Epistemics and Expertise in Peer Tutoring Interactions: Co-Constructing Knowledge of Spanish

MICHELE BACK
University of Connecticut
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Neag School of Education
249 Glenbrook Road, Unit 3033
Storrs, CT 06269-3033
Email: michele.back@uconn.edu

Peer tutoring is viewed as a valuable component of additional language learning due to the presence of a more knowledgeable interlocutor. Yet researchers and language program directors alike often ignore the linguistic and cultural differences that peer tutors possess, instead categorizing them homogeneously as 'experts' or 'native speakers.' In this article, I use a case study to closely examine how knowledge is negotiated in one peer tutoring cohort. Grounding my analysis in ethnomethodological and linguistic anthropological notions of epistemics and expertise, I show how one peer tutor drew from various embodied, artifactual, and historical resources in order to negotiate lexical gaps and position herself as an expert in the target language. At the same time, I demonstrate how essentialist ideologies help construct a language expert by highlighting the learners' alignments to the tutor's epistemic stance as knower, even when faced with conflicting information. These findings question the ways knowledge and expertise are traditionally perceived in peer tutoring and other additional language learning contexts, emphasize the need for training peer tutors in cooperative learning methods and articulating their knowledge with that from the classroom setting, and highlight the complex ideologies that surround the 'right to know' a target language.

Keywords: peer tutoring; epistemics; Spanish; interlocutor differences

PEER TUTORING, A METHOD OF COOPERA- tive learning, is viewed as having multiple bene- fits for additional language learning. Consisting of one or more learners and what Huong (2007, p. 336) termed the "more knowledgeable peer," an individual who ostensibly possesses more lin- guistic and/or cultural expertise, peer tutoring is both cooperative in its construction of mean- ing through dialog and asymmetrical in terms of status and knowledge possession. As such, inter- actions regarding what is known and not known

about the target language are crucial elements of peer tutoring discourse, both for tracking the learning process and for establishing and negoti- ating tutor/learner identities.

Yet a review of the research literature indicates a lack of differentiation regarding what peer tutors, as assumed experts, bring to tutoring interac- tions. Grouped under categories such as 'native speaker,' studies of peer tutoring often fall prey to the same essentialist definitions that characterize interlocutors in other studies on second language learning. The inability to articulate the linguistic, cultural, and symbolic differences in knowledge that peer tutors possess contributes to an ongo- ing perception by learners, language program directors, and researchers alike of languages and

cultures as static and decontextualized, rather than as imbued with an array of personal histories and perspectives. Moreover, undifferentiated treatment of peer tutor knowledge results in a shortage of detailed analyses regarding how this knowledge often conflicts with learner perceptions, textual/artifactual resources, and other sources of information about the language.

One way to articulate these differences is through analyzing particular peer tutoring cases and how knowledge is enacted therein. In this article I combine a case study approach with a close discourse analysis and the ethnomethodological notion of *epistemics in interaction*, or "how participants display, manage, and orient to their own and others' states of knowledge" (Jakonen & Morton, 2015, p. 73). This concept has been utilized in other studies of L2 learning, including classroom peer interaction (Jakonen & Morton, 2015), teacher–student interaction (Sert, 2013), and L2 writing (Bell & Elledge, 2008; Efstathiadi, 2010). As noted in Rusk, Pörn, & Sahlström (2014), "[e]pistemic stance and status, knowing and the dynamic relationships between participants' knowledge is recognizably a vital part of doing [language] learning and teaching" (p. 3). Within this context-based exploration of knowledge in interaction, I also incorporate linguistic anthropological notions of *expertise*, which highlight the ideologies and socialization processes that surround the display and negotiation of knowledge.

The study analyzes how one peer tutor–learner cohort co-constructed knowledge and expertise in peer tutoring sessions for Spanish as an additional language. Specifically, it addresses the following research questions:

RQ1. What resources does the peer tutor use to mediate knowledge and expertise in the target language?

RQ2. What role does epistemic stance play in the co-construction of expert and novice identities in this peer tutoring setting?

RQ3. What role do the learners play in positioning the peer tutor as knowledgeable?

After a review of previous studies on peer tutoring, I discuss how notions of epistemics and expertise can be used as frameworks for analyzing the co-construction and mediation of knowledge in peer tutoring sessions. I then present the case of one peer tutor, Lorena, and her peer learners, Alice and Rhonda. After providing contextual details about the setting and participants, I focus on three conversational episodes from this cohort

where knowledge was negotiated successfully and unsuccessfully, employing the categories of resolved and unresolved lexical epistemic search sequences (ESSs) as well as conversational and embodied expressions of alignment and knowledge negotiation.

Through this analysis I show how Lorena used symbolic, embodied, and artifactual tools to mediate gaps in her own knowledge of Spanish, while continuing to construct her own epistemic stance as expert. Lorena's learners played a key role in aligning to Lorena's epistemic stance through mitigations and silences, despite conflicting information from textual or artifactual sources, some of which were the same tools that Lorena used to mediate her lexical gaps in Spanish. These findings interrogate the ways that more knowledgeable interlocutors are traditionally perceived in second language learning environments and emphasize the need to further explore the complex ideologies surrounding the 'right to know' a target language, as well as to train tutors in methods that allow them to jointly negotiate meaning with their learners. The study also begins to move the discussion on peer tutoring from its dominant focus on English language teaching toward another language, here Spanish, with its own rich cultural and linguistic variety that feeds into interlocutor differences. Finally, by incorporating embodied expressions of expertise, the study adds to expanding research evidence that explores alternative interactional resources for claiming knowledge and treats language as an embodied activity.

PEER TUTORING AND LANGUAGE LEARNING

Collaborative, peer interactive language learning is perceived as beneficial for language learners from both interactionist (Keck, et al., 2006; Mackey & Goo, 2007) and sociocultural (Swain, 2006; Swain & Lapkin, 2002) perspectives. While interactionists highlight the increased opportunities of peer interaction for negotiation of meaning, sociocultural theorists note the prospects for collaboration, scaffolding, and co-construction of knowledge. Several studies have pointed to the added value of a more knowledgeable interlocutor, such as a peer tutor (e.g., Beasley, 1997; Fernández–Dobao, 2012; Gisbert & Font, 2008; Hamid, Sussex, & Khan, 2009; Huong, 2007; Young & Miller, 2004). Previous studies on the involvement of more knowledgeable interlocutors in language learning settings have primarily focused on learners of English (e.g., Bell & Elledge, 2008;

Fernández–Dobao, 2012; Thonus, 2004; Weigle & Nelson, 2004), although some research on peer interlocutor discourse in Spanish is also available (e.g., East, Tolosa, & Villers, 2012; Wright et al., 1995).

Peer tutoring, defined in Gisbert & Font (2008) as a method of cooperative learning "based on the creation of pairs of students with an asymmetrical relationship and a single common goal" (p. 482), is said to have multiple advantages for language learners and tutors alike. Meadows (2010) noted that activities, such as peer tutoring, that allowed learners to interact with more competent speakers of a target language, enabled learners to "establish a legitimate positioning for themselves" within the target culture (p. 106). Drawing further upon the notion of legitimate peripheral participation, Young and Miller (2004, p. 521) discussed how one English language learner–tutor cohort evolved with respect to their participation in "revision talk," with the learner gaining greater ownership of both the interaction and the revision process. East et al., (2012) discovered that students of Spanish in New Zealand reacted much more positively to the language and the classroom setting when they were able to participate in online reciprocal peer tutoring with English language learners in Colombia. Further psychological benefits of peer tutoring include findings by Gisbert and Font (2008), who demonstrated that English language learners showed improvements in self-concept and self-esteem with respect to their abilities in English after interactions with peer tutors. Logistical benefits to peer tutoring were also discovered; Huong (2007) noted how the presence of a more knowledgeable peer paved the way for briefer task negotiation, allowing learners to focus more on the content of the lesson.

Despite these benefits, other researchers have argued that the peer tutoring context often leads to imbalanced exchanges, leaving little opportunity for learner interaction. For example, Trimbur (1987) showed that peer tutors talked twice as much as learners and asked more closed questions, in this way restricting learner involvement. Thonus (2004), in a review of peer tutoring studies, noted that most findings pointed to peer tutors using longer turn lengths, an increased use of directives, and a 'take charge' approach relative to the learner. Jones et al. (2006), in a comparison of online versus face-to-face peer tutoring, found that an online context was more egalitarian and addressed more global issues for the very reasons raised by Trimbur (1987) and Thonus (2004). Finally, Waring (2005) showed that peer tutoring settings could create a "pattern of resistance" due to differing identity claims and competing notions of expertise (p. 141).

It appears, therefore, that although peer tutoring offers the potential for increasing learner participation, the problems described previously can inhibit these benefits. One possible reason for issues such as peer tutor dominance is a lack of training; even though training has been deemed essential for the incorporation of appropriate tutoring behaviors (Fuchs et al., 1994; Thurston et al., 2009), peer tutor training varies widely among institutions and language departments. For example, although the peer tutor in the current study received written materials to assist with oral participation exercises, she had received no explicit training on how to use these materials. A lack of training often leads peer tutors to adopt a less interactive approach, utilizing strategies such as closed questions and longer times at talk (Thurston et al., 2009).

In further examining the disadvantages of peer tutoring raised by prior studies, what stands out is an overarching concern with perceived peer tutor expertise, indicated by what researchers have termed a more 'teacherly' or 'take charge' attitude. Thonus (2004) outlined how learners expect tutors to behave as "higher status interlocutors" (p. 235), while both Henning (2001) and Thonus (2002) noted the disconnect between the perception of a tutor as more "peer-like" and perceived tutorial success. Peer tutors come from a variety of different sociolinguistic backgrounds, yet their position as tutors often leads to an assumption that they are experts in all of the varieties and registers of the language taught in the classroom. Yet, to date, little has been done to unpack the reasons underlying this perception of peer tutors as unreserved experts.

One of these reasons could be the categorization of peer tutors before they even engage in interactions with learners. Supervisors and researchers alike frequently group peer tutors into essentialized categories such as 'native speaker,' despite the problematic nature of this categorization (e.g., Fernández–Dobao, 2012; Thonus, 2004; Thorne, 2003). Creese, Blackledge, and Takhi (2014) noted that the 'native speaker' label "automatically endows one with a high level of competence in all domains of one's first language" (p. 938). Yet critiques of the native speaker label abound in second language acquisition (SLA) literature, ranging from its inability to take into account multilingual interaction (Cook, 1999; Firth & Wagner, 1997; Llurda, 2009), to its glossing over of the complex interplay between language skills and allegiance to a particular

culture (Leung, Harris, & Rampton, 1997). More-over, the term 'native speaker' is rarely defined in these studies, and it is up to the reader to determine what, precisely, these interlocutors can and cannot do with the language.

Even when native speakers are described in more detail in the peer tutoring literature, they are still positioned unreservedly as experts in the variety and register of the language being taught, with no attempt to distinguish between the types of knowledge they might possess and how that might affect their negotiations with learners (for an important exception, see Weigle & Nelson, 2004). This type of positioning not only fails to account for the differences in knowledge that impact the process of negotiating meaning, but also ignores the personal histories, symbols, and complexities that each speaker of a language brings to any given interaction. As Thorne and Hellermann (2015) asserted, "heterogeneity of expertise is a commonplace dimension of the human experience" (p. 282), a fact that is not readily acknowledged in most research on peer tutoring.

Rather than using static categories such as 'native speaker,' many scholars have suggested reconceiving this notion as a context-sensitive, interactional achievement (Doerr, 2009; Egbert, 2004; Firth & Wagner, 1997; Kubota, 2009; Piller, 2002) that views language as symbolic and contextual (Kramsch, 2009; Song & Kellogg, 2011). This outlook supports the use of a case study approach in order to examine in detail the particular episodes in which an expert or native speaker identity may or may not be constructed, as well as the symbols and contexts realized in each interaction. Furthermore, this approach parallels ethnomethodological and linguistic anthropological notions of knowledge and expertise, incorporating important elements such as interaction, ideology, and socialization. An outline of these notions follows in the next section.

EPISTEMICS, EXPERTISE, AND PEER TUTORING INTERACTION

Unlike the essentialized portrayals of knowledge in much of the research on peer tutoring, ethnomethodological approaches to epistemics highlight its highly interactional nature, noting that territories of information claimed by interlocutors can overlap and shift depending on context and area of knowledge (Kamio, 1997). These territories are often negotiated through mediation, a dialogically constructed, socio-interactional achievement in which interactants work together to resolve troubles of un-derstanding (Pekarek Doehler, 2002; Poehner, 2008). This type of work may also incorporate what Thorne (2003) and others have termed "mediational artifacts," such as written texts or Internet search engines (p. 39).

Heritage (2012) highlighted the interactional nature of epistemics by differentiating between epistemic *status* (the relative access to these territories by interlocutors) and epistemic *stance* (how this access to knowledge is expressed moment to moment), noting that epistemic status "can be altered from moment to moment as a result of specific interactional contributions" (p. 4). These expressions may include linguistic resources such as boosters ("certainly") and hedges ("maybe"), which serve to confirm and downplay, respectively, a speaker's epistemic status. As mentioned previously, other resources for mediating knowledge may be artifactual, such as the incorporation of technology or texts; or embodied, including hand gestures, gaze direction, or shaking one's head (Belhiah, 2009; Sert & Walsh, 2013).

The notion of epistemic status highlights how expressions of stance can index not only the knowledge in question, but also the "rights to possess and articulate it" (Heritage, 2012, p. 5). The hierarchical and ideological aspects of epistemics are further outlined from a linguistic anthropological perspective in Summerson Carr's (2010) discussion of expertise. Summerson Carr saw expertise as "inherently interactional," not unlike the notion of epistemics (p. 18). Individuals in positions of expertise often acquire what Matoesian (1999) and Summerson Carr (2010) termed "mastery of verbal performance," including the use of language "to index and therefore instantiate already existing inner states of knowledge" (p. 19). This performance includes the mastery of certain verbal registers, as well as nonverbal signs, through an extensive process of socialization, evaluation, and institutionalization. Socialization practices that transmit expertise can include role-playing exercises, similar to those found in Motivational Interviewing (Summerson Carr, 2010) or among magicians' apprentices (Jones & Shweder, 2003), or the observation–internalization–imitation sequence used with Mexicano woodcarvers' apprentices (Briggs, 1986), preservice teachers, and other apprenticeship relationships.

However, as I have mentioned previously, many peer tutors have not been trained in tutoring methods; nor, as speakers of a particular language variety, have they necessarily been socialized into the expression of other varieties. Because of this, peer tutors frequently lack the master or

expert registers of these repertoires, as well as knowledge about how to transmit them to students. Thus, their own requests for information during a peer tutoring session cannot be treated as teacher-centered 'known answer' or display questions. In fact, a tutor's request for information may be viewed as evidence of what Heritage (2013) termed K− (knowledge minus) relative to the peer learner, and could be potentially face-threatening for the tutor. Given that expertise is "always subject to public evaluation" (Summerson Carr, 2010, p. 21), the negotiation of a peer tutor's epistemic status of K+ requires ongoing co-construction of this status by both the tutor and the learner.

The interactional and ideological nature of theories on epistemics and expertise paves the way for a context-focused approach to interactions regarding peer tutor knowledge. In the analysis of the data to follow, I focus on *epistemic search sequences* (ESSs) for lexical items. As described in Jakonen & Morton (2015), ESSs are collective resolutions of knowledge gaps. I limit my analysis to lexical items because they are usually more easily resolved (e.g., with a translation or circumlocution) compared to morphological or syntactic items, which often result in more extensive and explicit grammatical explanations. For this reason, lexical ESSs unknown to the tutor could present more of a challenge to a tutor's epistemic status, due to their inability to answer as quickly as to a known lexical item.

Here, I present a brief example of a lexical ESS that was successfully resolved by the peer tutor. (See the Appendix for transcription conventions.)

EXCERPT 1: *"Ventajas"*

1 Alice:	**ventajas?** °is that wind°?
	advantages
2 Lorena:	um: **ventajas es algo bueno.**
	advantages is something good
3	the um-plus >the pros<
	((puts two thumbs up))
4 Alice:	°oh ok°

As seen in this excerpt, resolved ESSs are frequently negotiated with the provision of an equivalent in the opposite language from the request, an explanation of the word in Spanish, gestures, or a combination of these strategies. Here, Alice's confusion of *ventajas* [advantages] with a similar sounding word in Spanish, *viento* [wind], was not explicitly addressed by Lorena. Instead, Lorena used an explanation ("*ventajas es algo bueno*"), an

English translation ("plus" "the pros"), and a gesture (two thumbs up) to resolve Alice's initiated lexical ESS. Alice's uptake of this resolution is evident from her utterance, "oh ok" in 4.

In this study I distinguish between *resolved*, *unresolved*, and *semi-resolved* ESSs. The distinction of resolved versus unresolved parallels Jakonen and Morton's (2015) response types in ESSs, in which resolved sequences are interactions in which a "knowing" response is accepted, and unresolved sequences are interactions with an "unknowing" response, or in which the search is not taken up. To this framework I add a third category, *semi-resolved*, which indicates that a knowing response has been accepted, but that there is some doubt on the part of the tutor regarding its accuracy, as evidenced by the use of mitigations.

The examination of the three ESSs to follow uses a close discourse analysis to outline, turn by turn, how these ESSs were negotiated in interaction, as well as how participants aligned to tutor and learner constructions of expertise. Before this, I provide additional contextual information on the participants and the peer tutoring setting.

SETTING AND PARTICIPANTS

The data from this study come from a larger data set of peer tutoring sessions from the Spanish department of a mid-sized public university in southern California. At the time of the study, approximately 30% of the undergraduate students at the university identified as Hispanic or Latino. Many of these students decided to major in Spanish, or had close contacts with other Spanish majors. Given this rich group of potential tutors, and given a lack of resources for developing a language laboratory, the department created a peer tutoring program for beginning Spanish speakers to practice their oral communication skills with what the department labeled 'native' Spanish speakers, generally self-identified Hispanic/Latino junior or senior year students. The application process to become a peer tutor was fairly informal; interested students would talk to the department's language program coordinator, who would assess their language skills and assign them to time slots during the quarter. Peer tutors earned independent study credits for their participation.

Participation in this program was mandatory for students in the first through sixth quarters of Spanish language courses, which constituted the first 2 years of Spanish at the university. As part of their oral practice grade, each student was required to sign up for at least one peer

tutoring session per week. An excerpt from the department's Spanish 1–6 syllabus further outlines the requirements and restrictions:

> Oral Practice: You may sign up for oral practice. *This will be conducted by native speakers.* This time is not to be used for written homework, assignments or compositions. *Do not ask the tutors for help with these assignments,* as it will be considered unauthorized collaboration. (my emphases, Spanish 1–6 syllabus, April 2011)

Peer tutors were provided with written materials for scaffolding oral practice sessions with the students. These materials included conversation questions, pronunciation exercises, and short readings. Generally, peer tutoring sessions for the lower levels (Spanish 1–3) adhered strictly to the oral practice materials. However, sessions for Spanish 4–6 were more open; many students solicited tutor assistance in practicing oral presentations for class, even though this was explicitly forbidden in the syllabus. Peer tutors would also often lead the conversation in different directions from the practice materials, depending upon the proficiency of the learner.

With the assistance of several undergraduate student researchers, I collected video and audio data from 43 peer tutoring sessions held during the spring quarter of 2011. These sessions were approximately 45 minutes in length, and were composed of as few as one and as many as five learners interacting with one peer tutor. In order to obtain better audio of the sessions, I supplemented the video with a digital voice recorder placed on the tutoring table. After recording, another group of undergraduate students and myself transcribed the audio and video data using conversation analysis (CA) transcription conventions (see the Appendix for a list of these conventions). This close discourse analysis included a focus on discursive features of alignment, such as overlaps, intonation, and laughter, in addition to the content of the interactions. Video data were also transcribed and analyzed for multimodal expressions of alignment, including gesture, gaze, and the incorporation of artifacts such as cell phones and written oral practice materials.

The data for this study involve one peer tutor, Lorena, and her peer learners, Rhonda and Alice. Lorena was a senior and a Spanish major. Although Lorena did not explicitly take up the identity category of native speaker, in her interactions with learners, including this cohort, she did provide a great deal of information about her background, such as the fact that her mother was from Mexico and her father was from Texas, but also spoke Spanish. She also frequently used the first person plural pronoun, "we," when referring to Mexicans. This background information suggests an orientation to a heritage identity, if not that of native speaker; that is, Lorena's comments on her family members and her own identity closely referenced the fact that Spanish was at least one of her home languages.

As I began to examine the peer tutoring videos, I observed that Lorena's time at talk was quite high relative to other peer tutors. Lorena would often tell long, detailed stories about her childhood, her friends, and her husband that were at best tangentially related to the conversation topics in the oral practice materials. These stories left little time for peer learners to interact and paralleled previous findings regarding peer tutor dominance. Yet despite this dominance, the learners initiated a great deal more ESSs with Lorena compared to other peer tutor–learner cohorts. This may have been because Lorena, unlike many of the other peer tutors, had a consistent tutoring schedule that allowed her to see the same groups of learners for several sessions over the course of the quarter. These repeated meetings played a role in establishing familiarity and a more trusting environment, which would have allowed learners to feel more at ease in initiating ESSs.

One of Lorena's cohorts included Alice, an Asian-American student who was taking Spanish 5; and Rhonda, an African-American senior who, like Lorena, was a Spanish major. Lorena, Alice, and Rhonda met at least five times over the course of the spring quarter; each of these five sessions was recorded. While Alice was clearly a peer learner in these sessions, Rhonda's role was less clear. Although Rhonda was one of the undergraduate researchers tasked with video recording the tutoring sessions, she would often sit at the table when Lorena was tutoring and participate in the sessions, rather than simply turning on the camera and leaving. Rhonda later told me her goal in participating was to practice her Spanish. It was also evident that she was friends with Lorena, as they both would reference conversations and events that had occurred outside of the tutoring sessions.

The unique nature of this particular peer tutoring cohort, with each participant possessing varied identity categories of friend, learner, and expert, motivated my interest in closely analyzing how they negotiated knowledge among themselves. As I show in the following section, participants drew upon these identity categories, as well as a variety of resources and histories, in order to resolve the lexical item and negotiate their respective epistemic stances. I selected three

types of ESSs for a close discourse analysis: one resolved ESS for the word *militares* [military]; one unresolved ESS for the word *carbón* [coal]; and one semi-resolved ESS for *mellizos* [fraternal twins]. The first two examples come from the first recorded session, filmed at the beginning of the quarter, while the third example comes from the fourth recorded session, filmed at week six of the quarter.

CO-CONSTRUCTING KNOWLEDGE AND EXPERTISE: THREE EXAMPLES

In their first recorded tutoring session, Lorena, Rhonda, and Alice were discussing the advantages and disadvantages of living with one's parents, as prompted by the oral practice materials. Lorena was translating a particular episode in her childhood, which she had stated in Spanish in a previous turn, when Rhonda began to construct another example in Spanish:

EXCERPT 2*: "Militares"*

1 Lorena:	my door, ((gaze to Alice))	<always had to be open.> ((opening door gesture with hand))
2	(.8) °always = °	
3 Rhonda:	=y, a veces ahm, eran es- estricto? *and, sometimes they were strict* ((Lorena's gaze to Rhonda))	
4 Lorena:	aha ((nods))	
5 Rhonda:	muy, porque a:a hhh (2.0) hhHHH *because very **a:ahm***	
6 Lorena:	(3.0) ahh↑huh, ((maintains gaze on Rhonda))	
7 Rhonda:	(3.0) mili- militario, (.) *military*	
8 Lorena:	OH, porque son, um = *because they're* ((eyes widen, gaze upward))	
9 Rhonda:	=yeah. hHHH↑	
10 Lorena:	son, son *they're,* del militar = *from they're* ((hand on *the *military* forehead)) ((gaze back to Rhonda))	
11 Rhonda:	=mhm yeah=	
12 Lorena:	=son militant(.)tes? hhHH.*they're militant?* ((gaze to table, furrows brow))	
13	that sounds ne[gative.] ((gaze moves upward, hand to chin))	
14 Rhonda:	[milio.] militares? m[mm] *military*	
15 Lorena:		[mil]itares? *military* ((gaze to Rhonda, points to Rhonda))
16 Rhonda:	ye[ah].	
17 Lorena:	m[hm?] ((nods))	

Rhonda initiated the lexical ESS with a search for the word "*militares*" in order to define why her own parents were so strict (5). Lorena ceded her turn to Rhonda for over 7 seconds, during which she maintained her gaze on Rhonda. This period of time was punctuated only briefly by a laugh from Lorena as Rhonda continued to search for the word. Lorena may not have offered immediate assistance because there was not enough context available to provide a suggested word. Another possibility was that, due to Rhonda's status as a Spanish major and a friend, Lorena constructed Rhonda's epistemic stance as a co-knower, rather than a learner. When Rhonda produced an erroneous utterance, "**militario,*" (7), Lorena's gaze shifted upward as she began her own search. Her repetition of "son" (they are), use of the filler "um" and pauses indicated she was also having trouble producing the correct word. Her first attempt, "*militantes*" was produced hesitantly, as seen by the raised tone at the end and, in the video, a furrowed brow and continued gaze away from Rhonda.

Lorena confirmed that she was not happy with this lexical item by her evaluative comment, "that sounds negative" (13). When Rhonda offered "*milio. militares*" in the following turn, Lorena turned her gaze to Rhonda and repeated the word "*militares,*" indicating what Greer et al., (2009) termed "receipt through repetition" (p. 6). Lorena complemented this repetition with embodied gestures of agreement and co-construction, stretching her hand outwards toward Rhonda and nodding. Both Rhonda and Lorena completed the ESS by continuing to co-construct agreement on the chosen word through nods, affirmative overlapping utterances ("yeah", "mhm"), and repetition.

In this excerpt we see how Rhonda and Lorena co-constructed an acceptable lexical item to provide a rationale for Rhonda's assessment of her parents as strict. Lorena, despite her prescribed role as peer tutor, positioned Rhonda as an equal possessor of knowledge in this search by turning her gaze to Rhonda and allowing her to complete her turn over several seconds of silence. Later, by providing a possible word that

she immediately evaluated as unsatisfactory with her comment, "that sounds negative," Lorena referenced the symbolic knowledge she had of the term "*militante*," which is normally used to describe revolutionaries and activists. Her acceptance of Rhonda's suggestion, "*militares*," was punctuated by an outstretched, pointing gesture, a nod, and an affirmative "mhm?" Despite not having provided the correct word, Lorena played an active part in the co-construction of this search sequence by ceding her turn to allow Rhonda ample search time, incorporating her personal knowledge of "*militantes*," and the use of her outstretched hand and nod to signal correctness of the term "*militares*."

Throughout this ESS, Alice did not participate, remaining silent until the topic had changed. However, Alice did initiate a lexical ESS a few minutes after this particular sequence. Prompted by a second conversation question regarding myths and legends, Alice began to recount the story of Santa Claus and his delivery of coal to misbehaving boys and girls as an example of a myth. As she continued, she became stuck on the Spanish equivalent of the lexical item "coal." Due to the length of this excerpt I divide both it and the analysis into two parts.

EXCERPT 3: *"Carbón"*

1 Alice:	eh, **NO reciben regalos**
	they don't get presents
2 Lorena:	a[ha]
3 Alice:	**[y,] reciben, um**
	(1.5) coal
	and they get
4 Rhonda:	HH[hh]
5 Lorena:	[co]al,**una bolsa** <↑how do you say
	de:ehm COAL?((gaze to
	a bag of ((gaze to Rhonda, head tilt))
	table))
6 Alice:	like =
7 Rhonda:	=hH[HH]
8 Alice:	[I]used this word too =
	((gaze upward, rubs eye))
9 Lorena:	=think, okay when we have a barbecue:eh [HHH]
	((gaze upward, hand on chin))
10 Rhonda:	[hHHH]hh

Alice begins this ESS with a filler ("um") and pause (3), followed by a code switch into English that indicated a lexical gap. Lorena's question, "how do you say coal?," combined with a movement of her gaze to Rhonda, again indicated a positioning of Rhonda's epistemic status as equal

to her own. Although Alice also attempted to collaborate in resolving the ESS, as evidenced by her gaze upward (8) and the statement, "I used this word too," Lorena did not take up this attempt at collaboration with any sort of verbal or embodied acknowledgement. Instead, Lorena moved her gaze upward (rather than toward Alice) and referenced her own cultural knowledge in an attempt to find the correct word ("okay, when we have a barbecue . . ."). In subsequent turns (not transcribed here for reasons of space), Lorena continued to draw upon cultural knowledge by mentioning several obscure Mexican city names in response to Alice's joking suggestion of *piedras negras* [black rocks] as the Spanish equivalent for "coal."

After a few seconds, Lorena incorporated both Rhonda and Alice into the ESS by asking whether they had the Google Internet search application on their mobile phones. Alice and Lorena both visibly initiated searches on their phones (Rhonda was off camera and so it is unknown whether she was also searching). After several seconds of searching, Alice offered another suggestion for "coal":

23 Alice:	**trosss- o carbón?**
	coal?
	((Lorena's gaze to Alice))
24 Lorena:	**car- carBON ↑WELL**
	coal ((moves both hands in opening gesture))
25 Alice:	(wano =)
26 Lorena:	[= agh]
27 Alice:	**[bol]so de carbón**,
	bag of coal
28 Lorena:	your phone is much faster than mine apparently↑

Lorena repeated Alice's suggestion, "*carbón*," but rejected the word—and, subsequently, Alice's epistemic stance as knower—with the statement "well" in an upraised tone, opened hands, and a noise of frustration ("agh"). Alice repeated the word in a collocation "*bolso de carbón*" [bag of coal], which Lorena again did not take up, commenting instead upon the relative speed of Alice's phone compared to hers. In a few more turns the conversation had shifted to other topics and the Spanish lexical item for "coal" was never resolved.

In this exchange Lorena's epistemic stance fluctuated from claiming a lack of knowledge, to drawing upon her own personal history in order to facilitate the ESS, to positioning herself as more knowledgeable than her designated peer learner by rejecting a suggested lexical item. Lorena's

initial downgrading of her own knowledge did not disengage her from her status as expert; indeed, knowing participants often downgrade the epistemics of their responses (Jakonen & Morton, 2015). At the same time, Lorena's incorporation of her cultural knowledge of barbecue-related terms in Spanish served to mediate her epistemic stance as knower. This stance was co-constructed by Alice and, possibly, Rhonda; despite the fact that Alice found "*carbón*" on a neutral search engine (and despite the fact that *carbón* is, in fact, the Spanish equivalent for coal), Lorena's own doubt as expert led to a lack of resolution of the ESS.

As Summerson Carr (2010) noted, one element of expertise is the assumption that others are less knowledgeable. In the discussion on "coal," Lorena negotiated her expert role and cultural knowledge to position herself as doubtful about Alice's own claims to knowledge, even though these claims were assisted by an artifactual, outside source. Alice accepted this evaluation and even co-constructed doubt with Lorena with an upraised tone at her suggestion of "*carbón?*" (23) and by not pressing the issue further once Lorena's own phone failed to turn up the desired word. Thus, despite an inability to make her own claim to knowledge of the correct Spanish word, Lorena's gestures, claims to cultural knowledge, and rejection of Alice's suggestion, combined with Alice's alignment to these actions, allowed her to maintain an epistemic status of expert within the cohort. We could also say that Rhonda, although off camera, also showed alignment with her lack of participation and silences, which implied agreement with Lorena's rejection of "*carbón*."

In the final excerpt we see Lorena's continued construction of an expert identity during a vocabulary activity. While reading from a list of words relevant to an assignment from Alice's class, Lorena came upon the word *mellizos* [fraternal twins]. What followed was a brief monologue on the term, in which she again attempted to engage Rhonda in a lexical search:

EXCERPT 4: *"Mellizos"*

1 Lorena: **mellizos, mellizos**! i've NEVER heard
                 mellizos ((gaze on text))
2   for twins. i've heard,   **cuates,** a:and
                 um (.)   ((gaze to Rhonda))
3   <there's another
                 one.> (3.5)
                 ((gaze back to paper))
4   **GEMELOS**. (1.0)

5   °yeah°.   <<those are the
                 ((gaze back to   ones I've heard
                 Rhonda, nods))   ((index finger up
                                         briefly))
6   but I've never heard
                 mellizos.>

In this monologue Lorena first expressed surprise at the term "*mellizos*," then used a negative booster ("never") to emphasize her not having heard the term. In 2–4, she volunteered the lexical items that she had heard for "twins," which included the Mexican Spanish "*cuates*" for fraternal twins (from the Náhuatl word *coatl*) and "*gemelos*," or identical twins. During this monologue Lorena turned her gaze to Rhonda twice, perhaps hoping to co-construct and then confirm the lexical item "*gemelos*," similar to how "*militares*" was achieved. However, Rhonda did not take up this invitation—or, at least, her reaction was inaudible—and Lorena produced the item on her own after a few seconds. Note again that Alice, as the designated peer learner in this sequence, and despite the fact that she had been involved in discussing the text in prior turns, was not drawn into the negotiation for the word "*gemelos*," nor did she offer suggestions. Lorena's comment, "those are the ones I've heard," paired with a pointing gesture outwards, again incorporated her historic and symbolic knowledge into her epistemic stance. Similar to Excerpt 3, by claiming what she did know, Lorena was able to downplay her lack of comprehension of lexical items she did not know, thus continuing to negotiate a superior epistemic stance. Moreover, by indexing this historic, cultural, and symbolic knowledge as belonging not only to her, but to a collective community, Lorena effectively 'devoiced' this knowledge and rendered it as expertise (Summerson Carr, 2010, p. 25). Again, the lack of verbal or embodied contribution from either Rhonda or Alice served to align them to the perception of the word "*mellizos*" as something unheard of or unusual.

In these excerpts we note a complex array of overlapping resources, from symbolic to artifactual to embodied, to co-construct knowledge and expertise. Though Lorena engaged actively with the other two participants, each was constructed differently with respect to their epistemic stance. At the same time, Rhonda and Alice appeared to construct Lorena unreservedly as the expert during these sequences, even when Lorena attempted to draw Rhonda into various ESSs, or when artifactual resources conflicted with Lorena's assessments. These disconnects carry

some important implications regarding the consequences of perceived expertise and the implications for language learning, peer tutoring, and interlocutor epistemics. I discuss these issues in the next section.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Although Summerson Carr (2010) has stated that it is mostly up to the would-be expert to successfully enact expertise, incorporating notions of epistemic stance and status allows us to see how knowledge and expertise are instead co-constructed in interaction. In the peer tutoring cohort examined here, Lorena did establish an interpretive frame of expert through the incorporation of personal history, devoicing, and various embodied strategies, all of which indexed her right to know. Working through her own lexical gaps, Lorena was able to successfully negotiate the overlapping epistemic domains of artifactual resources, such as the text and an Internet search with her own domain of knowledge, affirming those resources that she knew and discarding or ignoring those that she did not know. Both Rhonda and Alice demonstrated alignment with Lorena's epistemic stance by allowing Lorena to hold the floor during most negotiations of ESSs and giving her the final say on lexical searches. These findings support previous findings by Thonus (2004) and Bell & Elledge (2008) regarding peer tutor dominance and perceptions of tutors as higher–status interlocutors.

However, Lorena also employed several attempts at collaboration with Rhonda in order to negotiate certain lexical items. Although this led to the successful resolution of one word, "*militares*," Rhonda did not take up subsequent collaborations. This could be because Rhonda, as evidenced by her own goals to practice Spanish, had determined her epistemic status as a sort of 'expert novice,' somewhere on the continuum between Alice's novice learner identity and Lorena's expert status. Lorena's attempts to construct Rhonda as a co-expert conflicted with Rhonda's own perception of her status, leading to a lack of collaboration on ESSs. Rhonda's efforts to resolve "*militares*" may have been due to the fact that she initiated the search for that lexical item. When the search was initiated by either Alice or Lorena, as in the cases of "*carbón*" and "*mellizos*," Rhonda perhaps felt that she would overstep her liminal role of expert novice if she contributed. This failed collaboration again points to the contextual nature of negotiating expertise, and suggests that perceptions of tutors as higher status

interlocutors contain strong ideologies of hierarchy and, in the case of language tutoring, essentialized conceptions of so-called 'native speakers.' In other words, Lorena's position as peer tutor, combined with references to her personal history as a speaker of Spanish, may have led Rhonda and Alice to limit their engagement during resolutions of ESSs.

These findings highlight not only the context-sensitive nature of epistemic stance and status, but also of target language knowledge itself. Lorena's multiple references to her personal history and what she had 'heard' or witnessed in her past point to the symbolic, ideological, and context-specific nature of linguistic and cultural knowledge. As Song and Kellogg (2011) stated, "[f]oreign language word meanings appear to be palimpsests of different layers of meaning: iconic, indexical, and, ultimately, symbolic and signifying" (p. 589). As demonstrated by Lorena's monologue on the word "*mellizos*," there are potentially multiple versions of certain lexical items, particularly in a global language such as Spanish. Although these palimpsests were slightly disturbed by the appearance of a new word or meaning, resulting in the multiple ESSs discussed in this article, Lorena favored her own historical knowledge of these words over artifactual sources in order to construct her epistemic stance as knower. Lorena's favoring of "*cuates*" over "*mellizos*" is potentially enriching knowledge for her learners, but also speaks to the need for more articulation between classroom and peer tutoring sessions regarding which variety of Spanish is being taught. A more comprehensive training program for peer tutors that addresses language varieties taught in the classroom would help to address these and other trouble sequences in peer tutoring interactions by aligning bodies of knowledge between the two environments. Moreover, the trouble sequences analyzed here suggest that both peer tutors and classroom teachers would benefit learners by providing them with strategies for negotiating words with multiple equivalents in Spanish, especially given that most learners frequently anticipate a one-to-one correspondence between one language and another.

Additional implications of this case study for peer tutoring in additional languages include recognizing the socialized processes of mediating expertise and epistemic status. This study highlighted how Lorena's learners readily adopted and maintained the norms of expert–novice interaction, even when Lorena solicited help. Moreover, Lorena's rejection of Alice's few contributions also reinforced an expert–novice dichotomy,

even when artifactual knowledge (e.g., the Google search results, the vocabulary reading) conflicted with Lorena's assertions. This dichotomy could be disrupted by training tutors in cooperative learning methods, in which they actively adopt a role of facilitator rather than language expert, thus opening the door to more opportunities to negotiate meaning on an equal level with their learners. Another possible disruption to this dichotomy would be to have more than one tutor in peer tutoring sessions, which could provide an extra source of knowledge for negotiating grammatical, pragmatic, cultural, and lexical items. This latter suggestion could also work as a training method for peer tutors, pairing one peer tutor with a more experienced one so that the novice tutor may observe, internalize, and imitate cooperative learning methods and ways of articulating expertise.

Finally, the interactions in this study highlight the ideological nature of expertise, as each participant displayed her own assumptions regarding Lorena's right to know, either through a reluctance to participate as co-knower (Rhonda) or an acceptance, evidenced by silences, of ESSs where alternative possibilities were discovered (Alice). Through these hesitations, Rhonda and Alice co-constructed Lorena, a self-identified speaker of Spanish as a home language, as the default expert. These co-constructions parallel previous findings on assumptions regarding native speaker abilities, which may in turn be rooted in ideologies of racial and ethnic essentialism. Because these ideologies were not explicitly oriented to in the interactions, we cannot say with certainty that Rhonda and Alice's perceptions of Lorena as an expert were in any way related to perceptions of her ethnic identity. Nevertheless, it is an important potential connection for future research, which could expand upon recent studies on how race and language abilities are often conflated (e.g., Flores & Rosa, 2015). Challenging assumptions that are rooted in—at the very least—essentialist conceptions of interlocutor expertise could lead to more egalitarian and productive negotiations of meaning, as well as peer tutors who are more savvy and skilled at both communicating their own expertise and recognizing the expertise of others.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Throughout this study I have emphasized the contextual, interactional nature of knowledge and expertise as a response to the essentialized perceptions of knowledge in previous studies on peer tutoring. Given that this is a case study, it is not my intention to generalize these findings to other peer tutoring settings, even to those within my own, larger data set. However, it is my hope that this study will motivate others to further explore how knowledge is enacted and negotiated among peer tutoring cohorts, in this way continuing to outline the complex overlays of history, ideology, and socialization practices that characterize the knowledge of any given language. Peer tutoring in additional language learning offers a unique environment for exposure to these overlays; however, the perception of peer tutors as a homogeneous group of 'experts' limits our understanding of epistemic complexity, just as perceptions of 'one' target language and culture restrict our ability to negotiate the global reality of linguistic and cultural heterogeneity. With this study I hope to begin a dialogue on how we can take advantage of the rich linguistic and cultural complexity of peer tutors, while at the same time discussing how training might give them the necessary tools to negotiate this complexity in meaningful and egalitarian ways. It is quite clear from this study and others that the current trend of leaving peer tutoring to the so-called 'experts' reduces its benefit for learners and tutors alike.

Last, it is hoped that further research will also delve deeper into the whys of homogenous perceptions of linguistic expertise, including an analysis of how identity categories such as race and ethnicity relate to this perception, as well as the myths that continue to surround the native and nonnative speaker. Similar to the benefits of differentiating instruction for language learners, by recognizing the differences in knowledge that interlocutors bring to interactions, we can learn to accommodate these differences, while still appreciating the unique awareness that peer tutors and other interlocutors contribute to additional language learning.

Board (IRB) of the University of Connecticut (Protocol no. H15-303).

REFERENCES

Beasley, C. (1997). Students as teachers: The benefits of peer tutoring. *Teaching and Learning Forum, 97*. Accessed 9 November 2015 at http://ctl.curtin.edu.au/events/conferences/tlf/tlf1997/beasley.html

Belhiah, H. (2009). Tutoring as an embodied activity: How speech, gaze and body orientation are coordinated to conduct ESL tutorial business. *Journal of Pragmatics, 41*, 829–841.

Bell, D. C., & Elledge, S. R. (2008). Dominance and peer tutoring sessions with English language learners. *Learning Assistance Review, 13*, 17–30.

Briggs, C. L. (1986). *Learning how to ask: A sociolinguistic appraisal of the role of the interview in social science research.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*, 185–209.

Creese, A., Blackledge, A., & Takhi, J. K. (2014). The ideal "native speaker" teacher: Negotiating authenticity and legitimacy in the language classroom. *Modern Language Journal, 98*, 937–951.

Doerr, N. M. (2009). Introduction. In N. M. Doerr (Ed.), *Native speaker concept: Ethnographic investigations of native speaker effects* (pp. 1–12). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

East, M., Tolosa, C., & Villers, H. (2012). Reciprocal role peer tutoring: Can it enhance students' motivation and perceptions of proficiency when learning a foreign language? *Babel, 47*, 24–31.

Efstathiadi, L. (2010). The use of epistemic markers as a means of hedging and boosting in the discourse of L1 and L2 speakers of Modern Greek: A corpus-based study in informal letter-writing. *Themes in Science and Technology Education, 3*, 181–206.

Egbert, J. (2004). A study of flow theory in the foreign language classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue canadienne des langues vivantes, 60*, 549–586.

Fernández–Dobao, A. (2012). Collaborative dialogue in learner–learner and learner–native speaker interaction. *Applied Linguistics, 33*, 229–256.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal, 81*, 285–300.

Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review, 85*, 149–171.

Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., Bentz, J., Phillips, N. B., & Hamlett, C. L. (1994). The nature of student interactions during peer tutoring with and without prior training and experience. *American Educational Research Journal, 31*, 75–103.

Gisbert, D. D., & Font, C. M. (2008). The impact of peer tutoring on the improvement of linguistic competence, self-concept as a writer and pedagogical satisfaction. *School Psychology International, 29*, 481–499.

Greer, T., Bussinguer, A., Butterfield, J., & Mischinger, A. (2009). Receipt through repetition. *JALT Journal, 31*, 5–34.

Hamid, M. O., Sussex, R., & Khan, A. (2009). Private tutoring in English for secondary school students in Bangladesh. *TESOL Quarterly, 43*, 281–308.

Henning, T. (2001, March). *Theoretical models of tutor talk: How practical are they?* Paper presented at the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC), Denver, CO. Accessed 9 November 2015 at http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED451569

Heritage, J. (2012). Epistemics in action: Action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 5*, 1–29.

Heritage, J. (2013). Epistemics in conversation. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *Handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 370–394). Malden, MA: Wiley–Blackwell.

Huong, L. P. H. (2007). The more knowledgeable peer, target language use, and group participation. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue canadienne des langues vivantes, 64*, 333–354.

Jakonen, T., & Morton, T. (2015). Epistemic search sequences in peer interaction in a content-based language classroom. *Applied Linguistics, 36*, 73–94.

Jones, G., & Shweder, L. (2003). The performance of illusion and illusionary performatives: Learning the language of theatrical magic. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 13*, 51–70.

Jones, R. H., Garralda, A., Li, D., & Lock, G. (2006). Interactional dynamics in on-line and face-to-face peer-tutoring sessions for second language writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 15*, 1–23.

Kamio, A. (1997). *Territory of information.* Philadelphia/Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Keck, C. M., Iberri–Shea, G., Tracy–Ventura, N., & Wa–Mbaleka, S. (2006). Investigating the empirical link between task-based interaction and acquisition: A meta-analysis. *Synthesizing Research on Language Learning and Teaching, 81*, 91–131.

Kramsch, C. (2009). *The multilingual subject: What foreign language learners say about their experience and why it matters.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kubota, R. (2009). Rethinking the superiority of the native speaker: Toward a relational understanding of power. In N. M. Doerr (Ed.), *Native speaker concept: Ethnographic investigations of native speaker effects* (pp. 233–248). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Leung, C., Harris, R., & Rampton, B. (1997). The idealised native speaker, reified ethnicities, and classroom realities. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*, 543–560.

Llurda, E. (2009). The decline and fall of the native speaker. *Contemporary Applied Linguistics, 1*, 37–53.

Mackey, A., & Goo, J. (2007). Interaction research in SLA: A meta-analysis and research synthesis. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second*

language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies (pp. 407–452). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Matoesian, G. M. (1999). The grammaticalization of participant roles in the constitution of expert identity. *Language in Society, 28,* 491–521.

Meadows, B. (2010). "Like my tutor and stuff, people I would talk to": Laying claim to imagined national communities of practice in language learner discourse. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 7,* 88–111.

Pekarek Doehler, S. (2002). Mediation revisited: The interactive organization of mediation in learning environments. *Mind, Culture, and Activity, 9,* 22–42.

Piller, I. (2002). Passing for a native speaker: Identity and success in second language learning. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 6,* 179–208.

Poehner, M. E. (2008). *Dynamic assessment: A Vygotskian approach to understanding and promoting L2 development.* New York: Springer Science & Business Media.

Rusk, F., Pörn, M., & Sahlström, F. (2014, August). *The exclusive use of the L2 when doing L2 learning: Epistemic status.* Paper presented at Open Spaces for Interaction and Learning Diversities, Padova, Italy.

Sert, O. (2013). 'Epistemic status check' as an interactional phenomenon in instructed learning settings. *Journal of Pragmatics, 45,* 13–28.

Sert, O., & Walsh, S. (2013). The interactional management of claims of insufficient knowledge in English language classrooms. *Language and Education, 27,* 542–565.

Song, S., & Kellogg, D. (2011). Word meaning as a palimpsest: A defense of sociocultural theory. *Modern Language Journal, 95,* 589–604.

Summerson Carr, E. (2010). Enactments of expertise. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 39,* 17–32.

Swain, M. (2006). Languaging, agency and collaboration in advanced second language proficiency. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Advanced language learning: The contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky* (pp. 95–108). London: Continuum.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2002). Talking it through: Two French immersion learners' response to reformulation. *International Journal of Educational Research, 37,* 285–304.

Thonus, T. (2002). Tutor and student assessment of academic writing tutorials: What is "success"? *Assessing Writing, 8,* 110–134.

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

Thorne, S. L. (2003). Artifacts and cultures-of-use in intercultural communication. *Language Learning & Technology, 7,* 38–67.

Thorne, S. L., & Hellermann, J. (2015). Sociocultural approaches to expert–novice relationships in second language interaction. In N. Markee (Ed.), *Handbook of classroom interaction* (pp. 281–298). Oxford: Wiley–Blackwell.

Thurston, A., Duran, D., Cunningham, E., Blanch, S., & Topping, K. (2009). International on-line reciprocal peer tutoring to promote modern language development in primary schools. *Computers & Education, 53,* 462–472.

Trimbur, J. (1987). Peer tutoring: A contradiction in terms? *The Writing Center Journal, 7,* 21–28.

Waring, H. Z. (2005). Peer tutoring in a graduate writing centre: Identity, expertise, and advice resisting. *Applied Linguistics, 26,* 141–168.

Weigle, S. C., & Nelson, G. L. (2004). Novice tutors and their ESL tutees: Three case studies of tutor roles and perceptions of tutorial success. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13,* 203–225.

Wright, J. E., Cavanaugh, R. A., Sainato, D. M., & Heward, W. L. (1995). Somos todos ayudantes y estudiantes: A demonstration of a classwide peer tutoring program in a modified Spanish class for secondary students identified as learning disabled or academically at-risk. *Education and Treatment of Children, 18,* 33–52.

Young, R. F., & Miller, E. R. (2004). Learning as changing participation: Discourse roles in ESL writing conferences. *Modern Language Journal, 88,* 519–535.

APPENDIX

Transcription Conventions

bold text	Spanish
regular text	English
()	inaudible utterance
(bueno)	transcriber's best estimation of nearly inaudible utterance
[	onset of overlap of utterances
]	end of overlap of utterances
=	utterances that have no discernable silence between them
(0.5)	silence represented in tenths of a second
(.)	"micropause," ordinarily less than 2/10 of a second
.	falling/final intonation
?	rising intonation
,	continuing intonation
:	prolongation or stretching of sound
-	cut-off or self-interruption
bueno, BUEno, BUEno	increased loudness
º	markedly quiet or soft talk
↑↓	sharp rise (up) or fall (down) in pitch
<>	rushed stretch of talk
><	slow stretch of talk
<	talk starts with a rush
((cough))	transcriber description of events
hhHHH	aspiration or laughter

Accessed 3 September 2014 at
http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/faculty/schegloff/TranscriptionProject/. Adapted for the study.