Investigating L2 writing through tutor-tutee interactions and revisions: A case study of a multilingual writer in EAP tutorials

Lu Yu

Department of Curriculum and Instruction, The Pennsylvania State University, 256 Chambers Building, University Park, PA, 16802, USA

A R T I C L E I N F O	A B S T R A C T
	This case study draws on the framework of Vygotskian sociocultural theory to investigate tutor-tutee interactions carried out in a series of tutoring sessions and the tutee's subsequent revisions to her writing drafts over the course of a semester. In total, eight tutoring sessions were analyzed, along with 12 pieces of writing constructed by the writer for five writing tasks. The results showed that the writing tasks, rather than the writing stages, influenced both the problem areas addressed by the tutor and the directiveness of his feedback. Overall, the tutor focused more on the rhetorical aspects of the texts than on the sentence-level issues, and he adopted a largely directive approach to tutoring. However, the tutee incorporated more sentence-level than text-level suggestions into her subsequent drafts. In the meantime, contextual, interpersonal, and institutional forces all shaped her text revision decisions. Over time, the tutee's writing showed changes on rhetorical aspects directly connected to her tutor's mediation, but she continued to work on some basic text-level issues. The study suggests the importance of providing tutorial support that is sensitive to writers' emerging abilities as well as their needs and responsiveness as revealed during the course of tutor-tutee interactions.

1. Introduction

In the second language (L2) writing literature, it is widely accepted that teacher/tutor feedback provided in one-on-one, face-to-face environments benefits multilingual writers due to its immediacy and the potential to be context-rich, to focus on specific writing needs, and to provide opportunities for interaction and negotiation (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2014; Harris & Silva, 1993; Leki, 2009). The role of individual writing conferences has been examined through different theoretical frameworks (e.g., the cognitive-interactionist perspective and Vygotskian sociocultural theory), in different tutorial settings (e.g., classroom-based and writing center-based), and with learners of various language proficiency levels. Despite the value placed on providing oral feedback and interacting with multilingual writers about their texts, the relationship between the interactional processes in writing conferences and the drafts subsequently produced by L2 writers has been under-researched (e.g., Goldstein, 2006; Patthey-Chavez & Ferris, 1997; Williams, 2004). The existing feedback/revision studies focus principally on only one writing conference/tutoring session and its effect on the texts the learners produce. It is not clear, therefore, how writing instructors or tutors may vary their approach to tutoring the same learners when the writing task is different or when the learner is at different stages of the writing process. Adopting a case study approach, this research investigates tutor-tutee interactions in a series of tutorials operated in conjunction with a first-year English as a second language (ESL) academic writing course offered at a large US university, along with the tutee's subsequent revisions made on her drafts during the semester. The study aims to explore the empirical connection between the tutor and tutee's interactional processes, the tutee's text revisions, and her L2 writing development.

E-mail address: Lzy5097@psu.edu.

2. Literature review

2.1. Debates on approaches to tutoring

Traditionally, the principles of tutoring multilingual writers have been influenced by the writing center philosophy that prioritizes rhetorical concerns (e.g., organization, content, and argument) over linguistic concerns (e.g., grammar, punctuation, and mechanics) and favors a collaborative, non-directive approach to tutoring (Gillespie & Lerner, 2000; Moussu, 2013; Severino & Cogie, 2016; Severino, 2009). Originally developed to serve L1 writers, these tutorial guidelines have been challenged and debated when L2 writers' needs and situations are considered (Blau & Hall, 2002; Harris & Silva, 1993; Myers, 2003; Powers, 1993; Thonus, 1993, 2004). In regard to priorities, Harris and Silva (1993) argued that whether working with ESL writers or L1 writers, tutors should be firm about addressing rhetorical concerns before sentence-level, linguistic issues. A different view, however, is that in ESL writers' texts it is not always possible to distinguish global from local concerns given that these may be intertwined and that some fundamental language issues can create problems at the rhetorical level (Blau & Hall, 2002; Myers, 2003). The suggestion, therefore, is that the central role of language in ESL students' writing should be better acknowledged and that tutors should provide instruction on issues at both the rhetorical and linguistic level.

In terms of the debate over directive versus non-directive approaches to tutoring, some scholars have argued for a more directive style of interaction in tutoring ESL writers (e.g., Blau & Hall, 2002; Harris & Silva, 1993; Powers, 1993). A directive style, as noted by Severino and Cogie (2016), is characterized as a hands-on approach where tutors tell writers how to improve their texts rather than dialogue with the writers and lead them to reach solutions to their own problems. In her empirical studies comparing the tutoring of non-native English-speaking (NNES) writers with the tutoring of native English-speaking (NES) writers, Thonus (1999, 2004) found that tutors asked more "closed" (yes/no) questions, rather than open-ended, Socratic questions when tutoring NNES students, but the reverse situation occurred when they worked with NES students. In addition, the tutors produced longer turns, provided more suggestions, and initiated fewer extended negotiation sequences in sessions with NNES students than with NES students. Thonus (1999, 2004) identified two key contributing factors to the tutoring style observed among tutors working with NNES writers: (1) more direct feedback, although not aligned with traditional writing center philosophy, was more comprehensible to NNES writers, and (2) the NNES tutees expected their native-speaking tutors to take on a more authoritative, teacher-like role. Overall, Thonus (2014) emphasized that tutor training must give up the one-size-fits-all approach to embrace instead tutoring practices customized to meet the needs of each individual multilingual writer.

More recently, in a series of articles reporting survey data collected from a university writing conference program and writing center attendees across 26 US states, Eckstein (2013a, 2013b, 2016) found that the student populations differed in terms of their experiences and expectations regarding the focus and style of writing conferences. Lower-proficiency English L2 learners preferred less-interactive conferences focused more on linguistic issues whereas higher-proficiency English L2 learners preferred more collaborative interactions and feedback focused on rhetorical concerns (Eckstein, 2013b). At the surveyed writing centers, in comparison with the L1 students and Generation 1.5 students, the L2 students not only expected more grammar-focused feedback, but also reported receiving more language support than did the other two groups of students (Eckstein, 2016).

Research on tutor-tutee interactions and teacher-learner writing conferences has also drawn on Vygotskian sociocultural theory in understanding the structure of social interactions (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994; Ewert, 2009; Patthey-Chavez & Ferris, 1997; Williams, 2002). According to Vygotsky's (1981) general genetic law of cultural development, cognitive development originates from social and interpersonal activity, which is then internalized by the individual to function on the intrapsychological plane through a complex process mediated by semiotic tools. In their seminal study on oral corrective feedback directed at L2 learners' written errors, Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994) drew on the concept of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) to propose that the effectiveness of oral feedback cannot be determined outside moment-by-moment interactions between the learner (tutee) and the mediator (tutor). In their study, a regulatory scale of 12 levels of feedback with an increasing degree of explicitness provided by the tutor was identified based on an analysis of tutor-tutee interactions. Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994) argued that assistance rendered by a tutor should be highly strategic to be sensitive to the learner's ZPD, and development occurs when learners internalize the mediation provided by the tutor as they show increasing signs of independent functioning.

2.2. Relationship between writing conferences and text revisions

Compared with the body of studies on the interactional processes in writing conferences, far less research has investigated the impact of these conferences on students' subsequent writing. In one of the earliest studies examining writing conferences with ESL students and the relationship between conference discourse and students' revisions in subsequent drafts, Goldstein and Conrad (1990) found that revisions were much more likely to occur if they had been negotiated during the conference. In a following case study, however, Goldstein (2006) found that the connection between the negotiation of meaning during conferences and students' subsequent success in revisions may be less direct than suggested in Goldstein and Conrad (1990). Goldstein (2006) thus compellingly showed the complex relationship between text and context: what seems to be an ideal conference for successful revisions may be influenced by factors outside the conference discourse, such as the learner's time schedule and the writing instructor's course requirements.

In another earlier study, Patthey-Chavez and Ferris (1997) compared strong writers with weak writers in terms of their distribution of talk during writing conferences and their subsequent revisions. The study found that stronger writers consistently took more initiative and spoke more than weaker writers during writing conferences. Moreover, compared with weaker writers, stronger

writers made more substantial revisions and transferred fewer suggestions from conferences verbatim into subsequent drafts. Referring to the Vygotskian notion of ZPD, the researchers showed that all the participants, to varying degrees, improved their texts as a result of the assistance received from their teachers during the conferences. In a later study, Williams (2004) indicated that a higher level of incorporation of suggestions was seen when the feedback was provided more explicitly or when the learners actively participated in the tutor-tutee interactions. Further, compared with text-level issues addressed during the tutorials, issues related to sentence-level features were more likely to be incorporated into subsequent drafts. In this study, two of the five tutoring sessions conducted by four tutors focused almost entirely on issues related to content and organization, whereas in two other sessions the tutors heavily prioritized language. One tutee closely followed her tutor's suggestions, whereas another tutee rejected most of the suggestions given by a different tutor. It is not known whether these results reflected the tutoring styles of the observed tutors and how the tutees ordinarily responded to tutorials, or whether the pattern would change should more tutoring sessions carried out by the same tutors or tutees be examined.

In summary, studies on the relationship between conferencing discourse and L2 writers' subsequent text revisions have explored how factors related to interactional processes, L2 learners' language proficiency, text features, and contextual situations may influence learners' uptake of the suggestions provided during writing conferences. Overall, the existing research has mostly focused on one conference session and its relationship with learners' revisions in subsequent drafts. It is still not clear how tutor-tutee interactions might change when different texts are discussed, or how learners would perform in subsequent, new texts that are beyond revisions on the same paper.

The current study seeks to elucidate this relationship by analyzing eight tutoring sessions conducted by a tutor with a tutee during one semester, wherein multiple drafts composed by the learner for different writing assignments are investigated. The study is guided by the following questions:

1 To what extent did the tutor vary his approach to tutoring the same learner when the writing task was different and when the learner was at different stages of the writing process?
2 To what extent did the learner incorporate the suggestions provided during the tutoring sessions into her subsequent drafts?
3 What changes in text quality did the learner demonstrate over time?

3. Method

3.1. Context of the study

This study was carried out during the tutorials operated in conjunction with a one-semester academic writing course offered to first-year international undergraduates at a large US university. Altogether five major writing assignments were required by the course over the semester: an extended definition essay, a comparison and contrast essay, a topic proposal, an annotated bibliography, and a problem-solution essay. The third and fourth assignments were designed to prepare students for the final problem-solution essay. For the topic proposal assignment, the students were required to identify and analyze a problem and discuss some of the challenges that should be considered by those seeking to solve it. The annotated bibliography helped the students to compile useful resources on both the problem and possible solutions to the problem. In the problem-solution essay, the students were required to address the same problem again, followed by the presentation and analysis of several possible solutions and an argument in favor of one of these. Taken together, the last three assignments would address the same topic and they functioned as a chain of genres in facilitating students to compose increasingly complex texts.

The class from which the tutee participant was recruited met twice a week for a total of two and a half hours. The instructor conducted two writing conferences with each student during the semester. In addition to the writing assignments, each student delivered two oral presentations to the class, one on the topic for the comparison and contrast essay, and the other on the final problem-solution essay. The course text was Rosa and Eschholz's Models for Writers: Short Essays for Composition (2015).

An optional one-credit tutorial was offered for students who wished to receive extra tutoring for their course assignments. At the beginning of the semester, the instructors of the course collected writing samples from the students and encouraged those whom they thought would benefit from extra attention to their writing to register for this tutorial. Participation in the tutorial was, however, voluntary. In the tutoring sessions, which were around 30 min long each and offered on a weekly basis, a tutor would meet with a tutee individually to discuss potential issues with the assigned writing tasks.

3.2. Participants

Most of the tutors conducting the tutorials were graduate students in Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) who were enrolled in a tutoring internship class in the department through which both the course and the tutorials were offered. The tutor (Ryan, a pseudonym) recruited for this study was tutoring for the third semester and had just obtained his TESL degree. He also had the experience of teaching the academic writing course for two semesters during his graduate assistantship as a graduate student. Ryan spoke Chinese as his first language and was highly proficient in English. The tutee, Ling (a pseudonym), was a first-year Thai undergraduate majoring in materials science and engineering. It was her second year in the US at the time of the study. Ling came to the country after finishing high school in Thailand, where she had been taught English vocabulary and grammar by a Thai-speaking teacher and engaged in simple conversations with an L1 English-speaking teacher. In the US, Ling had attended a boarding high school for a year to prepare for the transition to university. She was taking the tutorial at the recommendation of her writing course instructor.

When I approached the director of the tutoring program with information about this study, she suggested that I recruit tutors who already had some tutoring experience. Of the tutors with such experience, Ryan was the only one who wished to participate, had a schedule that accorded with mine, and was paired with a tutee (Ling) who was also interested in taking part. For these reasons, Ryan and Ling were selected as the study participants.

3.3. Data collection and analysis

At the request of the director of the tutoring program, data collection began in the second month of the spring semester, after the tutor and tutee had met a few times and become familiar with each other. In the first recorded tutoring session, Ling and Ryan discussed the first draft of the second major assignment required for the course, the comparison and contrast essay. Altogether eight tutoring sessions were audiotaped and analyzed for the study. During these sessions, Ling's first and second drafts for each of the three major assignments — the comparison and contrast (C/C) essay, the topic proposal (T/P) essay, and the problem-solution (P/S) essay — were discussed, and Ling revised her draft after each tutorial. Before Ling began her first draft of the topic proposal, the course instructor asked the class to complete a 250- to 300-word journal entry as preparation. Similarly, before submitting her first draft of the problem-solution essay, Ling was required to prepare a solution essay to discuss possible solutions to the proposed problem. Ling discussed both the journal entry and the solution essay with Ryan during the tutoring sessions. To fulfill the course requirements, Ling had only to revise the journal entry to produce a second draft whereas a revised draft of the solution essay was not required.

Each draft Ling brought to the tutorial for discussion was collected immediately after the tutoring session, together with the revised draft that Ling completed following the tutorial. The dataset comprises a total of 12 drafts composed by Ling. Table 1 summarizes the essays discussed during the tutoring sessions and the drafts collected afterwards. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with the tutor and the tutee respectively at the beginning of the study. At the end of the data collection, an email interview was administered with Ling with the goal of understanding her views on the effectiveness of the tutorials, the type of feedback she preferred, and her reasons for following or not following her tutor's suggestions in the revision process.

To address Research Question 1, the tutoring sessions were analyzed from two perspectives: whether the tutor gave priority to rhetorical concerns or linguistic concerns, and whether he adopted a more directive or non-directive style of tutoring. Following Williams (2004), all the episodes of problematicity that occurred in the tutoring sessions were identified and transcribed. A problematicity episode was an interaction, initiated by the tutor or the tutee, where whether something in the writing might need revision – and if so, how to revise it – was discussed. Such an episode consisted of three phases: (1) identification of a potential problem, (2) negotiation about the nature of the problem, and (3) resolution of the problem if it was decided that some revision in the text was necessary (Cumming & So, 1996). Each episode of problematicity was coded depending on whether it pertained to content, organization, or topic selection (text-level), vocabulary or grammatical features (sentence-level), or conventions of academic writing such as the use of APA style (conventions). Occasionally, it was difficult to determine whether an issue was linguistic or rhetorical, as these two kinds of problems can be intertwined. In such cases, the coding depended on whether the source of the problem was principally grammatical (e.g., word choice and sentence structure) or rhetorical. Not all the problematicity episodes identified resulted in a suggestion for change, as sometimes the tutor asked the tutee to clarify and then decided that no change was necessary after all. To determine the directiveness of the assistance Ryan provided during the tutoring sessions, a regulatory scale representing increasing levels of explicitness in mediation was generated through an inductive analysis of the tutoring sessions. The procedure followed was similar to Aljaafreh and Lantolf's (1994) approach to identifying levels of assistance in providing oral corrective feedback. In the current study, the mediational moves adopted by Ryan in the tutorials were identified and placed on a scale of explicitness, and the distribution of the moves in each tutoring session was calculated.

Research Question 2 explores the connection between writing conferences and the writer's subsequent text revisions. All the suggestions for text changes proposed during the conferences were identified, whether initiated by Ryan or by Ling. Again, the suggestions for revisions were categorized into text-level, sentence-level, and the level of academic writing conventions. The revised drafts were then analyzed to determine whether the suggestions had been incorporated into Ling's subsequent texts. Occasionally, Ling did not take up a suggestion in her next draft, but did so instead in a third draft, or even in the next essay assignment. Such cases were considered examples of uptake of the suggestions for change in the data analysis.

Finally, Research Question 3 was addressed qualitatively by analyzing the major problem areas identified by Ryan across the tutoring sessions and the extent to which Ling's drafts composed for the three major writing assignments (C/C, T/P, and P/S essays)

Table 1
Essays Discussed during Tutoring Sessions and Drafts Collected Afterwards.

Tutoring session	Essay discussed during tutoring	Essay collected after tutoring
1	Draft 1 of C/C essay	Draft 1 and draft 2 of C/C essay
2	Draft 2 of C/C essay	Draft 3 of C/C essay
3	Draft 1 of journal entry	Draft 1 and draft 2 of journal entry
4	Draft 1 of T/P essay	Draft 1 and draft 2 of T/P essay
5	Draft 2 of T/P essay	Draft 3 of T/P essay
6	Solution essay	Solution essay
7	Draft 1 of P/S essay	Draft 1 and draft 2 of P/S essay
8	Draft 2 of P/S essay	Draft 3 of P/S essay

reflected the changes Ryan had suggested. Specifically, the three drafts for each assignment were compared to identify major changes made over the drafts for the same assignment. In addition, the first drafts of the T/P essay and the P/S essay were compared with the first draft of the C/C essay to determine changes in Ling's independent writing over different assignments.

To check the reliability and soundness of the data analysis procedures, a second rater with training in qualitative research and experience teaching the academic writing course recoded all the data. Interrater reliability (Miles & Huberman, 1994) for the categorization of the problematicity episodes was 93.8 %. The interrater reliability value for the coding of Ling's uptake of Ryan's suggestions was 92.4 %, and for the data on changes in Ling's text quality over time, an interrater reliability of 94.7 % was achieved for the 38 coding decisions. In analyzing the directiveness of Ryan's assistance, the other rater and I coded the data separately, and then we compared and refined the codes on the mediational moves on the regulatory scale as well as the distribution of the moves over the tutorials. Discrepancies were resolved through discussion and re-analyzing the relevant data. Finally, following the data analysis, the findings were shared with Ryan and Ling to check the viability and validity of the interpretations.

4. Findings

4.1. Research question 1: approach to tutoring adopted by Ryan

4.1.1. Problem areas addressed during the tutorials

Table 2 presents the distribution of the problematicity episodes as they occurred in each tutoring session. It can be seen that overall, Ryan focused markedly more on text-level issues in Ling's writing than on either sentence-level issues or issues related to the conventions of academic writing. The number of text-level episodes initiated by Ryan account for over half the total number of problematicity episodes. Sentence-level issues were discussed much less frequently but there was still some treatment on them in a few tutoring sessions. In addition, text-level issues were discussed less frequently over time, with 30 episodes devoted to such issues in the first half of the tutorials (T1-T4) and only 19 text-level related episodes in the rest of the tutoring sessions (T5–T8). Similarly, there was a decline in episodes where sentence-level issues were addressed over time. A total of 12 episodes targeted sentence-level issues in the first half of the tutoring sessions (T1–T4), whereas only six episodes focused on issues of this kind in the remaining four sessions (T5–T8). Conventions of academic writing, in contrast, were least addressed, with no more than three problematicity episodes devoted to such concerns in each tutoring session.

The writing task discussed in each conference influenced the occurrence of the episodes targeting text-level issues. Compared with the tutorials in which the C/C essay and the P/S essay were discussed (T1, T2, T7, and T8), far fewer episodes (only 7) involving text-level issues were identified during T4 and T5, where Ryan and Ling worked on the first two drafts of the T/P essay, and only three episodes targeting text-level issues occurred in T6 during which the solution essay was discussed. In the tutorial where Ryan and Ling looked for online sources to prepare for the T/P essay (T3), Ryan explained that he did not consider T/P to be a very formal essay, as shown in Excerpt 1:

Excerpt 1

1 L: It's okay to have only two body paragraphs, right?
2 R: Yeah, I think so (.) that's fine (.) to me, topic proposal is not even like a (.) super
3 formal essay- it's more of a justification of why you want to do it- why this is a problem

Note. L = Ling, R = Ryan. See Appendix A for transcription conventions.

As Ryan states, the purpose of the T/P essay was to identify a problem that needed to be addressed, the argument for which would be incorporated into the final P/S essay. Compared with the C/C and P/S essays, the T/P essay was less complex in terms of organization, and during the tutorials Ryan mainly focused on the appropriateness and sufficiency of the examples provided to explain the seriousness of the problem. Similarly, only three text-level problematicity episodes occurred during T6. Each episode,

Table 2
Distribution of Episodes of Problematicity across Tutoring Sessions.

	T 1 C/C 1	T 2 C/C 2	T 3 Journal	T4 T/P 1	T5 T/P 2	T6 S	T7 P/S 1	T8 P/S 2	Total
Text-level	**8**	**11**	**6**	**5**	**2**	**3**	**9**	**5**	**49**
Tutor initiated	5	10	5	4	2	3	9	4	42
Writer initiated	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	7
Sentence-level	**0**	**5**	**3**	**4**	**3**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**18**
Tutor initiated	0	5	3	4	3	0	3	0	18
Writer initiated	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Conventions	**3**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**13**
Tutor initiated	2	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	9
Writer initiated	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	4

Note: T1 stands for the first tutoring session.

however, involved a lengthy discussion and negotiation between Ryan and Ling, which ranged in length from three minutes and 20 s to nine minutes. In this tutoring session, they worked on the essay prepared by Ling on three possible solutions to the problem identified in her T/P essay, sexism in the language of politicians in the US. Instead of addressing various text-level issues in the essay, as he had done with the C/C and P/S essays, Ryan focused only on the feasibility of the three proposed solutions.

In regard to the question of whether the stage of drafting influenced the problem areas addressed by the tutor, Ryan explained during the interview conducted at the beginning of the study that he tended to focus on text-level over sentence-level issues in the tutee's initial draft to make sure the essay was on the right track, and he would deal with linguistic issues when the tutee worked on the final draft. An analysis of the tutor-tutee interactions, however, indicates that Ryan actually addressed sentence-level issues in Ling's first drafts of the journal entry as well as in the T/P and P/S essays. It was found that sometimes an error at the linguistic level did, indeed, affect the content and logic of the text. In T3, for example, Ryan and Ling discussed the first draft of the journal entry composed by Ling as preparation for the T/P essay to follow. In the text, Ling discussed why she considered sexism in the US to be a problem. She included the following two sentences in the journal entry: "I found that sexism recurrently addresses the US. Sexism has been already addressed in the US for a long time." Ryan found the sentences confusing and prompted Ling to clarify, as shown in Excerpt 2:

Excerpt 2

```
 1 R: What is this?
 2 L: (4.0) Oh:: (5.0)
 3 R: (xx) but then this sentence, what does this sentence mean? "I found that sexism
 4    recurrently addresses"
 5 L: So like, I say, like (.) in the US history, like there was (2.0) er I forgot
 6    ((laugh)), so like it's kind of like gender inequality in US history and then after
 7    the (.) after the women rights like (.) pass (.) American people kind of thought
 8    that they already like done with this issue
 9 R: Um, but actually it's not?
10 L: It's not. It's like after Trump became president, it's kind of like recur- repeat
11 R: Um. Okay. Er, so these two sentences, what are the difference? "Sexism
12    recurrently addresses, Sexism has been already addressed" Er, (2.0) I think
13    it's be addressed instead of addresses, er, (2.0) yeah, so you can- you can put
14    the recurrently here (.) has been recurrently addressed
```

In this conversation, Ryan points out that the consecutive use of the active and passive voice with the word "address" is confusing in regard to the problem identified. After an attempt by Ling to explain the meaning she had intended to convey, Ryan suggests that she use the passive voice and integrate the two sentences into just one sentence (Lines 12–14). In the revised version of the journal entry, Ling indeed combined the two sentences and used the passive voice for "address:" "Sexism has been recurrently addressed in the US for a long time."

4.1.2. Directiveness of tutor feedback

Table 2 also shows that when an issue was raised for discussion, it was most likely initiated by Ryan, and all the sentence-level issues were initiated by him as well. This point is connected to the overall explicit approach to tutoring he adopted. In Table 3, the mediational moves he adopted are identified and placed on a scale of 1–9, representing an increasing level of explicitness in terms of the assistance offered. Level 1, "Tutor restates the tutee's utterance", represents the most implicit form of assistance whereas Level 9, "Tutor provides suggestion for revision or a mini-lesson on how to compose a section", represents the most explicit form of mediation. Table 4 presents the distribution of the mediational moves across the eight tutoring sessions. It can be seen that the moves were unequally distributed across the mediational levels, with the mediation at Level 9 accounting for the highest number of instances of assistance (92), followed by Level 3, "asking for explanation" (69 occurrences), and Level 7, "identifying a problem" (33 occurrences).

Further analysis of the tutor-tutee interactions shows that when he noticed a text-level issue that was relatively straightforward, the tutor tended to be more explicit in identifying the problem and providing his suggestion for revision. An example is given in Excerpt 3, where Ryan and Ling were discussing the thesis statement in the first draft of Ling's P/S essay:

Table 3
Mediational Moves Adopted by the Tutor – Implicit to Explicit.

1	Tutor restates the tutee's utterance
2	Tutor continues the tutee's utterance
3	Tutor asks for explanation (e.g., in the form of a "how", "where", "why", or "what" question)
4	Tutor asks for clarification (e.g., in the form of a yes/no question, or alternative question)
5	Tutor seeks confirmation
6	Tutor evaluates tutee's rhetorical or linguistic choices
7	Tutor identifies a problem
8	Tutor offers a choice
9	Tutor provides suggestion for revision or a mini-lesson on how to compose a section

Table 4

Distribution of Mediational Moves across Tutoring Sessions.

	T1 C/C 1	T2 C/C 2	T3 Journal	T4 T/P 1	T5 T/P 2	T6 S	T7 P/S 1	T8 P/S 2	Total
Restating	1	1	2	0	0	2	3	2	11
Continuing	0	0	1	1	0	2	3	0	7
Asking for explanation	3	11	7	6	3	19	14	6	69
Asking for clarification	2	1	5	2	2	0	3	0	15
Seeking confirmation	5	5	4	3	1	3	4	0	25
Evaluating	2	1	0	0	2	2	3	0	10
Identifying a problem	2	12	3	4	3	1	6	2	33
Offering a choice	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3
Providing a suggestion or a mini-lesson	12	14	7	13	10	11	13	12	92

Excerpt 3

1 R: So, if you look at this thesis statement, it says "Sexism in the language of
2 politicians is a significant problem to be solved in the United States by (.)
3 passing a law, creating an organization, and exercising the training diversity
4 program." And then right now, these three solutions are parallel. They're on the
5 same level, you can't see which one is better, which one is not
6 L: So I have to say which one is the better?
7 R: Eventually, uh, like, uh, in your- in your body paragraphs you actually say which
8 one is better, right?
9 L: Yeah
10 R: So then in your thesis statement you should also say so
11 L: But do I have to like (.) say about other solution?
12 R: Yes. At least in my class, yes, but- yeah, um, because to my understanding, thesis
13 is a reflection of the whole essay, right? If- if your essay- the essay is separated
14 into three main parts, right? So the first part is the problem, the second part is
15 the solutions that wouldn't work and then the solutions that would work. If these
16 three parts are the major (.) components of the essay, then they should be
17 reflected in the thesis statement
18 L: But how can I like:: do it here?
19 R: But then- it doesn't have to be one sentence
20 L: Oh
21 R: It can be multiple sentences
22 L: Okay

Ryan's feedback in this conversation is overall explicit. Rather than exploring whether Ling might be able to identify any problem with the thesis statement on her own, or at least to partially solve the problem with his assistance, Ryan directly tells Ling the issue with her thesis statement (Lines 4–5), how to address it (Line 10), and why she needs to make a change (Lines 12–17). Following this tutoring session, Ling revised the thesis statement by adding a sentence to indicate what she considered to be the best solution to the problem of sexism: "Sexism in the language of politicians is a significant problem to be solved in the United States by passing a law, creating an organization, and exercising the diversity training program. However, the diversity training seems to be the best answer for the problem."

For sentence-level issues, on the other hand, Ryan raised more questions to ask for clarification or to negotiate meaning with Ling. He sometimes also waited for a longer time to get a response from Ling, as shown in Excerpt 2, in which he was confused about the use of the active voice for "address" followed by the passive voice with the same word. This instance shows that at least some sentence-level concerns genuinely hindered Ryan from comprehending Ling's text. As Ryan commented in the interview at the beginning of the study, in his view, one issue with Ling's writing was that sometimes she did not express herself clearly such that he was unable to understand what she was trying to say.

In regard to issues related to the conventions of academic writing, Ryan provided more explicit feedback when he was able to identify the problem easily. An example can be seen in the following interaction:

Excerpt 4

1 R: Sometimes I see you put period before the parenthesis. Um yeah, like this one::
2 L: Okay
3 R: World War I and then period ((Ryan made the correction in Ling's text))
4 L: Okay

In this conversation, Ryan tells Ling directly that when an in-text citation is included at the end of a sentence, the period is to be placed after the citation, whereas Ling had placed the period in front of it. As he offered this feedback, Ryan made the correction in Ling's text.

With regard to Ryan's overall approach to providing assistance, a further point worth noting is that just as the writing task influenced the problem areas targeted by him, the task also played a role when it came to the directiveness of Ryan's mediation. In T6, for example, Ryan asked for explanation from Ling (Level 3 mediation) more frequently than during any other tutorial, as displayed in Table 4. The text discussed during T6 was the solution essay composed by Ling as preparation for the final P/S assignment. In the essay, Ling listed three possible solutions to the problem of sexism in the language of politicians: a law to protect women from being victims of sexist language; a diversity training program to educate politicians about the concepts related to sexism and to help them overcome misconceptions; and political correctness used as a tool to restrict the use of offensive and sexist language. During the tutorial, Ryan raised a series of open-ended questions to help Ling evaluate the proposed solutions in detail. Some of the questions raised by Ryan during the tutorial are presented in Table 5. These questions elicited considerably more talk from Ling as compared to her more limited contributions to the other tutoring sessions.

Table 5
Examples of Open-ended Questions Raised by the Tutor in T6.

Solution 1:	1 Why do you think it's not good?
Passing a law	2 So what are the pros of this solution?
	3 Assume that we can make such a law, what do you think the law will say?
Solution 2:	1 So let's talk about training. So, how do you exactly do that?
Diversity training program	2 What kind of people will be trained?
	3 What about the effectiveness of the training?
Solution 3:	1 What do you exactly mean by political correctness?
Political correctness	2 So, what's the good side about it?
	3 Who will actually define what's correct and what's incorrect?

4.2. Research question 2: connection between writing conferences and text revisions

In terms of the connection between tutorials and subsequent text revisions, Table 6 indicates that in comparison with suggestions related to text-level issues, suggestions on sentence-level issues and issues pertaining to the conventions of academic writing addressed during the tutoring sessions were more likely to be incorporated into subsequent drafts. The rate of uptake for suggestions on the latter two types of issues was 87.50 % and 90.9 % respectively, whereas 60.5 % of the text-level suggestions were taken up. For text-level issues, more suggestions for change (16 in total) were made in the tutorials (T1 and T2) where the first and second drafts of the C/C task were discussed than in the tutorials addressing any other writing tasks. This pattern is consistent with the distribution of problematicity episodes, as shown in Table 2, where T1 and T2 together account for the highest number of text-level problematicity episodes. As noted above, not all the problematicity episodes resulted in a suggestion for change, and thus the number of problematicity episodes and the number of suggestions for change differ. Relatedly, the incorporation rate for text-level suggestions was, in fact, lowest (43.8 %) on the first writing task, the C/C essay, whereas the rate increased to 90 % with the last writing task, the P/S essay.

The interview conducted with Ling following the data collection revealed that several factors prevented her from incorporating the suggestions into subsequent drafts. Firstly, of all the writing conferences, the uptake of text-level suggestions following T2 was the lowest, with only three of the 10 text-level suggestions incorporated into the subsequent draft, whereas all four of the sentence-level suggestions given in the same tutorial were taken up. Ling was given only two days by the instructor of the writing class to revise and resubmit the draft following this tutorial, a shorter time than she had usually been allowed to revise a draft. With limited time, Ling focused more on addressing surface-level issues in her revisions than on making extensive text-level changes.

Table 6
Suggestions for Change and Incorporation into Revisions.

	T 1 C/C 1	T 2 C/C 2	T 3 Journal	T4 T/P 1	T5 T/P 2	T6 S	T7 P/S 1	T8 P/S 2	Total
Text-level	**6**	**10**	**4**	**4**	**2**	**2**	**5**	**5**	**38**
Incorporated	4	3	3	3	0	1	4	5	23 (60.5 %)
Not incorporated	2	7	1	1	2	1	1	0	15 (39.5 %)
Sentence-level	**0**	**4**	**2**	**4**	**3**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**16**
Incorporated	0	4	2	3	3	0	2	0	14 (87.5 %)
Not incorporated	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2 (12.5 %)
Conventions	**2**	**2**	**2**	**1**	**2**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**11**
Incorporated	2	2	2	0	2	1	0	1	10 (90.9 %)
Not incorporated	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 (9.1 %)

A second reason was that at one point in the collected data, Ryan's feedback was in direct conflict with the feedback provided by the course instructor. It is interesting to see that Ling chose to follow her instructor's feedback even though the tutor's suggestion was more appropriate. In the first draft of the C/C essay, Ling mentioned that Forbes had ranked Donald Trump as the world's second most powerful person. When she and Ryan discussed the second draft of the essay, Ryan found that Ling had changed the text to say that Trump was listed as the world's second wealthiest person. After learning that the suggestion to change was given by the instructor, Ryan showed his disagreement, specifying that being powerful and being wealthy were different things. He told Ling that she could actually change the text back to the original version and explain the reason to her instructor. In the third draft of the essay, instead of taking up Ryan's feedback, however, Ling retained the change suggested by her instructor. Later, Ling admitted that her tutor's suggestion was correct, but she had followed her instructor's feedback given that the essay would be graded by the instructor.

Thirdly, although Ryan controlled the agenda of the tutorials most of the time, on a few occasions, especially towards the end of the semester, Ling demonstrated her agency by resisting her tutor's suggestion. When Ling expressed disagreement with Ryan's feedback, she did not incorporate his suggestion into her subsequent draft. For example, in the first draft of the P/S essay, when discussing the idea of creating a diversity training program as a solution to the problem of sexist political rhetoric, Ling proposed charging a fee to program participants, which Ryan questioned in the tutorial, as shown in Excerpt 5:

Excerpt 5

```
 1 R: I think a couple of things you need to do. First, um, I'm not sure you should
 2 charge those people (.) because I feel in a lot of the cases if the hirer wants you
 3 to do some training they'll pay for it
 4 L: I mean if there's a lot of politicians, like- and you need a lot of paper, like test,
 5 and people, maybe trainers, how the government (.) like pay for this? I feel like
 6 the government need to test a lot of people, but they (2.0) like not involved in
 7 the politics, so
 8 R: Okay
 9 L: I think charge- charging the politicians may be better
10 R: Okay. Yeah, let's- let's see what ((instructor's name)) says, right, and then see if
11 you want to change
```

This interaction begins with Ryan questioning the appropriateness of charging a fee to participate in the training program. Ling then explains why she thinks a fee is necessary (Lines 4–7). After Ling repeats her stance (Line 9), Ryan does not insist on his opinion anymore, but suggests that they let the course instructor decide whether a change should be made. It turned out that Ling did not change her stance in the subsequent second and third drafts of the essay.

Finally, in the collected dataset, on three occasions Ling did not incorporate a suggestion made by Ryan into her immediate subsequent draft. However, she did incorporate the suggestions into the third draft of the same writing task or into a new task when she narrowed down the topic or reorganized her essay. These instances reflected the non-linear, recursive processes of Ling's text construction and revision.

4.3. Research question 3: changes in text quality

During the tutorials, the majority of the problematicity episodes and suggestions for change provided by Ryan targeted text-level issues. The rhetorical aspects of Ling's three drafts constructed for the three major writing assignments, the C/C essay, the T/P essay, and the P/S essay, therefore, are analyzed to trace changes in the quality of her texts over time. In Table 7, the major problem areas in each draft addressed by Ryan in the tutorials are listed, along with the corresponding improved areas as reflected in Ling's subsequent drafts. The changes in text quality are examined both within the same task and across tasks. The first draft comparisons are made to explore how Ling's writing on the assigned tasks changed over time before she had received feedback from her tutor.

It can be seen from Table 7 that Ryan addressed multiple aspects of the content and organization of Ling's texts, including the introduction and conclusion, the topic sentence, the thesis statement, supporting details, and counterarguments. For the C/C task, through successive drafts, Ling developed more focused body paragraphs, clearer topic sentences, a more effective conclusion, and transitional statements to connect the body paragraphs. In the meantime, in both the first and second drafts, Ryan identified claims in the body paragraphs for which Ling had not provided sufficient explanation or adequate supporting evidence. This turned out to be the area that Ling continued to work on as she progressed through the drafts of the C/C assignment and the subsequent T/P task.

For the T/P task, with Ryan's assistance, Ling constructed a more coherent introduction in her second and third drafts of the essay. A major issue that Ryan addressed during the tutorials pertained to providing sufficient evidence in support of the main point of the essay. For example, in explaining why sexism in the language used by politicians ought to be addressed, Ling commented that both the media and politicians used words such as "ambitious" and "over-confident" to describe Hillary Clinton. In the tutorial in which the first draft of the essay was discussed, Ryan suggested that Ling explain why these words have a sexist connotation. However, Ling did not provide such an explanation in either the second or the third draft of the essay.

For the last writing task, the P/S essay, in addition to more clearly specifying her proposed solutions to the identified problem, Ling improved her writing most significantly by developing the counterargument in the final draft. Ling had presented the idea of creating a diversity training program as the most effective way to address sexism in the language of politicians, and she further proposed that as the last step of the program, the participants' understanding of the concepts related to sexism should be assessed

Table 7

Changes in Text Quality (Text-level).

	Major problem areas addressed by Ryan	Areas of improvement in Ling's texts
Draft 1 of C/C	Overlapping idea in different body paragraphs Underdeveloped body paragraph Unclear topic sentence Incomplete conclusion	
Draft 2 of C/C	Underdeveloped body paragraph Inconsistent comparison points Incoherence in one body paragraph	(Compared with Draft 1 of C/C) Overlapping idea deleted from one body paragraph Clearer topic sentence Improved conclusion
Draft 3 of C/C		(Compared with Draft 2 of C/C) Reorganized body paragraphs Transition added between paragraphs
Draft 1 of T/P	Information gap in introduction Lack of appropriate/powerful examples Irrelevant supporting detail	(Compared with Draft 1 of C/C) Better organization without overlapped ideas Clearer topic sentences Improved conclusion
Draft 2 of T/P	Incoherent introduction Insufficient explanation of one example	(Compared with Draft 1 of T/P) More coherent introduction Relevant supporting detail More explanation of one example
Draft 3 of T/P		(Compared with Draft 2 of T/P) More coherent introduction
Draft 1 of P/S	Incomplete thesis statement Mismatch between the problem and solutions	(Compared with Draft 1 of C/C) Better organization without overlapping ideas Clearer topic sentences Improved conclusion Stronger and more sophisticated arguments
Draft 2 of P/S	Lack of counterargument Insufficient illustration of the con side of a solution Insufficient explanation of one solution	(Compared with Draft 1 of P/S) Improved thesis statement More coherence between problem and solutions
Draft 3 of P/S		(Compared with Draft 2 of P/S) Added counterargument More illustration of the con side of a solution More explanation of one solution

with a test. In the last recorded tutoring session in which Ryan and Ling worked on the second draft of this essay, Ryan explained the concept of counterargument, thereby prompting Ling to consider whether her proposed solution had any disadvantages. Following this tutorial, Ling added a paragraph that included counterarguments with rebuttals in the last draft of her P/S essay.

Overall, compared with the first draft of the C/C essay, the initial drafts of the T/P and P/S essays composed by Ling included more unified body paragraphs and complete conclusions. Additionally, in the P/S essay, Ling presented more sophisticated arguments whereby she discussed the pros and cons of each of the three possible solutions and compared them as a basis for presenting one as the most effective of the three. On the other hand, during the tutorials in which the first drafts of the last two assignments were discussed, Ryan noted that Ling still needed to work on some basic issues at the text level, including an incoherent introduction, irrelevant supporting detail, misalignment between the identified problem and the solutions proposed, and insufficient supporting evidence.

5. Discussion

This study extends the existing research on L2 writing conferences and text revisions by examining the processes through which Ling worked with her tutor Ryan in eight weekly EAP tutorials and composed multiple drafts for a series of writing tasks. With regard to Research Question 1, a clear role of writing task has been found on the problem areas addressed by the tutor as well as the directiveness of his feedback. Among the examined writing tasks, both the T/P essay and the solution essay served as preparation for the final P/S essay. In the first two assignments, Ryan addressed fewer areas of rhetorical problems than in the C/C and P/S assignments. He mostly focused on the content of the text, such as the background context to the problem, Ling's argument on its seriousness, and possible solutions to the identified problem. The tutoring session in which Ryan and Ling discussed the solution essay was characterized by a much more non-directive style on Ryan's part and more active participation by Ling as they collaboratively compared the proposed solutions and sought to determine the best one.

Unlike the writing tasks, writing stages were not shown to exert an obvious influence on Ryan's approach to tutoring. He addressed both text-level and sentence-level issues in various drafts of Ling's essays. The tutor-tutee interactions also evidenced instances in which the distinction between text-level and sentence-level issues was not clear-cut but rather intertwined, echoing the observation made by a number of writing center scholars (e.g., Blau & Hall, 2002; Myers, 2003; Severino & Cogie, 2016).

Ryan focused more on the rhetorical aspects of Ling's texts than the linguistic issues. This finding, along with his intention to postpone the discussion on grammatical issues until the final draft (as expressed in the interview), mirror the practice endorsed by traditional writing center philosophy that prioritizes global concerns, such as organization and content, over sentence-level issues (e.g., Gillespie & Lerner, 2000; Harris & Silva, 1993; Severino, 2009). Ryan's intention to refrain from discussing sentence-level issues until the final draft may have derived from the tutoring training that he received. In practice, however, he did not rigidly adhere to this principle. In addition, a grammatical error could affect the content and logic of an essay, as shown in Excerpt 2, where Ryan addressed the error once it was noticed.

Ling stated in the post-study interview that her writing had improved thanks to Ryan's assistance. Ling believed that Ryan's suggestions were all helpful, but those targeting the content and ideas of her essays were the most effective. This response diverges from the findings reported in earlier studies where ESL students preferred error correction and feedback on grammatical and word choices over feedback on rhetorical issues in their texts (e.g., Cumming & So, 1996; Leki, 1991; Moussu, 2013). A possible reason for Ling's appreciation of Ryan's feedback on the content and ideas of her writing is that the goal of the writing course, for which the tutorials were offered, was to familiarize multilingual writers with the expectations and processes of producing written English for academic purposes. The guidelines for evaluating the essays as stated in the handbook provided to the instructors required that when in doubt, organization and content should be given priority over grammar. It was likely that these evaluation criteria were communicated to Ling in class. Having taught the course prior to tutoring Ling, Ryan was also well aware of how Ling's texts would be evaluated by her instructor. Apart from course expectations, Ling's perception of her own writing may account for the type of feedback she preferred. In the same interview, she commented that a major problem with her writing was that although she was able to come up with many ideas and topics, she did not know how to organize them or write about them logically. Ryan's suggestions on the rhetorical issues in Ling's writing helped her to improve in what she considered the weakest areas of her drafts. Overall, Ling trusted Ryan's knowledge and expertise, and she was satisfied with the tutorials. This finding corroborates the findings in Okuda (2019), where more positive evaluation of the tutorials occurred when the tutees' motives and goals aligned with those of the tutors and with the writing center policies.

Although Ryan raised more open-ended questions in certain tutorials (T6 and T7 in particular) than in others, his general approach to tutoring was rather directive. Ryan acknowledged in the interview that he was aware of his overall directive approach in tutoring Ling. He explained that on noticing a problem, he liked to point it out immediately, as he might forget about it otherwise. It seems that Ryan's directiveness in providing assistance depended more on whether he understood Ling's intended meaning, or whether there was a genuine need to negotiate meaning before he could diagnose a problem and propose a solution to it (as the questions presented in Table 5 show).

In his widely cited article on writing center tutoring, North (1984) argues that the tutor's job "is to produce better writers, not better writing" (p. 438). This view is consistent with Vygotskian theory's perspective on social interaction and mediation (e.g., Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994; Nassaji & Swain, 2000). With sufficient assistance, it is possible for the learner to get the problematic areas in a text corrected and produce a subsequent draft of higher quality. For the learner to actually develop and become a better writer, however, it is necessary to afford him/her opportunities to take more responsibility in task performance, and thus to become increasingly independent as a result of internalizing mediation offered by a more knowledgeable other. In this sense, there is room for Ryan to give Ling more opportunities to reconsider her rhetorical and linguistic choices before identifying the problem for her, and to afford her more space to propose a solution on her own.

For Research Question 2, this study indicates an indirect relationship between tutor-tutee interactions and subsequent drafts produced by the tutee. The issues addressed in a given tutoring session were not necessarily reflected in the tutee's subsequent text. Consistent with the observation reported in previous research (e.g., Dressler, Chu, Crossman, & Hilman, 2019; Williams, 2004), the present study finds that compared with feedback on text-level issues addressed during the tutoring sessions, feedback on surface-level issues was more likely to be incorporated into the writer's subsequent drafts. Meanwhile, factors such as Ling's time schedule, the feedback offered by the course instructor, and Ling's stance on the topic under discussion all influenced her uptake of the suggestions provided by Ryan. As the tasks involved multiple drafts and as the assignments were designed to build on each other, it is worth noting that Ryan's advice was not always incorporated into Ling's immediate subsequent draft. Instead, his suggestions were at times taken up in a later draft of the same essay, or in a new writing task as Ling had more time to work on the essay, narrow down the topic, or restructure her text. This means the benefits of tutoring may not be seen in an immediately improved piece of writing, a reason for which Williams (2004) calls for more longitudinal research to better understand the relationship between better texts and better writers.

Regarding Research Question 3, over time, the quality of Ling's texts demonstrated changes on several rhetorical aspects directly linked to the feedback provided by Ryan during the tutorials. On the other hand, Ling continued to experience difficulty with a few text-level issues even after receiving feedback from Ryan, such as developing a coherent and effective introduction and providing sufficient supporting evidence for the claims made in the essay. Over the semester, Ling's writing showed development in a number of ways as reflected in (1) the reduced number of text-level and sentence-level issues addressed by Ryan in successive tutorials, (2) the increased rate at which Ling incorporated text-level feedback into her work, and (3) improvements in Ling's first drafts of subsequent, new assignments. The findings that the rate of Ling's uptake of Ryan's suggestions did not show a linear increase over time, and that Ling showed more improvement in certain areas of writing while remained to work on other areas, are in line with the Vygotskian perspective that rather than a smooth, continuous path of progress, learner development is a non-linear, unevenly progressing process that is context-dependent and impacted by the quality of instructional mediation (Lantolf & Aljaafreh, 1995; Lantolf, Kurtz, & Kisselev, 2016; Vygotsky, 1978).

Lastly, the role of the tutor and his relationship to the tutee influenced the structure of the dyad's interactions as well as the tutee's subsequent revisions in important ways. Thonus (2001) argues that the tutor's role is not to be prescribed in a decontextualized manner by tutorial manuals, but rather it should be understood as a continuum of roles ranging from that of a teacher to that of a peer. In the present study, the experience of having tutored for two semesters and teaching the academic writing course as an MA student perhaps gave Ryan more authority as the mediator in assisting Ling's writing. During the tutorials, Ryan sometimes took on the role of an instructor by giving mini-lessons on what was expected on a given writing task or how to construct a certain section of the task. At other times, Ryan was more like an equal peer in his interactions with Ling over issues such as whether her selected topic would work or how to negotiate with her course instructor over text revisions.

6. Conclusion

This study has revealed the dynamic, fluid nature of tutor roles and strategies and the multifaceted, nonlinear, and recursive processes of the multilingual writer's text construction and writing development. Individualized tutor-tutee interactions are seen as an optimal site for documenting and understanding L2 learners' process of performing, appropriating, and developing writing abilities (Cumming & So, 1996; Cumming, 2016). In this process, the sociocultural context, the focus and quality of the feedback provided by the tutor, and the individual student's response to the feedback are all crucial dimensions that interact with and thus influence each other (Goldstein, 2006; Hyland & Hyland, 2006). In the current study, Ryan's approach to tutoring differed in terms of the problem areas addressed and the degree of explicitness in his feedback when writing tasks and task expectations varied. Ling's text production and ensuing revisions were shaped, in turn, by a complex interplay of textual, interpersonal, contextual, and institutional forces.

One important implication of the study is that the training provided to tutors should place more emphasis on providing mediation and support that is sensitive to the emerging, "ripening" abilities of multilingual writers (Poehner, 2018, p. 256). The regulatory scale of the levels of feedback developed by Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994) could be introduced to tutors in order to make them aware that explicit and implicit forms of assistance exist on a continuum. To provide appropriate feedback, it is important for a tutor to consider the writer's needs and responsiveness as revealed during the course of tutor-tutee interactions. In addition, it may be a good practice for tutors to read the draft before a tutorial in order to identify issues and create a stronger plan to work on those issues with the writer, or to encourage tutors to observe, tape, and review the tutorials for consciousness-raising (Thonus, 2004). In terms of research, tracing writers' text production and revisions over a longer period of time and investigating their writing in new texts instead of focusing on revisions on a single paper would afford greater insight into the writers' struggles as well as their developmental processes.

For future studies, more research with a larger sample of tutors and multilingual writers is needed to better understand the connection between tutorial interactions, text revisions, and writers' development over time. Further, future research could benefit from including retrospective interviews or stimulated recalls in data collection to gain a more nuanced understanding of writers' revision decisions. One limitation of the present study is that member checking was conducted two years after the initial data was collected, which took place in 2017. Although member-checking interviews were performed with the participants individually, the research would have been rendered more valid and rigorous had the member checking been conducted during or at the conclusion of the original study. Finally, this study does not include an examination of the comments provided by the course instructor when the changes in the tutee's texts were analyzed. The revisions made by the tutee that were not directly linked to the interactional processes may have derived from the instructor's feedback. Investigating instructor commentary along with tutor feedback will bring to light the role of the "silent participant" in the writing tutorials (Thonus, 2001, p. 61), and thus provide a more enriched and contextualized interpretation of writers' developmental processes.

Declaration of Competing Interest

None.

Appendix A. Transcription Conventions (Adapted from Jefferson, 2004)

Symbol	Meaning
(.)	A short pause, less than 0.5 seconds
(2.0)	A timed pause, e.g., 2 seconds
–	Truncated word or unfinished sentence
::	Lengthened word or sound
_	Speaker emphasis
(())	Researcher notes or comments
(xxx)	Unintelligible word or phrase

References

Aljaafreh, A., & Lantolf, J. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zone of proximal development. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*(4), 465–483. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02064.x.

Blau, S., & Hall, J. (2002). Guilt-free tutoring: Rethinking how we tutor non-native-English-speaking students. *The Writing Center Journal, 23*(1), 23–44.

Cumming, A. (2016). Theoretical orientations to L2 writing. In R. M. Manchón, & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.). *Handbook of second and foreign language writing* (pp. 65–88). Berlin: De Gruyter.

Cumming, A., & So, S. (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. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(96)90002-8.

Dressler, R., Chu, M.-W., Crossman, K., & Hilman, B. (2019). Quantity and quality of uptake: Examining surface and meaning level feedback provided by peers and an instructor in a graduate research course. *Assessing Writing, 39*(1), 14–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2018.11.001.

Eckstein, G. (2013a). The interaction of theory, philosophy, and practice in ESL writing conferences. *The CATESOL Journal, 24*(1), 174–186.

Eckstein, G. (2013b). Implementing and evaluating a writing conference program for international L2 writers across language proficiency levels. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 22*(3), 231–239. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2013.03.001.

Eckstein, G. (2016). Grammar correction in the writing center: Expectations and experiences of monolingual and multilingual writers. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 72*(3), 360–382. https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.3605.

Ewert, D. E. (2009). L2 writing conferences: Investigating teacher talk. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 18*(4), 251–269. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2009.06.002.

Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. (2014). *Teaching L2 composition: Purpose, process, and practice.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Gillespie, P., & Lerner, N. (2000). *The Allyn and Bacon guide to peer tutoring.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Goldstein, L. (2006). Feedback and revision in second language writing: Contextual, teacher, and student variables. In K. Hyland, & F. Hyland (Eds.). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 185–205). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Goldstein, L., & Conrad, S. (1990). Student input and negotiation of meaning in ESL writing conferences. *TESOL Quarterly, 24*(3), 443–460. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587229.

Harris, M., & Silva, T. (1993). Tutoring ESL students: Issues and options. *College Composition and Communication, 44*(4), 525–537. https://doi.org/10.2307/358388.

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Contexts and issues in feedback on L2 writing: An introduction. In K. Hyland, & F. Hyland (Eds.). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 1–19). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. Lerner (Ed.). *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Lantolf, J., & Aljaafreh, A. (1995). Second language learning in the zone of proximal development: A revolutionary experience. *International Journal of Educational Research, 23*(7), 619–632. https://doi.org/10.1016/0883-0355(96)80441-1.

Lantolf, J. P., Kurtz, L., & Kisselev, O. (2016). Understanding the revolutionary character of L2 development in the ZPD: Why levels of mediation matter. *Language and Sociocultural Theory, 3*(2), 153–171. https://doi.org/10.1558/lst.v3i2.32867.

Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals, 24*(3), 203–218. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1991.tb00464.x.

Leki, I. (2009). Before the conversation: A sketch of some possible backgrounds, experiences, and attitudes among ESL students visiting a writing center. In S. Bruce, & B. Rafoth (Eds.). *ESL writers: A guide for writing center tutors* (pp. 1–17). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Boynton/Cook.

Miles, M., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Moussu, L. (2013). Let's talk! ESL students' needs and writing center philosophy. *TESL Canada Journal, 30*(2), 55–68. https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v30i2.1142.

Myers, S. (2003). Reassessing the "proofreading trap": ESL tutoring and writing center instruction. *The Writing Center Journal, 24*(1), 51–70.

Nassaji, H., & Swain, M. (2000). A Vygotskian perspective on corrective feedback in L2: The effect of random versus negotiated help on the learning of English articles. *Language Awareness, 9*(1), 34–51. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658410008667135.

North, S. (1984). The idea of a writing center. *College English, 46*(5), 433–446. https://doi.org/10.2307/377047.

Okuda, T. (2019). Student perceptions of non-native English speaking tutors at a writing center in Japan. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 44*, 13–22. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.01.002.

Patthey-Chavez, G. G., & Ferris, D. (1997). Writing conferences and the weaving of multi-voiced texts in college composition. *Research in the Teaching of English, 31*(1), 51–90.

Poehner, M. E. (2018). Probing and provoking L2 development: The object of mediation in dynamic assessment and mediated development. In J. P. Lantolf, M. E. Poehner, & M. Swain (Eds.). *The Routledge handbook of sociocultural theory and second language development* (pp. 249–265). London: Routledge.

Powers, J. (1993). Rethinking writing center conferencing strategies for the ESL writer. *The Writing Center Journal, 13*(2), 39–47.

Rosa, A., & Escholz, P. (2015). *Models for writers: Short essays for composition* (12th ed.). Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Severino, C. (2009). Avoiding appropriation. In S. Bruce, & B. Rafoth (Eds.). *ESL writers: A guide for writing center tutors* (pp. 51–65). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Boynton/Cook.

Severino, C., & Cogie, J. (2016). Writing centers and second and foreign language writers. In R. M. Manchón, & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.). *Handbook of second and foreign language writing* (pp. 453–471). Berlin: De Gruyter.

Thonus, T. (1993). Tutors as teachers: Assisting ESL/EFL students in the writing center. *The Writing Center Journal, 13*(2), 13–26.

Thonus, T. (1999). How to communicate politely and be a tutor, too: NS-NNS interaction and writing center practice. *Text, 19*(2), 253–279. https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1999.19.2.253.

Thonus, T. (2001). Triangulation in the writing center: Tutor, tutee, and instructor perceptions of the tutor's role. *The Writing Center Journal, 22*(1), 59–81.

Thonus, T. (2004). What are the differences? Tutor interactions with first- and second- language writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*(3), 227–242. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.012.

Thonus, T. (2014). Tutoring multilingual students: Shattering the myths. *Journal of College Reading and Learning, 44*(2), 200–213. https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.

2014.906233.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1981). The genesis of higher mental functions. In J. V. Wertsch (Ed.). *The concept of activity in Soviet psychology* (pp. 144–188). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

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*(3), 173–201. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.009.

Lu Yu is a PhD candidate in the College of Education at the Pennsylvania State University. Her research interests include Vygotskian sociocultural theory and second language development, Dynamic Assessment, and second language writing.