees' revisions. Several scholars have highlighted that active participation of L2 learners in tutor-tutee talk leads them to revise the drafts more successfully (Goldstein & Conrad, 1990; Weissberg 2006a; Williams 2004; Williams & Severino, 2004). In line with these scholars, this study examines the extent to which discussion at the writing center leads to student revision. Through tutor-tutee interactions, then this study aims to answer the following questions:

- 1) What types of feedback do the tutors provide most often to their tutees?
- 2) How do Korean tutors use Korean translation to facilitate their tutor talk with tutees?
- 3) To what extent do the tutees reflect tutor feedback into their revisions?

### **III. METHOD**

#### **1. Participants**

The participants are two Korean tutors, Ms. Kim and Ms. Lee, and seven Korean university students at a small town near Seoul, Korea. The two tutors have taught College English at this university for five to six years and have worked twice a week as tutors at the writing center that opened at this university in this particular semester. Ms. Kim met with four students (S1, S2, S3, and S4), and Ms. Lee met with three students (S5, S6, and S7). All students were enrolled in College English as a requirement. They were all female sophomores from various departments, such as Information and Statistics, Child Education, Media Design, and Administration. The students had English proficiency levels ranging from 400 to 500 in the TOEIC scores with no study abroad experience.

#### **2. Data Collection**

All the writing tutorials with the seven students—one tutorial with each student for one assignment—were video-recorded in Fall, 2013, and copies of their first and revised drafts were collected. Each tutorial lasted for about 30 to 40 minutes. As a requirement of the

College English course, the students were asked to meet with the tutor at least once a semester to receive extra points. They brought to the tutorial a writing assignment in the College English course in which they could choose their own topic, received help from the tutors, and submitted their revised drafts to the writing center one week later.

### 3. Data Analysis

The video-recorded tutorials were transcribed line by line and coded, based on Williams (2004). Drawing on Bartlett (1982), Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987), and van Gelderen (1997), Williams (2004) identified three steps of revision: detection (notice of the problem), identification (diagnosis of what the problem is and decision on how it can be fixed), and correction (actual revision). These steps can be initiated by the writer herself, a teacher, a peer, or a tutor. In the case of the writing tutorials, both detection and identification can be made by the writer or the tutor while actual correction is solely up to the writer. While Williams focused on only detection and classified tutor talk into three categories (i.e., tutor-initiated direct feedback, tutor-initiated implicit feedback, and tutee-initiated talk), this study takes into account both detection and identification. Depending on who initiates detection and identification, this study classifies tutor talk into seven different types: 1) tutor-detecting and tutor-identifying; 2) tutor-detecting and tutee-identifying; 3) tutor-detecting, tutee-identifying, and tutor-identifying; 4) tutee-detecting and tutor-identifying; 5) tutee-detecting and tutee-identifying; 6) tutee-detecting, tutee-identifying, and tutor-identifying; and 7) tutor-detecting without identification. While the first three are initiated by the tutor, the other three are initiated by the tutee. Both Type 3 and Type 6 refer to incidents in which the tutee incorrectly identifies a problem and the tutor corrects it. Type 7 is unique in that only detection is made without any identification either by the tutor or the tutee.

To investigate the extent to which these different types of tutor talk are reflected in student revision, students' initial and revised drafts are compared, and the number of times each type of feedback is incorporated, differently incorporated or unincorporated by an individual student in his/her revision is counted.

## IV. RESULTS

### 1. Types of Tutor Talk

The analysis of tutor talk reveals that Ms. Kim and Ms. Lee seem to use tutor-detecting feedback.

**TABLE 1**  
Tutor Talk: Ms. Kim

	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4	Type 5	Type 6	Type 7
S1	19	20	1		3	1	
S2	20	13	8				1
S3	8	7	3	1	1		1
S4	28	20	5				
Total	75	60	17	1	4	1	2

As seen in Table 1, Type 1 (tutor-detecting, tutor-identifying) and Type 2 (tutor-detecting, tutee-identifying) constitute the majority of Ms. Kim's tutor talk. Except 1 shows Ms. Kim's use of Type 2 feedback with Student 4.

Excerpt 1

- 1 T: Isn't there something awkward here? *If win a lottery*  
 2 S4: The subject [is dropped]  
 3 T: That's right. The subject is dropped, isn't it?  
 4 S4: *If I*<sup>1</sup>

Here, Type 2 feedback takes place in turns 1-2, where the tutor initially detects a problem, and Student 4 identifies the problem: a dropped subject. At the same time, S4 self-corrects the problem herself in turn 4. Ms. Kim uses Type 2 feedback almost as frequently as Type 1. Ms. Kim also uses Type 3 feedback, as seen in Excerpt 2, more often than Ms. Lee in her tutor talk.

Excerpt 2

- 1 T: You're talking about someone's first impressions, aren't you? First impressions of someone can be different, and then do not use *their* here. You used *their*. Don't you think you should say *of someone*?  
 2 S3: Yes.  
 3 T: Write *someone* and then *someone* is singular.  
 4 S3: Yes.

<sup>1</sup> All the writing center sessions recorded in this study were conducted in Korean and translated into English by the researchers. Italics are used to mark utterances originally spoken in English.

- 5 T: Then what would you use?  
 6 S3: *they*  
 7 T: *his*  
 8 S3: Ah, *his*.  
 9 T: *or her* like this  
 10 S3: Yes.

Ms. Kim identifies S3's problem in the sentence "first impression of someone can be different than their actual character or personality" and then tries to elicit identification by providing a grammatical explanation that the word someone is singular and by directly asking "what would you say?" Once the student fails to identify the problem in turn 6, however, Ms. Kim provides the correction, *his* or *her* instead of *their*.

**TABLE 2**  
Tutor Talk: Ms. Lee

	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4	Type 5	Type 6	Type 7
S5	27	1	1				
S6	10	1	1				3
S7	25	2	2				6
Total	62	4	4				9

In contrast with Ms. Kim, who engages in Type 2 talk as much as Type 1, and who also makes use of Type 3 tutor talk, Ms. Lee's tutor talk consists primarily of Type 1, with little used of Type 2 and Type 3 feedback, as shown in Table 2. The following excerpt shows an example of Ms. Lee's Type 1 interaction with her tutee.

Excerpt 3

- 1 T: Look at this here. When *and* comes, an adjective should be followed by another adjective. You should say *pretty and tall*. You said *pretty*, and then you shouldn't use a noun. So you should say *delicious and healthy*.

Excerpt 4

- 1 T: You said *it is a good*. *A* is followed by a noun. You should say something like *it is a good food source*.

During the tutorial with Student 5, in Excerpt 3, Ms. Lee detects a problem in the sentence (the natto is delicious and health food for our health). Unlike Excerpt 1, where Ms. Kim detected a problem and Student 4 identified it, Ms. Lee does not give Student 5 the opportunity to identify the problem. Instead, she identifies the problem on her own, the unparalleled structure of *and*, and suggests the correction herself. In Excerpt 4 as well, Ms. Lee initiates detection (you said *it is a good*) and identifies the problem herself by stating the grammatical rule that the article *a* should be followed by a noun. As can be seen in these two excerpts, Student 5 does not participate in the tutor talk at all, which is in contrast to Student 4, who had the opportunity to identify her own problem.

In addition to the difference in distribution of Type 1 and Type 2 tutor talk between Ms. Kim and Ms. Lee, another notable difference is in the comparison of the rest of the types—Type 4, 5, and 6 in which problem detection is initiated by the tutee. Although it is a small number, six occasions of tutee-detecting interactions occurs in Ms. Kim's tutorials while none of this type takes place in Ms. Lee's tutorials.

Excerpt 5 shows an example of Ms. Kim's Type 4, where the tutee initiates detection and also identifies the problem, whereas Excerpt 5 is Type 5, where the tutee detects a problem, and the tutor diagnoses the problem.

#### Excerpt 5

- 1 S1: *When I came back home*  
 2 T: Good. Correct it as you said, *came back home*, you just said correctly, but why did you write it incorrectly here?

In Excerpt 5, Ms. Kim asks S1 to read aloud her own writing about the most memorable day sentence by sentence. While reading the original sentence (when I came back to home), S1 detects and identifies the problem that the word *home* is used as an adverb here, and she then self-corrects it without the help of the tutor.

Excerpt 6 shows a case where the tutee initiates detection during the tutorial with Ms. Kim.

#### Excerpt 6

- 1 S3: Don't you think this part is unnecessary as well?  
 2 T: Do you also think this part should be removed?  
 3 S3: Yes.  
 4 T: It is already stated here.  
 5 S3: Yes.

- 6 T: It is repeated.  
7 S3: Yes.

Previous to Excerpt 6, Ms. Kim indicated that one of the sentences Student 3 wrote was redundant and also pointed out the grammatical mistakes in another sentence. Student 3 then moves beyond the grammatical correction, detecting the same issue of repetition in this sentence and asking the tutor's opinion (turn 1). Over the next few turns, the tutor agrees that this sentence is repeated and could be removed.

Therefore, it is clear that Ms. Kim and Ms. Lee use different types of tutor talk. While Ms. Kim often uses directive Type 1 feedback, she often elicits participation from her tutees by using Type 2 and 3 tutor talk as well. On the other hand, Ms. Lee engages in predominantly Type 1 tutor talk .

## 2. Use of Korean Translation

The different patterns of tutor talk used by Ms. Kim and Ms. Lee relate to their different use of L1 translation during the tutorial. In Ms. Lee's tutorials, L1 translation was mostly used by her tutees to clarify their original intention as in Excerpt 7.<sup>2</sup>

### Excerpt 7

- 1 T: Is this *first impression* or *impressions*?  
2 S6: I meant a singular.  
3 T: If you mean *first impression*, you have to say *doesn't*. You can also put an *s* like *first impressions*. What did you mean?  
4 S6: I meant that first impressions do not tell us everything about others.  
5 T: Umm, then either *first impression* or *impressions* is fine. Just make an agreement between the subject and the verb.

In Excerpt 7, Ms. Lee notices and identifies the problem in agreement between the subject and the verb in Student 6's sentence "first impression don't tell us everything about someone," and asks for clarification from S6. After figuring out what S6 meant through her Korean translation (turn 4), Ms. Lee explicitly states that either a singular or a plural is workable in this context. Excerpt 8 shows another case of S6's use of Korean translation to make Ms. Lee understand what she originally meant in the writing.

---

<sup>2</sup> Direct translation of the English sentence into Korean is underlined in the excerpts.

## Excerpt 8

- 1 T: *Hit it off?* What did you want to say?
- 2 S6: Immediately, we immediately got close to each other after talking together.
- 3 T: *Hit it off* sounds weird. *Immedi, immediately* means right after something happened like immediately after you lost something, you regret immediately after you purchased something. Why don't you change a little bit? *Immediately* does not look proper here. Then *hit it off* does not sound okay either. You can simply say *get close. I realized that . . . impression of people?*
- 4 S6: I mean people's first impression about me.
- 5 T: People's impression about me? Then you can say *my first impression to other people.*

In Excerpt 8, Korean translation clarifies the writer's intention again, as in Excerpt 7. In examining the phrase 'hit it off' in the tutee's sentence "I also immediately hit it off with her," Ms. Lee asks for S6's original intention (turn 1, "What did you want to say?"). S6 provides the Korean translation (turn 2), which she considers equivalent to the English sentence. Once Ms. Lee understands S6's intended meaning, she suggests another possible expression: *get close*. In the next turn, Ms. Lee detects another problem in the sentence (turn 3, "I realized that my impression of people wasn't all that good") and requests clarification from S6 with rising intonation. After S6 delivers her intention through the means of Korean translation (turn 4), Ms. Lee corrects the expression to *my first impression to other people*. Therefore, as can be seen in Excerpts 7 and 8, in Ms. Lee's tutorial, Korean translation is used by the tutee primarily to clarify misunderstanding and confusion. After this misunderstanding has been clarified, Ms. Lee usually suggests a correction.

On the other hand, Ms. Kim uses Korean translation in order to elicit tutee participation as you see in Excerpt 9.

## Excerpt 9

- 1 T: Next, *after that I realized that, I realized?* What? *That wasnot exactly the first impression of the person?* Don't you think this sentence is a little bit awkward? What did you want to say? After that
- 2 S2: After that, I realized that my first impressions are not correct.
- 3 T: Okay, then *I realized that* is fine. What subject would you use?

- 4 S2: (no response)  
 5 T: First impressions are not correct?  
 6 S2: (no response)  
 7 T: not correct. You should put a subject and the verb in the that clause.  
First impressions?  
 8 S2: (no response)  
 9 T: First impressions are not correct. Tell me any expression.  
 10 S2: *First impression are are not accurate.*  
 11 T: *Accurate*. Good. Then you can do the same thing here. *I realized that*  
 then what would you put?  
 12 S2: first impressions  
 13 T: first impression are  
 14 S2: are  
 15 T: not  
 16 S2: not accurate  
 17 T: accurate. Good. You can do it like this. Right?  
 18 S2: (nods)

Excerpt 9 shows an example of Type 2 tutor talk, in which the tutor detects a problem, but the tutee identifies the problem. Ms. Kim detects that there is no subject in the original sentence (“After that, I realized that was not exactly the first impression of the person”). As in the case of Ms. Lee, S2 also uses Korean translation at Ms. Kim’s clarification request (turn 1, “What did you want to say?”). However, unlike Ms. Lee’s tutorial, where Korean translation was used primarily by the tutee to negotiate meaning, in Excerpt 9, Ms. Kim also uses Korean translation to elicit the tutee’s answer. In turn 5, the tutor translates the correct English sentence in Korean and asks the tutee to fill in the missing subject. Although there is no response from S2 (turn 6), Ms. Kim continues to encourage the tutee in turns 7 and 9 by providing the Korean translation. In turn 10, finally S2 states a whole sentence in correct English. From turn 11, both the tutor and the tutee collaborate to write the correct sentence in the margin of the paper.

Even in her use of Type 3 feedback, where the tutee is unable to diagnose a problem and Ms. Kim fills in the knowledge gap, it is quite apparent that Korean translation helps to elicit tutee participation. In Excerpt 10, Ms. Kim uses the Korean translation to obtain a response from S4.

#### Excerpt 10

- 1 T: Because you did not have enough money. Then you should say the

- reason. How would you say it?
- 2 S4: Umm, because
- 3 T: That's right. What would you use? *Because* you did what?
- 4 S4: Because I didn't have enough money.
- 5 T: Good. Why don't you write it [in English]? I didn't have money. What is to have in English?
- 6 S4: *have*
- 7 T: How would negate it?
- 8 S4: *have not money*
- 9 T: *have not money? Did not, I did not have enough money?*
- 10 S4: *enough*
- 11 T: Good, *enough money.* Because I did not have enough money.

Interestingly, in Excerpt 10, not only Ms. Kim but also S4 use Korean translation as a medium to arrive at the correct English sentence. In turns 1-4, S4 answers in Korean to Ms. Kim's use of Korean translation as elicitation. In next turns, Ms. Kim continues to use Korean translation to elicit an answer in English from S4. This time, Ms. Kim uses a word-by-word translation in Korean. In turn 6, the tutee succeeds in providing the correct word 'have,' although she uses negation incorrectly. Through these repeated attempts by Ms. Kim to elicit a response by means of Korean translation, S4 fills in the correct word 'enough', and both the tutor and tutee successfully build the correct clause ("...because I did not have enough money").

As can be seen in Excerpts 9 and 10, in Ms. Kim's writing tutorial, Korean translation is used not only to clarify misunderstanding between tutor and tutee as in Ms. Lee's writing tutorial, but also to encourage the tutee to participate in tutor talk. By translating a target English sentence into Korean as well as by breaking it into segments to make it more manageable for the tutee, Ms. Kim helps minimize the burden on the tutee and allows her to contribute to the conversation.

### 3. Revision

The different patterns of tutor talk used by each tutor make a difference in the extent to which the tutees reflect tutor's feedback in their revision. As can be seen in Tables 3 and 4, in comparison with Ms. Lee's tutees, Ms. Kim's tutees show higher acceptance rates of Type 1 feedback. Out of 19, S1 incorporates 16 instances (84%) of Type 1 feedback into her revision, while she does not incorporate three instances. S2 accepts 18 instances of Type 1 feedback out of 20. S3 and S4 incorporate 5 (63%) and 26 instances (93%) of Type 1 tutor feedback, respectively, into their revisions (See Appendix 1 and 2 for S4's first and

final drafts). However, among Ms. Lee's tutees, except for S5, both S6 and S7 show quite low acceptance rates in their revision (3 out of 10 and 11 out of 25). For instance, in Excerpt 6, in which Ms. Lee pinpointed the problem of disagreement between the subject (first impression) and the verb form (don't tell) using Type 1 tutor talk, S6 failed to correct the problem in her revision, repeating the ungrammatical sentence "First impression don't tell us everything about someone." Additionally, instead of accepting Ms. Lee's suggestion provided in Excerpt 7, S6 uses a different expression—"we became close friends"—and deletes the entire sentence in which Ms. Lee suggested "my first impressions to other people."

**TABLE 3**  
Instances of Incorporation, Unincorporation, and Deletion: Ms. Kim

Correction	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4	Type 5	Type 6	Type 7
Incorporated	16	19	1		3	1	
Differently							
S1 Incorporated							
Unincorporated	3	1					
Deleted							
Incorporated	18	13	8				1
Differently							
S2 Incorporated	1						
Unincorporated	1						
Deleted							
Incorporated	5	7	3	1	1		
Differently							
S3 Incorporated							
Unincorporated	2						1
Deleted	1						
Incorporated	26	20	5				
Differently							
S4 Incorporated	1						
Unincorporated	1						
Deleted							

**TABLE 4**  
Instances of Incorporation, Unincorporation, and Deletion: Ms. Lee

Correction	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4	Type 5	Type 6	Type 7
S5 Incorporated	18	1	1				
Differently	2						
S5 Unincorporated	7						
Deleted							
S6 Incorporated	3		1				2
Differently	4	1					
S6 Unincorporated	2						
Deleted	1						1
S7 Incorporated	11						2
Differently	3			1			2
S7 Unincorporated	1						
Deleted	10	2		1			2

Moreover, in comparison with Type 1 feedback, in which tutees play a minimal role in detecting and identifying problems, the other types of tutor talk, such as Type 2 and 3, where tutees try to self-identify their problems, and Types 4, 5, 6, where tutees initiate detection, show a high ratio of incorporation, except for a few instances—one unincorporated in S1, and three deletions in S7, although the occurrences are quite rare across Ms. Lee’s tutorials. The high acceptance rate of these types of tutor talk may reveal that greater tutee participation in writing tutorials can help tutees reflect upon the writing elements under discussion during the tutorial and have a greater impact on their revisions. The fact that Ms. Kim’s tutees are more likely to reflect tutor feedback into their revision may also indicate that involvement of tutees in tutorial may lead to more revision.

Interestingly, the analysis reveals that detection without identification of a problem like Type 7 varies in its acceptance rate, depending on the tutee. While S6 shows quite a high acceptance rate with regards to Type 7 tutor talk (2 out of 3), S7 dealt with these suggestions by simply deleting one third of the text where the tutor suggested she look for an alternative expression. As seen in Excerpt 8, Ms. Lee detects a problem in the expression ‘immediately’ but does not make a correction, instead suggesting to the student that she “change it a little bit.” In her revision, S6 replaces the word ‘immediately’ with ‘before long’. However, as can be seen in Excerpt 11, S7 deletes the sentence where the tutor made a similar suggestion to look for usage of the word ‘adapt.’

## Excerpt 11

- 1 T: Let me see. Why did you try to use *adapt* in a passive voice?  
2 S7: (no response)  
3 T: It is a good idea to use *adapt* for the meaning of gettingadjusted to and  
to use *to*, but do you have to use it as passive or active? [...]  
4 T: Ah, so in that case [when you are not sure], it is right to choose *adapt*  
5 S7: Yes.  
6 T: Then you should look up the word in a dictionary.  
7 S7: Yes.  
8 T: The dictionary will tell you how it is used as well as whether it is used  
as passive or active. The dictionary with a lot of examples is a good  
one.  
9 S7: Yes (nods).

In Excerpt 11, Ms. Lee suggests that the tutee should look up the word ‘adapt’ to see whether it is used in passive or active voice, without giving her the correction. Although S7 answers affirmatively to the tutor’s suggestion and seems to agree to it by nodding, she ends up deleting the entire sentence and instead writes a new sentence, “I could not know about new friends” in her revised draft.

## V. DISCUSSION

The comparison of the two tutors Ms. Kim and Ms. Lee reveals that they use different types of tutor talk and that the different patterns of tutor talk are closely related to the different ways in which L1 translation is used in the tutorials. Although both Ms. Kim and Ms. Lee mostly detect problems for the tutees (Type 1, 2 and 3 feedback), Ms. Kim encourages tutee participation afterwards by using Type 2 and 3 feedback as often as Type 1. In comparison with Type 1, Type 2 and Type 3 feedback is likely to give opportunities for the tutees to correct their own mistakes once the tutor detects a problem in the original writing. During this process, word-to-word translation of English phrases or sentences into Korean serves as a tool to facilitate tutee participation by mediating their access to their limited L2 knowledge. On the other hand, Ms. Lee tends to use Type 1 feedback, in which she both detects and identifies the problem for students. Since Ms. Lee usually provides the solution for the problem, the tutee does not have as many chances to become involved in the discussion as in Type 2 and Type 3. In their limited participatory role, then, the tutees often use Korean translation to make their thoughts understandable to the tutor.

The different patterns of tutor talk discovered between Ms. Kim and Ms. Lee are also reflected in the student revisions. In comparison with Ms. Lee's tutees, most of Ms. Kim's tutees show a higher acceptance rate of tutor feedback. This finding is in line with those of several scholars who have detected a close connection between participation at the writing center and student revision. As Williams (2004) stated, text-based revisions resulting from writing center discussion often represent "interactional features of negotiations" during the tutorials, that is, when the tutees are involved in "extended negotiations" and are provided "assisted performance and scaffolding" by the tutor (p. 190). As Goldstein and Conrad (1990) and Williams (2004) have already noted, greater tutee participation—as seen in Ms. Kim's tutorials—seems to result in more reflection on tutor feedback and more changes in revision.

This study, however, reveals quite a different finding from those of several scholars who have compared native tutor interaction with L1 and L2 students. Unlike the recommendation made by Powers (1993) and Thonus (1999), that a more directive tutor role is desirable with non-native tutees rather than with native tutees, this study implies that it may be beneficial for even non-native tutees to actively participate in tutor talk, when it is conducted in L1. The higher acceptance rate of tutor feedback when tutees worked more collaboratively, as in the case of Ms. Kim, is a case in point. Also, the study demonstrates that the sharing of the same native language between the tutor and the tutee can facilitate discussion, not only serving as a clarification tool as suggested by J. Lee and U. Maeng (2013), but also mediating the discussion so that the tutor and the tutee can solve a problem collaboratively, in particular, when the tutee's language ability is not high as in this study.

The findings of this study are limited in their generalizability since it is based on only two Korean tutors with a few tutees. In order to delve into the usefulness of the native language more deeply, future studies should investigate a larger and more diverse population of non-native tutors and tutees. As writing centers are no longer restricted to North American countries, but are now spread all over the world, a greater understanding of these interactions would be beneficial for both students and teachers. One of the biggest obstacles in establishing writing centers in countries other than English speaking countries is questionability of the quality of feedback non-native tutors can provide in comparison with that of native tutors. As this study shows, as non-native tutors are capable of actively encouraging the participation of tutees by relying on their same language background, non-native tutors can help tutees become better writers.

## REFERENCES

Bartlett, E. (1982). Learning to revise: Some component processes. In M. Nystrand (Ed.),

- What writers know: The language, process and structure of written discourse* (pp. 345–363). New York: Academic Press.
- Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The psychology of written composition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Brooks, J. (1995). Minimalist tutoring: Making the student do all the work. In C. Murphy & S. Sherwood (Eds.), *The St. Martin's sourcebook for writing tutors* (pp. 83-87). New York: St. Martin's.
- Clark, I. L. (1995). Collaboration and ethics in writing center pedagogy. In C. Murphy & S. Sherwood (Eds.), *The St. Martin's sourcebook for writing tutors* (pp. 88-95). New York: St. Martin's.
- Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language acquisition. In J. Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 33–56). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Goldstein, L., & Conrad, S. (1990). Student input and negotiation of meaning in ESL writing conferences. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24, 443-460.
- Harris, M. (1995). Talking in the middle: Why writers need writing tutors. *College English*, 57, 27-42.
- Lee, Jeongsook, & Maeng, Unkyung. (2013). Code-switching behavior of Korean-English bilingual teenagers. *Modern English Education*, 14(3), 67-95.
- North, S. M. (1984). The idea of a writing center. *College English*, 5, 433-446.
- Powers, J. (1993). Rethinking writing center conferencing strategies for the ESL writer. *Writing Center Journal*, 13, 39-47.
- Ritter, J. (2002). Negotiating the center: An analysis of writing center tutorial interactions between ESL learners and native-English speaking writing center tutors. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64(06), 2224A.
- Thonus, T. (1999, March). *NS-NNS interaction in academic writing tutorials: Discourse analysis and its interpretations*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of American Association of Applied Linguistics, Stamford, CT.
- Thonus, T. (2004). What are the differences? Tutor interactions with first- and second-language writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 227-242.
- van Gelderen, A. (1997). Elementary students' skills in revising. *Written Communication*, 14, 360–397.
- Weissberg, R. (2006a). *Connecting speaking and writing in second language writing instruction*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Weissberg, R. (2006b). Scaffolded feedback: Tutorial conversations with advanced L2 writers. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing* (246-265). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, J. (2002). Undergraduate second language writers in the writing center. *Journal*

*of Basic Writing, 21(2), 73-91.*

Williams, J. (2004). Tutoring and revision: Second language writers in the writing center. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*, 173-201.

Williams, J. (2006). The role(s) of writing centers in second language writing instruction. In P. K. Matsuda, C. Ortmeier-Hooper, & X. You (Eds.), *The politics of second language writing: In search of the promised land* (pp. 109–126). West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press.

Williams, J., & Severino, C. (2004). The writing center and second language writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*, 165-172.

## APPENDIX 1

### S4's First Draft

Introduction-good morning. it's a great pleasure to make a presentation to you today.

I will announce about the things that I want to do if I won the lottery.

The reason I chose this topic was that I thought if I won the lottery it would be nice.

But I don't know what to do for the prize money.

So I write about this topic.

I do not deal with profound about lottery. I will simply talk about things want to do.

Half of the people who won the lottery is living the worse life than usual. However I will never live an unfortunate life.

First I will deposit half of prize money in the bank. So I receive huge interest. Then I go out shopping. During that times what I want to bought, but could not bought purchase without worry. I buy clothing, fashion goods and new furniture. I would like to move a house with large garden and second floor. The things that I had dreamed from early childhood. Also buy a car. Now go to the plastic surgery, I do plastic operation that I didn't that had not enough money. What I want to surgery is all of face. I love a face like 박민영, 민효린. And do not diet hard, I will be slim to remove fat. after having other appearance I would like to go around the world trip. Hong kong, Japan, Australia and so on.

The important things are nobody will know that I won the lottery. As come out television, because trouble with neighbor.

When If I won the lottery I don't know whether I will do that or not. However, even though my imagination, I enjoyed while this thinking. In order to happen this situation for real, I will buy lotto from now.

Thank you for listening to my funny story.

## APPENDIX 2

S4's Final Draft<sup>1</sup>

Introduction-Good morning. It's a great pleasure to make a presentation to you today. I want to tell you about the things that I want to do if I win the lottery. The reason I chose this topic was that I thought if I win the lottery it would be nice. However, I don't know what to do with the prize money. So I am writing about this topic. I do not deal with the profound thing about the lottery. I will simply talk about things I want to do.

Half of the people who won the lottery are living a worse life than before. However I will never live an unfortunate life. First, I will deposit half of prize money in the bank. So I receive huge interest. Then I go out shopping. I can purchase what I wanted to buy, but could not buy without worry. I want to buy clothing, fashion goods and new furniture. I would like to move into a house with a large garden and a second floor. The things are that I had dreamed of since early childhood. I will also buy a car. Now I wants the plastic surgery. I will do the plastic operation that I could not do because I did not have enough money. What I want to get the surgery is all of face. I love a face like 박민영 and 민효린. I will remove fat to be slim without a hard diet. After having the surgery I would like to go on a trip around the world. Hong Kong, Japan, Australia and so on.

The important thing is nobody knows that I won the lottery. If it comes on television, it would be trouble with other people. If I win the lottery I don't know whether I will do that or not. However, even though it is my imagination, I have enjoyed thinking this. For this situation to happen for real, I will buy the lotto tickets from now.

Thank you for listening to my funny story.

**Examples in: English****Applicable Languages: English****Applicable Levels: Tertiary**

Sookyung Cho  
 Department of English Linguistics  
 Hankuk University of Foreign Studies  
 107 Imun-Ro, Dongdaemun-Gu, Seoul 130-791, Korea  
 Tel: (02) 2173-3194  
 Email: sookyoungcho@hufs.ac.kr

---

<sup>1</sup> Underlines emphasize the changes made in the revision.

Suyeon Kim  
College of Liberal Arts  
Anyang University  
Smaduk-Ro 37-22, Manan-Gu, Anyang, Gyeonggi, 430-714, Korea  
Tel: (031) 467-0783  
Email: [suyeonster@gmail.com](mailto:suyeonster@gmail.com)

Received 14 March 2014

Revised 8 May 2014

Accepted 16 May 2014