University of Huddersfield Repository

Stapleford, Katharine, Caldwell, Elizabeth F. and Tinker, Amanda

Talking academic writing: A conversation analysis of one-to-one writing tutorials with students from vocational backgrounds

Original Citation


This version is available at http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/32380/

The University Repository is a digital collection of the research output of the University, available on Open Access. Copyright and Moral Rights for the items on this site are retained by the individual author and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full items free of charge; copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided:

- The authors, title and full bibliographic details is credited in any copy;
- A hyperlink and/or URL is included for the original metadata page; and
- The content is not changed in any way.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk.

http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/
Talking Academic Writing: a Conversation
Analysis of One-to-One Tutorials

Katharine Stapleford
Dr Elizabeth Caldwell
Dr Amanda Tinker

EATAW Conference
Royal Holloway, University of London
19-21 June, 2017

An ALDinHE funded project
Outline

• Background to project
• Conversational Analysis (CA)
• Tutorial analysis - overall phases
• Giving feedback in tutorials
• General reflections and questions
Background to Project
Conversation Analysis (CA)

- Talk in interaction (institutions) from sociology
- Dynamic context
- Comparative/distinctiveness
- Sequencing/turn-taking
- Turn activity and design
- Lexical choice and formulation
- Detailed linguistic analysis
- Drew and Heritage (1992); Sidnell (2010); Sidnell and Stivers (2013)
- Little CA of academic skills tutorials
Tutorial analysis - overall phases

Openings

Responding to Problem/Task

Closings
Openings

Rapport building
Opening 1 (general)
Problem presentation (often with an account)
Establishing prior knowledge
Reference to previous tutorials
Practicalities/locating documents
Checking brief/identifying task
Student reports progress so far
Opening 2 (focus)
Problem reformulation

So what are we looking at today then?

I've done part of it but I'm not quite sure I'm going in the right direction

So before you came here what academic writing did you do?

So you’re producing an action plan…and a commentary

So what would you like to focus on today?

So is there something specific you’re unsure of?

I didn’t finish my assignment cos I need a little bit of help from you.

She was saying we have to include theoretical aspects so it was a bit tricky for me.

I'm struggling to linking up to um I'm struggling to link, to link up some words. It just becomes repetitive.

Discourse marker ‘So’ (Bolden, 2008; Stokoe & Sikvekand, 2016)
Responding to Problem/Task

**Tutor Activities**

- Questioning/eliciting
- Formulation/reformulation (*So...*)
- Preference (boundaries/roles)
  - (Schegloff, 1998, 2007; Stokoe, 2013)
- Display (expertise) (Parry, 2004; MacKiewicz, 2005)
- Evaluation (indirect, questions, tag questions)
- Suggesting (mitigated, modal verbs)
- Reader expectations
- Modelling (academic conventions)
- Praise
- Directive/instructional (*You need to...*)
- Reassurance (*Well I think you seem to be on the right lines*) and to start to signal closure

**Student Activities**

- Continuers (*yeah*)
- Agreement (minimal responses – *right, ok*)
- Formulation
- Reformulation of problem
- Disagreement/challenge (less common)
- Accounts (saving face after evaluation)
  - *I ran out of time...*
  - *Just shoved it in today cos it came to my mind...*
  - *...just a draft...*
So, I think the main things you need to do then are to reduce this, make it clear what you’re focusing on, what are the major issues..what are the theories. And make sure every paragraph is very clear..

I’m sure it will be fine after we discussed last time. Um, and then if you’ve made those changes, *cos I can’t do too much with one assignment because is has to be your work, so I can’t*…
Giving feedback in writing tutorials

• How do tutors highlight issues in writing?
• How do solutions / corrections happen?
• How do tutors find the balance between being overly directive, or being too vague?
• How is rapport maintained?
• How does the tutor encourage the student to have the confidence and skills to self-correct?
Extract example

Academic Skills Tutorial: 1-1 (T & S)
Up to 45 mins

Tutor: experienced ESOL teacher / teacher trainer

Student: final year undergraduate; near native speaker; return visit to the tutor
The start of the tutorial...

So what would you like to focus on today?

Erm, I would like you to look at my work and correct my grammar and to see if...

Well remember that I can’t correct your grammar, that’s for you...

No not correct, feed, give me feedback.

Oh right, okay.

Sorry, I always say that.
The inferential path

Distance between what people mean and what they say

The shorter the path, the more direct

(Mackiewicz & Riley 2003)

Longer paths are often more polite, but have more potential for misunderstanding, esp with L2s
Highlighting problems

T: this↑ (2.5) I’m not su↑re↓ about (.5) that (1) final sentence↓ (.)
S: >the last one↓<
T: mmm::↓↓ °what do you think↓°
    (2)
S: umm:: ((paper shuffling noises))
    (6)
T: how does it link↓=
S: =OHKay >what↑< ih-ih- I was <just trying to support> (2) dis what I put in↓
1) Signal the problem

“\textit{I’m not sure about…}”

Inherent (mild) evaluation
(Mackiewicz 2005)

\begin{itemize}
\item T implies problem is with reader, and not necessarily with text or student.
\item Evaluation is a face-threatening act, but mitigated by context – student is seeking feedback
\end{itemize}
2) T hands over to student

“What do you think?”

T tries to elicit problem from student (and implicitly tries to gain agreement that S there is a problem)

Gives opportunity for S to respond

Empowering, student centred

But – what happens if S can’t see the problem?

(cf Kim & Silver 2016)
3) T prompts and guides

If S doesn’t know what the issue is, T provides a more specific prompt

“How does it link?”

T may have to reformulate - be more direct, and give a stronger evaluation

“Yeah, it doesn’t link very well, in my eyes”
How do solutions happen?

Evaluations often followed by suggestions

(Thonus 1999)

“In making suggestions, [tutors] insert themselves into the writer’s composing process and, consequently, may make writers defensive about changing their writing.”

(Mackiewicz. 2005, p. 365)
If you were to, to keep it you’d have to sort of explain its...relevance a bit more

T not comfortable with this knee jerk reaction and suggests an alternative

But... S still not sure how to do this
Agreeing on a solution

Evaluation and suggestion reformulated several times, T gets progressively more direct

So maybe you, it might be better if you put it at the beginning.

but you need to make it clearer

Until, T tentatively suggests a practical solution

(cf Stokoe & Sikveland 2016)
The tutorial path

- Feedback in tutorials highlights the effect of the writing on the reader.
- Lengthening the inferential path through elicitation of the problem scaffolds S in developing their skills in appraising their own writing.
- Solutions become less important than process.
- Time-consuming.
- Must be done skilfully.
General Reflections

• Did you recognise these phases and activities of the tutorial?
• How typical is the feedback example?
• How could this be used for Continuing Professional Development?
• Questions?
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