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Abstract

The writing center is a common writing support service in North America with unique historical and theoretical underpinnings (Boquet, 1999; Bruffee, 1984; North, 1984). In the last couple of decades, it has truly become a global pedagogy, being implemented in around 65 countries worldwide (e.g., Archer, 2007; Bräuer, 2002; Tan, 2011). Although writing centers have been well received by international scholars, more studies are needed to discuss the economic and political imperatives of establishing writing centers in respective contexts and possible impacts on different student populations as a result. To address this issue, this multi-layered case study explores how the educational philosophy, pedagogical rationale and concepts of the global writing pedagogy are interpreted by administrators and enacted in pedagogical practice at Maple Leaves University (MLU)\(^1\), an internationalizing university in Japan. To examine the language planning stage, data were collected from interviews with five administrators and relevant university documents. For pedagogical practices, primary data included audio-recordings and student interviews from four tutor-tutee dyads concerning three types of writing tutorials: (a) Japanese students seeking consultation on Japanese writing, (b) Japanese students seeking consultation on English writing, and (c) international students seeking consultation on Japanese writing.

By looking at process of implementation from a language policy and practice perspective (Hornberger, 2005; Ricento & Hornberger, 1996), this study found that the MLU Writing Center was caught between ideal literacy/educational practices of a “world-class university” (Deem, 1996).

\(^1\) Pseudonym
Mok, & Lucas, 2008) and the local literacy realities at MLU. In the language planning, the internationalizing goals of a world-class university (e.g., English language policies, increasing international student enrollment, and student-centered education reforms) were the primary motives behind the establishment of MLU’s Writing Center. In tutorial practices, particular aspects of the Writing Center pedagogy were challenged by tutees’ disciplinary practices, beliefs towards non-native English tutors, and Japanese language learning needs. This study adds a policy perspective to the scholarship of writing centers, encouraging further research into the macro-context of writing centers and suggesting tutors be considered as key literacy educators who could better inform policy-making from the bottom-up.
Lay Summary

The writing center is a common writing support service in North America. At the writing center, tutors do not proofread students’ work and instead try to engage students in dialogue. In the past few decades, it has gained interest by practitioners worldwide as an effective pedagogy. This dissertation focuses on a writing center at a Japanese university to examine the motives behind the establishment of the writing center and to learn how the writing center pedagogy is practiced in graduate student tutorials. This study first found that the writing center was established as a part of the initiative to raise the university’s international profile. In tutorials, the writing center pedagogy was challenged by such factors as students’ needs/beliefs of improving writing and their usual practices of learning writing. This study suggests that tutors are key literacy educators that could better inform university academic writing policies from the ground up.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Introduction

Language planning is common practice for universities in implementing effective academic curricula, programs, and student support services (Marriott, 2006). Faced with pressures from governments and inter-governmental organizations, universities have needed to be increasingly strategic in their language planning. In this process, it is often the case that universities incorporate innovative and internationally accredited policies to help in their transformation into entrepreneurial, world-class universities (Deem, Mok, & Lucas, 2008). The educational standards of universities highly positioned in university rankings are often sought by other universities (Doherty & Singh, 2005). Educational concepts that promote multilingualism and student-centered learning are highly valued and posed as universal alternatives to ‘outdated’ traditional teaching/learning methods (Mok, 2007; Nguyen, Elliott, Terlouw, & Pilot, 2009).

This dissertation focuses on one such pedagogy that has become globalized throughout the past few decades—the writing center, a writing support service that originated in the United States. Focusing on a Japanese university that has recently established a writing center, this dissertation study will investigate how the educational philosophy, pedagogical rationale and concepts of the globalized writing pedagogy are interpreted by administrators and enacted in pedagogical practice. Conceptualizing the implementation as a multi-layered process, this dissertation follows a manuscript-type dissertation, or a dissertation comprised of “a compilation of research articles” (Paltridge & Starfield, 2007, p. 70) to thoroughly examine both the planning and practice stages.
The purpose of this introductory chapter is to provide readers with sufficient background information to read through this dissertation. I first introduce the rationales, conceptual frameworks, and research questions of my study. Then, I present my methodology and analytical methods I employed. Finally, I describe my positionality as a researcher and outline the organization of my dissertation.

1.2 Rationale of Study

1.2.1 Writing centers from a policy perspective

Writing centers, which are commonly seen in American universities, have a unique theoretical and historical background. Although American universities have had different forms of writing support over time (e.g., writing labs, writing clinics), the current form of writing centers was formulated around the open admissions period in the 1970s, when universities let in a large number of educationally diverse students (Boquet, 1999). Grounded in collaborative learning theories (Bruffee, 1984) and the “process writing” approach in composition studies (North, 1984), the writing center was conceptualized as a non-hierarchical, student-focused environment where students could discover the writing process collaboratively with their peer tutors. To this day, the popular axiom “[o]ur job is to produce better writers, not better writing” (North, 1984, p. 438) is commonly used to characterize writing center work (Boquet & Lerner, 2008).

In the last couple of decades, writing centers have been implemented worldwide, mostly by U.S.-based scholars working overseas and foreign scholars who have returned to their countries after gaining their degrees in American universities (e.g., Archer, 2007; Bräuer, 2002; Tan, 2011). According to the Writing Center Directory (St. Cloud State University, 2016),
writing centers can be found in 65 countries, which shows their growing popularity. The pedagogical concepts adopted by writing centers seem to appeal to universities searching for improved methods of teaching writing. These include fostering autonomous writers, peer tutoring, collaborative learning, the process writing approach, and writing across the curriculum (Archer, 2007; Bräuer, 2002; Frank, Haacke, & Tente, 2003; Girgensohn, 2012; Papay, 2002; Reichelt et al., 2013; Weber et al., 2015; Yasuda, 2006). For instance, some scholars in Poland, Japan, and Hong Kong report that one-on-one tutoring based on the process writing approach is more effective than the traditional teacher-directed, product-oriented writing classes (Ertl, 2011; Fujioka, 2012; Reichelt et al., 2013; Xiao, 2001; Yasuda, 2006). Some writing educators in German-speaking countries also highlight the role of the writing center as a writing program that promotes the importance of writing skills across and within disciplines in both English and other languages (Bräuer, 2002; Bräuer & Girgensohn, 2012; Doleschal, 2012). A frequent discussion in this literature is on how the pedagogical principles of writing center theory have required reconceptualization due to religions, customs, and existing literacy practices (Cain, 2011; Harbord, 2003; Papay, 2002; Santa, 2002; Turner, 2006; Weber et al., 2015).

Although writing centers have been welcomed as a sound pedagogy worldwide by these international scholars, the majority of writing center studies has been based on local reports and practitioner inquiry, which confirms the pedagogical value of writing centers as a ‘best practice.’ More studies are needed to discuss the economic and political imperatives of establishing writing centers in a variety of contexts and the possible literacy impacts on different student populations as a result. For instance, Salem (2014) shows us that writing centers are highly relevant to the political landscape of American higher education. Salem’s wide-scale analysis of American university webpages demonstrated that writing centers were primarily found in universities with
relatively privileged students (public universities and residential liberal arts colleges), as the writing center philosophy is well matched with the institutional missions of equal opportunity, personal transformation, and a “rich living-and-learning environment” (p. 35) found in these types of universities. In contrast, writing centers were not often found in universities with a more working-class student enrollment. Salem argues that in implementing writing centers over other types of academic support services, universities can make themselves accountable for their institutional missions, their commitments to certain higher education agenda, and as a result, they can make their unique education marketable. In non-American contexts, if one traces the socio-political/economic backgrounds of writing center initiation in different regions of the world (East Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Europe), the roles of the writing center in internationalizing, modernizing, and “Westernizing” universities can be identified. For instance, writing centers enhance international competitiveness in East Asian writing centers (Chang, 2013; Tan, 2011); they provide the symbolic capital of Western-style education at American universities in the Middle East, Europe, and Central America (Aguilo, 2008; Santa, 2009); and they demonstrate the links between the writing center and knowledge capitalism evident in higher education policy in Japan, Germany, and Russia (Bräuer, 2012; Gustafsson & Ganobcsik-Williams, 2016; Macgilchrist & Girgensohn, 2011).

These socio-political/economic backgrounds of writing center implementation point to the importance of understanding local practices from a macro perspective. Instead of researching “what’s implementable and what works,” writing center studies should focus on “under what conditions, if any, various education policies get implemented and work” (Honig, 2006, p. 2) to critically examine and better inform praxis, including tutor training and writing center administration. To address this issue, this dissertation explores a case of writing center
implementation in Japan from a language policy and practice perspective (Hornberger, 2005; Hornberger & Johnson, 2007; Ricento & Hornberger, 1996), particularly in relation to the currency of neoliberal higher education reforms and international competitiveness (Rizvi & Lingard, 2013).

1.2.2 Writing centers in Japan

Japanese higher education provides a case of universities frequently engaging in “policy shopping” (Byram & Parmenter, 2012, p. 263), in other words, searching for innovations from leading universities worldwide (Rappleye, Imoto, & Horiguchi, 2011). This trend can be attributed to the business-oriented nature of university management influenced by neoliberalism, managerialism, and economic rationalization (Kaneko, 2004; Mok, 2007; Yonezawa, 2002).

Starting in the 21st century, market-based principles became the basis of university governance under the administration of Prime Minister Koizumi, which promoted privatization and market competition. Also known as the “Toyama Plan” in 2001, the Japanese government created a platform for severe competition amongst universities; they offered more competitive grants, performance-based funding allocations, and required quality assessment through external evaluation organizations (Tsuruta, 2013; Yonezawa, 2003). As a result, universities relied heavily on government initiatives to plan their educational and internationalization measures such as English-medium programs, international partnerships, and curricula (Kudo & Hashimoto, 2011; Yonezawa, Akiba, & Hirouchi, 2009). In recent years, universities have been urged to find innovative educational measures that could foster a global workforce and regain Japan’s economic power in Asia (Cabinet’s Office, 2013).

Writing centers gained popularity in Japan in this competitive environment. A unique characteristic of Japanese writing centers is that they are targeted towards both English and
Japanese writing. In the following sections, I review the brief history of, and discuss the research gaps in three types of writing center tutorials central to my dissertation research: (a) Japanese students\(^2\) seeking consultation on Japanese writing (JJ), (b) Japanese students seeking consultation on English writing (JE), and (c) international students seeking consultation on Japanese writing (IJ). To avoid confusion, these tutorials will be denoted respectively as JJ, JE, and IJ throughout the dissertation. These three types of academic literacy were chosen based on several factors. First, according to my extensive search of writing centers in Japan, these three types of tutorials were most commonly offered in Japanese universities. Second, all three were explicitly or implicitly referred to in the government’s internationalization and quality assurance plans (MEXT, 2003, 2008a, 2008b, 2012). Third, the three types of tutorials were chosen to illuminate possible tensions between Japanese and English language education in Japanese universities. In writing about the impact of globalization on language teaching in Japan, Kubota (2002) illustrates the tensions between English as a global language and Japanese as a national language vis-à-vis the spreading linguistic diversity within Japanese society. The three types of tutorials were chosen to possibly reflect some of these tensions found in the Japanese higher education context.

1.2.2.1 Writing centers for Japanese students with Japanese writing (JJ)

The emergence of “JJ writing centers” (writing center services for Japanese students’ Japanese writing) is related to the so-called open admissions era of Japanese universities starting from the early 2000s (MEXT, 2012). Although Japanese universities have traditionally administered high-stakes entrance exams, due to the decreasing numbers of incoming Japanese

\(^2\)“Japanese students” refers to native Japanese-speaking students in this dissertation.
students caused by a declining birth rate, universities have started to administer more lenient exams (e.g., interview-based exams) to attract students (Tsuruta, 2013). This is said to have led to an influx of Japanese students without basic skills, including low Japanese literacy skills, and students who do not take their studies seriously (Yamada, 2014). In order to improve the quality of undergraduate education, the Ministry of Education published guidelines that articulated a set of skills necessary for students to function well in society upon graduation, one of which was communication skills (MEXT, 2008a). Along with other campus services that the Ministry listed, writing centers were recommended as a way to help foster written communication skills (MEXT, 2008a). Some universities also promoted their writing centers as spaces for active learning, another government measure proposed to transform teacher-directed classrooms and passive learning attitudes of students (Iwamoto, 2008; MEXT, 2012; Takahashi, 2012). After these quality assurance guidelines were publicized, the late 2000s saw an increase in Japanese basic writing programs and JJ writing centers (MEXT, 2016) promoted as extracurricular learning spaces for Japanese literacy development and academic socialization.

Although there are several local reports on JJ writing centers (Iwamoto, 2008; Takahashi, 2012), less research has investigated the impacts of this new pedagogy on existing academic literacy practices in Japanese universities. One novel concept introduced into the Japanese context is generalist tutoring, in other words, discussing one’s writing with a student from another discipline. The role of generalist tutoring is an important research topic for JJ writing centers, as this new educational environment counters the traditional form of writing instruction based on mentorship from professors in the same discipline (Sato, 2008; Ushiogi, 1993) and might result in new learning practices. In American writing center literature, although non-expert tutoring is recommended to realize the philosophy of the non-hierarchical peer tutoring (Harris,
1992a; Hubbuch, 1988; Pemberton, 1995; Powers & Nelson, 1995), it has also been critiqued by those who consider specialist tutoring (tutors working with tutees in the same discipline) more effective in helping writers achieve disciplinary practices (Clark & Healy, 1996; Dinitz & Harrington, 2014; Kiedaisch & Dinitz, 1993; Mackiewicz, 2004; Shamoon & Burns, 1995).

1.2.2.2 Writing centers for Japanese students with English writing (JE)

“JE writing centers” (writing center services for Japanese students’ English writing) began to increase around 2003, when the government announced its 5-year project to cultivate “Japanese who can use English” (MEXT, 2003). The main goal of universities was to prepare students with practical and specialized English skills for the global workplace (MEXT, 2003), with the government-funded universities proposing innovative practices to attain this goal. After this plan was announced, three pioneers of writing centers in Japan—Waseda University, Sophia University, and Osaka Jogakuin University—received Good Practices funding for establishing their writing centers as part of their English-medium Liberal Arts Programs (Osaka Jogakuin University, 2016; Sophia University, n.d.; Waseda University, 2005). Since these programs were modeled on American liberal arts colleges that commonly offer first-year composition courses (Salem, 2014), the writing center was necessary to liberal arts education in order to aid students with their English written assignments. This strategic connection of fostering competent English writers in the global society aligned well with the government’s plan and upheld writing centers as a valuable entity to achieve this goal. As was the case with these pioneering universities, JE writing centers are likely to receive funding if they are marketed to implement the government’s educational agenda of fostering bilingual workers, researchers, and leaders with high English proficiency.
The JE writing center has been positively evaluated by English language educators based in Japan, who argue that these centers can help students demystify English academic writing upon entering university (Ertl, 2011; Fujioka, 2012; Kimura, Sato, Moody, Suzuki, & Kojima, 2013; Yasuda, 2006). The writing center’s process writing approach is deemed necessary for improving English writing skills for Japanese students who do not have a habit of writing multiple drafts (Fujioka, 2012). Some scholars also observed the benefits of peer-to-peer English tutorials in that tutorials conducted in students’ first language can allow them to share language learning strategies and to realize the writing center’s collaborative learning philosophy (Nakatake, 2013, 2014; Sadoshima, Shimura, & Ota, 2008).

However, what is missing in the discussion is student (both tutor and tutee) perceptions of the linguistic statuses of non-native English speaking tutors in JE writing centers. One of the issues that Japanese universities face in creating English language programs in general is recruiting qualified teaching staff, especially the decision-making around hiring native or non-native English speaking teachers (Leong, 2017; Toh, 2016). Although the unique assets of non-native English speaking (NNES) teachers have been reported by research (Moussu & Llurda, 2008), university and language school administrators around the world still seem to have a biased idealization of native English speaking (NES) teachers in Japan and in many other parts of the world, evident in hiring practices and on institutional websites (Jenkins, 2014; Leong, 2017; Rivers & Ross, 2013; Ruecker & Ives, 2015). In JE writing centers, although there are writing centers in Japan that staff native speakers (Hokkaido University, n.d.), non-native English speaking graduate students are more likely to be hired as peer advisers at language centers or writing tutors at writing centers (Hays, 2009; Nakatake, 2013; Sadoshima, 2009), given the government’s recommendations for universities to increase graduate student
employment (Senaha, 2011). Research that explores these non-native students’ interactions could cast light on the power dynamics concerning the legitimacy of English amongst these students and contribute to the scholarship on non-native writing teachers in ESL contexts as well (Liu, 2005).

1.2.2.3 Writing centers for international students with Japanese writing (IJ)

International student recruitment has become a common internationalization strategy for universities worldwide, and Japan is no exception. According to the Japan Student Services Organization (2017), in 2016 a total of 171,122 international students studied in Japanese higher education institutions. However, this number is still half of what the Japanese government aims for. In 1983, Prime Minister Nakasone announced a plan to increase the number of international students to 100,000 by the year 2000. This goal was attained in 2003, and in 2008, the goal was increased to 300,000 international students by the year 2020 (MEXT, 2008b). Compared to the first plan, where the aim was to contribute to Asia’s international development, the second plan emphasizes recruiting talented international students who can contribute to the Japanese economy and research fields, while also enhancing universities’ international competitiveness.

Given the growing international student population, several Japanese universities started writing center consultations for their international students from the late 2000s to early 2010s (Masamune, 2009; Matsuta, 2011; Taniguchi, 2015; Yanagisawa & Takano, 2011). These universities felt a need to establish a writing support service to lessen the burden on instructors proofreading international students’ papers. Some scholars write that through the repeated process of talking about writing with a tutor, international students will be able to notice their mistakes and acquire strategies to write papers on their own (Masamune, 2009; Matsuta, 2011). In this case, the notion of developing autonomous writers, one of the tenets of the writing center
(North, 1984), is strategically interpreted as fostering independent writers who learn to write papers by themselves, with minimal help from course instructors.

It is also evident that the writing center is a part of a university’s internationalization strategies. Some leading universities that received funding for their internationalization initiatives often include writing centers as one of their international support services (Kyushu University, 2014; Senaha, 2011; Sophia University, 2014). Waseda University, which had the largest number of international students in 2016 (over 4,000), has continuously received government funding for their writing center services for international students. In their funding application, they have also written about their intentions to hire Chinese students as tutors and offer writing consultations in Chinese, to serve the language learning needs of this growing international student population (Waseda University, 2012). Ritsumeikan Asia Pacific University, which had the third largest international student enrollment in 2016, also has a writing center for their international students and hires international students to tutor English language learners (Ritsumeikan Asia Pacific University, 2012). The demand for writing centers will likely increase in Japanese universities as the international student enrollment continues to rise.

Although some research has investigated “IJ writing centers” (writing center services for international students), a general tendency is identifying the conditions in which the writing center tenets such as the non-proofreading policy and collaborative learning can be realized (Doyle, Omori, & Akita, 2013; Masamune, 2009; Matsuta, 2012; Nakayama, 2010). However, an important discussion that has not taken place is whether the writing center philosophy that de-emphasizes grammar instruction and directive feedback matches with international students’ language learning needs, a contentious issue in North American writing centers (Blau & Hall, 2002; Moussu, 2013; Myers, 2003; Nakamaru, 2010; Rafoth, 2015; Thonus, 2014; Weigle &
Nelson, 2004). Although the non-directive, hands-off technique has proved ineffective from researchers’, tutors’ and international students’ perspectives in North American writing centers (Blau & Hall, 2002; Myers, 2003; Nakamaru, 2010; Thonus, 2004, 2014; Weigle & Nelson, 2004), one gap in research is that the institutional role of writing centers is seldom examined beyond tutorial interactions. Thus, more comprehensive, systematic research that involves multiple stakeholders (professors, administrators, tutors, students, other academic services) is needed to evaluate the role of writing centers in ensuring international students’ academic success.

1.3 Research Questions

The following research questions will be addressed to examine writing center implementation at a Japanese university from a language policy and practice perspective. I address two overarching research questions, which allow me to investigate how the educational philosophy, pedagogical rationale, and concepts of the globalized writing pedagogy are interpreted by administrators and enacted in pedagogical practice. Research Question 1, which focuses on the language planning stage, will be addressed in Chapter 2. The sub-questions of Research Question 2 will be addressed in Chapters 3, 4, and 5. These sub-questions are related to pedagogical practices and address the research gaps identified for JJ, JE, and IJ tutorials in the previous section.

RQ1. What were the rationales for establishing a writing center at a Japanese university? (Addressed in Chapter 2)
• What macro factors and institutional factors influenced the decision-making process of the university policy planners?

• How did the planners justify the establishment of a writing center in their planning?

RQ2. How is the writing center pedagogy enacted in the three types of tutorials (JJ, JE, and IJ)?

• What type of knowledge and strategies do JJ tutors use in generalist tutoring? How do their students see the role of generalist tutors? (Chapter 3)

• How do JE tutees perceive their non-native tutors’ stances? How might the tutors’ linguistic statuses impact these perceptions? (Chapter 4)

• How do the Writing Center administrators, tutors, and international students view the role of the IJ Writing Center? (Chapter 5)

1.4 Conceptualization of the Study

1.4.1 Multilayered and socially situated approaches to language policy

This dissertation employs Language Policy and Planning (LPP) as its overarching framework. The writing center is conceptualized as an academic language policy and a type of language education policy. Language education policies are designed from “an understanding…of the current language practices and proficiencies of a society and from a set of beliefs (or ideology) of what should be an ideal situation” (Spolsky, 2008, p. 30). Thus, the writing center is a policy enactment aiming to modify, support, and improve university students’ (in some cases, faculty members’) academic language learning up to a level deemed acceptable by university stakeholders.
Furthermore, the writing center, like other policy enactments, is a “multilayered construct” (Ricento & Hornberger, 1996, p. 419) embedded in multiple social organizations. Using the metaphor of an onion, Ricento and Hornberger (1996) argued that language policy and planning is a “multi-layered construct, wherein essential LPP components—agents, levels, and processes of LPP—permeate and interact with each other in multiple and complex ways as they enact various types, approaches, and goals of LPP” (p. 419). Policy is planned, interpreted, and implemented in and across macro and micro-level contexts, for instance, from the legislation and political processes, state and supranational agencies, institutions, and finally to classroom practitioners located at the center of the LPP onion (Ricento & Hornberger, 1996). The multi-layered and socially situated approach to language policy has been an important development in the field of LPP in better connecting the macro and micro of policy implementation (Johnson & Ricento, 2013). For instance, as a way to slice through the LPP onion, research combining discourse analysis and ethnographic methods (i.e., ethnographies of LPP) demonstrate how discourses and ideologies of policy are taken up, negotiated, or resisted by institutions and educators (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007; Johnson, 2010; Pastor, 2015; Ramanathan, 2005; Ricento & Hornberger, 1996).

In this dissertation, the multi-layers of academic language policy are useful in conceptualizing each chapter and in bringing them together. Figure 1.1 depicts the macro, meso, and micro-layers that the writing center is embedded in. Following Miranda, Berdugo, and Tejada’s (2016) conceptualization, this study uses the macro and meso-context levels to refer to the international and national setting; the micro context, the university setting, is divided into top, mid, and bottom levels to signify the university as a policy-making organization (the top), the
administration of writing center (the mid), and actual tutorial practices (the bottom) (see Figure 1.2).

At the center of the diagram is the writing center. The writing center is situated in the university, which is its micro-level context. The university decides the planning, implementing, financing, and staffing of the writing center. As scholars in university language planning have
mentioned, universities are autonomous institutions often responsible for planning their educational policies (Hult & Källkvist, 2016; Miranda, Berdugo, & Tejada, 2016). Japanese universities are also autonomous in the decision-making of their institutional polices, research activities, and educational practices. However, their polices and governance systems are often created in response to the government’s educational agenda at the national level or the meso-level context (Kudo & Hashimoto, 2011). Finally, the macro-level, the very outside layer, is the international context that influences both government-level and university-level policymaking. At the international level, powerful discourses of best educational practices are circulated by such institutions as the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the World Bank (Rizvi & Lingard, 2013). Another international discourse is the world-class university model projected through university ranking exercises (Deem et al., 2008; Yonezawa, 2003).

The aim of my research is to slice through these layers (as the arrow in the figure indicates) and to make sense of the socio-economic and political factors (policies, discourses, institutional mandates, perceived institutional realities) that shaped the writing center and its impacts on pedagogical practices. To look through these layers, my dissertation focuses on both the planning stage and local Writing Center practices, as explained in the following sub-sections.

1.4.2 Focus 1: Language planning (Chapter 2)

The first focus of this dissertation is on the language planning stage of the Writing Center\(^3\) at Maple Leaves University\(^4\), which is the primary site of this study. Language planning

\(^3\) I use upper case “Writing Center” to denote my research site, and lower case “writing center” to refer to writing centers in general.

\(^4\) Pseudonym
in universities gained attention in the late 1990s. Kaplan and Baldauf (1997), who were the pioneers of university language planning, described the conditions of an ideal university language and literacy policy suiting both students’ language needs and universities’ missions. They claimed that universities should constantly re-examine their policies by paying close attention to changes in student demographics and societal literacy demands. In recent years, research on academic language and literacy support centers has gained more recognition due to the diversification of student population, particularly in Australian universities (Fenton-Smith & Gurney, 2016; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Marriott, 2006). Fenton-Smith and Garney (2015) use the term “academic language policy and planning (ALPP)” (p. 2) to refer to the planning and implementation of these academic support services. Multiple issues are involved in ALPP, such as access policy (whose language should be supported), personnel policy (who teachers or tutors should be), curriculum policy (what and how it should be supported), resourcing policy (how the service should be funded), and evaluation policy (how it will be evaluated) (Fenton-Smith & Gurney, 2016).

In this dissertation, Chapter 2 inquires into the academic language policy and planning of the Writing Center. In particular, the notion of policy borrowing (Steiner-Khamsi, 2014) will be employed as a conceptual framework to illuminate the socio-economic and political motivations of establishing the Writing Center.

1.4.3 Focus 2: Local writing center practices (Chapter 3, 4, 5)

Pedagogy plays an important role in actualizing education policies and is crucial in exploring policies from the bottom-up. Although pedagogy is variously addressed in policy, it commonly derives from idealizations and imaginations of a better nation and posed as an alternative to the status quo (i.e., traditional teaching styles, undesirable learning outcomes)
Liddicoat, 2014). Educators are then catalysts between top-down ideals and local realities (Ramanathan, 2005). A large number of bilingual/multilingual education scholars have conducted research into teachers’ agency, beliefs and classroom practices to illuminate the gaps between policy and practice (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007; Johnson, 2010; Menken & Shohamy, 2008; Pastor, 2015; Ramanathan, 2005; Ricento & Hornberger, 1996; Skilton-Sylvester, 2003; Stritikus & Wiese, 2006). These studies demonstrate that while educators can succumb to perpetuating dominant language ideologies present in policies, such as monolingualism and the favoring of particular languages in power (e.g., Menken & Shohamy, 2008; Pastor, 2015), they can also resist these and pursue their own ideals of multilingual education (e.g., Hornberger, 2005; Ramanathan, 2005; Skilton-Sylvester, 2003).

While studies have researched educators’ views and pedagogical practices, an important group missing in LPP studies is students and their engagements with pedagogy. The writing center tutorial is a rich space to research students’ negotiations of literacy needs with their tutors. With the writing center being a centralized unit of the university, writing center policies (e.g., non-proofreading policy, process writing approach) reflect the university’s stance towards how students’ academic language should be supported (Cook-Gumperz, 1993; DiPardo, 1992; Grimm, 1999). Embodying the writing center policies, tutors act as textual mediators (Lillis & Curry, 2006) to modify, control, and improve students’ academic literacy practices as sanctioned members of the university. However, in this process, tutors encounter the realities of institutional academic literacy practices evident in students’ writing and immediate writing needs (Blau, Hall, & Strauss, 1998; Bokser, 2005; Clark, 2001; Gillam, Callaway, & Wikoff, 1994; Thonus, 2001). In this dissertation, the three types of writing center tutorials (JJ, JE, and IJ) will be focal points for examining the negotiations between the institutional ideals embodied in tutors’ pedagogical
practices and the local realities that students bring to their tutorials. These tutorials are each situated within the inner layer of the LPP onion and are influenced by outer layers such as macro socio-economic factors, policy discourses, and institutional realities.

1.5 Research Site and Participants

The research site, a writing center at Maple Leaves University\(^5\) (MLU) in Japan, was purposefully selected based on several factors and criteria. First, the university needed to have a writing center that offered the three types of writing center services mentioned in the previous section. Second, since its philosophy is a crucial factor in identifying a writing center, I looked for a writing center that followed the original writing center philosophy theorized by composition scholars such as Stephen North and Kenneth Bruffee. Third, I chose a university that I had relatively easy access to, due to institutional connections. Based on these criteria, I chose MLU, a national research university located in Western Japan. In the fall of 2014, I contacted the associate director of the Writing Center at MLU by email through the mediation of an acquaintance working as a Writing Center tutor (see Appendix A for the third party recruitment letter). After receiving approval for the study from the Director, I had several meetings with the associate director, the Director of the MLU library\(^6\), and other Writing Center staff at MLU prior to data collection. More information on the institutional background of MLU will be introduced in the methodology sections of Chapters 2 to 5.

Two groups of participants were recruited throughout the data collection period (from April to August 2015). The first group was those involved in the planning and administration of

\(^{5}\) Pseudonym

\(^{6}\) The MLU writing center was located in the university’s main library.
the Writing Center. The associate director, primarily in charge of the local administration, agreed to participate in the study and introduced me to four other eligible participants. These were the initiator of the Writing Center, two Writing Center administrators, and a Writing Center staff member (the details of the participants appear in the methodology section of Chapter 2). I emailed or explained in person the details of my study and set up an interview date with each (see Appendices B and C for the invitation letter and consent form).

The second group of participants consisted of 22 graduate students in total; 12 graduate student tutees and 10 graduate student tutors, as illustrated in Figure 1.3. The graduate student tutees consisted of eight native Japanese-speaking students and four international students. The graduate student tutors consisted of nine native Japanese-speaking students and one international student from Iran. The number of tutor and tutee participants is uneven because two tutors (one in JJ, the other in JE tutorials) worked with two tutee participants each.

![Figure 1.3 Visualization of the 12 tutor-tutee dyads](image)

All student participants were between their early 20s and 30s. At the start of my data collection period, I met with all of the tutors at their weekly meeting to explain the details of my study and to distribute the invitation letter (see Appendix D). All but one tutor agreed to participate and signed the consent form (see Appendix E). As for recruitment of tutees, I left copies of the
invitation letter at the Writing Center and distributed them to students who had finished their appointments (see Appendix F for the invitation letter). Although I planned to recruit either undergraduate or graduate students, I noticed undergraduates were too busy to participate in a study at the beginning of the school year. Thus, I decided to exclude undergraduate students and instead recruit graduate students, who seemed more flexible with their time. The inclusion criteria of tutee participants were as follows:

- **For JJ tutorials:** 4 graduate students whose first language is Japanese in need of consultation about a draft of an academic paper (written assignment for class, parts of dissertation, etc.) in Japanese to be submitted within the term;
- **For JE tutorials:** 4 graduate students whose first language is Japanese in need of consultation about a draft of an academic paper in English to be submitted within the term;
- **For IJ tutorials:** 4 graduate international students whose first language is not Japanese in need of consultation about a draft of an academic paper in Japanese to be submitted within the term.

For the type of academic paper, I excluded scholarly manuscripts on the advice of the associate director who was concerned with copyright issues if written samples would be included in my dissertation. Thus, I mainly looked for graduate students who were working on their dissertations, written assignments, and other academic genres that were due within the period of data collection.

Since on-site recruitment posed challenges, I decided to use snowball sampling to recruit participants. In snowball sampling (or chain sampling), the researcher relies on personal contacts
to identify eligible participants (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2013). I asked several tutors to introduce me to eligible colleagues from the same or different departments. I was able to recruit eight participants using this method. As for JE tutee participants, who were the most difficult to recruit, one tutee participant in the English-medium department introduced me to three of her colleagues. I sent out invitation letters to the potential participants and met them at a later date to obtain their consent. Three of the ten tutee participants had visiting the Writing Center at least once prior to this study, whereas the remaining participants had never used the Writing Center service. Although I initially intended to recruit regular users of the Writing Center service, I discovered that students typically use the Writing Center only when needs arise. Therefore, many of the participants were first-time users of the service.

I met participants individually to explain my study and received their consent to participate (see Appendix G for the consent form). Tutor and tutee participants received bookstore gift cards; 1000 yen (approximately 10 Canadian dollars) for tutors and 2000 yen (approximately 20 Canadian dollars) for tutees as a token of thanks for their participation. Further information on the tutor and tutee participants will be detailed in the methodology sections of Chapters 3, 4, and 5.

1.6 Methodology and Analysis

1.6.1 Methodology

The duration for my data collection was one semester (April to July 2015), given that class assignments are usually due within a term. This study employed a single case study design (Yin, 2014), the case being the university. A case study is understood to be an in-depth examination of the case, its phenomenon in question, and the contextual factors that the case is
embedded in (Merriam, 1998; Stake, 2006). The design of case study in this research is an embedded design with multiple units of analysis or sub-cases within the case (Yin, 2014). The units of analysis differ according to each research question. Table 1.1 shows the methods and participants for each research question.

Table 1.1 Summary of Research Questions, Data Collection Methods, and Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What were the rationales for establishing a writing center at a Japanese university? (Addressed in Chapter 2)</td>
<td>Interviews; document collection</td>
<td>The initiator of the Writing Center, two Writing Center administrators, associate director of the Writing Center, Writing Center staff member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How is the writing center pedagogy enacted in the three types of tutorials (JJ, JE, and IJ)? (Addressed in Chapters 3, 4, 5)</td>
<td>Questionnaire; observation &amp; audio recording of tutorials; interviews &amp; collection of written drafts</td>
<td>4 tutor-tutee dyads for three types of tutorials (12 tutees &amp; their respective tutors)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Question 1**

To answer Research Question 1, semi-structured individual interviews were conducted with those involved in the planning and administration of the Writing Center. These included the initiator of the Writing Center, the associate director, two university administrators, and one Writing Center staff member. Prior to the interview, publicly available documents were obtained from the university and government websites to better facilitate the interviews. Interview protocols were designed to inquire into the participants’ perceptions, beliefs, and opinions on the functions of the Writing Center and the Writing Center philosophy. The individual interviews
were all conducted in Japanese and lasted for 60 to 90 minutes (see Appendix H for the interview questions). All interviews were audio-recorded with the consent of the participants.

**Research Question 2**

For Research Question 2, I collected data from a total of 12 tutor-tutee dyads (four dyads each for JE, JJ, and IJ tutorials), as described in Table 1.2. The same data collection procedure, as outlined below, was conducted for all 12 cases. As the asterisks indicate, the tutor in JJ Case 1 also tutored the tutee in JE Case 3. Another overlap is JE Case 1 and 2, in which one tutor was in charge of both tutorials. This occurred because there were fewer tutors in charge of JE tutorials.

Table 1.2 Composition of the 12 Tutor-Tutee Dyads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
<th>Case 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JJ</strong></td>
<td>*Tutor-Tutee</td>
<td>Tutor-Tutee</td>
<td>Tutor-Tutee</td>
<td>Tutor-Tutee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tutor-Tutee</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tutor-Tutee</strong></td>
<td>*Tutor-Tutee</td>
<td>Tutor-Tutee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IJ</strong></td>
<td>Tutor-Tutee</td>
<td>Tutor-Tutee</td>
<td>Tutor-Tutee</td>
<td>Tutor-Tutee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Step 1: Meeting with the tutee**

I first met with tutee participants prior to their Writing Center visit to go over the study and to obtain their informed consent and completed form. After that, I gave them a questionnaire that asked for their background information (name, age, faculty, year of program), the type of writing they planned to bring to the tutorial, their experience(s) using the Writing Center, and their views on the Writing Center philosophy (see Appendix I for the questionnaire). The participants filled in the questionnaire and submitted it to me on the day of their tutorials.
Step 2: Observing the tutorial

After the tutee made an appointment at the Writing Center, I contacted the tutor who was working in the selected time slot (I had already received consent from most tutors at this point). The tutee could either choose between a 45-minute or 90-minute tutoring session, according to the Writing Center policy. On the day of the tutorial, I observed and audio-recorded the tutorial. Figure 1.4 depicts the position of me, the researcher, and the tape recorder. While observing the tutorial, I took notes on the type of questions tutees asked and the feedback tutors gave. The tutee’s written draft and any other tutee or tutor notes generated during the tutorial were collected.
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Figure 1.4 Arrangement of participants, researcher, and recording device

Step 3: Post-tutorial interviews with tutors and tutees

My presence as an observer of the tutorial might have affected tutors to be more conscious of their tutoring strategies (e.g., engaging in dialogue rather than teaching).
Within a week after the tutorial, I scheduled an individual semi-structured interview with the tutor and tutee respectively. Post-tutorial interviews or retrospective interviews are often used in writing center studies to understand perceptions and tutoring strategies (Mackiewicz & Thompson, 2013; Thonus, 2002; Weigle & Nelson, 2004). Inspired by Thonus’s (2002) method, I prepared a rough, script-like transcript of each tutoring session prior to the post-tutorial interviews. This transcript was used to refresh participants’ memories and to ask about their perceptions of certain interactions that took place during the tutorial. For some long interactions, I did not transcribe word by word but summarized the main message. This was because the purpose of the post-tutorial interview was not to focus on micro-linguistic features of the interview discourse (unlike Thonus’s analysis) but on the content (e.g., tutoring strategies and feedback). The interviews lasted between 60 to 90 minutes and were conducted in Japanese.

For tutors, I scheduled an interview at their earliest convenience. The interview protocols for the tutor interviews (see Appendix J) were designed to examine their tutoring strategies, beliefs about the Writing Center philosophy, and about the Writing Center’s role in improving MLU students’ academic literacy.

For tutee participants, I scheduled an interview after they submitted their final drafts. If the dates of the tutorial and final submission were more than two weeks apart, I met with the tutee twice: once within one week of the tutorial and again after the final draft submission. The aim of this interview was (a) to examine their perceptions of the Writing Center tutorial (feedback, tutoring strategies, Writing Center pedagogy, tutor’s expertise), (b) to examine what they revised in their writing after the tutorial, and (c) to examine the benefits and drawbacks of the Writing Center as a viable writing support service (see Appendix J for the interview questions).
1.6.2 Analysis

The study used thematic analysis, defined as “a method for identifying, analyzing and reporting patterns (themes) within data” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 79) that is often done through coding, a method to reduce and organize the data. After I transcribed the interview data in Japanese with the help of two research assistants fluent in Japanese, I followed the data analysis process outlined in Braun and Clarke (2006) and Creswell (2014). First, I read through and coded the data by copying-and-pasting it into designated “code” folders. The codes were generated from the ground-up (i.e., data) and were mainly informed by my research questions. For example, I came up with twelve codes from the interview data of the Writing Center administrators. For each code, I had a list of participants’ interview excerpts. I then created a mini-description that summarized these excerpts. Finally, I compared the descriptions of each code, found patterns, and synthesized them into larger themes. These themes served as the starting point of my write up.

For Research Question 2, a more complex data analysis procedure was involved to conduct a cross-case analysis within and across the JE, JJ, and IJ tutorials. My cross-case analysis was inspired by the procedure in Merriam's (1998) analysis procedure. After I read through and coded the interview data, I wrote a description of each tutorial in a way that highlighted the tutors’ and tutees’ similarities and differences of their perceptions of the role of the Writing Center, their philosophy, and their satisfaction with the tutorial. Then, I generated salient themes from the descriptions. I then compared the themes across cases and linked similar themes that spoke to the same phenomenon. In this way, I had descriptions of each tutorial and common themes across the four cases. The audio-recorded data from each tutorial, collected
written drafts, and questionnaires served as complementary data to help holistically interpret each tutorial and to better understand participants’ accounts of the interviews. For Chapter 5, which required a systematic analysis of different stakeholders, I incorporated the administrators’ interview data related to the topic of international student writing into my analysis.

For the interview, questionnaire, and audio-recorded data in this dissertation, I translated the data excerpts from Japanese to English. A bilingual professional fluent in English and Japanese later checked the accuracy of these translations.

### 1.7 Positionality

During my childhood, secondary education, and postsecondary education, English has been a big part of my life and identity. Brought up by my parents who were bilingual education researchers in Japan, I was immersed in a predominantly English-only environment at home. To further advance my English proficiency, I pursued a university degree in English language studies. I became passionate about English education when I took courses taught by leading scholars of Applied Linguistics in Japan who were strong advocates of Communicative Language Teaching, Task-based Language Teaching, and Focus on Form. Although I was trained to improve English education in Japan with these methods, my ambition was countered by local realities when I started to teach at a high school in Tokyo. I started to reassess my views towards the ‘best practices’ from the West, which many Japanese scholars with doctoral degrees in applied linguistics from Inner Circle countries brought home. It was around this time when I happened to hear that there was a writing center at my university. During my six years I was enrolled in the university, I never knew of its existence. I became extremely curious about writing centers—their philosophy, history, pedagogical goals, and most importantly, why
Japanese universities were so attracted to them—and decided to pursue my doctoral studies on this topic.

Although I had studied about writing centers in depth, I had never worked in a writing center. This outsider stance in a way allowed me to develop a critical view towards writing centers when constantly hearing and reading about the writing center’s “practitioner lore” (Gillespie, 2002; Liggett et al., 2011; Thompson et al., 2009). I read works by critical writing center scholars about how the collaborative, meaning-focused writing center pedagogy can exclude students who are unfamiliar with academic discourse practices and who may require more direct, explicit assistance with language (Bawarshi & Pelkowski, 1999; Bokser, 2005; Cooper, 1994; DiPardo & Freedman, 1988; Grimm, 1999). I felt Japanese universities were just implementing writing centers because they were “American” and were uncritical about the history and underlying pedagogical philosophy of writing centers. In addition to my non-affiliation with my research site, this critical stance helped in establishing my role as an objective researcher. In many writing center studies (including many dissertation studies), it is often the case that the researcher also works as a director or a tutor at their writing center, which sometimes reinforces the writing center’s lore and uncritical examination of writing center praxis.

Although I came into the research site ready to reveal the exclusive nature of writing centers and their neo-colonialist influence as a “Western” pedagogy, I soon realized I needed a more balanced view towards writing centers. The tutors were passionate about their jobs, constantly reflecting on their practices and seeking measures of improvement. Although a few tutees expressed dissatisfaction with their tutorials, overall, most of them appreciated their tutors’ feedback and said they planned to go back if they had the time. Nonetheless, I did not want to
completely discredit my subjective interpretations. Thus, I kept a researcher journal and wrote down salient and critical episodes that I thought needed a more thorough critical analysis.

At MLU, the Writing Center associate director, staff, and tutors were very welcoming to me as an outsider. I was assigned a desk right next to the associate director in the Writing Center where I could oversee the tutorials taking place. Since I visited my research site as much as possible (three to four times a week) in the first couple of months, I had a lot of opportunities to talk to the associate director, staff, and tutors about the Writing Center and other institutional practices. What facilitated this rapport building was our shared language (Japanese) and educational background in Japan. For the tutee participants, although we had studied at different institutions, the shared attribute of being graduate students helped with building rapport. For the tutee participants of the IJ tutorials, we shared the commonality of being an international student at our respective institutions.

Sometimes, my status as a researcher in language education from a Canadian university created unexpected interactions. Some participants sought advice for improving their tutorials, especially for JE tutorials. Knowing my background in English language education, the associate director asked if I could train the tutors. I initially did not take on this role since my study was not meant to be an intervention study. However, towards the end of my data collection period, I found myself giving advice to tutors, informing them about key findings from writing center scholarship, and voicing my opinion at tutor meetings. A Writing Center staff member even asked me to join one of the administrative meetings in which I voiced my opinions against the misconceptions that administrators had of their JE tutors. Although these interactions took place after I collected all the data from the JE tutorials and thus did not affect my data, they did inform my stance when undertaking data analysis, for instance, when finding themes.
Through this research experience, I was reminded of a basic lesson that being critical of macro-structures is different from transforming them. In the financially restrictive environments Japanese universities operate in, sometimes practices need to be improved within the given situation and with the available resources. I believe my role as a researcher is to offer a different lens through which writing center administrators and tutors can view taken-for-granted practices, and then using the insights gained to reflect on them. This stance has greatly impacted this dissertation research.

1.8 Dissertation Organization

To reiterate, this dissertation is a manuscript-type dissertation, which comprises “a compilation of research articles” (Paltridge & Starfield, 2007, p. 70). Contrary to a traditional IMRAD (Introduction-Method-Results-Discussion) structure or other structures, the manuscript chapters stand alone as independent research studies (Paltridge & Starfield, 2007). I adopted this dissertation format because the multiple units of analysis generated distinct research topics, enabling me to write four manuscripts. As an inevitable consequence of this type of dissertation, such information as the descriptions of the research site and methodology is reiterated in each chapter. Table 1.3 provides an overview of the research question(s), participants, and data of each manuscript chapter (Chapters 2-5).
Table 1.3 Overview of Chapters: Title, Research Question(s), Participants, and Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter title</th>
<th>Research question(s)</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Data included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2: Policy Borrowing in University Language Planning: A Case Study of a Writing Center in Japan</td>
<td>RQ 1: What were the rationales for establishing a writing center at a Japanese university?</td>
<td>Initiator of the Writing Center, two university administrators, associate director, a Writing Center staff member</td>
<td>Interviews, policy documents, meeting notes, institutional policy plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3: The Role of Generalist Tutoring: A Case Study from Japan</td>
<td>RQ2-1: What type of knowledge and strategies do JJ tutors use in generalist tutoring? How do their students see the role of generalist tutors?</td>
<td>4 tutors; 4 tutees</td>
<td>Interviews, audio-recorded data of tutorials, written drafts, questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4: Perceptions of Non-native English Speaking Tutors at a Writing Center in Japan</td>
<td>RQ2-2: How do JE tutees perceive their non-native tutors’ stances? How might the tutors’ linguistic statuses impact these perceptions?</td>
<td>3 tutors; 4 tutees</td>
<td>Interviews, audio-recorded data of tutorials, written drafts, questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5: The Writing Center and International Students in a Japanese University: A Language Management Perspective</td>
<td>RQ2-3: How do the Writing Center administrators, tutors, and international students view the role of the IJ Writing Center?</td>
<td>Writing center administrators; 4 tutors; 4 tutees</td>
<td>Interviews with writing center administrators and tutor/tutees, audio-recorded data of tutorials, written drafts, questionnaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter 2 stands alone as a case study of the policy borrowing and language planning of the MLU writing center, addressing Research Question 1. Presenting data from interviews and policy documents, I follow the establishment process of the MLU Writing Center, including how it was initiated, who proposed it, why it was approved, and other social factors that contributed to its rather speedy implementation. I indicate several characteristics of the economically-
motivated language planning of the Writing Center from a policy borrowing perspective (Steiner-Khamsi, 2014) and point to some challenges in actualizing internationalization goals within the Writing Center.

Chapters 3, 4, and 5 address the sub-questions of Research Question 2 by comparing the tutors’ tutoring practices (beliefs, strategies) and tutees’ perceptions of tutorials. In Chapter 5, administrator interviews are also included as data to allow for a systematic analysis based on language management theory.

Chapter 3 deals with the topic of generalist tutoring in JJ tutorials. Based on the government’s agenda regarding higher education quality assurance, Japanese literacy has gained attention as an important communication skill for the knowledge economy and has led to an increase in university writing initiatives. MLU followed this trend by launching its Writing Center and a cross-curricula academic writing course. What the Writing Center brought in was the concept of generalist tutoring to a university with established discipline-specific research practices taught by supervisors. Through a close examination of tutorials and reflections, this chapter explores the four cases to determine the strategies tutors use in generalist tutoring and how tutees see the role of generalist tutors in improving their disciplinary literacy practices.

Chapter 4 presents findings from JE tutorials. Drawing on the notion of student stance and motives in peer feedback research (Storch, 2004; Zhu & Mitchell, 2012), this chapter investigates how the tutors’ linguistic statuses as non-native English speakers might impact their tutees’ perceptions of tutorials. Considering tutees’ evaluation of tutor stances (i.e., use of tutoring strategies, display of writing/language expertise), I present three key conditions that contributed to the positive evaluation of tutorials with non-native tutors: (a) the match between tutor and tutee motives, (b) tutees’ (dis)preference of particular tutoring strategies, and (c) a trust
in the tutor’s writing expertise, but not necessarily their language expertise. Given these conditions, I discuss how the Writing Center’s philosophy might limit tutors’ capabilities as language experts and tutees’ perceptions of the role of English writing tutorials.

Chapter 5 explores the crucial issue of whether writing center pedagogy matches with international students’ Japanese language learning needs. From a language management perspective (Nekvapil, 2016), I examine the institutional role of the MLU Writing Center by comparing the beliefs and interests in improving international students’ writing among administrators, tutors, and international students themselves. Findings show the discrepancies between administrators’ urgency to remedy international students’ lack of writing skills, the tutors’ conceptualizations of their tutoring philosophy, and international students’ Japanese language learning needs. I conclude by discussing the challenges inherent in increasing international student enrollment and the role of writing centers in providing sufficient language support.

Finally, Chapter 6 is the conclusion chapter, which ties the manuscript chapters together. I summarize key findings; list the theoretical, methodological, and practical implications of my study; and provide directions for future research.
Chapter 2: Policy Borrowing in University Language Planning: A Case Study of a Writing Center in Japan

2.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to explore the act of ‘policy borrowing’ (Steiner-Khamsi, 2014) in language-in-education planning. Focusing on the popularity of the writing center (a writing support service that originated in the United States) in Japan, I explore the political and socio-economic factors that shaped the planning of a writing center at a Japanese university. In pursuing this task, I trace the process of the writing center establishment evident from documents and interviews with five university staff involved in the Center’s planning. Policy borrowing as a conceptual framework (Steiner-Khamsi, 2014) is employed to illuminate the ways in which the writing center was situated in relation to MLU’s institutional mission at different phases of the language planning process. Findings show that the idea of the writing center was interpreted in multiple ways to accomplish the governmental and institutional missions to create a world-class university. Such missions included increasing international student enrollment, improving the quality of education, and promoting scholarly publications in English. Given these findings, I discuss the following: (a) issues of policy borrowing in MLU’s language planning, and (b) the contradictions between the university’s quantitative goals and the use of process-oriented pedagogies such as those implemented in writing centers.
2.2 Policy Borrowing and Language Planning

Due to the increased pressures of internationalization, many universities around the world are compelled to implement education models and frameworks that can contribute to their entrepreneurial status and to prove their international competitiveness through university ranking exercises (Deem, Mok, & Lucas, 2008; Mok, 2007). As Mok (2007) points out, these practices are often based on academic practices of world-class Western universities (e.g., publishing in English, international partnerships, student-centered curricula). This trend can be observed in university language education as well, as language planners adopt frameworks that promote the multilingual, entrepreneurial, and international profile of the university (Imoto & Horiguchi, 2015; Miranda, Berdugo, & Tejada, 2016; Phan & Hamid, 2016). Some examples are medium of instruction policies (Doiz, Lasagabaster, & Sierra, 2012); multilingual frameworks such as Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) often seen in European universities (Pérez-Cañado, 2012) and parallel language use in Nordic countries (Hult & Källkvist, 2016); and the use of Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR), a communicative language benchmark developed by the Council of Europe (Byram & Parmenter, 2012).

Although a plausible rationale for implementing innovative or globally recognized measures is to improve the status quo of education, studies in policy borrowing inform us of the political nature of adapting so-called “best practices” (Steiner-Khamsi, 2014). Policy borrowing or educational transfer is a field in comparative education that studies the rationales, processes, and consequences of adopting an educational model from another context. Researchers in this field have traditionally examined cases of cross-national attractions of a particular education reform (Phillips & Ochs, 2004; Steiner-Khamsi, 2012; Takayama, 2010), such as the United States’ interest in Japanese education in the 1980s (Rappleye, 2006). At the
onset of policy borrowing, there are often *impulses* that inspire policy makers to look for successful cases elsewhere, for instance, economic competition, political change, and negative external evaluation (Phillips & Ochs, 2003). Throughout this process, *externalizing potentials* of a particular education policy or model, such as its guiding philosophy, goals, structures, processes, and educational techniques, are strategically employed to advocate for policy change (Phillips & Ochs, 2003). The *reference society*, the country or context where the policy is adopted from, is key in trying to understand the values and rationales of policy borrowers. For instance, Takayama (2010) demonstrated that when Japan faced a decline in its ranking on the 2003 PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment) Test, Japanese progressives strategically made reference to the Finnish education model as a successful, “humanitarian and egalitarian icon” (p. 59) to voice dissent from existing conservative-led practices and to revise their political views. In this case, Finland served as an ideal reference society, demonstrating high educational achievement on the international assessment test, and for this reason, its educational features could be strategically taken up for policy making.

Transfer of educational knowledge is not merely an act observed between politicians or governments. Due to globalizing forces and more independence from the state, educational institutions have the autonomy to search for successful models and import them into their systems (Rappleye, Imoto, & Horiguchi, 2011). Researchers in language education have employed a policy borrowing lens to understand driving forces behind the spread of popular language education policies and frameworks such as the CEFR in Vietnam and Japan (Rappleye et al., 2011; Van Huy & Hamid, 2015), CLIL in European and Asian countries (Paran, 2013), and immersion education in China (Qiang & Kang, 2011). These studies show that a language education policy could be implemented not only to address pedagogical issues, but also due to
the socio-economic and political interests of language planners that might come into conflict with pedagogical practices. For instance, an ethnographic study conducted by Rappleye et al. (2011) depicts the multiple interests and identity politics involved in a Japanese university implementing CEFR, a European language education policy framework. At this university, CEFR was implemented by European foreign language instructors who had personal interests and priorities in promoting plurilingualism. However, the implementation of a standardized language framework was not quite successful when it met with criticism from other teachers disagreeing with the idea of homogenization and American-educated instructors unfamiliar with the European concept of “plurilingualism”. This study demonstrated that globalized education policies serve to fulfill particular ideologies and values but could cause conflicts and dissonances when implemented in practice. Examining the motives behind policy borrowing in the language planning process would contribute to a better understanding of the macro-micro relationships of policy implementation.

2.3 Borrowing the Idea of the Writing Center

To add new knowledge to policy borrowing in language planning, this chapter provides an example of the education transfer of a writing center, a common writing support service in North America, to a Japanese university.

The writing center is a common writing support service in North America where students can receive feedback on their writing from tutors (Moussu & David, 2015). What makes a writing center unique are its historical and theoretical underpinnings. As noted in Chapter 1, writing centers gained momentum during the open admissions period of the 1970s that took place at American universities. The open admissions policy was a historical event in American
higher education, as universities and colleges lowered their admissions policy to admit diverse student populations, including women, African Americans, and returning veterans (Carino, 1996). However, this created a need to offer remedial courses for students who were underprepared for college studies. A characteristic of remedial education around this era was the influence of progressive pedagogical theories. Composition scholars advocated for a “process writing” approach that prioritized meaning expression rather than correct form, and offered techniques that let students discover for themselves, and with peers, the process of drafting, composing, and editing (e.g., Elbow, 1998; Murray, 1969, 1979). Remedial programs were typically run by English departments, while writing centers served a supplementary role in supporting students enrolled in these courses (Carino, 1996). The writing center was articulated as a non-hierarchical, student-centered environment for students to collaboratively discover the writing process with their peer tutors, which marked a turn away from the skills-based approaches of correcting students’ writing habits evident in earlier writing clinics and labs (Lerner, 2005). These educational philosophies still lend themselves to current writing center practices according to the International Writing Center Association’s definition of the facility:

[…] in the [writing] center writers actually engage in writing processes with tutors as they learn by doing how to plan, to brainstorm, to ask questions for revision, to rework written text, to add variety to sentence structure, to organize large amounts of material into a research paper, to proofread, and so on. Two cardinal rules for writing centers are that there be easily accessible stacks of scratch paper lying around and that the pen remain in the hand of the writer. (International Writing Center Association, 2006, ¶ 9)
In the past couple of decades, the idea of writing centers has spread throughout Asia
(Chang, 2013; Hayward, 1994; Johnston, Cornwell, & Yoshida, 2008; Tan, 2011; Turner, 2006;
Xiao, 2001), Europe (Doleschal, 2012; Harbord, 2010; Santa, 2009; Stassen & Jansen, 2012),
Africa (Archer, 2007; Broekhoff, 2014; Miller, 2002; Papay, 2002), the Middle East (Ronesi,
2009; Weber et al., 2015), and Central America (Aguilo, 2008; García-Arroyo & Quintana,
2012). Writing centers have been established for various purposes, but the central rationale
seems to be to introduce writing instruction to contexts in which writing was not previously
considered a crucial component of education. For some English as a foreign language contexts
in Asia and Europe, the process writing approach underpinning the writing center was welcomed
as an alternative to the teacher-centered, product-oriented approach (Ertl, 2011; Reichelt et al.,
2013; Xiao, 2001). Writing centers have also been established at American off-shore universities
in Middle Eastern countries to complement new writing programs (Ronesi, 2009) (see Chapter 1
for more information on international writing center trends).

In the case of Japan, writing centers were first established by Japanese universities
famous for their English-medium liberal arts programs in 2004 (Johnston et al., 2008; Kimura,
Sato, Moody, Suzuki, & Kojima, 2013). Since then, writing centers have become more popular,
and have quickly adapted to providing assistance to domestic and international students with
their Japanese writing (Iwamoto, 2008; Takahashi, 2012) (see Chapter 1 for more information on
the history of Japanese writing centers). Writing centers also gained popularity as an innovative
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8 English as a foreign language (EFL) is a term referring to English language learning in a context where
the dominant language in society is not English. This is often contrasted with English as a second
language (ESL); English language learning in contexts where English is the dominant language in society.
pedagogy when they were recommended by the government as an effective extra-curricular facility to foster students’ communication skills in both Japanese and English (MEXT, 2012).

The academic scholarship and professional community of writing centers is steadily growing in Japan with an annual conference hosted by a professional organization called The Writing Centers Association of Japan. However, the majority of scholarship consists of local reports or practice-oriented research examining the effectiveness of writing center tutorials (e.g., Doyle, Omori, & Akita, 2013; Hays, 2009; Ota & Sadoshima, 2012) and has not been written from a language planning perspective. The rationales for implementing writing centers are glossed over in these reports and little is written on the details of the policy borrowing. In order to dig into deeper questions of why (and how) the writing center was created and for whose benefits, I trace the policy borrowing and language planning processes of a writing center at a Japanese university, focusing on the impulses and externalizing potentials that led to the writing center implementation. The research questions addressed in this chapter are:

What were the rationales for establishing a writing center at a Japanese university?

• What macro factors and institutional factors influenced the decision-making process of the university policy planners?
• How did the planners justify the establishment of a writing center in their planning?
2.4 Research Site and Method

2.4.1 A Japanese national university

The research site, Maple Leaves University (MLU), is a national university located in a rural area of Japan. It is a comprehensive research university with undergraduate and graduate programs in humanities, social sciences, and sciences. As for its international profile, a little over a thousand international students (less than 10% of the total student population) are enrolled. A majority of international students enter graduate programs (90% of the total number of international students admitted study at the graduate level) and they make up 20% of the graduate student population.

The unique nature of Japanese national universities needs to be explained to understand the context of the study. Although Japanese higher education has experienced reforms since the start of the 21st century, one of the most impactful was the incorporation of Japanese national universities (Kaneko, 2009). Due to the economic recession in the 1990s and increasing public debt, the Japanese government began downsizing and privatizing the public sector to promote competition and efficiency (Hatakenaka, 2005; Yamamoto, 2004). National universities were also targeted as an area of the public sector that should gain autonomy while competing for excellence with other universities. Although there was significant opposition from academics, the National University Corporation Law was introduced in 2003 and officially implemented by universities from April, 2004 (MEXT, 2001).

After incorporation, the management of national universities and their relationships with the government drastically changed (Kaneko, 2009). Contrary to the pre-incorporation period in
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which the government strictly managed universities’ budgets, as independent legal entities, national universities are now held more accountable for their initiatives and expenditures. For the management of the corporation, the President of the university has the ultimate power to decide and manage finances on university matters in consultation with the executive board, academic senate, and external auditors (Kaneko, 2009; Oba, 2007). As a target for determining institutional missions, every six years, the Ministry of Education presents mid-term goals to be achieved by each national university regarding research, education, and management. After each term, the universities’ performances are monitored and assessed by the Council for Evaluation of National University Corporations and future budget allocations are determined (Kaneko, 2009).

In this way, national universities’ institutional policy-making depends heavily on the government’s educational and political agenda. At the time this study was conducted, national universities were completing their second mid-term goal period (2010-2015). MLU had stipulated their institutional plan in 2012 based on their mid-term goals and were in the process of major reforms in improving learning environments, curricula, research functions, and management structures.

2.4.2 Research method and participants

This study was conducted as part of the researcher’s institutional case study investigating the language planning and pedagogical practices of the Writing Center at MLU. I conducted semi-structured individual interviews with five university staff including three faculty members, one library staff member, and one university research administrator who fulfilled different roles in the Writing Center administration (see Table 2.1 for participant information). These participants were either chosen by me or recommended by Mr. Yamamoto (the associate director of the Center) as key personnel in developing the Writing Center. It should be noted that these
five participants became involved with the planning at different phases over time, which was one of the characteristics of the planning process, as detailed in subsequent sections.

Table 2.1 *Name of Participants, Job Title, and Relationship to Writing Center*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Job title</th>
<th>Relationship to Writing Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Kawamaru</td>
<td>Professor in education</td>
<td>Initiator of the Writing Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Yamamoto</td>
<td>Associate director of the Writing Center</td>
<td>Associate director &amp; tutor for faculty members’ English tutorials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Honda</td>
<td>Library staff</td>
<td>Writing Center staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Furuta</td>
<td>Professor in biology</td>
<td>Writing Center administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Misawa</td>
<td>University research administrator</td>
<td>Writing Center administrator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although not serving on the administration committee, Mr. Kawamaru was a professor in the Faculty of Education and the initiator of the MLU Writing Center. Mr. Yamamoto, a former faculty member in the sciences, was the associate director of the Writing Center in charge of the daily management of the Center; he was also a consultant for the faculty’s English writing tutorials. Mr. Honda was the library staff member in charge of the Writing Center’s logistics, such as advertising, human resources, and supply management. Mr. Furuta was a professor in biology, serving as a Writing Center administrator, and Mr. Misawa, a research administrator specifically overseeing the Center’s research promotion activities.

The main data sources for analysis were interviews conducted in Japanese and documents. Interview protocols were designed to examine the participants’ perceptions, beliefs, and opinions about the function of the Writing Center in relation to the university’s institutional goal. Documents included MLU’s institutional plans, the Writing Center web site, and internal
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meeting reports. Data analysis consisted of two stages: (1) Using thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006), I first identified themes from participants’ interviews such as institutional goals, the role of the Writing Center, views of the Writing Center philosophy, and the establishment process in order to get a general overview of participants’ involvement in the planning and their beliefs regarding the role of the Writing Center; (2) then, referring to the documents and interviews, I streamlined the order of events pivotal to the planning of the Writing Center and identified four phases:

- Initiation of the idea
- “MLU Action Plan 2012”
- “Research University Grant”
- Implementation

I categorized relevant documents (i.e., institutional plans and internal meeting reports) and interview excerpts into these four phases. This procedure allowed me to trace how the idea of MLU’s Writing Center evolved in and through each phase. The following section explicates the four phases in detail.

2.5 Language Planning Process of the MLU Writing Center

2.5.1 Phase 1: Initiation of the idea

The creation of a writing center at MLU was initiated in May 2012 by Mr. Kawamaru, a professor in the Faculty of Education, at a faculty meeting also attended by the president of MLU. According to Mr. Kawamaru, the president attended the faculty meeting every three months to speak about the institutional goals of the university. One of the goals discussed was increasing international student enrollment. MLU had been accepting a larger number of international
students into its graduate programs. In 2012, out of the 994 international students, 744 were graduate students and 127 were those categorized as “research students” (研究生) who took relevant courses until their graduate programs officially approved their enrollment as graduate students. MLU had been making great efforts to recruit international students by increasing the number of partnership universities, participating in international university fairs, and administering entrance exams in China, where more than half of their international students came from. Their goal set in 2014 was to increase international student enrollment to 20% of the whole student population by 2023, meaning more than double the current number.

However, when the president mentioned the faculty’s duty to increase the number of international students, Mr. Kawamaru, who was in charge of the international strategy plan for the Faculty of Education, decided to speak out in opposition to the president’s statement in front of 200 other faculty members. His recollection was that he said the following:

The Faculty of Education already admits enough students, including a lot of international students. And currently, supervisors, and if they are not present, other graduate students, are sacrificing their time to check international students’ Japanese writing […] Unless there is something…like a writing center that can check their writing instead of supervisors and other fellow students, we cannot increase international student enrollment (Mr. Kawamaru, Interview 2-1)\textsuperscript{11}.

\textsuperscript{11} Superscripts after each excerpt correspond to the original Japanese interview excerpts listed in Appendix L.
The Faculty of Education was one of the most popular programs for international graduate students. However, Mr. Kawamaru mentioned that the faculty was being overburdened with the task of raising the quality of international students’ graduate level writing. This seemed to be a common institutional issue voiced by other participants as well. Mr. Kawamaru learned about writing centers when he was pursuing his doctoral degree in the United States. Interestingly, he never visited the writing center at his institution as a student, but had a recollection of the writing center as a place that took care of international students’ writing issues. This image of writing centers prompted him to make the above comment at the meeting.

A few days later, Mr. Kawamaru was called into the president’s office. The president told Mr. Kawamaru that if he really thought MLU needed a writing center, he should create one. Mr. Kawamura’s assigned mission was to create a proposal for what kind of writing center MLU needed. The president assigned a secretary to Mr. Kawamaru to help gather information about writing centers in Japan and funded the cost of his investigation.

Three months later, Mr. Kawamaru visited two writing centers in Japan, University A, one of the pioneering writing center universities, and University B, which had recently established a writing center. They were both leading international universities in Japan and were chosen because they offered both English and Japanese tutorial services. After the visit, Mr. Kawamaru wrote in his proposal what he described as “an innovative and ideal writing center” that would further solidify the president’s decision. According to the written report he generated, the MLU Writing Center would support both the Japanese and English writing of both students and faculty members in different academic genres such as course assignments, job applications, and research articles. Mr. Kawamaru wrote that the Writing Center’s goal of developing autonomous writers was applicable and beneficial to all members at MLU.
It is not exactly clear why the president endorsed the suggestion of a writing center. According to Mr. Kawamaru, the president had once rejected the idea of the writing center brought up by one faculty member who was concerned about students’ lack of writing skills. As Mr. Kawamaru speculated, one of the reasons might have been the fact that other leading Japanese universities were opening writing centers. However, he later restated that the biggest determiner was the potential role the Writing Center could play in promoting the faculty’s English writing for publication. It turned out that this might have been the most important rationale of establishing a writing center at MLU, as evident in subsequent phases.

2.5.2 Phase 2: “MLU Action Plan 2012”

Meanwhile, MLU was in the process of drafting the “MLU Action Plan 2012.” This Action Plan was a crucial plan outlining necessary reforms and timelines to accomplish MLU’s mid-term goals. In drafting this Plan, university faculty and staff members formed committees to decide specifics of their assigned agenda and submit a report to the Action Plan committee. Mr. Furuta was the head of the “Quality Education Assurance Committee” in charge of MLU’s curricular reforms. Mr. Kawamaru’s writing center proposal landed in the hands of this committee to be also included in the Action Plan. The committee’s job was to reassess Mr. Kawamaru’s report and propose concrete measures including recruitment of tutors, budgetary issues, and a timeline for initiation. Mr. Kawamaru participated in some of these committee meetings. In order to learn about writing centers, the committee read a book about creating writing centers written by a Japanese professor at University A. Similar to Mr. Kawamaru’s proposal, the committee also saw the value of the Writing Center as cultivating autonomous writers who can communicate their opinion or research in a logical way. Furthermore, they wrote in their report that the Writing Center should first and foremost be a place to help students learn
the basics of academic writing in both Japanese and English. To support their point, the committee cited in their report the governments’ higher education agenda on promoting life-long learning, active learning, learner autonomy, and increasing studying hours outside of classes (MEXT, 2012). The committee also pulled up statistics on MLU students’ lack of independent study (e.g., “40% of students spend less than half of their class hours for independent study”) to justify that the Writing Center could encourage students to take more initiatives into their own learning. A major difference from Mr. Kawamaru’s report was that the committee considered English writing services for faculty to be a future goal and not an immediate one. In the interview, Mr. Furuta expressed his views that English writing services were “too early, too soon” （時期尚早） for MLU and that Japanese writing should come first:

For writing articles and essays, I hope the Writing Center could take leadership in instructing students how to write research articles and assignments […] first and foremost, I just want students to be able to write normal Japanese papers. English articles come after that. Because you can’t write good papers in English if you can’t [write good papers] in Japanese. And people who can’t write good papers in English, can’t [write good papers] in Japanese either. (Mr. Furuta, Interview 2-2)

In the published Action Plan, the committee’s emphasis on student writing support was reflected, though a new duty was added to the Writing Center; the Plan indicated that the Writing Center would help humanities and social sciences (HSS) faculty members “English-ize” (英語化する) their Japanese research articles. Neither Mr. Kawamaru nor the “Quality Education
Assurance” committee specifically wrote about HSS faculty and had no clue about what “English-ize” meant. However, they both mentioned that it was added because the president was always concerned about the comparatively low number of English publications coming out of the HSS departments.

After the Action Plan was released, the “Writing Center Establishment Committee” was set up. In the committee meetings, it was decided that the Writing Center would be housed in the library and the Writing Center tutors would be recruited from a newly established graduate-level Japanese academic writing course. Approximately one year later, the Writing Center at MLU was initiated. Mr. Honda, who participated in the meetings, reported that all was smooth sailing, except for one agenda: how to support faculty members’ English writing.

Here the committee discussed [how to support writing] English articles. But actually it doesn’t really say anything substantial. For a start, the committee decided on “English-izing” (英文化する) HSS faculty’s research abstracts and sharing them online, which was like evading the crux of the issue, like starting from what’s possible for now. So they didn’t touch upon how they could actually support researchers’ writing in English, because it just seemed impossible to do that [to help researchers support and improve their English writing]. (Mr. Honda, Interview2-3)

2.5.3 Phase 3: “Research University Grant”

Shortly before the initiation of the Writing Center, an event occurred that actualized the Writing Center’s role in promoting research activities. MLU received the “Research University Grant” from the Ministry of Education aimed to promote top-notch research in Japanese universities. The social background of this Grant comes from Japanese universities’ decreasing
number of research citations in top-tier journals, especially in the sciences. Allowing universities a 200 to 400-million-yen expenditure, this ten-year grant was designated to creating measures to increase the research productivity of the selected universities. The suggested measures include conducting pioneering research in innovative fields and hiring university research administrators who collaborate with faculty towards academic publishing.

The research grant was announced with good timing in 2012 right after the “MLU Action Plan” was released. MLU had already started various measures aimed at increasing its research productivity. One of these measures was the creation of the “Organization for Research Promotion”, a centralized unit led by the president that determines MLU’s research strategies. The Organization was working on a plan to increase the number of SCI (Science Citation Index) research articles by setting a quota of three publications per faculty and decided to use the Grant to help make MLU a world-class university, defined as ranking amongst the Top 100 universities in university ranking exercises in the next ten years. Given the agenda in the Action Plan, the Organization indicated that a part of the Research University Grant would be spent on expanding the Writing Center and also spent on enhancing the HSS faculty’s research productivity in English.

Mr. Misawa was hired as a university research administrator under this Grant and worked for the Organization of Research Promotion. Among other duties, he was assigned to manage the Grant finances on the Writing Center’s research promoting activities. Mr. Misawa joined the administrative team right after the initiation of the Center and played a pivotal role in designating the specifics of the Center’s research services. It was decided that the Writing Center would offer the following four services for faculty members:
• Offering one-on-one English scholarly writing tutorials (conducted by a faculty member)
• “English-izing” HSS faculty members’ Japanese articles and research abstracts in in-house journals
• Subsidizing editing service fees of English manuscripts written by faculty
• Holding workshops and seminars on research writing

In the interview, Mr. Misawa interpreted “English-izing” as rewriting Japanese research articles and abstracts into English for a global audience, not merely translating them. At the time of data collection, he was working with departments across campus to set up a system that allowed faculty members to pursue this task. Although he mentioned the daunting task of motivating HSS faculty to write in English, he envisioned the Writing Center being a “Writing and Research Center” where faculty could learn how to better write English articles and contribute to MLU’s research productivity. He said he got this idea from a famous research university in the United States that he visited before, which shows his ambitions to transform MLU into a university comparable to an American research university.

2.5.4 Phase 4: Implementation

The Writing Center opened in the fall of 2014, two years after Mr. Kawamaru initiated the idea. Interestingly, there were no faculty assigned to direct the Writing Center and the local management was left in the hands of a couple of library staff including Mr. Honda and the graduate students recruited as tutors. A couple of months before opening, the writing center director from University A came to MLU to offer several workshops about the history, philosophy, and management of writing centers. Mr. Honda described frequently having meetings with graduate student tutors to decide the Writing Center philosophy and procedures
for writing center tutorials. A year later, Mr. Yamamoto, a faculty member in the sciences, was hired as the Associate Director of the Writing Center.

The Writing Center philosophy was made up of two components that reflect the rationale of the Writing Center in the Action Plan. One is to foster academic writing skills and the other is to strengthen the research function of the university by developing researchers’ skills to disseminate knowledge globally (国際発信力). At the time of the data collection, the Writing Center offered tutorials in Japanese and English for students (tutored by graduated students) and faculty (tutored by the Writing Center associate director, Mr. Yamamoto). In addition, the Research University Grant covered research writing workshops, seminars, and the subsidization of editing service fees. Table 2.2 specifies the types of services the MLU Writing Center offered:

Table 2.2 *Types of Services Offered at MLU Writing Center*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target clientele</th>
<th>Language of Writing</th>
<th>Medium language</th>
<th>Type of writing</th>
<th>Tutor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students (domestic/international)</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Course assignments, graduating theses, etc.</td>
<td>Graduate student tutors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students (domestic/international)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Course assignments, graduating theses, etc.</td>
<td>Graduate student tutors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty members</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Manuscripts, abstracts (other types of research writing)</td>
<td>Mr. Yamamoto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Writing Center administration team included all interview participants except for Mr. Kawamaru, who opted out of the Center’s administrative role. Although the team decided on personnel and financial issues, the ground-level work (i.e., tutoring, advertising) was mainly led by the graduate student tutors and Mr. Yamamoto.
2.6 Discussion

2.6.1 Planning and borrowing for a world-class university

The idea of the MLU Writing Center went through multiple phases before being put into practice. Throughout the process, stakeholders such as Mr. Kawamaru, Furuta, and Misawa proposed and justified different functions for the Writing Center in accordance with their distinct institutional roles and values: Mr. Kawamaru as a faculty member in charge of the Faculty of Education’s international strategies, Mr. Furuta as the chair of the Quality Education Assurance Committee, and Mr. Misawa as the university research administrator. Figure 2.1 summarizes the first three phases and the major rationales identified in them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiation (Faculty of Education meeting)</th>
<th>To increase international student enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLU Action Plan 2012</td>
<td>To foster Japanese academic literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research University Grant</td>
<td>To support faculty’s research writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.1 The main rationales in each phase

In the initial phase, Mr. Kawamaru implicated that a writing center could be a savior for faculty members who spend a considerable amount of time editing international students’ writing and in turn could increase MLU’s international student enrollment. Mr. Furuta’s committee, which was working to enhance the quality of the curricula, saw the value of writing centers in improving
students’ Japanese academic literacy and learner autonomy. However, during the last phase, an additional role was assigned to the Writing Center, which was to increase research production in English primarily for HSS faculty, something that had always concerned the president.

These justifications came from the macro socio-economic and political pressures on MLU to become an entrepreneurial world-class university; pressures such as increasing international student enrollment, creating more student-centered curricular reforms, and enhancing MLU’s status as an international research university. These were all pressing national higher education goals that all participants, as members of the National University Corporation, needed to address in their institutional planning and policy implementation. It was under this neoliberal climate of competing for excellence that allowed for economically-motivated language planning to take place.

The different types of rationalizations and interpretations of the writing center share characteristics of Steiner-Khamsi’s (2012) selective policy borrowing “octopus” metaphor: “local actors reach out and grab the arm of the octopus closest to their particular policy agenda, and attach (local) meaning to a (global) policy” (p. 459). What attracted policy makers to the idea of the writing center was its guiding philosophy of developing autonomous writers in the case of student writing support. In regards to the support of faculty members’ research, they were also drawn to the enabling structures of the writing center, the concept of a designated center for writing, in helping faculty disseminate their work in English. These externalizing potentials were applied to solve institutional issues that hindered MLU from attaining an entrepreneurial status, namely the lack of Japanese and English writing skills of both students and faculty. What further justified the policy borrowing was the fact that the writing center was an established entity in two important reference societies or universities, one being Japanese leading international
universities with bilingual writing centers and the other, an American research university with a promising “Writing and Research Center”. This shows that policies from global and local leading universities serve not only as a legitimate reason for policy borrowing but can also contribute to MLU’s “performativity” (Ball, 2012, p. 19) in gaining a reputation as an entrepreneurial university. As reputable national universities like MLU are pressured by the government to transform themselves into world-class universities within the next ten years, it may become the case that pedagogy could be implemented not only for education, but more for the university’s performance, accountability, and productivity, a process that is increasingly following the tendencies of neoliberal higher education management practices seen around the world (e.g., Fejes, 2008; Mok, 2007; Olssen & Peters, 2005).

### 2.6.2 Product-oriented goals and the writing center: A paradox

However, the collaborative Writing Center pedagogy might not have been a solution to some of the MLU’s numerical goals. There seemed to be an insufficient consideration put into applying the idea of the Writing Center as a collaborative space to attain product-oriented goals such as increasing the number of international students and English publications to a certain number in the next ten years. Mr. Kawamaru’s plan to lessen the burden of faculty checking international students’ writing and admitting more students is rather unrealistic, as writing centers are not editing services. In addition, it was not clear how the writing center pedagogy could increase the number of English publications of the HSS faculty. Mr. Misawa and Mr. Yamamoto, who were closely working with faculty, expressed the view that faculty’s limited English proficiency and research geared to a Japanese audience was a challenge in attaining this goal. This has led Mr. Misawa and Mr. Yamamoto to seek more efficient ways to boost writing productivity regardless of the faculty’s research topics or proficiency in English:
If you were Japanese, you would know what Kojiki is, but if you want your research to be read globally, you need to explain what it is in English for the reader. So re-writing abstracts in English is a good thing, but they need to separate the content from Japanese if they want to get it out in English [...] Unless each faculty come up with a system to teach pointers to tailor the language and content for a global audience, their [faculty members’] abstracts would just remain as plain translation from Japanese to English. (Mr. Misawa, Interview\textsuperscript{2-4})

This, developing academic writing skills…we have this goal but how to achieve this is another issue. If it’s writing in a foreign language, I’m even more unsure how we can teach academic writing skills. If the genre is research articles, we just need to make them write articles in English [...] I’m always wondering if there are any fast tricks [to make them writing articles in English], like some sort of techniques. But then if I focus too much on teaching techniques, I forget about our Writing Center philosophy (Mr. Yamamoto, Interview\textsuperscript{2-5}).

The fast tricks to produce research that Mr. Misawa and Mr. Yamamoto both mention indeed reflects the urgency of increasing research productivity and attaining status as a world-class university within a given timeframe. With this product-oriented mentality, it is questionable whether the Writing Center as a collaborative learning space can be realized. Product-oriented goals tend to motivate language planners to seek a ‘quick-fix’ solution (Phillips & Ochs, 2003), which temporarily works to satisfy internal criticism and to show efforts of improving the status
quo. However, Phillips and Ochs (2003) caution that quick-fix decisions can be “one of the most dangerous outcomes of the process of cross-national attraction” (p. 455) in that the context of implementation may not be sufficiently scrutinized. This can cause policy failure or leave a huge burden on practitioners (Van Huy & Hamid, 2015). In the case of Mr. Yamamoto, he was caught between following the collaborative pedagogy on the one hand, and teaching fast trick writing techniques. However, Mr. Yamamoto, as a member of the National University Corporation, would soon need to assess his practices based on institutional goals.

2.7 Conclusion

The aim of this chapter was to identify the political, socio-economic motivations involved in the planning of the Writing Center, a globalized education policy from leading universities. Through the planning and implementation process described by the participants and in the documents, it was found that the main rationale of the planning came from pressures to make MLU a world-class university. In this process, the guiding philosophy and enabling structures of writing center were selectively borrowed and used as solutions to fix institutional problems that hindered MLU from enhancing its international status.

Given the findings of this study, I suggest implications for academic literacy planning. First, university language planners should scrutinize the affordances and consequences of writing centers or any kind of pedagogy before implementing it. Although the planners in this study saw potential in some aspects of the writing center, it seemed that the writing center was not assessed in its entirety, especially its unique historical background and controversial topics on inclusiveness. For instance, what was missing from the discussion was the writing center’s non-directive tutoring style and non-proofreading policy not meeting the language learning needs of
international students and non-traditional students (e.g., Babcock, 2008; Grimm, 1992; Myers, 2003). Second, as Fenton-Smith and Gurney (2016) point out, for more successful language planning, language education specialists (people with expertise) should be involved in the process to discuss appropriate pedagogy and language learning needs with people in positions of power such as the president and committees. Although there is a language education department at MLU, none of the faculty members were involved in the planning of the Writing Center, which is uncommon when considering other writing centers in Japan that were planned and directed by language or writing education specialists. As Japanese universities are tasked with raising their international profiles, language planners are key players in negotiating universities’ forceful language policies and helping to create academic language policies that are educational and beneficial to university members.
Chapter 3: Generalist Tutoring at a Japanese university

3.1 Introduction

In the past decade, the Japanese government’s quality assurance plans have been urging Japanese universities to implement educational measures that allow students to foster skills needed for the knowledge economy (Kaneko, 2004). As a part of this project, writing programs and writing centers are increasing in number in Japanese universities (Inoshita, 2008; Yamada, 2014). A significant change that the writing center brought to Japanese universities was the idea of generalist tutoring, in other words, tutorials led by tutors without knowledge of their tutees’ disciplines. Although this concept is novel for Japanese higher education, as mentorship from professors in the disciplines was the traditional form of writing education (Sato, 2008; Ushiogi, 1993), few studies have examined the impact of generalist tutoring on existing academic literacy practices in Japanese universities.

Analyzing audio-recorded data and post-tutorial interviews of four generalist tutoring sessions at a Japanese writing center, this chapter reports on the tutors’ tutoring strategies and the tutees’ perceptions of tutor roles in improving their academic writing. Findings show that tutors differed in the degree of engagement with tutees’ disciplinary fields, which were rooted in their beliefs of tutor roles, research, and writing. For tutees, their tutors fulfilled roles in ways that complemented their relationships with supervisors and research groups. Given the findings, I discuss implications for writing center research and tutoring training, particularly for reconceptualizing the neutrality of generalist tutoring and clarifying tutor roles/responsibilities as non-specialist readers.
3.2 International Writing Centers: A General Review

The internationalization of composition studies has become a familiar topic, as U.S.-based writing instruction models (e.g., first year composition courses, writing centers) have been widely implemented in many countries (Bräuer, 2002; Harbord, 2010; Tarnopolsky, 2000; You, 2004). Despite the popularity of these models, numerous calls have been made both from American and foreign writing scholars to critically reflect on the dissemination of U.S. composition scholarship as ‘best practices’ (Anson & Donahue, 2014; Donahue, 2009; Muchiri, Mulamba, Myers, & Ndoloi, 1995). Donahue (2009) elaborates that the internationalization of composition can portray the U.S. as “a homogenous nation-state with universal courses, sovereign philosophies and pedagogies, and agreed-on language requirements,” while presenting other countries as “somehow lacking or behind the times” (p. 214). Donahue and others suggest that there is no one-size-fits-all writing pedagogy and knowledge exchange should go both ways, not just flow in a unidirectional fashion (Anson & Donahue, 2014). In recent years, we can see more U.S.-based composition scholars portray their experiences working with colleagues in the Middle East, Europe, and Africa, critically reflecting on their dominant, global positions (Arnold, 2016; Broekhoff, 2014; Papay, 2002; Ronesi, 2009; Weber et al., 2015).

Among composition scholarship, Donahue (2009) particularly praises the writing center community as having the “strongest development in terms of exchange of teaching practice and pedagogical framing, always explored in context” (p. 222). This is evident in the burgeoning international writing center literature in Asia, Europe, the Middle East, Africa, and Central and South America (Archer, 2008; Bräuer, 2002; Broekhoff, 2014; Chang, 2013; García-Arroyo & Quintana, 2012; Harbord, 2010; Johnston, Cornwell, & Yoshida, 2008; Reichelt et al., 2013; Ronesi, 2009; Santa, 2002; Scott, 2016; Tan, 2011). A frequent discussion in this literature is on
how universities have modified the pedagogical principles of writing center theory to suit institutional contexts and needs. Some report on how writing center tenets (i.e., philosophy, collaborative learning, peer tutoring) required reconceptualization due to religion, customs, and existing literacy practices (Cain, 2011; Harbord, 2003; Papay, 2002; Santa, 2002; Turner, 2006; Weber et al., 2015). On a broader socio-political level, writing centers seem to match the needs of institutionalized writing support due to changing student demographics (Emerson, 2012) and the student-centered, individualized learning model advocated under the knowledge-based economy (Bollinger, 2016; Gustafsson & Ganobcsik-Williams, 2016; Scott, 2016). Cases from American branch campuses in Middle Eastern and African countries remind us that the global spread of writing centers are not free from the powerful influence of the United States in internationalizing, modernizing, and westernizing universities (Broekhoff, 2014; Harbord, 2010; Ronesi, 2009).

Although studies have informed us of international writing centers, much of it has been on writing center administration and less on actual tutorial practices. In order to realize the “equal trade models of exchange” (Donahue, 2009, p. 231) of writing center scholarship, studies on actual tutorial practices in non-North American contexts would contribute to a deeper understanding of the internationalization of writing centers, providing insights to both the U.S. and international writing center scholarship.

3.3 Writing Centers in Japan: Skills, Competencies, Human Resources, and Writing Education

In this study, I focus on writing center practices in Japan. I concur with others on situating writing center practices within socio-historical and economic contexts (Cain, 2011;
Harbord, 2010). In this respect, I outline the current social changes and governmental agenda that have shaped reforms in university-level Japanese writing instruction.

In contrast to the scholarly discussion and long history of composition instruction in secondary schools in Japan, composition was not an established academic field in universities. From the 1980s, several professors gradually raised concerns about Japanese students’ lack of writing skills, pointing out that Japanese secondary schools were too focused on reflective essays and not preparing students for the kinds of argumentative writing necessary at the university level (Ito, 2014). Although academic literacy development gradually became an imminent task due to these professors’ grassroots movement, it was impossible to establish writing courses or programs due to the fixed liberal arts curriculum in Japanese universities (Ito, 2014). A big change came in 1991 when the Ministry of Education deregulated curricular restrictions and gave universities more freedom to create their own courses (Yamada, 2001). Ito (2014) finds that this led to an increase in the number of writing programs and courses.

In addition to this curriculum reform, another driving factor of the emergence of writing centers in Japan was the significant demographic change and diversification of the student population. The inverse ratio of the growing number of universities and shrinking 18-year old population has caused universities to administer more lenient entrance exams to secure their quota of students (Tsuruta, 2013). The absence of a rigorous gate-keeping mechanism is said to have caused an influx of students without basic literacy, math, and study skills, leading to a strong need for remedial education programs (Iwamoto, 2008; Yamada, 2014). As a response to deteriorating Japanese literacy skills, there has been an increase in university writing initiatives since the late 2000s, and in 2014, 86% of universities offered academic writing programs as a part of their first-year education, recording a 20% increase from a decade ago (MEXT, 2016).
Inoshita (2008) observes that most writing programs focus on basic Japanese writing skills (correct usages of Kanji characters, honorifics, etc.) and study skills (library research, citation practices, essay writing skills). Although less is reported on graduate-level writing education, the government’s call for a more systematic research training method steered some universities to implement writing workshops, dissertation/research writing courses, and a peer advising system for dissertation/research writing (Inoue, 2007; Watanabe, 2005; Yokoyama, 2009).

What accelerated the increase of writing programs and initiatives was the emphasis on fostering communication skills in a series of government quality assurance reports beginning in the 2000s. In these measures, the government urged universities to set concrete goals for fostering “human resources” (人材) with a skill-set aligned with the demands of the knowledge economy (Abe & Watanabe, 2012; MEXT, 2008a, 2012), and writing skills have been highlighted as important for both undergraduate and graduate education. Given this socio-economic background, writing centers gained popularity among Japanese universities around the mid 2000s (Johnston et al., 2008), often employed as a source of government funding and as a branding strategy to showcase human resource development strategies. What particularly seemed to attract universities is the student-centered educational philosophy often framed as a solution to Japanese students’ poor literacy skills and indolent learning attitudes (Iwamoto, 2008; Takahashi, 2012). The fact that the writing center is an innovative model of student support from American universities (often epitomized as leading world-class universities) also added value to its implementation in Japan (Kato-Otani, Chihara, Nakai, Inada, & Onishi, 2007; Nakazawa & Takahashi, 2013). As noted in the previous chapter, these strong rationales resulted in a number of universities receiving government funding for their writing centers (Takahashi, 2012;
Watanabe, 2012) and writing centers were taken up as model practices for fostering communication skills by the government (MEXT, 2008a).

3.4 Role of Non-Specialists in Language Education

3.4.1 In U.S. writing centers

One of the significant changes that the writing center brought to Japanese universities was the idea of generalist tutoring, a term that describes tutors and tutees from different disciplines discussing a piece of writing. This was novel for Japanese higher education, as mentorship from professors in the disciplines was the traditional form of writing education (Sato, 2008; Ushiogi, 1993).

In examining this unique pedagogy, it is necessary to review the past discussions on the tutor’s disciplinary expertise/non-expertise in U.S. writing center scholarship. As possessing expert knowledge counters the very philosophy of peer tutoring and collaborative learning, non-expertise is a recommended trait of a writing center tutor (Harris, 1992a; Hubbuch, 1988; Pemberton, 1995). A peer tutor’s unfamiliarity with the field and non-authoritative stance are said to help writers in reconstructing their subject knowledge, noticing logical fallacies, and finding new connections between ideas. Several practitioners confirmed these benefits in their writing center practices. Powers and Nelson (1995) and Chanock (2002) observed that a tutor’s non-expert questions enabled tutees to reassess their subject knowledge and to clarify assignment requirements with their instructors. Some also noted that tutors developed strategies to approach unfamiliar research writing as they gain more experience (Devet et al., 1995; Summers, 2016). Summers (2016) identified the “expertise-based tools” (p. 117) that graduate student tutors at the University of California, Los Angeles employ when confronted with unfamiliar content, such as
being transparent about their lack of specialist knowledge, holding the writer responsible (i.e., asking them to explain their claims), and refocusing the topic on general writing strategies.

However, some researchers also argued against generalist tutoring and suggested that tutors would be better able to help writers if they possessed disciplinary expertise (Clark & Healy, 1996; Shamoon & Burns, 1995; Tinberg & Cupples, 1996; Waldo, 1993; Walker, 1998). These arguments vary regarding the degree of specialized knowledge that tutors should possess. Some say tutors should be experienced members of the discipline (Clark & Healy, 1996; Shamoon & Burns, 1995), while others recommend a genre-based approach in which tutors learn different disciplinary conventions and research genres in their training (Tinberg & Cupples, 1996; Waldo, 1993; Walker, 1998). Since these arguments were only supported by informal observations, a series of empirical studies comparing sessions by tutors with and without disciplinary knowledge greatly contributed to this discussion (Dinitz & Harrington, 2014; Kiedaisch & Dinitz, 1993; Mackiewicz, 2004). All of the studies found that tutors who were familiar with the expectations of a discipline (i.e., senior students and professional writers within the discipline) were better able to make full use of their tutoring strategies, as they knew the disciplinary expectations and had experienced the process of writing in the field. Conversely, non-expert tutors were seen to find it challenging to improve their tutees’ papers due to a lack of disciplinary expertise. For instance, Kiedaisch and Dinitz (1993) detailed a business major tutor struggling to improve his tutee’s literature paper that revolved around plot summaries. Non-expert tutors also made inaccurate suggestions on surface-level rules of the discipline and expressed mistaken expectations of the genre (e.g., changing informative writing to persuasive writing), especially in technical fields like engineering (Mackiewicz, 2004). Furthermore, faculty members, who observed both types of tutorials, highly evaluated specialist tutorials and linked
the quality of tutorials with a tutor’s knowledge of the discipline (Dinitz & Harrington, 2014; Kiedaisch & Dinitz, 1993). A common evaluation was that specialist tutors could better challenge students’ points of view and accurately identify global and local issues, while generalist tutors could not do so as easily. However, some cases demonstrated tutors being too authoritative or aggressive in altering the language and ideas expressed in their tutees’ papers (Dinitz & Harrington, 2014; Kiedaisch & Dinitz, 1993). These cases indicate that being familiar with the field does not always guarantee a successful tutorial and as Dinitz and Harrington (2014) accurately point out, “different components of expertise might be teased out to help tutors use their expertise most productively” (p. 92, emphasis in original).

Although these empirical studies challenged the idealization of generalist tutoring, what is missing in the literature are the students’ perceptions of being tutored by non-expert tutors, especially for graduate-level writers working in highly specialized fields and discourse communities. As Waring’s (2005) conversation analysis shows, graduate-level tutoring involves complex negotiation of disciplinary expectations, as the graduate student in Waring’s study resisted a majority of her tutor’s feedback in order to claim her identity as a responsible member of her disciplinary community. Nonetheless, student perceptions of tutor roles—and, as a result, the success of tutorials—are co-constructed and determined by multiple factors (Thonus, 2001; Weigle & Nelson, 2004). Weigle and Nelson (2004) indicated that in the case of international graduate student tutees, the tutor roles and tutorial success were dependent on factors such as the tutor’s/tutee’s beliefs about writing, language proficiency, affective factors, and the setting in which the tutorial took place. Identifying factors that contribute to successful generalist tutoring in different writing center contexts could be of importance to writing center praxis and scholarship.
3.4.2 In other instructional contexts (CBI, ESP)

Due to the lack of empirical research examining the role of expertise/non-expertise in writing center research, literature on content/non-content specialist debates in other instructional contexts can provide insights into the field. In Content-Based Instruction (CBI) and English for Specific Purposes (ESP), the level of subject matter knowledge has been a contested issue (Belcher, 2006; Lyster & Ballinger, 2011). In the case of CBI, which aims for students’ content and target language learning, different instructional models and collaborations with subject teachers would determine the language specialist’s level of subject matter knowledge (Lyster & Ballinger, 2011; Met, 1998; Shaw, 1997; Stoller, 2004). For instance, content-driven models in which language specialists teach the subject matter in the target language would require more content knowledge than language-driven models that focus on language learning through content (Met, 1998; Shaw, 1997). In any case, language specialists would need to work in close collaboration with content area specialists not only to determine what areas to cover in class, but also to set explicit goals of students’ language development and to develop a systematic assessment of these goals (Davison, 2006). Although the same would apply to ESP, in which language specialists teach technical English in professional fields (i.e., legal, aviation, medical English), it has been pointed out that a complete mastery of specialist knowledge is unrealistic and unrequired (Belcher, 2006; Dudley-Evans, 1997; Ferguson, 1997). Rather, as those who teach language as a meaning-making resource, ESP teachers should know a field’s epistemological basis, genres, and disciplinary culture (Dudley-Evans, 1997; Ferguson, 1997). Dudley-Evans (1997) adds that full content understanding of the material is unnecessary and suggests that teachers should not be hesitant to draw on students’ content knowledge to realize a
learner-centered approach. Classroom studies provide evidence that even with limited disciplinary knowledge, ESP teachers employ strategies to solve “in-class subject knowledge dilemmas,” defined as “unpredicted situations in-class where [the teacher’s] subject knowledge is limited” (Wu & Badger, 2009, p. 19). Common strategies included re-directing students’ attention to linguistic aspects in the material, asking students about the content, and emphasizing language learning skills (Atai & Fatahi-Majd, 2014; Ghanbari & Rasekh, 2012; Wu & Badger, 2009). Although CBI and ESP contexts differ from a writing center’s (e.g., writing center ‘peer’ tutors would carry less authority than teachers), two main principles of non-expert language teaching could be inferred from the CBI and ESP literature:

- Based on shared, explicit goals for language development, identify and distinguish roles, responsibilities, and areas to cover between language and content specialists;
- Possess effective facilitation skills that focus students’ attention on the functions of the language in a text and allow students to draw on their content knowledge

In the hope of making a contribution to further understand the nature of generalist tutoring in writing centers, this chapter explores the impacts of generalist tutoring on graduate student writers’ disciplinary literacy practices in a Japanese university setting. The research questions addressed are: What type of knowledge and strategies do tutors use in generalist tutoring? How do tutees see the role of generalist tutors?
3.5 This Study

3.5.1 Research site

This study took place at Maple Leaves University (MLU)\(^{12}\), a national research university in Japan. National universities in Japan are heavily impacted by the government’s educational agenda. The incorporation of national universities in 2004 brought in an audit system through which national universities are assessed based on their stipulated goals developed together with the government (see Chapter 1 for more information on the incorporation of national universities).

After the National University Corporation law was established, MLU’s governance system and education curricula underwent systematic changes to meet government standards. In 2009, MLU announced its institutional goals for the next 15 years in a publication titled, “Maple Leaves University’s Long-Term Goals: The Future Image of MLU in 10-15 years,” which became the basis for various reforms. One of the education reforms was the development of a systematic liberal arts education curriculum in both undergraduate and graduate education aimed to equip students with the flexible skills needed in the knowledge economy; it was named “MLU Literacy” in a more detailed reform plan published the following year. Just as the government stipulated, a learning management tool was introduced, so that students can track their skills gained through the liberal arts courses.

At the graduate-level, each faculty developed liberal arts courses designed to foster key skills and knowledge across disciplines. On the graduate school website, these courses are categorized into three strands: “social-survival skills,” “research ethics,” and “international

\(^{12}\) Pseudonym
understanding” with the intention of fostering researchers, educators, and job specialists who can actively engage in the global society.

### 3.5.2 The academic writing class and the writing center

As one of the courses open to all graduate students in the “social-survival skills” strand, a Japanese academic writing course was initiated in 2013, taught by three professors from the Faculty of Education. According to the course syllabus, the course was for graduate students who wish to pursue an academic career, and was designed to teach the skills needed to write clear, logical sentences, and techniques to teach/supervise writing. A variety of activities were incorporated throughout the course to give students opportunities to share their writing with others from different fields and to comment on each other’s writing. For their final assignment, students were required to submit a research proposal written for an imaginary academic audience.

According to the course instructors, another rationale for establishing this course was to train and recruit tutors for the Writing Center, another novel writing initiative for MLU initiated in the same year. The purpose of the Writing Center is to foster autonomous writers through collaborative dialogue, offering one-on-one tutorials for Japanese writing to all members of the university. Every year several Writing Center tutors are recruited from the academic writing course and receive further training from experienced tutors in writing center pedagogy and philosophy. According to the previous year’s two-day tutor training materials, the newly hired tutors learn about the Writing Center philosophy, the basic procedures of the tutorial, and tutoring strategies (questioning, note-taking, and brainstorming), which are demonstrated by experienced tutors through mock tutorials. Besides the two-day training, tutors hold weekly meetings to reflect on tutorial practices and share ideas to resolve them. In these meetings, each
tutor leads a 30-minute tutor training seminar on such topics as Japanese grammar, tutoring strategies, research genres, and tutoring theory. During my data collection period at MLU, I attended these weekly meetings and was amazed at the graduate tutors’ professionalism and dedication towards their work.

These “specified ‘writing’ designated spaces” (Lillis & Scott, 2007, p. 13) (the academic writing course and Writing Center) were novel reforms for MLU where an apprenticeship model of research training and education served as the basis of MLU’s graduate education. Professors each have their “research groups” (研究室) and graduate students decide to join a group based on their research interests in the first year. This tightly knit community is the basis of research activities in the 11 different faculties at MLU. A common research practice is the research seminar held once or twice a week in which members of the research group discuss each other’s research. Students learn writing in their disciplines in these academic spaces and through individual consultations with supervisors. Thus, new cross-disciplinary spaces of sharing and receiving feedback on writing are likely to impact these discipline-specific literacy practices.

3.5.3 Participants

During a three-month period in 2015, I observed four Writing Center tutorials between graduate student tutors and tutees from diverse disciplines and research groups in the humanities and social sciences. The participants were either in their master’s or doctoral programs. Table 3.1 shows the participants’ names, gender, majors, and level/year of study (M denotes masters-level; D denotes doctoral-level).
Table 3.1 Participant Name, Gender, Major, and Year in Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
<th>Case 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutor</td>
<td>Tutor</td>
<td>Tutor</td>
<td>Tutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobita\textsuperscript{13}</td>
<td>Taro</td>
<td>Yohei</td>
<td>Yasuo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Male; Religious studies; M2)</td>
<td>(Male; Law; D1)</td>
<td>(Male; Education; M2)</td>
<td>(Male; Philosophy of education; D2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutee</td>
<td>Tutee</td>
<td>Tutee</td>
<td>Tutee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Tadashi</td>
<td>Yoko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Male; Philosophy of education; M1)</td>
<td>(Male; Anthropology; M2)</td>
<td>(Male; Philosophy of education; D1)</td>
<td>(Female; Economics; M2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yasuo (Case 4) was the most experienced tutor, working at the Center for close to two years since its inception; other tutors had around a year or less of tutoring experience. All tutee participants were male students except for Yoko. Jun, Ken, and Tadashi brought their research proposals that they planned to present at their research seminars and later submit to their supervisors. Yoko brought the written draft of her final assignment, which was a research proposal to be submitted to her supervisor. All of these writings were written in Japanese.

### 3.5.4 Data collection procedure and analysis

After contacting and confirming the tutees’ participation, each tutee reserved a time slot (either 45-minute or 90-minute tutoring session) at the Writing Center. The tutors working during those time slots all agreed to participate. Prior to a tutorial, I met with the tutee to give them a questionnaire asking for their background information and thoughts about the Writing Center philosophy. After I observed and audio-recorded a tutorial, I collected the tutee’s draft and any notes taken by tutor and tutee. Within an average of a week, I scheduled an individual interview with the tutor and the tutee. All interviews were conducted in Japanese. The interview

\textsuperscript{13} Pseudonyms were chosen by me if there were no requests for specific pseudonyms by participants.
with the tutee was conducted after they submitted the final draft of their writing that they brought to the Writing Center.

Prior to the interviews, I prepared a rough transcript of the tutorials to better review critical incidents with participants. This transcript was effective in formulating specific questions about a tutor’s feedback and a tutee’s uptake. For the final draft, all but one participant, Tadashi, submitted a copy of their final drafts to me. Tadashi explained that he changed the topic of his paper right before his submission, thus did not finish revising the draft.

After all interviews were finished, the interview data was transcribed and thematically analyzed (see Chapter 1 for a more detailed explanation of the procedure). This process involved finding emerging themes related to a tutor’s knowledge and strategies, and a tutee’s perceptions of the role of the tutor in each case. After the themes were identified, I identified patterns and connections between tutor and tutee accounts within and across themes. The tutorial transcripts and tutees’ written drafts were used as supplementary data for my analysis.

I present each case (dyad) separately to highlight critical incidents that characterize some of the tutors’ tutoring approaches and tutees’ perceptions of their tutors.

3.6 Findings

3.6.1 Case 1: Nobita and Jun

3.6.1.1 Nobita: Balancing between a specialist and generalist tutor

Nobita (the tutor) was a second-year Master’s student specializing in religious studies and Jun (the tutee) a first-year master’s student in educational philosophy. Although Nobita and Jun were in different Faculties, they had one commonality—their research involved philosophical
inquiry of thought. Due to this commonality, Nobita said he could understand Jun’s research and better offer suggestions to make the writing coherent.

For Nobita, the Writing Center was a place to organize ideas, which he reported greatly benefiting from. Nobita decided to work as a tutor partly because he wished to improve his own writing. Before becoming a tutor, he felt that nobody understood his writing because it was too abstract, a style that, according to him, resembled the writing of a philosopher he was studying at that time. He decided to take the MLU academic writing class and applied to become a tutor to learn what kinds of writing are hard to understand as a reader.

This writing experience greatly impacted his tutorial with Jun. As Nobita reflected, he wanted Jun to become more aware of his readers. Jun brought to the tutorial his five-page master’s thesis research proposal to be presented in his research seminar. For his thesis, Jun planned to explore the discourses of educational achievement debates in Japan. Soon after the tutorial began, Nobita realized Jun was critiquing the debates without sufficient evidence and not in a collegial manner. For instance, Jun used the word “convoluted” (困難な)\(^{14}\) to describe previous debates on the declining educational achievement level of Japanese students:

Nobita: I tend to do this too, but for readers it’s better to show what you mean by “convoluted,” like perhaps give an example of a confusing debate.

Jun: I see. I was writing off the top of my head so wasn’t thinking how the reader might react.

---

\(^{14}\) Although the English equivalent for 困難 is “difficult” or “challenging”, Jun was using the term to describe the “convoluted” debates which he characterized as scholars’ incongruent and repetitive arguments that failed to pose solutions to educational problems.
Nobita: Some scholars might argue that they’re not convoluted. If you elaborate what you mean by “convoluted,” you could prevent criticisms. (Case 1 Tutorial)

As the mitigation move “I tend to do this, too” shows, Nobita suggested that this advice was based on his own experiences. As a fellow researcher in philosophical studies, he wanted to inform Jun of the consequences of challenging other researchers and explain that there are other ways to mitigate the possibly offensive tone.

Although Nobita seemed like he was invested in Jun’s research, he explained in the interview that he sometimes mitigated his opinions by telling Jun that the final choice was up to him or by switching to strategies through which Jun could notice the fallacy on his own. For instance, these included reading aloud Jun’s writing to him, so that Jun could feel what it sounded like. He also referred to the principles of academic writing gained from the MLU academic writing class to help organize Jun’s paragraphs and sections, for instance, outlining main arguments and talking about the notion of paragraph writing. Thus, it could be said that Jun’s research experiences in philosophical research were at the core of Nobita’s tutoring, with other more neutral (non-specialist) strategies used to avoid being too engaged with the content of Jun’s writing.

3.6.1.2 Jun: Someone to discuss alternative expressions

Jun had been a member of his educational philosophy research group since his undergraduate years and had learned the basics of academic writing from his supervisor. After entering the graduate program, he joined a research seminar in which members of his research group (graduate students, supervisors, recent graduates) gave oral feedback on a student presenter’s writing (i.e., research proposal, manuscript, conference abstract), which was
distributed to the audience beforehand and read aloud by the presenter. According to Jun, the feedback was always very detailed, usually covering both linguistic aspects and content.

Given this feedback practice in his research group, Jun was well informed of his field’s disciplinary conventions, which impacted his uptake of Nobita’s feedback. Although Jun observed that Nobita’s feedback helped him to realize that he was too caught up in his own writing and was not aware of his readers, there were several times when the principles taught in his discipline were incongruent with Nobita’s feedback. This occurred when Nobita pointed out provocative language Jun used in critiquing some of the educational debates, as discussed with respect to “convoluted” in the previous section. Jun had used the word “unproductive” (不毛な) to describe the outcomes of educational achievement debates, which Nobita pointed out might be offensive to some scholars and gave him the following advice:

Nobita: Manners are important in writing. Because research writing is a tool for communication, you can’t just deny the reader like that. Maybe you can use a different word because it [“unproductive”] sounds kind of too subjective […] And people might argue, “You can’t say unproductive until you show us what a productive argument is.”

Jun: That’s indeed true. (Case 1, Tutorial3-2)

Although Jun seemed to agree with Nobita, he decided not to revise the word in his final draft, as he commented in the following interview excerpt:
I didn’t really change this part, because it’s never been pointed out to me that the expression [“unproductive”] is provocative. In my presentation, I did try to tell the audience that I describe these debates as “unproductive” for the sake of my argument, so it won’t sound like an accusation. Also, I couldn’t come up with any other suitable word (Jun, Case 1, Interview^3^3^).

Jun’s decision to resist Nobita’s advice was based on his previous learning experiences in his research group and the presentation mode of his writing. Since his writing was orally presented to his audience, he felt he could clarify his writing on the spot. Another piece of advice that Jun rejected was the principle of “paragraph writing,” a writing technique commonly used by the Writing Center tutors. Nobita introduced paragraph writing when he found two short paragraphs that could be combined into one, informing Jun that readers expect a paragraph will contain only one main idea, and having two paragraphs for the same topic will confuse readers. However, “paragraph writing” countered Jun’s past understanding from his research group that paragraphs should not be too long. Jun explained that he created two paragraphs to avoid a lengthy paragraph and left his two paragraphs as they were. According to him, paragraph writing was just “another way of constructing paragraphs” that did not need to be followed.

Although Jun did not explicitly resist Nobita’s advice in front of Nobita (possibly to save face), what he later revealed in his interview exemplifies advice resisting as a method of claiming identity (Waring, 2005). As with the graduate student tutee in Waring’s study (2005), Jun referred to the voices of the expert members of his community to justify why he did not accept Nobita’s suggestions. Jun’s accepting and resisting certain types of feedback reflected his
perceptions of the role of Writing Center tutors who are not in the same disciplinary area, initially described in his pre-tutorial questionnaire, which we discussed in our interview:

Tomoyo: You said in your questionnaire, “In academic writing, there are parts that I should write in a particular way but also parts that have no right answer. Writing center tutoring is more appropriate for the latter case”. Do you still feel this way?
Jun: Yes, of course, it’s easier if someone told me to write in a certain way, but the Writing Center is not for that […] it’s like finding an expression that I agree on through talking with the tutor, and I think this kind of feedback is useful.

Tomoyo: How is it different from your supervisor’s feedback? Does he give you more directions in how to write?
Jun: Yes, he edits a lot but I think he also guides me to a better way of writing through dialogue. (Jun, Case 1, Interview3–4)

Jun distinguishes between the roles of the writing center tutor and his supervisor. He did not see his tutor as an absolute figure to decide right or wrong like his supervisor, but rather as a language informant, a person to discuss alternatives and broaden his range of language use.

3.6.2 Case 2: Taro and Ken

3.6.2.1 Taro: Tutoring from a positivist perspective

Case 2 showcased a tutorial between two individuals with different epistemological stances. Taro, the tutor, was a Ph.D. student in law. Prior to studying at MLU, he was trained in a specific genre of legal writing at his law school for several years. He wished to become a Law
professor after his program and became a tutor to gain experience teaching writing. On the other hand, his tutee Ken was a second-year master’s student in anthropology. He brought a draft of his research proposal, which was to be distributed as a handout and read in his research seminar. He was about to leave for China to conduct his fieldwork on “park matchmaking,” (公園お見合い) an event where parents gather at a park to find their child’s marriage partner.

Due to this difference, there were several instances when Ken and Taro differed in the way they understood the genre of a research proposal and the nature of research. Taro noted that he was often surprised by the unfamiliar genre and different nature of research. He explained that his main strategy was to embody an interested reader, but one who might be confused with Ken’s writing and to ask a series of questions to let his tutee realize that his writing was confusing. For instance, Taro was surprised to see that Ken devoted much of his 11-page research proposal to explicating the social background and literature review of park matchmaking. In the tutorial, he indicated that he could not identify Ken’s research objective and asked him a series of questions that could draw out this information:

Taro: It’s a really interesting topic. In Japan, too, more and more young people can’t or don’t get married. But I want to ask you, what is the reason you wanted to focus on, or research unmarried men and women in China?

Ken: The reason?

Taro: Yes, like for example, because you want to provide a solution to this social problem in Japan or something like that. You don’t have to try to solve it […] But why are you interested in this particular topic?
Ken: [...] Well, first of all, I wanted to know why park matchmaking exists only exists in China and why Chinese people go to those events, because we don’t see it here in Japan. So, in this section, I write the possible reasons, like the social background surrounding these parks. I thought I should write this part first.

Taro: I see, there are matching making events in Japan, but I’ve certainly never heard of park matchmaking in Japan. But then, I want to know why you choose to examine this issue and as a result, what implications you want to draw [...] [In this section,] I can see how you situate park matchmaking in the society, but I can’t see how you situate or problematize park matchmaking in your research. (Case 2, Tutorial^3-5)

In this interaction, Taro advises Ken that he should explicitly state his research goals and contributions at the beginning of his research proposal, commenting that it will just be a case study of park matchmaking if he didn’t. Although Taro appeared to act as a generalist tutor who elicited Ken’s original intentions and gave feedback in how they could be better conveyed, his advice and feedback were motivated by his own research paradigm. In his interview, Taro, as a researcher from a social sciences field, explained that he felt dissonances with Ken’s methodology and research stance throughout the tutorial. Two major issues were the lack of generalizability and objectivity. These dissonances stemmed from his positivist paradigm that he was well associated with, as he explained in his interview with me:

I thought he had a hypothesis to test in his research, whether there are a number of them or only one. But, I noticed that he doesn’t have any hypotheses to test, so I don’t want to say this but it’s kind doing research in a haphazard way. If he has a hypothesis that has
objective grounds, he can analyze his results based on the hypothesis, but he doesn’t have anything. I think it’s really necessary for him to find a way to objectify his research and so I was wondering how he’s going to do that. (Taro, Case 2, Interview 3-6)

Towards the end of the tutorial, Taro provided ways to improve the objectivity of Ken’s research:

Taro: Maybe if you interview those who don’t go to park matchmaking, you’ll be able to objectify your research […] When you go to interviews, you get too subjective, right? […] I’m not a professional in interviewing but this way [interviewing non-park matchmaking participants], you will be able to persuade your reader.

Ken: I see. (Case 2, Tutorial 3-7).

Taro’s beliefs about a good research study were based on positivism, which aims to eliminate subjectivity and searches for an absolute truth. His comments in the interview and advice to Ken showed his lack of knowledge about the interpretivist paradigm of anthropology, calling research without a hypothesis as “doing research in a haphazard way” and interviews “too subjective.” He differed from Nobita in that he was unhesitant to engage with the content and state his own opinion from his point of view. In a way, Taro might have added a new approach to Ken’s research, but this was done in a way that overlooked the “ways of knowing, doing, and writing” (Carter, 2007, p. 388) in Ken’s discipline.
3.6.2.2 Ken: To articulate ideas better

Ken had never shown his writing to others outside his field and commented that he was sometimes perplexed by Taro’s questions. He had received his training in academic writing mainly through his supervisor who always gave him extensive comments on both content and style in his research seminar. Due to these long discussions, he said his seminar sometimes lasts up to several hours.

Although Taro suggested that Ken should explicitly state his research focus to guide his reader, Ken had his own justification for the way he structured his proposal, which was related to the audience of his writing. He mentioned this in his interview:

I just look up everything to prevent questions from other people […] For example, when someone asks me “why are you doing this research?”, if I just say I want to do this research because I want to, it’s not enough, right? That’s why I need to first show like this is lacking, therefore I conduct research. So first I show what was missing from my reading of the literature, like one or two points, and then in order to prove how I found out that these were missing, I write a lot about the background. (Ken, Case 2, Interview 3-8)

In saying “people,” Ken is referring to members of his research group, the sole audience of his proposal. Ken wrote his proposal in such a way as to prevent others’ questioning, which seemed unconventional for Taro. When asked if other students write proposals in the same way, Ken responded that he had never seen others’ presentations in the field, except his other
colleague in the same research group\textsuperscript{15}. His stance as a researcher in Anthropology also motivated the structure of his research proposal. He was taught by his supervisor that ethnographic researchers should not decide on a specific focus before fieldwork, and should instead study the cultural background and previous literature before entering the field.

Although there are a few reported cases suggesting that epistemological differences result in inappropriate feedback and overt advice resisting (Dinitz & Harrington, 2014; Waring, 2005), Ken noted that he was open-minded about his tutor’s comments. Since his supervisor had pointed out his weakness in organizing ideas, he learned ways to articulate his ideas better in his writing. Like Jun with Nobita, Ken saw Taro’s role as a language informant, but not necessarily as someone who judges the content of research. In his revised draft the only revisions made according to feedback were in alignment with his supervisor’s views. For instance, one content-related suggestion that he accepted was Taro’s advice on methodology, that he should interview those not involved in park matchmaking to seek objectivity. This revision was only motivated by the fact that his supervisor once told him he could interview different types of participants.

3.6.3 Case 3: Yohei and Tadashi

3.6.3.1 Yohei: Tutoring as a layperson

Tadashi was in the same research group as Jun. He brought to his tutorial the introduction and literature review section of his doctoral research proposal (six pages long), which he was planning to present in his research seminar. A notable characteristic of Case 3 was the reverse tutor-tutee power hierarchy with regards to their levels of study; Tadashi was a doctoral student

\textsuperscript{15} There were only two graduate students in Ken’s research group, including Ken.
while the tutor, Yohei, was a master’s student. Tadashi was researching thoughts of the American philosopher Ralph Waldo Emerson, which he seemed very enthusiastic in talking and writing about. At the beginning of the tutorial, Yohei and Tadashi agreed that they would work on improving the writing in such a way that Yohei, as a layperson in philosophy studies, could clearly understand Tadashi’s research objectives.

This articulation of Yohei’s role as a layperson might have been key to a successful tutorial. Yohei had a clear stance and approach as a non-specialist reader, which was fundamental to his tutoring practices. When asked during our interview about the particular challenges he faced in tutoring a doctoral student, he said he might have tried too hard to understand the content, which in his opinion, was not the role of the Writing Center tutor:

It’s difficult. Sometimes you have to try to understand the content, but if you misunderstand it and give misguided feedback, it will confuse the writer. I think a tutor’s primary role is to organize ideas. Not discussing the content, but rather extracting the main points and suggesting possible ways to reorganize them. (Yohei, Case 3, Interview 3)

Compared to Nobita and Taro, who engaged with the content of their tutees’ writing, Yohei held the view that tutor intervention should be minimal, which informed his tutoring strategies. For instance, when Tadashi’s writing was abstract and lacked clarity, Yohei asked if his interpretations were correct (“Am I right in saying that…?”) or asked questions whenever the writing was abstract (“What do you mean by…?”). This was done to make Tadashi realize the incoherence and abstractness of his writing. This strategy is similar to “the tool of blame”
(although done in a politer way than blaming) used by graduate tutors in Summer’s (2016) writing center observations at UCLA, which “uses the consultant’s inexperience as an excuse to get the knowledgeable writer to do more rhetorical work” (p. 135).

3.6.3.2 Tadashi: “We’re doing this together”

The questions from Yohei, a non-specialist reader, were helpful for Tadashi who, like Jun, was able to realize his writing was self-fulfilling but not necessarily comprehensible to others. What was most noticeable in this case was the Writing Center’s “environmental role” (Pemberton, 1995, p. 127) of providing a comfortable, safe space for students to discuss their writing, which Yohei could fulfill in comparison to Tadashi’s supervisor. In talking about the role of his tutor in improving his writing during our interview, Tadashi noted several differences between the tutorial with Yohei and research consultations with his supervisor:

When I have these consultations with my supervisor, I feel like crying. He criticizes my writing as if he’s going to destroy me and tells me to write again […] It’s not discussing on the spot. He gives me feedback and I say ok I’ll rewrite this. There’s no “we’re doing this together” feeling. Rather than doing it together, every time it’s more like showing my writing to him, going back home and revising it, showing it to him and revising again, That’s how it’s like with my supervisor. (Tadashi, Case 3, Interview 3-10)

In comparison with his supervisor, Tadashi appreciated the kindness and openness of Yohei in listening to his ideas and the collaborative discussions because it was a new environment of writing advising for Tadashi. He said his writing might improve more through tutorials than through the painstaking apprenticeship with his supervisor. As Pemberton (1995)
claims, although writing tutors may not be qualified to comment on content, they can be “the one quasi-authoritative source that students feel most comfortable with” (p. 125). Tadashi’s case also points to Thonus’s (2002) study, which demonstrated that successful tutorials were those in which the tutees felt their tutors were less authoritative and that they could distinguish from instructor consultations.

Furthermore, another consequence of the tutorial was that Yohei’s questions required Tadashi to represent his expertise to an outsider and to reconstruct his subject knowledge, which confirms one of the advantages of generalist tutors (Harris, 1992a; Hubbuch, 1988; Norgaard, 1999). Tadashi again points to the lack of “we’re doing this together” feeling with his supervisor in discussing and learning a concept:

For example I just use the term, “rationality” as if I understand what it is. But for the readers [tutors], they might not understand it, and wonder, “what is rationality?” so I try to explain what it is, right? But I think that the explanation is vague, most of the time […] But you only realize that here [at the Writing Center] because if it’s with my supervisor, he’d say, go back home and think about it. But here, I try to explain it so I learn what I didn’t know in the beginning. (Tadashi, Case 3, Interview³⁻¹¹)

His comment suggests that for doctoral students who are well versed in their topic, they might be able to benefit from a learning environment where they can practice and re-learn their knowledge, regardless of the tutor’s research specialization and level of study.
3.6.4 Case 4: Yasuo and Yoko

3.6.4.1 Yasuo: Tutoring as a minimalist

Yasuo, one of the most experienced tutors in the Writing Center, was not too surprised to see Yoko’s final paper, which required substantial revisions. This final paper was for her research seminar, and needed to be submitted to her supervisor. Since there were no set requirements for the paper, she was trying to write a research proposal for her master’s thesis with an aim to later incorporate it into her thesis. Her three-page draft was quite rough consisting of a combination of Japanese translations of English references, followed by some short paragraphs about her money game experiment which she planned to conduct for her thesis. Her request to Yasuo was to smooth out her Japanese translations and advise her on textual organization.

Yasuo’s perception of his role as a tutor was similar to that of Yohei, as he commented in his interview that tutors could only do a few things to foster better writers:

What I do in my sessions is to let writers organize their ideas, and help them with that process, or let them know their writing might be misunderstood by a reader, or let them know what they haven’t noticed. All I can do is to pursue these tasks in detail in my tutorials. (Yasuo, Case 4, Interview 3-12)

Among the strategies mentioned, Yasuo was often seen teaching the basics of academic writing to Yoko, including linguistic rules to resolve unnatural Japanese translations and the organization of her paper. What stood out was the way he explained the “basics of academic writing” and handled Yoko’s questions about writing in economics, a field unfamiliar to Yasuo.
For instance, in the following tutorial interaction, Yasuo responds to Yoko’s question about the register of language she should use in her paper:

Yoko: I once heard from my supervisor that people use less academic language for research articles or papers in economics […] But for my own research papers, I was wondering if I should use formal language or not.

Yasuo: That’s a difficult issue. Disciplines have their own registers of language. I guess you can use a different register if you want to, but it’s better to follow them because they have historically developed in the field. If it’s common to use less formal words in economics, there’s no reason not to use them. (Case 4, Tutorial 3-13)

In this interaction, Yasuo demonstrated his knowledge of academic language, accumulated through teachings from the MLU academic writing class, his own reading of academic writing books, and from his supervisor. His past learning experiences had formed what he considered to be an understanding of good writing, for example, not using unfamiliar and abstract vocabulary. Yasuo further explained that each word carries a social and ideological background, thus readers might interpret them in a different way—a lesson he learned from his supervisor. However, Yasuo also took into consideration disciplinary expectations and situated Yoko’s writing in her field, which was less observed in Nobita or Taro’s tutoring, each of whom pushed through what they deemed appropriate.

3.6.4.2 Yoko: Learning the writing process

Yoko had several dissimilarities compared to other tutees. She was finishing her master’s degree in economics and was in the midst of seeking a career in banking. Unlike other tutee
participants, she had never been explicitly taught academic writing by her supervisor, or been assigned many writing assignments. This was because the main research practices in her research group and other courses were reading books or newspapers (in English and Japanese), summarizing them, and discussing them in class. The few writing assignments she submitted never came back with comments and merely served, as she described in her interview, as “proof of attending classes”.

Yoko explained that she appreciated Yasuo’s instructional feedback on the organization and linguistic aspects of her paper. Previous research also confirms that the instructional role of a tutor is one of the qualities tutees expect and benefit from (Mackiewicz & Thompson, 2014). Since Yoko was not familiar with academic writing and did not have an established writing process, Yasuo was able to assist her in resolving questions and frustrations arising from the individual act of writing. Although her dissertation was the last piece of academic writing she would work on, she commented that “outlining” would be a useful technique that could be applied to her future career:

I don’t know if they have this at every company, but I heard from one company’s information session that they make you write an essay in your second year about the training you received and your assigned work. And I also think there are many opportunities to convey something to others [once I start working], so I learned that if I first outline my writing, I would make myself clear. (Yoko, Case 4, Interview)

This case demonstrates that Yasuo’s simple gestures (explaining the basics of academic writing, telling writers their writing is confusing, making them realize mistakes) was sufficient enough to
help less-experienced academic writers such as Yoko. Furthermore, the distance that Yasuo took from Yoko’s field might have allowed him to work on aspects that could be improved in Yoko’s writing (e.g., wordings, organization) without focusing too much on the content.

3.7 Discussion and Conclusion

This chapter explored how Japanese graduate student generalist tutors dealt with their non-expertise in the subject of their tutorials and how tutees saw the role of writing center tutoring in enhancing their academic literacy practices. In doing so, it suggests some implications for writing center theory and tutoring training, particularly for reconceptualizing the neutrality of generalist tutoring and clarifying tutor roles and responsibilities as non-specialist readers.

The examination of four tutorials provides several insights to the ongoing discussions on generalist and discipline-specific tutoring. In writing center theory, tutors are often assumed to have a neutral role as observers who modify their tutees’ writing process (Harris, 1992a; Hubbuch, 1988; North, 1984). However, this study showed that the tutors were neither universal nor value-free in their tutoring practices, as most tutors were seen engaging tutees with values of good writing shaped by their own research, writing, and learning experiences. Two extreme cases were Nobita and Taro, who engaged their tutees in discussions about language practices in philosophical studies and objectivity in research, which they valued in their work. Although Yasuo appeared to be less engaged with content than others, Yasuo’s feedback on the basic principles of academic writing was based on a culmination of his own apprenticeship in writing. This study suggests that the neutrality of generalist tutors may need more careful scrutiny and additional research could explore tutors’ funds of knowledge, identities, and the experiences that they bring into their practices.
Overall, the tutors in this study carried out several tasks that Dinitz and Harrington (2014) identified as ones that only specialist tutors could do, such as identifying both organizational and sentence-level issues, some were even seen challenging their tutees’ arguments. Based on the present data, the difference in tutoring was manifested in the ways the tutors distanced themselves from their tutees’ disciplinary fields. This distancing could be observed in the ways they embodied “the audience” in their tutorials. Although all tutors acted as an audience or reader of their tutees’ writing, Yosuke and Yasuo detached themselves from “a disciplinary audience,” as could be seen from Yosuke’s role as a layperson and Yasuo’s deliberation of his tutee’s disciplinary conventions. On the other hand, Nobita and Taro embodied a disciplinary audience, and gave feedback based on their own research assumptions, which sometimes resulted in advice on style, organization, and researcher stance that were incongruent with their tutees’ field. Although some suggest tutors approximate the disciplinary audience by learning disciplinary conventions, genres, and expectations (Walker, 1998), this study finds it might not be a requisite factor for writing center tutoring. Even if Nobita was knowledgeable in the philosophical inquiry of thought, his feedback might not have resonated with Ken’s experiences in his disciplinary community. Rather, acknowledging the disciplinary audience and maintaining a distance from them may be sufficient for generalist tutoring.

This leads to the question of what roles the tutor could play as a non-expert reader. Although the tutor’s feedback was not always accepted, the tutees’ interviews suggest particular pedagogical roles that generalist tutoring could fulfill. As Weigle and Nelson’s (2004) case study with international graduate students showed, this study also confirmed that the tutor’s role was determined by individual factors such as the writer’s level of study, experience with writing, beliefs of writing, and needs. However, the most significant factor was the tutees’ relationships
with their supervisors. As Thonus (2001) claims, the course instructor is a “silent participant” (p. 61) in writing center tutorials whose expectations of writing strongly impact the definition of tutor roles and tutorial outcomes. This is true for supervisors as well, as supervisors are key players in shaping graduate students’ “disciplinary identity formation” (Paré, Starke-Meyerring, & McAlpine, 2011, p. 221). Jun and Ken emphasized their tutors’ roles as language informants who helped them to better convey their arguments to supervisors and other research group members. For Tadashi who had been receiving strict mentorship from his supervisor, the Writing Center provided a motivational space for him to share his ideas and discuss alternatives in a less intimidating environment. In Yoko’s case, she benefited from her tutor’s instructional role on writing techniques, which she otherwise could not have learned from a research group that put less emphasis on writing. As with other non-specialist instructional contexts (ESP, CBI), these findings suggest that it is important to clearly distinguish a generalist tutor’s roles from those of disciplinary experts (i.e., professors) based on the writer’s contexts and needs. Although this cannot be done without negotiation with faculties and departments, the clear recognition of roles would help tutors better formulate strategies that could maximize the benefits of a writing center’s unique learning environment.

This case study provided a snapshot of the role of generalist tutoring at one writing center in Japan. The expectations, roles, and factors that enable successful generalist tutoring would depend on each institutional context, wherever writing centers are established. Universities would need to weigh the benefits of both generalist and specialist tutoring in creating academic support services and identify the specific factors that can make them beneficial to students. In this process, it is important to constantly consider the writing center’s relationship with different
faculties on campus, especially the impacts of its pedagogy on existing teacher-student relationships and disciplinary literacy practices.
Chapter 4: Perceptions of Non-native English Speaking Tutors at a Writing Center in Japan

4.1 Introduction

Drawing on the notion of student stance and motives in peer feedback research (Storch, 2004; Zhu & Mitchell, 2012), this chapter examines how non-native English speaking tutors’ linguistic statuses might impact their tutees’ evaluation of tutorials in an English as a foreign language context. Research on non-native English speaking teachers has become an important field in English language teaching in English as a second language (ESL)/foreign language (EFL) contexts (Moussu & Llurda, 2008); however, some researchers point out the paucity of research on non-native writing teachers (Liu, 2005). This is especially true with writing center studies, in which research has mainly focused on native English speaking tutors and interactions with their tutees (Severino & Deifell, 2011; Thonus, 2002; Williams, 2004). Considering that language proficiency would add another complex layer to tutor-tutee power dynamics, more research is needed to explore interactions with non-native speaker tutors in both ESL and EFL contexts.

Through observations and post-tutorial interviews with tutors and tutees, I found that the tutees’ evaluations of tutorials were affected by several factors including tutees’ writing needs, tutors’ expectations, previous learning experiences, and beliefs regarding good writing. Among these factors, I identified three key conditions that contributed to the positive evaluation of tutorials with non-native tutors; the match between tutor and tutee motives, tutees’ (dis)preference of tutoring strategies, and trust in the tutor’s writing expertise (but not necessarily their language expertise). In analyzing these results, I argue that the Writing Center philosophy could create the tutor’s imagined role as a non-native tutor with expertise in higher-order issues.
(e.g., textual organization and coherence), impacting their display of knowledge and tutee perceptions.

4.2 Non-Native Writing Center Tutors

4.2.1 English as a second language (ESL) contexts

Due to the growing international student population in North American universities, it has become more likely that non-native English speaking international students are hired to teach or tutor writing in composition classes and writing centers (Chang, 2011; Liu, 2005; Park & Shin, 2010; Wablstrom, 2013). Studies depict these teachers and tutors as feeling inferior about their English and challenged by students who overtly question their language proficiency (Chang, 2011; Liu, 2005). Compared to composition teachers who gradually establish student rapport and overturn these biases throughout a course (Liu, 2005), it is perhaps harder for writing center tutors to do so due to the writing center’s extracurricular role as a “one-stop shopping” (Cooke & Bledsoe, 2008, p. 119) for better papers. Wablstrom (2013) vividly describes the experience of working as a non-native tutor at an American university:

Students come to me expecting a native speaker, while my background places me in the writing center’s most archetypal customer group. I urge students to write candidly, to cut unnecessary hedging and hesitation, to jump right in and write boldly from the heart—while simultaneously concealing my true identity as best I can. (p. 10)

To fulfill her institutional role as a tutor, Wablstrom (2013) was urged to perform as a native-speaker in front of international student tutees (and perhaps native-speaker tutees as well), as her
true linguistic status might make students question her knowledge as an English writing tutor and disrupt their trust in her. Chang’s (2011) ethnographic research at Southern Illinois University not only echoes Wablstrom’s experience but also illustrates actual negative responses that students often have towards non-native tutors. Observing close to 20 tutorials and interviewing native English-speaking (NES) and non-native English speaking (NNES) tutees about their perceptions of their NES/NNES tutors, Chang found that although the tutees appreciated NNES tutors’ ability to explain grammar rules, both groups of tutees (a stronger tendency for NNES tutees), preferred to be tutored by NES tutors if given a choice. Furthermore, although NES tutors’ writing skills and language proficiency were unquestionably validated, NNES tutors were preferred only if they had good writing skills and a high English proficiency, posing a double burden for them. Interviews also revealed disturbing experiences specific to NNES tutors such as tutees directly challenging their qualifications as a tutor, leaving in the middle of the session, and changing to an NES tutor. Chang argues that tutees’ preferences for NES tutors’ “intrinsic knowledge of language” over NNES tutors’ “learned knowledge of grammar” (p. 437) comply with the “native speaker fallacy,” the unconditional, biased belief that “the ideal teacher is a native speaker” (Phillipson, 1992, p. 185).

In a study that took place at another university in the U.S., Park and Shin (2010) documented a unique case in which tutors and tutees shared the same language, in this case, Korean, to communicate in their tutorials. They compared perceptions of four Korean international graduate students, two tutored by native speakers of Korean and two by native speakers of English. From post-tutorial interviews, they found that the students tutored by Korean tutors were more satisfied with their tutorials, as they were better able to understand tutor feedback, explain their intended meanings, and ask more nuanced questions in their native
language. This parallels Cumming and So's (1996) qualitative analysis gained from comparisons between writing tutorials conducted in the ESL students’ dominant language (Chinese, Korean, and Japanese) and in English. They noted that the functional use of mother tongue “offered learners more profound opportunities to make logical links between their two languages…and to analyze the qualities that distinguished features of the two languages” (p. 216). Although this model could provide international students with effective tutoring (Babcock & Thonus, 2012), given the logistical issues of pairing up tutors and tutees who share the same first language, this may perhaps remain a model unique to some U.S. writing centers.\textsuperscript{16}

\textbf{4.2.2 English as a foreign language (EFL) contexts}

In the past two decades or so, there has been growing attention to writing centers in English as a foreign language contexts, such as in Malaysia (Tan, 2011), China (Dan, 2012), Taiwan (Chang, 2013; Chen, 2010), Hong Kong (Jones, Garralda, Li, & Lock, 2006), Korea (Turner, 2006), and Japan (Johnston, Cornwell, & Yoshida, 2008) Although students can consult tutors on their L1 (first language) writing (Chang, 2013; Gustafsson & Ganobcsik-Williams, 2016), the majority of writing centers provide English writing consultations. Compared to the common English-medium peer-to-peer tutoring model in North American writing centers, EFL writing centers often have diverse arrangements in terms of tutor profile and language of communication. Tutors could be a non-native or native English speaker, and could be a student

\textsuperscript{16} Although small in number, there are several multilingual writing centers in the U.S. that offer tutorials in languages and for writing other than English (e.g., Spanish, French, German, Japanese, Arabic, Chinese, Hebrew, Japanese, Italian, Portuguese, Russian) tutored by international students and U.S. students fluent in the language (Lape, 2013). These writing centers are commonly housed in foreign language departments.
or instructor based on the nature of the writing center. For instance, English language instructors tend to be the tutors if the writing tutorials are housed in language learning centers, as opposed to a peer-to-peer writing center (Chang, 2013; Hayward, 1994; Tan, 2011). As for the language used in tutorials, the tutorials can be conducted in English or the students’ native language, depending on the tutor’s language profile and the tutee’s possible preference to practice their English oral skills (Kim, 2007; Sadoshima & Ota, 2013).

Studies have examined tutorials in different arrangements with an aim to identify factors that contribute to the writing center’s collaborative learning philosophy, focusing on such topics as tutor dominance, rapport building, and tutee perceptions of tutorial services (Chen, 2010; Jones et al., 2006; Kim, 2007; Lee, 2015; Sadoshima, Shimura, & Ota, 2008; Winder, Kathpalia, & Koo, 2016). Discourse analytic studies conducted in Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Korea show face-to-face tutorials with non-native tutors (peers and instructors) were more tutor-dominated and instructional than tutorials on an online platform, tutorials with native-speaker tutors, and peer feedback (Chen, 2010; Jones et al., 2006; Kim, 2007). Tutorials conducted in English, a language not normally spoken by students, seemed to add formality and enforced tutor authority (Jones et al., 2006; Kim, 2007). For instance, in a study comparing online tutoring and face-to-face tutorials (both led by peer tutors) in Hong Kong, Jones et al. (2006) found that, while the tutor-tutee power relation was more equal in on-line tutorials, face-to-face sessions were more hierarchical, with tutors controlling the conversation with more directives and leading questions. The authors attribute this difference to the focus of the tutorials; in face-to-face tutorials, tutors were more likely to respond to students’ lower-order concerns and give students lessons on grammar, vocabulary, and style, while in online tutorials, the focus on higher-order issues enabled a more informal, egalitarian conversation. Chen’s (2010) study in Taiwan complements
these results from a tutee perspective. Chen compared tutee perceptions of receiving feedback from their writing center tutors (instructors) and from their peers in the same course. In writing center tutorials, the tutees benefited from their consultants’ expertise in English and saw their role as proofreaders. However, for higher-order concerns (organization and content), they turned to their peers from the same course, who were more familiar with the content of their papers and with whom they could engage in deeper conversations.

In contrast, some scholars in Japanese writing centers highlight the benefits of peer-to-peer English tutorials conducted in students’ first language and suggest that this arrangement can realize the writing center’s collaborative, student-centered learning philosophy in EFL contexts (Nakatake, 2013, 2014; Sadoshima, Shimura, & Ota, 2008). Sadoshima et al. (2008) compared tutorial recordings of six English-medium and L1-medium tutorials at their writing center and analyzed the number of utterances, topics under discussion, and interaction patterns. They found that in L1-medium tutorials, the tutees could more actively participate in the conversation by asking questions, elaborating on their arguments, and explaining their assignments. They observed more collaborative acts between tutors and tutees who shared a status of English language learner, such as consulting a dictionary and reaching solutions together. The effectiveness of this relationship is also supported by Nakatake (2014), who found that negotiation of meaning in L1-medium tutorials can better facilitate students’ subsequent revision processes and can contribute to fostering autonomous writers.

In sum, although English-medium face-to-face tutorials with NNES tutors can be more tutor-dominated compared to other forms of feedback (peer feedback, online-tutoring) (Chen, 2010; Jones et al., 2006; Kim, 2007), there might be a more equal power balance if the language of communication is shared by tutees and their peer tutors (Nakatake, 2013, 2014; Sadoshima,
Shimura, & Ota, 2008). However, compared to research in ESL contexts, less research has been conducted regarding the linguistic statuses of non-native tutors in EFL contexts. Nakatake (2013) and McKinley (2010) briefly mention the linguistic challenges faced by NNES tutors in Japanese writing centers. They both observed in their writing centers that in some cases, tutees expressed distrust towards their tutors’ linguistic feedback and complained that their tutors’ feedback was incongruent with that of their instructors. More research exploring this issue in EFL writing centers examining the power dynamics between NNES students in writing tutorials and the possible effects on student learning would be beneficial.

4.3 Motives, Stances, and Roles: Insights from Peer Feedback Research

A valuable area of research comparable to peer-to-peer writing center tutoring is peer feedback research (Yu & Lee, 2016). Although peer feedback is usually conducted in classrooms, a majority of research has investigated peer interaction between non-native speakers (e.g., Guerrero & Villamil, 1994; Storch, 2002, 2004; Villamil & de Guerrero, 1996; Yu & Lee, 2014; Zhu & Mitchell, 2012), which could shed light on understanding writing center tutorial interactions between NNES tutors and tutees.

Perhaps due to their differences in settings and purposes, peer feedback and writing center research have existed as separate fields with few researchers drawing from insights gained from each field. Although both foreground the concept of collaboration, Harris (1992b) notes that their goals make them two separate activities with dissimilar forms of collaboration. While the purpose of peer feedback is to train readers in critical reading skills and to train writers to have a better sense of audience, in writing center tutorials, tutors are skilled and trained responders who provide individualized help to writers (Harris, 1992b). In writing center theory,
tutors are trained in principles of writing center philosophy and special diagnostic techniques such as questioning that aim to improve the writing process and to foster better writers. Their jobs entail a high level of instruction and students would typically expect an expert role from them (Mackiewicz & Thompson, 2014), which is not the case with peer feedback.

However, peer feedback and writing center tutorials are similar in that writers (tutees) and readers (tutors) have specific goals while participating in tutorials and perceived roles of the other to achieve them. Given this similarity, a research area that could provide insight to writing center studies is group dynamics and student stances in peer feedback research (Allen & Katayama, 2016; Lockhart & Ng, 1995; Mangelsdorf & Schlumberger, 1992; Min, 2008; Storch, 2002, 2004; Yu & Lee, 2015; Zhu & Mitchell, 2012). Student stance is defined as “how students orient themselves toward and position themselves vis-à-vis peers and texts under review” (Zhu & Mitchell, 2012, p. 363). Stance would thus include students’ beliefs of good writing, motives of engaging in peer feedback activities, and their approaches to feedback practices. Some studies have reviewed peer feedback interactions and identified several reader stances and interaction patterns (Lockhart & Ng, 1995; Mangelsdorf & Schlumberger, 1992; Storch, 2002). A common aspect in all of these studies is that the pairs who were collaborative and sought solutions together were better able to develop a sense of audience and to internalize language learning than pairs lacking collaborative effort. For instance, Storch (2002) found that she could see more instances of knowledge transfer, hence more language learning opportunities, in pairs with “high mutuality” (p. 127), in other words, those who engaged with and contributed ideas to their texts, in contrast with those pairs who were indifferent to each other’s ideas.

A valuable contribution to this line of research was the examination of the underlying motives that led to different stances, interaction patterns, and outcomes of peer feedback (i.e.,
subsequent revisions, evaluation of peer response activities) (Storch, 2004; Yu & Lee, 2015; Zhu & Mitchell, 2012). Using activity theory, both Storch (2004) and Zhu and Mitchell (2012) interviewed their participants to make sense of how stances displayed during the peer feedback activity could be explained by their motives for improving writing and their objectives for participating in peer response activities. Storch (2004) interviewed both readers and writers in four peer feedback groups and found that conflicting or overlapping motives created different interactional patterns. In pairs in which both partners were dominant, she found through her interviews that the participants both felt superiority over their partner’s skills, thus the purpose of their activity was to display their knowledge and to compete with the other. She argues that the learner’s definition of the situation (Wertsch, 1985), or the learners’ perceived roles and goals of themselves and their peers, shapes how each activity will be carried out. This is influenced by multiple factors such as “their previous learning experiences, their beliefs about how best to learn a second language, and their estimation of their own language proficiency” (Storch, 2004, p. 474). Similarly, Zhu and Mitchell (2012), who examined two Spanish-speaking learners in peer response groups, argue that motives and objectives shaped participants’ actions, learning, and evaluation of the effectiveness of peer feedback activities. For instance, one participant’s learning goal was to increase the clarity in her writing, which fed into her “reader-centered, active, listening” role (p. 369) as a participant and shaped her view of the peer response as a place to test out her writing on peers. They suggest that learner behavior in peer feedback can be better explained by their motives than by cultural or linguistic backgrounds, which several studies point to (Carson & Nelson, 1996; Villamil & de Guerrero, 1996). Student stances and motives can also be key in understanding why certain students benefit or do not benefit from peer response activities (Yu & Lee, 2016).
The interplay between stances and motives could be applied to writing center tutorials in a slightly different way. A tutor’s stance could be determined by their motives to foster better writers and assessment of a tutee’s writing needs. A tutee’s stance would also be determined by their goals, but considering the nature of writing centers as service providing facilities (Thonus, 2002), a more crucial issue is how tutor performances, stances, and roles match with and are evaluated in relation to tutees’ motives for the improvement of their writing. As indicated in a number of studies exploring student satisfaction (Thompson et al., 2009; Thonus, 2001, 2002), the assessment of tutor stances or roles would be another crucial element for gaining an understanding of the learning experiences taking place in writing centers.

A tutor’s linguistic status as a non-native speaker could be one of the factors that impact the learner’s definition of the situation and hence the evaluation of tutor stances (strategies, expertise, roles) and something that is possibly assessed against their motives for improving writing through writing center tutorials. To explore this issue further, I seek to address the following research questions in this chapter: How do tutees perceive their non-native tutors’ stances? How might the tutors’ linguistic statuses impact these perceptions?

4.4 Methodology

4.4.1 Institutional background

This study is a part of a larger study conducted at a writing center at Maple Leaves University (MLU)\textsuperscript{17}, a national research university in Japan, between April and August 2015. MLU is a university often acclaimed for its research, but less known for its international

\textsuperscript{17} Pseudonym
education initiatives. However, this changed when MLU won one of the major government funding projects for internationalization in 2014. At the time of data collection, MLU was planning major education reforms, which included the creation of the MLU Writing Center. The Writing Center was initiated with the aim to support Japanese and English writing for course assignments, graduating theses, and publication manuscripts. I chose the MLU Writing Center as my research site, as it fit my selection criteria of offering both Japanese and English writing tutorials (see Chapter 1 for details on research site selection). However, it turned out that the initiation of English writing services for students was postponed until September 2015, thus not yet initiated at the time of data collection.

According to the Writing Center administrators, several obstacles factored into the postponement of the English writing tutorials. First, administrators felt no immediate need to offer English writing support services at MLU, as the majority of classes are conducted in Japanese. According to MLU’s recent government funding application in 2014, 3.2% of courses were conducted in English. Compared to other leading Japanese universities that indicate close to 10%, this number was relatively low. In this application, MLU declared its bold plan to increase English-medium classes to 50% within the next ten years. Second, the administrators were struggling to find and hire native English speakers as Writing Center tutors. Numerous attempts to hire new faculty were met with financial constraints. There were even plans of asking writing center tutors in an American university to tutor students and faculty members in English via Skype, although this did not seem realistic logistically. In the end, the administrators decided to hire four Japanese-speaking Writing Center tutors who were familiar with English academic writing. The four tutors participated in a number of tutor training sessions led by the associate director of the Writing Center who had expertise in English scientific writing. Since these tutors
were trained in the procedures, strategies, and approaches of Writing Center tutorials (see Chapter 3 for more detailed information on tutor training sessions), the sessions mainly focused on the knowledge and strategies needed to tutor English research writing. These included going over organizational structures of a research paper (i.e., IMRAD structure), identifying language learning resources such as dictionaries and concordance software, and evaluating research abstracts in English written by Japanese scholars. I was permitted to observe the meetings and noticed some of the challenges of tutoring English writing. The tutors and the associate director himself were uncertain about how much emphasis should be put on correcting grammar, which would counter the non-proofreading policy of their tutorials, and on higher-order issues such as organization and coherence. Tutors seemed to agree that it would be effective to first ask the writer about the content of the paper in Japanese and then work on each paragraph, with an emphasis on higher-order concerns.

4.4.2 Participants

Upon consultation with the associate director of the Writing Center, four pilot tutorials were conducted as part of the tutor training process. Among the four Writing Center tutors who volunteered to be English writing tutors, three of them participated in the study. Table 4.1 presents the name, gender, level of study (M for master’s, D for doctoral level), research field, and language expertise as indicated by their language test scores (Roxanna had not taken a language test before).
Table 4.1 *Tutor Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tutorial</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Level of study</th>
<th>Research field</th>
<th>Language expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Erika&lt;sup&gt;18&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>English language education</td>
<td>TOEIC 950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 3</td>
<td>Nobita</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>Religious studies</td>
<td>TOEIC 570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 4</td>
<td>Roxana</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Japanese as a second language</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the uneven number of tutor and tutee participants, Erika kindly volunteered to tutor two tutees in Cases 1 and 2. She was researching English literature at MLU and had studied abroad for two years in England. She took several English academic writing classes at the universities she attended in Japan and England. Nobita, the tutor in Case 3, had studied abroad at a language school in the United States after graduating high school. The TOEIC score he told me was from several years ago. Although he had studied Japanese studies for his undergraduate degree, he started to read many academic texts and write manuscripts for publication in English throughout his graduate studies at MLU. Contrary to Erika and Nobita who were Japanese nationals, Roxana in Case 4 is an international student from Iran pursuing her doctoral degree in Japanese as a second language. She had studied English in Iran from junior high school and it was one of her strongest subjects. Although she majored in Japanese studies at her university in Iran, she continued taking English language classes. At the time of the study, she read many articles in English and spoke English with other international students enrolled in her department. She had never taken an internationally accredited English language test before.

For tutee participants, I recruited four Japanese graduate students who met the following two requirements: (a) they planned to submit a final draft of their English academic writing to

<sup>18</sup> Pseudonyms were chosen by me if there were no requests for specific pseudonyms by participants.
their instructors/supervisors within the data collection period, and (b) they could bring at least one written draft to the pilot tutorial. The struggle in recruiting participants who met these criteria reflects the fact that Japanese is the predominant medium of instruction at MLU. In the end, one of the tutors introduced me to Mami, a graduate student in the Faculty of International Development. This faculty is unique in that 87% of its classes are conducted in English. Seventy percent of the student population consists of international students, a majority of them from South East Asian countries. Through snowball sampling, three other participants, Ryota, Shiori, and Miho—all from the same department—participated in the study. Table 4.2 displays participants’ basic information and Table 4.3 indicates the type of writing brought to the pilot tutorial and the tutees’ individual requests to their tutors.

Table 4.2 Tutee Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tutorial</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Level of study</th>
<th>Research field</th>
<th>Language expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case 1</td>
<td>Shiori</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>TOEIC 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 2</td>
<td>Ryota</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>TOEIC 600-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 3</td>
<td>Mami</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>TOEIC 900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 4</td>
<td>Miho</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>TOEFL iBT 78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 Type of Writing Brought to the Tutorial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tutorial</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type of writing</th>
<th>Request (Area of improvement)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case 1</td>
<td>Shiori</td>
<td>Research proposal</td>
<td>Organization, sentence coherence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 2</td>
<td>Ryota</td>
<td>Research proposal</td>
<td>Sentence coherence, appropriateness of expressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 3</td>
<td>Mami</td>
<td>Research proposal</td>
<td>Coherence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 4</td>
<td>Miho</td>
<td>Book summary</td>
<td>Organization, grammar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The four tutees were all studying Anthropology under the same supervisor. Shiori, Ryota, and Mami brought their research proposals (up to three pages) for the same short-term research program in the Philippines. Miho brought one of her course assignments, which was a two-page book summary. They all requested help on improving their organization and coherence; Ryota and Miho also asked for assistance on lower-order concerns (grammar, expressions). Overall, the four students had roughly the same English proficiency as measured by the TOEIC and TOEFL test, except Mami, who had a near perfect TOEIC score. Compared to Mami and Miho, who majored in English linguistics and had some experience in English academic writing, Shiori and Ryota had less exposure to English.

The tutees’ faculty, the Faculty of International Development, had unique features atypical of other English-medium programs in Japan. The program itself did not have an English language test requirement and courses did not require a high proficiency of English. According to the tutees, some professors used Japanese to scaffold the comprehension of domestic students. The tutees told me that in their research seminar, there is usually one session in Japanese and one in English. Although Japanese students needed to attend both, international students were only required to take the English session. Interestingly, students could choose to write their dissertations in Japanese, which the four tutees planned to do. Given this unique learning context, students searched out other opportunities to use the English language by participating in study abroad programs and regularly interacting with English-speaking students.

4.4.3 Procedure and analysis

Prior to the tutorial, I met with the tutee participants and gave them a questionnaire asking about their background information, the type of paper they planned to bring to their
tutorials, and their beliefs regarding the Writing Center philosophy. The tutees reserved one of the time slots in which the tutor participants were on duty. The 90-minute tutorials were observed and audio-recorded. All tutoring sessions were conducted in Japanese, and English was only used when the tutor or tutee read the text. Within a week after the tutorial, I conducted interviews with tutor and tutee participants to inquire about their perception of the English tutorials. For tutors, the questions were centered on their tutoring strategies and beliefs towards the role of English writing tutorials. For tutees, the questions focused on their evaluations of the tutorial and their perceived role of English writing tutorials as a viable academic support service. For participants to have a better sense of what happened in the tutorials, I prepared a rough transcript of the tutorial prior to the interview and reviewed it with the participants. All interviews were conducted in Japanese.

The interview data was thematically analyzed (Braun & Clarke, 2006). I read through the interview transcripts paying close attention to the ways the tutors described their tutors’ stances, including their strategies, roles, and goals for their tutoring work and categorized them into themes. I then compared these with the tutees’ perceptions of their tutorials and their tutors’ performances (see Chapter 1 for a more detailed description of the analysis). Through this process, I identified the similarities and/or differences between tutors’ and tutees’ motives, tutors’ stances, and tutees’ perception of tutor roles.

4.5 Findings

4.5.1 Case 1: Erika and Shiori

Erika tutored two students, Shiori (Case 1) and Ryota (Case 2). In both tutorials, her stance could be characterized by a meaning-focused approach to writing and her instructional
role as an experienced English academic writer. These stances were based on her motives as a Writing Center tutor to realize the non-proofreading policy and her several years of training in English academic writing.

As a common strategy to realize her motives, she tried not to point out mistakes, but rather, let the writer discover them by “showing the discrepancy between what the writer wants to say, what is written, and what I understood from the writing” (Erika, Case 1, Interview\(^4\)). In her meaning-focused approach, checking students’ grammar was something that took her time away from improving global issues and which she associated with a native speaker’s job, as she commented in her post-tutorial interview:

> At the Writing Center, our end goal is to work with writers to make sure their ideas are accurately expressed in their writing […] so the nitty-gritty grammar checking that comes at the end should be left to native speakers, because I feel otherwise, we don’t have the time to look into the textual coherence. (Erika, Case 1, Interview\(^4\)).

Her strategy was frequently observed during her tutorials. Shiori, her tutee from Case 1, had brought her research proposal for help with its organization and sentence coherence. Erika spotted several issues with sentence flow, rule-based grammatical errors (misuse of prepositions, pronouns), and stylistic issues such as an overuse of quotation marks. Drawing on what she learned in undergraduate courses, Erika explained in detail why Shiori should use quotation marks less frequently:
Erika: Why are these words all in quotation marks?

Shiori: I’m not sure why, but the first sentence is a direct quotation and the words in quotations are for emphasis, I think.

Erika: So, does this word [referring specifically to the word ‘knowledge society’] have a different nuance from its typical usage?

Shiori: Yes.

Erika: Is this defined later, though?

Shiori: No.

[…]

Erika: I understand how you feel but if you use quotation marks, readers might expect an explanation because it’s a keyword.

Shiori: Really?

Erika: Even if you want to emphasize an important word, rather than simply using double quotations, it would be better to use the “it is ~ that…” structure to make it clear what you’re emphasizing or to compare it [to something less important] to highlight its importance, or use alternative expressions. Since quotation marks are basically to indicate a direct quotation, if a term is not directly cited or not defined later, I think readers would wonder, “what’s this [term] about?” [“why is this in double quotations?”] (Case 1, Tutorial4,3)

Erika verbalized the questions she had as a reader (why certain words were in quotation marks) to show how the reader might interpret the text, then elicited Shiori’s intentions, and ended with a mini-lesson on stylistic conventions and other means to emphasize a key word.
After a few more negotiations, Shiori said in the tutorial that she would make sure to elaborate on what she means by ‘knowledge society’.

In her interview, Shiori provided the reflection that Erika not only helped her improve her organization and sentence coherence, but also taught her the importance of reader-awareness. Since the audience of her writing was usually her supervisor with whom she shared common knowledge, she especially appreciated input from a different reader and learned that readers of her proposal might be confused by the terminology she was using. This perception matched with the very intention of Erika’s strategy of embodying a confused reader.

Later in the interview, I learned that Shiori’s motive to improve her higher-order issues through the tutorial was formulated by her understanding of the Writing Center as a place that does not check grammar. This understanding also shaped the role that she expected of her tutor in relation to her native English-speaking peers:

Shiori: If I show my writing to my supervisor, since we’re in the same field, my supervisor knows what I want to do [for my research] from our conversations. So because the Writing Center tutor, like today’s tutor, checks my writing without any knowledge, I realized that I haven’t provided enough explanation or can’t convey my message to my readers, so I was really grateful for that.

Tomoyo: I see. How about when you want your grammar checked? [Will you ask] Your Filipino friend?

Shiori: Yes, I think so. For proofreading, I would ask a native speaker.

Tomoyo: Why is that?
Shiori: Well, it’s basically because the Writing Center doesn’t check grammar, but if it’s with native speakers, they not only catch simple spelling mistakes, but they can also accurately point out things like, you won’t use this expression or you won’t use this vocabulary here (Shiori, Case 1, Interview 4-4)

Shiori assigned the role of the Writing Center to improve the clarity of her writing, but not necessarily to refine the accuracy of her writing. This was why she had asked an international student from the Philippines (a native-speaker, according to Shiori) to proofread her paper prior to the tutorial. It could be suggested that understanding the purpose of writing centers is one of the premises of a positive tutorial outcome. Interestingly, Erika’s performance exceeded Shiori’s image of the Writing Center; Erika did point out several spelling mistakes, unnatural expressions, and vocabulary mistakes during the tutorial, which either Shiori forgot about or did not acknowledge.

4.5.2 Case 2: Erika and Ryota

In contrast to Shiori, who wanted consultation on her higher-order issues, Ryota asked Erika to check the appropriateness of his sentences, expressions, and idioms in his research proposal. Erika responded at the initial stage of the tutorial that she could provide suggestions with regards to the order of information and vocabulary choice, but suggested he consult a native speaker for the appropriateness of lower-order concerns. In her interview, Erika explained that she responded in this way because, “I’m not a native speaker, so I can’t judge what’s appropriate 4-5,” which echoed her stance as a Writing Center tutor, described in the previous section. It was also revealed in her interview that she was more cautious of pointing out grammar
mistakes in Case 2 because she had realized she gave Shiori incorrect feedback on a preposition in Case 1. In her words, she did not want to “step on a mine” again.

Erika’s refusal to judge appropriateness and her cautious stance towards pointing out grammar heavily impacted Ryota’s evaluation of her performance throughout the tutorial. Ryota commented in his interview that he felt “left in the dark” when he was told to consult a native speaker and felt that Erika responded in this way to deny her expertise in English. He also expressed that he felt concerned a couple of times when Erika seemed uncertain on some grammatical points or asked him the meanings of certain terminology. Ryota came to his Writing Center tutorial with the same expectation he had of his native speaker friends and said that he was expecting someone with a better command of English.

What further exacerbated Ryota’s negative perceptions was that, although Erika did point out ways to improve in vocabulary choice and mechanics, she mainly focused on organizational issues, particularly on changing the order of sentences, which was based on her meaning-focused approach. Ryota was expecting a more authoritative stance in discerning the correctness of his use of English and felt that Erika was refocusing the tutorial too much on higher-order issues due to her lack of English proficiency, as he reflected in his post-tutorial interview:

Tomoyo: Ok, so then the tutorial ended. So this was your initial request. To what extent was it met?
Ryota: In the end, she didn’t at all talk about idioms.
Tomoyo: By idioms, you mean appropriateness of expressions?
Ryota: Yes, appropriateness of expressions.
Tomoyo: I see that you sometimes asked her, “which one is appropriate”?

Ryota: Yes. So, I said so because I wondered “she can’t point out which [expression] is appropriate until I ask her myself?” […] But the main focus, I mean, the focus of the tutorial was about content, like, which content should come first. So, in terms of my request [which I told her at the beginning of the tutorial], I’m not entirely satisfied, but generally, I guess she made me notice several things that I wasn’t aware of,

(Ryota, Case 2, Interview^4-8)

In contrast to Shiori who was extremely satisfied with Erika’s tutoring, Erika’s priorities and strategies as a Writing Center tutor were incongruent with Ryota’s motives, leading him to question Erika’s competence as an English user. He also wondered whether he could trust a tutor who was not in his field. Although he accepted Erika’s suggestions on word choice (e.g., ‘developed nations’ instead of ‘advanced nations’), he rejected most of her advice on organization in his final draft, saying that he felt it unnecessary to change them. He told me that he does not plan to return to the Writing Center and will consult his supervisor or native speakers in his field.

Erika’s tutor stance was evaluated differently by Shiori and Ryota, resulting in opposite outcomes in terms of student satisfaction. This was because the two had divergent motives for improving their writing and in their expectations of the tutor. The differences between Shiori and Ryota exemplify how the degrees of alignment of motives between participants (in this case, the tutor and tutee) can determine the outcomes of the peer feedback activity (Storch, 2004; Zhu & Mitchell, 2012). While Shiori was accepting of Erika’s meaning-focused approach due to her motive to improve her organization, Ryota, who expected judgment on his linguistic
performance, could not capitalize on Erika’s strategies and knowledge. It also shows the
interrelations of student expectations and tutor performance. Certain expectations of non-native
writing center tutors can help shape motives and positive outcomes, as in the case of Shiori, but
also negatively impact tutorial outcomes if expectations are not met by non-native tutors, as in
Ryota’s case.

4.5.3 Case 3: Nobita and Mami

Mami differed from the other participants in that she had visited the Writing Center four
times for her Japanese writing. Even though it was her first English writing consultation, she
knew from past experiences that the Writing Center tutors gave good advice on organization. For
the tutorial under study, she asked for help on the coherence of her research proposal, which she
considered was the weak point in her writing. She had already had a native-English speaker
check her writing for sentence-level errors prior to the tutorial.

Nobita had the same motives as Erika in that the English tutorials should be used mainly
for organizational issues and displayed a more directive, instructor-like stance than other tutors.
Nobita first started with clarifying Mami’s research objectives and questions, and asked Mami to
explain what she wrote in each section. Then, Nobita took time silently reading each section and
asked Mami questions. Although he pointed out some lower-order issues such as choice of
vocabulary and active/passive verbs, he mostly focused on organization issues and ways to make
her objectives clearer to readers. In his interview, Nobita commented that he might have been a
little too directive and talked too much during the tutorial. In some interactions, he deliberately
indicated solutions to the flow of her research proposal to be able to go over the whole proposal
in the given time.
Nobita’s stance and strategies matched Mami’s motives, which led to a successful tutorial from both of their perspectives. At the end of the tutorial, Mami thanked Nobita for giving such an informative “lecture” (講義) (in her words). When asked why she felt this way in her post-tutorial interview, she responded:

Well, he gave excellent feedback on coherence. In terms of what I should emphasize in my writing, he was able to immediately identify that it’s “global mobility,” so I reconfirmed what I need to emphasize in my research. In the end, we still had time to go over the whole proposal, so that also made my proposal even more coherent. (Miho, Case 4, Interview 4–9)

Mami positively evaluated Nobita’s assistance in sharpening her research focus and clarifying her objectives in her research proposal, which was to re-examine global mobility of study abroad students. She even wanted to audio-record the tutorial because there were so many helpful pieces of advice. She was willing to come back to the writing center for another consultation on organization.

Although most topics were on organizational issues, there were a couple of instances where Nobita inevitably had to judge the appropriateness of expressions or the correctness of grammar. Nobita was able to give grammatical feedback if he was sure of his knowledge attained from reading English articles and books. However, like Erika in Case 1, not knowing the “correct” English seemed to be the core concern in his tutoring. For instance, Nobita encountered a situation in which he could not come up with the appropriate English expression. This happened when Mami asked Nobita the English-equivalent of ステレオタイプで見る, meaning
“stereotyping” in English. Nobita consulted a Japanese-English online dictionary\(^\text{19}\) and gave suggestions such as “fixed idea,” “stereotype,” and “you are being stereotypical.” However, he was uncertain about these answers and eventually suggested that Mami consult a dictionary herself or ask a native speaker.

Contrary to Ryota’s lack of self-confidence, Mami had a more lenient attitude towards his English proficiency. Mami expressed this view in reflecting on how she felt when Nobita showed uncertainty of his knowledge:

Well, I would feel less concerned if he could confidently say what is correct or not. But come to think of it, does it matter? Even if someone who specializes in English checks my writing, many of them will make mistakes, so I don’t know the right answer […] However, when I write in English, […] what’s most important is for the reader to fully understand my message. So the organization and sentence flow are the most important factors […] So, probably for English expressions, I think it’s best to consult a native speaker, because only certain people can judge the correctness of expressions. So then [for others], rather than checking those things [expressions], they can focus on what they’re good at […] For Nobita the other day, he was very skilled in checking the organization of my writing, so I want him to shine at that (Mami, Case 3, Interview\(^4\text{-10}\)).

\(^{19}\) The Writing Center has a laptop connected to the Internet on every desk designated for tutorials.
What Mami valued in her writing greatly impacted her evaluation of Nobita’s expertise and qualifications as a writing tutor. Her beliefs of good writing in which global issues such as organization and coherence exceed accuracy was the exact opposite of Ryota’s emphasis on appropriate linguistic features. Her view also points to her expectations of a non-native English tutor; they do not need to be concerned with perfecting the linguistic features of her writing, but instead, they should excel at improving her organization. The expectations was gained from the way she assigned “judge correctness” of English to the capacity of native speakers in saying “only certain people can judge the correctness of expressions,” implying non-native speakers are less capable of this task. The “strength” in dealing with higher-order issues being associated to non-native speakers is also discussed by Zhu (2001). In a study on mixed peer response groups with native and non-native English speaker participants in the United States, Zhu found that although non-native speakers could only give minimal language-related feedback to peers, they gave a comparable amount of feedback on global aspects of writing, claiming that their contributions to this aspect of writing should be highlighted in peer response groups. However, this division of roles also parallels the native/non-native dichotomy that categorizes different strengths in teaching English (Árva & Medgyes, 2000; Chun, 2014; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005; Medgyes, 1992; Reves & Medgyes, 1994). This dichotomous view has been critiqued for its misguided impositions of certain teaching skills/abilities (Selvi, 2014). In the case of Mami, the perceived dichotomy between tutors as writing experts and native speakers as language experts created imagined capacities for Nobita, who in fact could point out several language-related issues as well. This implies that native speakers would qualify as better writing tutors if they had writing expertise in addition to their unquestioned “native-speaker instinct.”
4.5.4 Case 4: Roxana and Miho

Roxana had a different profile from the other tutors. She was an international student from Iran studying Japanese language education and a fluent speaker of Japanese. Since Japanese and English were both her additional languages, she did not feel much difference between the two tutorials compared to other native Japanese tutors, who noted several challenges in tutoring English compared to Japanese in terms of providing grammar feedback.

Roxana shared her views with Erika about her ability to assist students with grammar to a certain level, but that she did not see the Writing Center as a place for exclusively helping with this issue. She considered excessive help on grammar as proofreading, which she said students could ask native speakers to do.

In her tutorial with Miho, who brought her book review assignment and wanted to improve her sentence coherence and grammar, Roxana noted that she tried to reach a solution collaboratively rather than directly pointing out and correcting mistakes. Like the other tutors, whenever she found an unnatural usage, she clarified Miho’s intended meanings and then made suggestions based on her knowledge of English academic writing. For instance, the most helpful advice according to Miho was when Roxana suggested she use the active voice for the sentence instead of passive, “Therefore, this policy was adopted in 1982 under martial law conditions and without public consultation.”:

Roxana: In this sentence starting with “Therefore,” isn’t the subject, so the person who did the action, important?

Miho: Yes, I think so. It’s “The president”.
Roxana: Yes, it’s the president, right? So why don’t you clarify the subject, and use active voice instead of passive voice? Because in the last sentence, you use active voice and clearly indicate the subject, so it’s better not to change so much from active to passive and passive to active again. You should clarify the subject and use active voice.

Miho: Ok I’ll do that. I tend to use passives for some reason.

Roxana: It might depend on the field of research, but for academic writing, it’s better not to use passives so much. The subject of the sentence will be unclear. (Case 4, Tutorial 4-11)

Miho commented in her interview that it was the first time she had ever received so much detailed feedback on her English writing. She said she was able to recognize her challenges in sentence coherence and her habit of using the passive voice.

Although she appreciated Roxana’s feedback on sentence coherence and grammar, she also commented that she sometimes felt uncomfortable with the formal atmosphere of the Writing Center and the routines in her tutorial. One such routine was reading each paragraph of her text aloud, which Roxana always asks her tutees to do in her sessions. Reading aloud is a common writing center tutoring strategy that helps writers to notice their own mistakes (Brooks, 1991). Although the other two tutors decided not to use this technique in their JE tutorials, Roxanna followed the procedure. Contrary to Roxanna’s collaborative, writer-centered stance, Miho saw her as, in her words, “a teacher-like figure” with higher expertise in English, which made her feel hesitant to demonstrate her oral skills. Perhaps because of this formal atmosphere and her view of Roxanna as a teacher-like figure, there were some points during the tutorial
where Miho did not push back on some of Roxanna’s unclear feedback—which was possibly due to Roxanna’s Japanese proficiency. Miho commented that she sometimes did not completely understand or agree with her suggestions, but brushed it off because she thought Roxanna’s English was better than hers.

Miho’s case is unique in that her previous learning experiences factored into her perceptions of tutor stance. She was more accustomed to discussing her writing with her international peers in comfortable, informal settings such as coffee shops and her peers’ houses, commenting that she felt nervous in a formal environment like the Writing Center. Although she positively evaluated Roxana’s language expertise, she also said she would only visit the Writing Center for less important assignments and would have her high-stakes writing checked by her native-speaker friends in a more relaxing environment. Miho’s case counters conclusions drawn from other Japanese studies (Nakatake, 2014; S. Sadoshima et al., 2008); even if the language of communication is shared, the tutors might be perceived as a teacher with authority and expertise, yielding unfavorable affective impacts on some tutees. Her case suggests that she might benefit more from her native English speaking peers from the same department with whom she can discuss different aspects of her writing without following specified routines and procedures.

4.6 Discussion and Conclusion

Drawing on the notion of student stance and motives, this study sought to address how tutors’ linguistic statuses might impact the tutees’ evaluations of tutorials. The evaluation of tutor stance was affected by several factors including tutees’ writing needs, expectations of tutors, previous learning experiences, and beliefs regarding good writing. In the remainder of this
section, I will discuss the noteworthy conditions that contributed to the positive evaluation of these tutorials in relation to the role of non-native tutors.

First, a description of tutor stances needs to be mentioned. The three tutors’ stances were determined by a number of factors, with one driving factor being their motive to realize the Writing Center philosophy. All tutors agreed on the view that the MLU Writing Center should be mainly for tutoring higher-order issues, such as organization and content, and not for grammar, a position aligned with some U.S. writing center advocates (Cogie, Strain, & Lorinskas, 1999). It was easier to realize the non-proofreading policy of their Writing Center when discussing improvements on the flow of sentences, organization, and content, as opposed to correcting lexico-grammatical errors or judging the legitimacy of certain expressions. Although tutors did provide grammatical feedback from time to time, checking students’ grammar was associated with proofreading, a native speaker’s job, and renounced as something that took their time away from improving global issues.

How were these stances perceived by tutees? With the exception of Ryota, the tutees were largely satisfied with their tutorials and said their requests were fulfilled. The tutors’ feedback was overall appreciated when the tutor could clearly explain why a certain word or sentence needed revision. This was especially true for tutees who had never learned academic writing in a formal setting, such as Shiori and Miho. Nonetheless, certain conditions needed to be in place to ensure a positive tutorial experience.

The first two important conditions were the extent of alignment between motives as well as tutees’ preferences for certain tutoring strategies. For Erika, Shiori, and Miho whose motives were to improve their higher-order concerns, tutors were able to assist them in learning certain conventions, pointing to writing habits, and making their writing more coherent. However, in
Ryota’s case, his product-oriented request mismatched with Erika’s perceived role as a tutor, resulting in dissatisfactory tutorial outcomes, according to Ryota. Some tutoring strategies also influenced the tutees’ perceptions of their tutorials. While Shiori appreciated the collaborative learning with a reader outside her discipline, this was not the case with Miho who perceived her tutorial to be too formal, especially when she was asked to read her text aloud. In the case of Ryota, he felt his tutor focused too much on higher-order issues instead of meeting his request of judging linguistic appropriateness.

Finally, and probably most relevant to the tutors’ linguistic statuses, there needed to be at least a certain amount of trust in tutors’ writing expertise coupled with a compromise of accepting their possible limitations in language expertise, as could be inferred from Shiori’s, Mami’s, and Ryota’s cases. Shiori and Mami primarily considered their tutors as experts in writing (dealing with higher-order issues), but did not see their role in improving the accuracy of their texts, commenting that they would ask native speakers for this kind of support. Mami’s statement, “they can focus on what they’re good at” echoes how she viewed her tutor’s linguistic status and what she hoped to benefit from them. This type of compensating mechanism or working around a tutor’s non-native linguistic status was key for a successful tutorial from the tutees’ perspectives. In Ryota’s case, it could be said that he could not find a way to capitalize on his tutor’s strengths and expertise, explicitly stating that the position of tutor is better fulfilled by native speakers who can speak Japanese.

These necessary conditions for tutorial success point to the distinct nature of writing center tutorials in comparison to peer feedback in which success is typically determined by individual motives and learning goals (Storch, 2004; Yu & Lee, 2015; Zhu & Mitchell, 2012). Compared to peer responders who take on various roles based on their own learning goals,
writing center tutors have a less flexible role due to their collective objectives to “produce better writers, not better writing” (North, 1984, p. 438), the priority of topics (higher-order concerns), and routines to be followed. In this study, the Writing Center’s non-proofreading policy not only served as a rationale to prioritize higher-order issues, but was also used to maintain tutors’ Writing Center identities. This identity work created their specific role as non-native tutors with main expertise in higher-order issues, impacting such factors as tutees’ motives, the expectations they carry, and ultimately, the evaluations of tutor stances. From a tutee perspective, their fixed motives and stances created a hit-or-miss condition of student satisfaction; the tutees who had motives that match with the Writing Center’s purpose were more likely to experience positive tutorial outcomes than those who did not.

Although the philosophy based on collaboration and non-proofreading is the cornerstone of writing centers, this fixed role might limit tutors’ capabilities in helping struggling writers and could lead to the production of a dichotomized view of native/non-native speakers. The tutors in this study could, in most cases, accurately spot spelling mistakes, unusual expressions and vocabulary, which Shiori noted, only native speakers are capable of doing. Moreover, tutors were able to give advice on improving the academic register of the text (e.g., Erika’s feedback on double quotations, Roxana’s feedback on active/passive voice), which some of the native speaker proofreaders did not point out. Although tutors’ performances showed that they could also provide feedback on lower-order issues, the native/non-native dichotomy fixed the perception that they are not grammar experts like native-speakers.

Given these findings, a necessary task is to ensure an environment where non-native tutors can be creative, flexible, and confident in employing a wide range of strategies to help writers with their writing. What would help envision this environment is the notion of mediating
strategies (Villamil & de Guerrero, 1996), in other words, the resources that non-native tutors can employ to meet tutees’ learning goals. These include employing symbols and external resources (writing notes, using dictionaries), employing their L1, and scaffolding techniques that include both directive (instructing) and non-directive (eliciting) feedback (Villamil & de Guerrero, 1996). For instance, instead of rejecting their role as proofreaders, which possibly re-enforces less positive assessments of non-native tutors, they could make maximum use of appropriate resources (i.e., books, dictionaries, corpuses) to address tutees’ language needs as much as possible. If they are asked to judge the naturalness of an expression, as experienced academic writers in English they should not be hesitant to draw on their experiences and intuition or to use resources to solve these issues. At the same time, research fields such as World Englishes could inform writing center tutor training by helping tutors to question the elusive concepts of “native speakers” and their often unquestioned roles of improving non-native English speakers’ writing (Hartse & Kubota, 2014; Jenkins, 2011) and to consider how these concepts could impact their stances in tutorials. Although tutors need continuous training in improving their language and writing expertise, as competent users of English (Cook, 2005), non-native tutors are key players at universities in both EFL and ESL contexts.
Chapter 5: The Writing Center and International Students in a Japanese University: A Language Management Perspective

5.1 Introduction

A total of 152,062 international students studied in Japanese universities in 2015, of which 91.4% came from Asian countries (Japan Student Services Organization, 2016). Universities face pressure to increase this number due to the Japanese government’s “300,000 International Student Plan” (MEXT, 2008b). To accommodate a large population of international students, universities offer various services to support their academic studies and life-related issues in Japan, such as hiring international student advisors, offering Japanese language courses, and implementing peer-support programs20 (Lassegard, 2008). As a type of academic support for writing—with their potential to fit into the planning for international students—writing centers have caught the attention of universities in the last decade (Doyle, Omori, & Akita, 2013; Matsuta, 2011; Nakayama, 2010).

To examine the institutional role of the writing center at a Japanese university, this chapter employs a language management lens to compare the beliefs and interests among administrators, tutors, and international students in improving their writing. Interviews with the three groups of participants displayed incongruences between the administrators’ interests aligned with institutional goals, the educational philosophy of the writing center, and international students’ language learning needs. The findings point to the tutor’s crucial role as language specialists who inform more organized language management, and the necessity for

20 Peer support programs are mentoring programs in which international students are paired up with (usually graduate-level) Japanese students who assist them with life-related issues (e.g., opening a bank account) and their academic studies. (Lassegard, 2008)
collaboration between academic support units and faculty members in providing sufficient academic socialization environments for international students.

5.2 An Overview of Writing Centers and International Students

The writing center is a common student support service in North American universities where students can consult a tutor about their writing (Moussu & David, 2015). Although one-on-one writing tutorials take place in other English-speaking universities (e.g., in Australia, the United Kingdom) (Barkas, 2011; Marriott, 2006), the writing center can be characterized by some unique factors. First, the tutors are usually undergraduate or graduate students in order to better implement collaborative and peer learning; this notion is rooted in its historical background—the writing center gained popularity in American universities during the progressive education movement in the 1970s as a non-hierarchical, student-centered environment (Boquet, 1999). Second, underpinned by Vygotskyian collaborative learning theories and the process writing approach, writing center pedagogy allows students to discover the writing process collaboratively with their peer tutors (Bruffee, 1984; North, 1984). In order to practice this, tutors are to engage in “minimalist tutoring” (Brooks, 1991) to provide writers with chances to take charge of their learning. Some minimalist tutoring techniques outlined by Brooks (1991) and other writing center scholars are to ask writers to read their texts aloud with the purpose of helping them to notice their mistakes, asking them questions rather than providing answers, providing them with grammar exercises instead of teaching them, and teaching them self-editing skills instead of proofreading their texts (Cogie, Strain, & Lorinskas, 1999; Friedlander, 1984; Kennedy, 1993).
This non-interventionist pedagogy created by composition scholars was soon questioned as to whether it was a suitable method for second language writers needing more explicit assistance in learning the acceptable linguistic and rhetorical conventions of American universities (Blau & Hall, 2002; Harris & Silva, 1993; Myers, 2003; Nakamaru, 2010; Powers, 1993). Furthermore, research on tutorials with second language writers demonstrated tutors’ challenges in realizing the collaborative philosophy in practice. Comparing written transcripts of writing center tutorials with first and second language writers, scholars have shown tutors taking a more direct approach in suggesting alternatives to second language writers rather than exclusively engaging them in dialogue (Thonus, 2004; Williams, 2008). To complement these micro-linguistic studies, large-scale surveys distributed to a number of writing centers reveal that tutors provide more grammatical instruction to second language writers than first language writers (Eckstein, 2016; Moussu & David, 2015). From interviews with second language writers, it has also been demonstrated that these writers often expect tutors to take an authoritative role in teaching them acceptable linguistic and rhetorical conventions, as opposed to them being a collaborative peer (Blau & Hall, 2002; Thonus, 2003). In this way, writing center researchers have shown over the years that the writing center philosophy that de-emphasizes grammar instruction and directive feedback should be reconsidered for second language writers in order to aid their language learning processes (Blau & Hall, 2002; Myers, 2003; Nakamaru, 2010; Rafoth, 2015; Thonus, 2014; Weigle & Nelson, 2004).

The discussion found in the literature on writing centers and second language writers has been mainly focused on what happens in tutorials, in other words, identifying effective tutoring strategies and testing the writing center’s “lore-based mandates” (Thompson et al., 2009, p. 79). However, as writing centers continue to be a common academic socialization space for
international students (Anderson, 2016; Beckett & Nam, 2011; Seloni, 2012; Séror, 2009, 2011), the scope of these discussions should move beyond tutoring strategies to assess the writing center’s institutional role, taking into account the broader context of university policies, faculty members’ expectations, and international students’ academic needs. Despite the gradual reconceptualization of writing center approaches towards the needs of second language writers, qualitative studies following international students’ academic trajectories show that the effectiveness of writing centers has been mixed. Some international students regarded the writing center as one of the “alternative sources of feedback” (Séror, 2011, p. 118) valuable to complete their assignments, and they benefited from tutors’ feedback on general writing strategies and grammar (Beckett & Nam, 2011; Seloni, 2012). Others, however, thought the writing center failed to address critical issues that can affect their academic success—for example, understanding discipline-specific writing and improving the linguistic aspects of their writing (Anderson, 2016; Beckett & Nam, 2011). These studies point to the need for writing centers to continuously re-examine their work in relation to faculty members’ and students’ voices (Schendel & Macauley, 2012). This is a critical discussion during a time when many universities are strategically admitting large numbers of international students while lacking adequate processes to provide guidance and support to students, particularly concerning their academic writing (Jenkins & Wingate, 2015).

5.3 Bringing the Discussion to Japan

The idea of the writing center has spread around the world over the past few decades—including in English as a foreign language contexts (e.g., Archer, 2007; Johnston, Cornwell, & Yoshida, 2008; Reichelt et al., 2013; Tan, 2011). One of the unique characteristics of writing
centers in this context is that some offer bilingual writing center services for English and the local language (e.g., Chinese and English, German and English, Japanese and English) (Chang, 2013; Gustafsson & Ganobcsik-Williams, 2016). Despite this quality, little is known about writing tutorials for languages other than English, and more importantly, their effectiveness in supporting international students studying these languages.  

In Japan, international student support is particularly important as many Japanese universities strive to increase international student enrollment and more universities have turned to writing centers to aid international students with their Japanese writing (Iwamoto, 2008; Matsuta, 2011; Nakayama, 2010). This trend could be linked to the efforts to decrease the workloads of content and language instructors taking care of these students’ writing (Masamune, 2009; Matsuta, 2011; Masaki Taniguchi & Doi, 2012; Yanagisawa & Takano, 2011). Indeed, international students’ lack of Japanese skills is frequently perceived as a challenge by universities (Internal Affairs and Communications Ministry, 2005; Isashiki, 2013). Some challenges that instructors face are students’ weakness in distinguishing between colloquial and written language, and their lack of experience writing research papers in Japanese (Fukazawa, 1994; Nishina & Takeda, 1991; Nitsu, 2003; Yamamoto, 2003). Attaining high proficiency in Japanese is also a challenge for many international students, especially those whose first language does not include Chinese characters (Nishina & Takeda, 1991; Nitsu, 2003). Although English-medium programs are increasing in Japanese universities (Huang, 2006; Rivers, 2010), a majority of students pursue their studies in humanities and social sciences, fields that often

21 An exception is Voigt & Girgensohn’s (2015) study which outlines some of the challenges in peer tutoring non-native German writers.
require Japanese proficiency to complete a degree (Lassegard, 2006). Furthermore, mastery of
Japanese is crucial if students plan to work in Japan following graduation; several Japanese
companies are proactively recruiting international students who can contribute to their
transnational businesses, with their main target being Chinese graduates from Japanese
universities (Breaden, 2014; Liu-Farrer, 2011).

Compared to the established literature on writing centers in North America, the current
writing center literature in Japan is still in its embryonic stage due to its short history. A general
tendency is for scholars to welcome writing center philosophy and assessing their success based
on its tenets, such as the proofreading policy and collaborative learning. For instance, scholars
point to the problem of international students misunderstanding the writing center as a
proofreading service and provide strategies to avoid directive grammar feedback (Masamune,
(2014) suggest that although tutors might address international students’ proofreading requests in
various ways, editing requests should be reconceptualized in relation to the collaborative
philosophy. Some also discuss pre-conditions for writing center tutorials with international
students to succeed, such as a student’s high Japanese proficiency, sociability, and cultural traits
that value cooperation and collaboration (Doyle et al., 2013; Masamune, 2009; Matsuta, 2012;
Nakayama, 2010). More comprehensive research involving different stakeholders is needed to
evaluate the role of writing centers in ensuring international students’ academic success.
5.4 Re-examining the Institutional Role of Writing Centers: A Language Management Perspective

In this study, language management theory (LMT) is employed as a conceptual framework to assess the institutional role of writing centers (Jernudd & Neustupný, 1987; Nekvapil, 2016; Neustupný & Nekvapil, 2003). LMT is a language planning theory that focuses on attempts to improve language problems in everyday communicative acts within a given community. Two important concepts in LMT are simple and organized language management. In simple language management, an individual manages their language practices by noting (or noticing) a "deviant” linguistic phenomenon in utterances or writings, evaluating it, planning an adjustment plan, and implementing the plan. These steps of language management can stop at any stage; for instance, a problem could be noted but left alone (Nekvapil, 2016). Language management can be evidenced on organizational levels as well. Organized management is a systematic attempt to improve language use on the micro-level, typically by more than one person (entity) in power who hold certain ideologies, for example, journal editors, business managers, schools, governments, and churches (Giger & Sloboda, 2008; Kaplan & Baldauf, 2005; Marriott, 2012; Sherman, 2015). One important research goal of LMT is to uncover the interplays between organized and simple management of a given organization or community, such as uncovering alignments and misalignments of different interests in improving linguistic varieties (e.g., dialects) (Neustupný & Nekvapil, 2003).

Student support centers such as writing centers are crucial services that help students manage their academic language learning while at university. By examining different interests in

---

22 Scholars have been critically re-examining the “noting” stage, especially on what kind of linguistic phenomenon is considered deviant and who evaluates it as so (Marriott & Nekvapil, 2012).
language management on such levels as university administrators, faculty members, writing center administrators, tutors, and students, one can see to what extent the goals of university policies are achieved on different levels, and in turn, how students’ language learning needs are taken up into policy making (Marriott, 2015; Neustupný, 2004). For example, Marriott (2004, 2006) investigated the organized management of a language and academic study skills (LASS) advisor working with international students in a pharmacy faculty at an Australian university. The study demonstrated the multi-layered and reiterative processes involved in creating language support measures that targeted the self-reported and faculty-reported language concerns of international students. The LASS advisor was an important actor who noted common language concerns in consultations with students (i.e., pronunciation and verb tense) and also took note of the areas students wished to improve, such as their communication skills for counseling patients. This noting stage consequently informed the planning and implementation of pronunciation workshops and communication skills courses offered by the language support unit. Another important player in this language management cycle was the academic lecturer who notified the advisor about the particular areas where students needed assistance while completing certain courses. According to Marriott, this case is an exemplary organized management in that it is informed by language problems in discourse-based practices.

This study aims to critically reflect on the institutional role of a writing center for international students at a Japanese university from a language management perspective. In contrast to previous studies—which explored the views of tutors and international students separately—participants in this study included writing center administrators, tutors, and students for the purpose of being able to compare their views towards the role of writing center pedagogy.
The research question I address in this chapter is: How do the Writing Center administrators, tutors, and international students view the role of the Writing Center?

5.5 Methodology

5.5.1 Research site: MLU’s international profile

Maple Leaves University (MLU)\(^{23}\) is a research-focused national university located in Western Japan. In 2015, the international student population consisted of fewer than 10% of the total study body. According to the 2015 student population statistics, the majority of international students were from Asian countries (91.4%); students from Mainland China comprise half of the international student population, followed by South East Asian countries (see Table 5.1). In line with the general trend of national universities’ having greater international graduate student enrollment when compared to private universities (Huang, 2006), 70% of international students were admitted in graduate-level programs.

Table 5.1 Top 5 Countries of Origin of MLU International Students in 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>688 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>120 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>66 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>48 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>34 (2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{23}\) Pseudonym
According to their internationalization strategy plan developed in 2014, MLU planned to increase the number of international students to 20% of the total student body within the next 10 years, which they hope to achieve by offering more English-medium courses. Given that only a handful of students come from inner-circle English-speaking countries\(^{24}\), one of their strategies is to recruit more students from English-speaking ASEAN countries. Although MLU is gearing towards internationalization through English, Japanese is still the language utilized by the majority of international students, especially those in humanities/social sciences departments. Multiple international student services were offered at MLU such as Japanese language/culture courses, conversation circles, and a peer support system. However, there were no writing support services exclusively for international students, and supervisors and Japanese graduate students were the ones who usually taught academic writing or did the editing work for these students.

5.5.2 The MLU Writing Center

The MLU Writing Center, which opened in 2013, offers both Japanese and English writing consultations for all members of the university. For Japanese writing tutorials, graduate students are recruited from a Japanese academic writing course as tutors. Eleven graduate tutors from various disciplines were working at the Center at the time of data collection. Newly hired tutors participate in tutor training sessions—held by experienced tutors—on the basic procedures of a tutorial (greeting, deciding on focus, diagnosis of writing, closing, and administering surveys), agenda setting of the tutorial, and tutoring strategies. An important part of the tutor training is the Writing Center philosophy. The philosophy posted on the website, modeled on other Japanese writing centers, is translated as follows:

\(^{24}\) The United States (10 students), Canada (2 student), United Kingdom (1 student), Australia (2 students), and New Zealand (2 students).
• The Writing Center tutoring proceeds with one-on-one dialogue with a tutor and collaboratively seeks solutions for making written texts more comprehensible. Instead of instructing, tutors use dialogue to make writers’ aware of their own writing and foster their academic writing skills.

• The Writing Center does not edit texts nor fix them. Instead, we provide support that aims to foster “writers who can write comprehensible academic texts independently.”

International students are frequent visitors at the Writing Center, making up nearly half of the total visitors in the year prior to data collection. Although there were no specific training sessions on how to tutor international students, this issue was occasionally brought up during weekly tutor reflection meetings.

In addition to student writing support, a unique aspect of the Writing Center is that it also offers writing support to faculty members; this is related to MLU’s institutional goal of increasing English-medium research productivity. The Writing Center offers writing consultations on research-related writing (e.g., abstracts and manuscripts), holds research writing workshops, and subsidizes editing fees.

5.5.3 Data collection and participants

The study’s data were drawn from a larger institutional case study examining the language planning and practices of the MLU Writing Center conducted between April and August 2015. In this larger study, I interviewed five university staff involved with the planning...

---

25 There were 562 visits in the academic year 2014 starting from April 2014 to March 2015; 299 domestic students and 263 international students.
and administrating of the MLU Writing Center. I also observed and audio-recorded 12 tutorials and later interviewed tutors and tutees regarding the Writing Center philosophy and institutional roles. To examine the organized language management of international students, semi-structured interviews with five university staff, four Japanese graduate student tutors, and four international graduate students were analyzed.

After contacting Mr. Yamamoto—the associate director of the Writing Center—who agreed to participate in the study, I was introduced to four other eligible participants: the initiator of the Writing Center (Mr. Kawamaru), two Writing Center administrators (Mr. Misawa and Mr. Furuta), and a Writing Center staff member (Mr. Ueda) (the participants’ details appear in the methodology section of Chapter 3). Participants were interviewed individually in Japanese for 60 to 90 minutes. Interview protocols were designed to access participants’ perceptions, beliefs, and opinions regarding the function of the Writing Center in relation to the institutional goal and their understanding of the benefits of the Writing Center philosophy to develop better writers.

For the tutor and tutee participants, I first recruited four international graduate student tutees through snowball sampling. After students made a reservation at the Writing Center for either a 45 or 90-minute tutorial, their respective tutors were asked to participate in the study. Interviews with tutors and tutees were conducted separately within a week of their tutorials, which were audio-recorded and observed by me. For tutors, the aim of the interview was to clarify the intentions behind tutorial practices and the perceived role of the Writing Center as an effective academic support service. For tutees, I asked how they perceived their tutor’s feedback and how they saw the role of the Writing Center in relation to their academic literacy development. The tutorials and interviews were all conducted in Japanese. Table 5.2 displays the
tutor and tutee participant profiles: their names, gender, countries of origin (for tutees), their majors, and level of study (M denotes masters-level; D denotes doctoral-level).

Table 5.2 Tutor and Tutee Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
<th>Case 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutor</td>
<td>Tutor</td>
<td>Tutor</td>
<td>Tutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kosei (Male; Psychology; D1)</td>
<td>Genta (Male; Philosophy of education; D1)</td>
<td>Akira (Female; Education; D1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutee</td>
<td>Shu (China) (Female; Japanese language education; D1)</td>
<td>Mei (China) (Female; Anthropology; M2)</td>
<td>Yuming (Taiwan) (Female; Law; M2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All participants were in the humanities and social sciences. The tutors were native Japanese speakers who were educated in Japan. Three of them were doctoral students and one was a master’s student. For tutees, three were from Mainland China and Yuming was from Taiwan. Only Shu, in Case 1, was a doctoral student, the others were master’s students. All tutees held the Level 1 certification of the Japanese-Language Proficiency Test (JLPT), which is required by most graduate programs at MLU. According to the JLPT website, Level 1 holders can understand Japanese used in a variety of circumstances such as in conversations, news reports, and lectures. In terms of writing, 50%-75% of Level 1 holders can write reports, application letters, emails, and letters in an appropriate register. However, the percentage drops to 25%-50% for more challenging writing tasks such as writing logical, argumentative essays (The Japan Foundation, 2012).

26 Pseudonyms were chosen by me if there were no requests for specific pseudonyms by participants.
All interview data were transcribed and thematically analyzed (Braun & Clarke, 2006). I identified themes based on: (a) administrators’ views of international students; (b) tutors’ perceptions of the Writing Center philosophy and the different strategies they used in their tutorials; and (c) tutees’ reactions to tutors’ advice, strategies, and feedback, and how they saw the role of the tutorial in improving their Japanese academic writing. I compared the themes of all groups (administrators, tutors, and tutees) and identified the similarities and differences with regards to the role of the MLU Writing Center.

5.6 Findings

5.6.1 Administrator’s beliefs: Managing research productivity

The MLU Writing Center was established in the midst of significant reforms intended to enhance MLU’s international status (see Chapter 2). As a national research university, MLU had two major internationalization missions to attain world-class university status: (a) to enhance faculty’s research productivity in English and (a) to increase international student enrollment. These goals were the major motivations behind the establishment of the Writing Center and influenced the language management beliefs regarding student writing.

According to the administrators I interviewed, at MLU, faculty members were primarily responsible for editing undergraduate and graduate students’ theses. On several departmental websites, it is written that students are advised to submit their drafts to their supervisors for a few rounds of revisions. However, as the number of international students increases every year, some participants pointed to the commonly recognized problem that faculty were being increasingly overburdened by editing and instructing students’ writing, and as a result, were often asking Japanese-speaking graduate students to proofread for them. Thus, the Writing Center was
initially proposed as a way to take care of international students’ language issues and to secure more time for faculty members’—and to some extent, graduate students’—research output. Although not officially stated on websites or on internal documents, this rationale was still prevalent amongst some writing center administrators, particularly by Mr. Yamamoto and Mr. Misawa. Referring to both domestic and international students, the associate director, Mr. Yamamoto, who oversees the daily tutorials in the Center, discussed the role of the Writing Center:

For a long time, faculty members have been writing their own manuscripts and editing students’ writing, but we want to fix that. We need to think how to efficiently support faculty and raise the research productivity of the university […] Also, if students were able to write better graduating papers, then we could lessen the burden on the faculty, because faculty members are overwhelmed with editing graduating papers. If we can provide writing support services and alleviate their burden, I think the Writing Center’s value would be recognized. (Mr. Kawamura, Interview5-2)

Mr. Yamamoto emphasized his view that as a university unit, the Writing Center is a vehicle to realize institutional goals and its progress should be assessed accordingly. However, he was not entirely certain about the collaborative philosophy and expressed his view that the Writing Center should be a place where students can learn academic writing skills from their tutors.

The research administrator, Mr. Misawa, also questioned the philosophy’s effects on the improvement of international students’ surface-level writing. Mr. Misawa was aware of the
Writing Center’s non-proofreading policy, and contended that the Writing Center might not have been the best approach to help increase research productivity. As a research administrator, he commented that there should be a proofreading service in addition to the MLU Writing Center to save Japanese Ph.D. students’ and faculty’s time spent on editing:

For fostering academic writing skills, this approach [the non-proofreading approach] is okay, but I think proofreading is necessary for international students. Right now, who is doing the proofreading for them? It’s probably their Japanese peers and so on. But as a university research administrator, we want Japanese Ph.D. students to spend time on their own research, not checking Japanese for international students. That’s why we’re actually looking for a system that could provide Japanese editing, and asking our English editing company [for this information]. (Mr. Misawa, Interview$^{5-3}$)

Although Mr. Misawa acknowledged the Writing Center as a means to foster writing skills, he did not consider it effective enough to completely alleviate the editing work done by university members and suggested outsourcing this work. His suggestion implies the urgency MLU is faced with in enhancing its status as an international research university.
5.6.2 Tutors’ beliefs: Collaborative dialogue\(^{27}\) as a guiding philosophy

Writing Center tutors engage in all steps of the language management cycle: they note particular language issues that are marked in the agenda setting stage with tutees, evaluate them, implement an adjustment plan, and receive feedback from tutees via anonymous post-tutorial feedback forms. In suggesting adjustment plans, the Writing Center philosophy serves as a guideline that helps determine tutors’ tutorial practices. Tutors commented that the philosophy is necessary for the Center to function as an organization, as it directs tutors towards the same pedagogical goal, which is to foster autonomous writers.

In achieving the ultimate goal of the Writing Center—to “develop autonomous writers”—“dialogue” (対話) and “collaboration” (協働) are two important concepts guiding tutorial practices. According to tutors, “dialogue” and “collaboration” enable the tutor and tutee to collaboratively reach a solution, instead of the tutor providing answers. Throughout the interviews, tutors contrasted these concepts with “instruction” (指導) and “editing” (添削), defined as the acts of providing answers and fixing the text without consulting the tutee. For instance, when asked about the importance of the philosophy in his interview, Kosei drew a clear line between what he does and does not do as a tutor:

It’s probably the underlying basis of our work and instinctively practiced. For instance, I always keep in mind “tutoring is one-on-one dialogue” and “collaboratively reaching a solution to improve the writing”, because what we definitely don’t do in the Writing

\(^{27}\) “Collaborative dialogue” is used here as a direct translation of 協働的な対話, which is a phrase taken from MLU’s Writing Center’s philosophy.
Center is providing answers or directing the tutorial one-sidedly. (Kosei, Case 1, Interview 5-4)

The tutors used various strategies to realize dialogue and collaboration in their tutorials. One common strategy was to ask questions or signal that something was wrong and to elicit answers from the tutees, which is one of the minimalist tutoring strategies recommended in traditional writing center guidelines (Brooks, 1991). This was especially clear when tutors pointed out incorrect uses of Japanese particles. Japanese particles are short words (many function as postpositions) that signal grammatical relationships between words in a sentence. Kosei mentioned that although particles are challenging for Japanese language learners—since particles have fixed rules—most tutees notice their mistakes through elicitation.

Another commonly observed tutoring practice was to ask a writer’s intentions before suggesting alternatives. Although this might be a natural interaction for tutors to understand the content, according to some tutors like Yosuke, this act of asking the writer’s intention distinguishes Writing Center tutoring from editing services:

To me, editing is focusing on the writing product, not the process. If it’s editing based on the writer’s intention or meaning, or something that involves collaborative dialogue, or something that can take into consideration the process or what the writer wants to say, I think it’s a better version of editing. (Yosuke, Case 4, Interview 5-5)

The idea that editing or any kind of one-sided act of correcting the written product is usually not favored in writing centers is because it is considered as taking away ownership of
students’ writing (Clark & Healy, 1996). In this study as well, tutors indicated ways to avoid an authoritative role, for instance, asking tutees to read their texts aloud, making them underline the important sentences, consulting a dictionary, or refraining from providing a definite answer.

However, all four tutors noted exceptions and limitations to the philosophy in practice, echoing the reality in other Japanese and American writing centers (e.g., Akita, Doyle, & Omori, 2014; Bell & Elledge, 2008). The tutors expressed the need to engage in certain levels of “editing” or “instruction” depending on the students’ immediate writing needs, proficiency levels, and assignment deadlines. For example, tutors provided direct instructions when they were explaining some strategies for good writing (e.g., how to maintain coherence and organize literature reviews) and when specifically asked a question about grammar or how to improve it. Countering the non-editing policy, Kosei commented that for international students, showing the answer is to some extent necessary:

Tomoyo: Do you try not to edit international students’ writing?
Kosei: Actually, I think there are many cases that editing is inevitable when tutoring international students.

Tomoyo: I see. Compared to domestic students?
Kosei: Yes. Unlike native speakers, when students don’t know how to express themselves in writing and I ask, “how can you fix this?” some of them don’t know how. In that case, exemplifying is the best way. (Kosei, Case 1, Interview 5-6)

According to Kosei, this is often the case with less advanced-level learners who, unlike advanced-level learners, cannot notice their mistakes and require more scaffolding. In these cases,
Kosei said he first explains why it is a mistake and lets the tutee fix similar mistakes in their writing.

Akira also acknowledged exceptions to the philosophy saying that; “It is not always the means to foster independent writers” (Akira, interview). In her tutorials, she determines her strategies based on the tutee’s language proficiency, time constraints, and requests. Sometimes she takes a learner-centered approach, for example, asking a tutee to consult a dictionary, but at other times she takes a directive stance. During her tutorial with Yuming, she took the latter approach in pointing out lexico-grammatical mistakes (e.g., misuse of prepositions, inaccurate vocabulary choice). Sometimes Akira provided a solution right after she pointed out a mistake without much dialogue; she did this to focus on other global issues that needed more attention.

Although Kosei and Akira seemed to understand the need for exceptions, Genta and Yosuke both pointed to some conflicting interests between their tutoring philosophy and students’ immediate needs, an issue common to both domestic and international students:

Our tutees don’t really expect educational outcomes from our tutorials. They just want us to solve their immediate problems, like symptomatic treatment. So sometimes I feel a gap between the philosophy and their presuppositions. It’s not a huge gap but sometimes the tutorials don’t go well because of it. I think that’s one of the challenges of this philosophy. (Genta, Case 3, Interview5-7)

I think there are two forces in play here. For them [students], they can come here to get their writing checked before their deadlines and get answers to their questions.[...] like strategically using our services for their purposes. Like my tutee who wanted me to check
her Japanese […] But while I serve their needs, I also want them to be more self-conscious, if they can. I will of course try to respond to their needs, but somewhere in that process, I want them to improve their skills as a writer. (Yosuke, Case 4, Interview5-8)

In sum, tutors need to take into account multiple factors in planning and implementing their adjustment plans. Although their tutorial practices are primarily shaped by the collaborative philosophy, issues such as their tutees’ immediate needs and deadlines also need to be taken into consideration. Their language management served the dual function of trying to develop better writers and addressing students’ immediate needs. However, this is not an easy task for tutors; as Genta and Yosuke explained, tutors can at times be caught between their philosophy and the reality tutors face during tutorials.

5.6.3 Tutees’ writing center experiences

5.6.3.1 Shu and Mei: “It’s not plain editing”

Shu, a PhD student in Japanese language education, was a frequent visitor to the writing center. For her tutorial, Shu brought her research proposal that was to be read aloud in her research seminar and later submitted to her professor. In her 90-minute session, she received feedback on both higher-order and lower-order issues and also had time to ask about some concepts of cognitive-psychology because Kosei, the tutor, had researched child psychology. In her interview, she said she could improve the readability of her literature review with Kosei’s advice on creating tables of previous studies and improving organization. Reflecting on past tutorials, she found the dialogue with tutors helpful in improving her writing. For example, she noted the difference between editing and writing center tutoring:
Shu: I started visiting the Writing Center to simply get my Japanese proofread, but through talking to the tutor, I was able to find what I want to say the most [in my writing] and understand my weakness in writing. I’ve learned a lot.

Tomoyo: I thought that was interesting.

Shu: Yes. At first I asked senior students or Japanese native speakers to check my writing for my presentations, but then I learned about this place in my academic writing class and decided to visit here before my presentation and to get my writing edited. But it wasn’t just plain editing and I was able to organize my thoughts in my writing. So I think it [the Writing Center] is very good. (Shu, Case 1, Interview 5-9).

When asked about what she meant by editing, she gave an example from her discussions with Kosei on usage of the particle “いわ” (wa) as a topic marker and “が” (ga) as a subject marker:

The tutor (Kosei) edits in consultation with me […] He doesn’t say “this is wrong” or “you shouldn’t use “いわ” like people do in editing, but explains when I should use “いわ” or “が” [for subject marker], depending on what I want to say […] so then it gives me an opportunity to proactively think about things like, “maybe I can better express my meaning using this sentence instead of that”. (Shu, Case 1, Interview 5-10)

Shu’s description of writing center tutoring matched with what Kosei and others said, that tutors take into consideration the writer’s intention when making changes to the text. In addition,
through talking with her tutor, she was able to learn differences in language usage and ways of expressing meaning, which she believed contributes to improving her writing skills.

This view was shared by Mei, a 2nd year master’s student, also from China. In her graduate program, her supervisor usually gave a lot of feedback on her writing, but she was always concerned about the register of her academic writing, which she thought was too colloquial. To her tutorial (45 minutes), Mei brought her research proposal to be submitted to her supervisor. Although she wanted her tutor to fix her colloquial Japanese expressions, Genta could not find any and started to search for other issues in her writing (e.g., organization, reference style, and lengthy sentences). Mei positively evaluated her tutorial, saying her tutor went beyond her request and pointed out how she could improve her proposal. She especially appreciated the tutor pointing out and teaching her the usage of “それに対して” (in contrast to), which she was using irregularly. Mei had similar views to Shu’s with regards to the writing center pedagogy, contrasting it to her friends’ editing:

When my friend checks my writing, they usually correct my grammar. Sometimes they also give comments […] but it’s via email so when compared to dialogue, the tutor’s dialogue is more enlightening because I can notice my mistakes through dialogue and the tutor follows a philosophy that aims to improve writing through dialogue. So that was a good thing [about my tutorial]. There were some unnatural expressions that I wasn’t aware of, like “それに対して [conversely]” and so I was able to learn how to improve them from him through dialogue and by him explaining it on the blackboard. (Mei, Case 2, Interview 5-11)
As much as Genta did not want to see himself as a language teacher, Mei said she learned from his teaching certain Japanese usages on the whiteboard, which resembles a common practice of teachers. Compared to her friends’ editing, which was not always elaborate, dialogue enabled her to learn better ways to convey meaning and highlighted improved Japanese usage.

Shu and Mei positively evaluated their tutorials, contrasting them to their friends’ editing. For them, collaborative dialogue was not so much a means to reach a solution together as it was a learning process through which the tutors pointed out or taught them ways to improve their texts. Both Shu and Mei countered the assumptions that second language writers expect their tutors to proofread their work (Cogie et al., 1999). They saw potential in the Writing Center as a service that goes beyond mere proofreading and as a place to become better Japanese language users, validating the claim that a writing center should actively engage in international students’ language learning processes (Myers, 2003).

5.6.3.2 Yuming: “It was like a Japanese language class”

Yuming came from Taiwan as a double degree program student. Double degree programs allow students to study abroad and receive a degree at both their home university and the host university. As these programs showcase international partnership, Japanese universities are initiating them to raise their international profiles (Yonezawa, 2007). In Yuming’s case, she was expected to complete her coursework in the political science department at MLU for one year, then go back to her university in Taiwan; after returning to Taiwan, she needed to write two master’s theses, one for MLU in Japanese and one for her own university in Chinese.

Yuming’s case points to the insufficient academic support for double degree students who are required to complete their degrees within a compressed time frame (Russell, Dolnicar, & Ayoub, 2007). Although Yuming majored in Japanese at her university in Taiwan, she had less
experience in academic writing, as her undergraduate major focused more on Japanese for business purposes (e.g., writing emails). However, she noted that her supervisor at MLU did not give her much feedback on her writing and she often felt hesitant asking her friends for help. She found her writing center tutorial helpful, as she was concerned whether her Japanese was comprehensible to her supervisor and thought her tutorial was a rare opportunity for learning appropriate academic use of Japanese.

To her tutorial, Yuming brought a book summary assignment for her research seminar. Her request to her tutor, Akira, was to check the naturalness of the Japanese expressions used. Interestingly, several time during the interview, Yuming described her tutorial as similar to a Japanese language class and Akira as a Japanese language teacher:

Tomoyo: What did you think about your tutor?
Yuming: I think I said this before, but she was like a teacher. A Japanese language teacher.
Tomoyo: She was like that? I see. I thought it interesting that you accepted all her advice in your draft.
Yuming: Yes, because it was helpful and her Japanese is absolutely better than mine. (Yuming, Case 3, Interview 5:12)

Yuming was extremely impressed with Akira’s language expertise and ability to explain grammar, which motivated her to accept all the feedback she received. Her trust in Akira’s knowledge and views of her as a teacher confirm the tendency of second language writers’ viewing their tutors as native speakers with linguistic authority (Thonus, 2004) and contradicts the philosophy emphasizing collaboration (Carino, 2003; Trimbur, 1987). The tutorial functioned
as an extracurricular language learning experience for Yuming that she felt could possibly help her in gaining sufficient academic language proficiency in order to complete her thesis.

5.6.3.3  Lin: “I have a time limit”

Similar to Yuming, although Lin majored in Japanese in her undergraduate years in China, she did not learn Japanese academic writing until she took an academic writing class at MLU the year before. Unlike other participants, one unique aspect of Lin was that she was in the midst of writing her master’s thesis due a few months later. In contrast to Mei, Lin’s supervisor seldom gave feedback on her writing or provided assistance, explicitly telling her to find someone to check her Japanese writing. Since she felt hesitant to ask her Japanese friends for proofreading, she started using the Writing Center because it was the only place that she could ask for help without hesitation. She was on her sixth visit to the writing center when she participated in this study.

In contrast to other tutees, Lin had a different view towards the philosophy of dialoguing. For her tutorial, she brought a part of her MA thesis that she planned to present in her research seminar. Her request to her tutor, Yosuke, was to fix her Japanese grammar, which he rejected by saying, “I can’t really fix it [your grammar] just like that, but we can talk it through and find solutions together.” According to Yosuke, he enacted his usual collaborative tutoring approach, by purposefully showing the wrong interpretation and eliciting the correct answer through questioning. Although Lin appreciated Yosuke’s detailed feedback on her particle mistakes, she questioned his style of tutoring, which she described as asking too many questions on the content of her writing. Although Lin did agree with the idea of collaboration and considered it better than copyediting—a process that does not allow her to learn from her
mistakes—she thought the long interactions that Yosuke characterized as doing collaboration were too time-consuming and inefficient when content matters are discussed:

Lin: As a philosophy, I think it’s helpful for writers. Tutors not only fix sentences but also explain why they should be fixed, so tell you the reason as well […] But in my case, I have a time limit.

Tomoyo: I see. […] You mean you didn’t have time because your presentation was on the following day [of the tutorial]?

Lin: Not my presentation but my thesis. I have a deadline […] It’s 80 pages long and it might exceed that.

Tomoyo: So as a philosophy it stands well, but for your master’s thesis, it doesn’t?

Lin: I think writing centers should adjust their tutorials based on tutees’ situation and their needs. (Lin, Case 4, Interview^5-14)

In contrast to Shu and Mei who positively evaluated dialoguing, Lin noted a gap between the philosophy and her immediate writing need, which was to improve surface-level writing and to learn correct Japanese usage. She sometimes considered it a waste of time when tutors try to seek solutions together such as by consulting a dictionary and asking a series of questions. She was concerned how much of her thesis tutors could cover in a single session if they were dialoguing every time they found an unnatural expression or grammar. Nevertheless, she said that she would continue visiting the Writing Center until her thesis was completed.
5.7 Conclusion

Language management often involves conflicting definitions, motivations, and interests of correcting a language problem (Kurata, 2012; Marriott, 2012). This study, which aimed to explore the institutional role of a Japanese writing center from a language management perspective, also found different interests in improving student writing among administrators, tutors, and international students themselves.

The two administrators’ views on the Writing Center’s role in securing more time for faculty’s and advanced-degree students’ research reflected the changing perceptions of the university’s responsibilities for supervising writing. They regarded international students’ lack of Japanese writing skills as a problem that took away faculty’s time to produce more research. Managing student writing for MLU’s research output and productivity thus points to the administrators’ strong interest in socio-economic management (Nekvapil, 2016), or managing language for socio-economic gains. In achieving this goal, administrators were uncertain about the collaborative Writing Center philosophy and were more interested in efficient ways to foster better writers and writing, such as teaching skills and providing editing services.

Although international students’ needs to submit polished writing to their supervisors did match with administrators’ intentions, their perceptions of the Writing Center pointed to a different type of language management need. They considered the Writing Center as an academic space for learning and negotiating academic language that they could not otherwise learn from their busy supervisors or their peers’ editing. Even Lin, who requested direct feedback on her master’s thesis, mentioned that she considered the Writing Center as a place to learn correct Japanese usage. They appreciated their tutors’ instructional role in discerning correctness,
explaining nuances, and pointing out unnatural usage, which improves both their surface-level writing and themselves as better Japanese writers.

Conflicting language management interests could be most clearly identified between administrators and international students on the one hand, and the tutors on the other. Regardless of administrators’ and international students’ interests in improving and learning form, the tutors’ language management was motivated by their own educational interests—to realize the philosophy of collaborative dialogue that de-emphasizes attention to form. This gap is caused by the initial language management interest of writing centers, which was assisting first language writers in a student-centered, non-hierarchical environment during the open admissions period (Boquet, 1999). The writing center philosophy born out of this particular socio-historical background is incongruent with MLU’s context (and many other universities worldwide) in which language learning support for international students is vital in pursuing bold internationalization initiatives. As a result, confirmed by other studies conducted in American writing centers (Blau & Hall, 2002; Myers, 2003; Nakamaru, 2010), the philosophy did not seem to fully reflect tutors’ actual tutorial practices and some tutors were caught between realizing the philosophy and responding to tutees’ immediate language needs.

As Japanese universities increase their international student enrollment and intensify their neoliberal research policies, faculty might find themselves with less time to provide comprehensive feedback on students’ writing, urging students to seek their own sources of writing help. How can writing centers provide support targeted to students’ language needs without becoming copyediting services that might be practical yet unbeneﬁcial for students? From a language management perspective that posits that organized language management should be formulated on the basis of linguistic challenges found within everyday discourses
(Nekvapil, 2009), tutors have a crucial role as language specialists in noting the linguistic and sociolinguistic challenges of students’ writing and informing organized language management in both their own tutorial practices and administrators’ decision-making practices. In this noting stage, organized language management would benefit from including the faculty’s noting processes into the management cycle. As Marriott (2006) showed, faculty members can better inform administrators and tutors of their academic writing requirements and of the linguistic and socio-linguistic challenges their international students face. Although asking writing centers to take care of all issues regarding student writing is unrealistic, and faculty would still need to supervise students on the academic content of their writing, the writing center could improve their organized language management by considering their role in relation to faculty and students’ language management goals. As an important university service for international students, the writing center can take a proactive role in providing effective instruction on language for students’ academic success and academic socialization.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

6.1 Introduction

This dissertation sought to address the academic language planning and educational practices of a writing center at a Japanese university. What led me to conduct this research was the worldwide trend of writing center implementation and the unique case of a growth in writing center popularity in Japan in connection with the socio-economic and political factors of higher education management. I was particularly interested in the higher education trends that led Japanese universities to implement writing centers, including internationalization, English language policies, and student-centered education reforms. Cutting across layers of language policy and planning processes, the aim of this multi-layered case study was to examine how the educational concepts and rationales of a global writing pedagogy were interpreted by administrators and enacted in pedagogical practices. This final chapter will first summarize the key findings in relation to the research questions; provide theoretical, methodological, and practical implications; and end with future directions for research.

6.2 Summary of Key Findings

In this dissertation, two research questions guided my investigations of the language planning process and pedagogical practices of a writing center. Research Question 1, which focused on the language planning stage, was addressed in Chapter 2. The sub-questions of Research Question 2 were addressed in Chapters 3, 4, and 5, each addressing the research gaps (see Chapter 1) identified for JJ (Japanese students with Japanese writing), JE (Japanese students
RQ1. What were the rationales for establishing a writing center at a Japanese university? (Addressed in Chapter 2)

- What macro factors and institutional factors influenced the decision-making process of the university policy planners?
- How did the planners justify the establishment of a writing center in their planning?

RQ2. How is the writing center pedagogy enacted in tutorial practices?

- What type of knowledge and strategies do JJ tutors use in generalist tutoring? How do their students see the role of generalist tutors? (Chapter 3)
- How do JE tutees perceive their non-native tutors’ stances? How might the tutors’ linguistic statuses impact these perceptions? (Chapter 4)
- How do writing center administrators, tutors, and international students view the role of the IJ writing center? (Chapter 5)

6.2.1 Focus 1: Language planning (Chapter 2)

In Chapter 2, which addressed Research Question 1, I explored the policy borrowing and language planning processes of the MLU Writing Center to illuminate the socio-economic and political motivations behind its establishment. I traced the process by analyzing relevant documents (institutional plans, meeting notes, government documents) and interview data with five stakeholders involved in the establishment of the Writing Center. One major factor that
accelerated the initiation of the Writing Center was the pressure of transforming MLU into a world-class university. In efforts to make MLU a world-class university, the key language planners attached multiple roles to the Writing Center to achieve three institutional goals: (a) increasing international student enrollment, (b) raising the quality of education, and (c) boosting research productivity in English. However, I pointed out a paradox in attaining numerical institutional goals with the means of a process-oriented pedagogy, evident in the case of increasing the number of English publications produced by faculty. This economically-motivated language planning characterized by policy borrowing as a “quick fix solution” (Phillips & Ochs, 2003) for institutional problems, points to ways that pedagogy could be implemented more for the sake of a neoliberal university’s performance, accountability, and productivity than for its actual educational value.

As Figure 6.1 illustrates, Chapter 2 identified the macro-layers within which the MLU Writing Center was situated. On the top were circulating discourses of the knowledge economy, world-class universities, and the internationalization of higher education promoted by intergovernmental organizations and world university rankings. On the national-level, the Japanese government appropriated these circulating discourses into their higher education agendas of fostering global leaders/researchers, increasing the enrollment of international students, and strengthening university quality assurance measures. On the institutional level, MLU, as a national university, closely aligned their policies with governmental agendas, creating the MLU Writing Center that could foster competent English writers (through JE tutorials), help international students with their writing (IJ tutorials), and help develop employable graduates (JJ tutorials). The Writing Center was proposed and implemented under these circumstances, with
the writing center philosophy of developing autonomous writers applied to aid in the achievement of multiple higher education agendas.

![Diagram of macro-layers of the MLU Writing Center](image)

**Figure 6.1** The macro-layers of the MLU Writing Center

One of the aims of this research was to situate the writing center implementation in the currency of neoliberal higher education reforms and international competitiveness (Rizvi & Lingard, 2013). Through examining the planning stage, it was evident that internationalizing MLU’s research and education through the means of English was one of the powerful imperatives that pushed forward the idea of establishing a writing center. However, it was also evident from the emphasis of Japanese writing support in the planning stage that the status of Japanese as an academic language was solid. Furthermore, as the humanities/social sciences faculty’s resistance to publish their research in English indicated (see Chapter 2), this status might not be completely replaced by English due to its established role as a primary language for research and education in Japanese secondary and post-secondary education. In this sense, Japanese literacy support at the MLU Writing Center (and perhaps writing centers at other non-Anglophone universities) might be seen as a form of resistance to the hegemony of “English-
ization” and maintenance of the national language. However, in the spirit of promoting multilingualism in higher education (Jenkins, 2014), another important question to consider is the role that a writing center could play in accepting and promoting linguistic diversity on campus, such as supporting students learning other foreign languages (Lape, 2013), rather than limiting its efforts to standardize Japanese and English writing.

6.2.2 Focus 2: Local writing center practices (Chapter 3, 4, 5)

How might these macro-factors impact Writing Center practices and local literacy/research practices at MLU, particularly at the graduate-level? The answer to this question was developed in Chapters 3, 4, and 5 by examining how writing center pedagogy was enacted by tutors in tutorials and how graduate student tutees perceived their tutorials. One important concept, which helps in understanding the impact of the global on local, was the research group (研究室). In this bounded research community, which serves as the root of all MLU research practices, the supervisor teaches research and literacy practices to apprentices comprised of graduate students and fourth-year undergraduate students. Depending on the research group, there are both domestic and international student apprentices, the number of students varying across groups\(^\text{28}\). However, around the time of the incorporation of national universities in 2004, MLU’s institutional planning geared heavily towards government higher education agendas and criteria for world-class universities. As a result, this basic literacy community was confronted by three major internationalizing factors: (a) new forms of education,

\(^{28}\) The number of students in each research group depends on how many students apply to the group each year. For the JJ participants in this study (see Chapter 3), Ken said there were only two graduate students including him, whereas Jun reported that 15 graduate students are in his group.
(b) English language policies, and (c) increasing international student enrollment, as described in Figure 6.2.

Figure 6.2 Internationalizing forces impacting the research group

In summarizing key findings from Chapters 3, 4, and 5, I discuss the role of the Writing Center in relation to these pressing internationalizing forces.

6.2.2.1 Chapter 3: New forms of education (JJ tutorials)

Given the governments’ quality assurance agenda, MLU was in the midst of incorporating innovative forms of education, including its liberal arts curriculum, and facilities that could promote active learning. For graduate students, MLU launched two designated spaces for writing—an academic writing class and a writing center—to help cultivate employable graduates with sound research writing skills. Chapter 3 (JJ tutorials) described the encounter between the Writing Center’s generalist tutorials, a new space for learning how to write, and the discipline-specific literacy practices of research groups. By analyzing audio-recorded data of tutorials and interview data, this chapter pointed to the limits of the neutral, generalist tutor described in writing center theory (Harris, 1992a; North, 1984; Pemberton, 1995) and the need to clearly distinguish tutor roles as a non-expert reader from an expert in the same field. For tutors
who could not draw this clear line, their knowledge sometimes inhibited them from envisioning their tutees’ disciplinary audience (research groups), resulting in feedback that was misaligned with tutees’ research (genre, audience, purpose of writing, research epistemology). As for tutees, they saw the benefit of their generalist tutorials in relation to their supervisory relationships, such as learning linguistic resources that could better convey their meaning (language informant role), discussing writing in a more uncomfortable space (environmental role), and learning new concepts of the writing process (instructional role). This suggests that the Writing Center could complement supervisor mentorships in certain ways, depending on the students’ level of study and writing needs.

6.2.2.2 Chapter 4: English language policies (JE tutorials)

Internationalizing higher education through the medium of English was a pressing issue for MLU, as evident in its urge to promote global research dissemination (see Chapter 2). MLU had also laid out challenging missions for increasing the number of English-medium courses to 50% over the next ten years. Following other leading universities, MLU decided to offer English writing tutorials to improve researchers’ and students’ writing skills. However, one major question regarded the legitimate resources to accomplish this task, in other words, who could contribute to this internationalization of writing. In Chapter 4 (JE tutorials), I was able to examine the role of non-native English speaking tutors—as sanctioned members of the university—in helping graduate students improve their English academic writing. Compared to other peer-to-peer writing tutorials that allow for more flexibility (Storch, 2004; Zhu & Mitchell, 2012), the Writing Center tutors played a complex role as “collaborative experts” who focused primarily on higher-order concerns, impacting their display of expertise and tutee perceptions. Given this fixed role, there needed to be certain conditions for a successful tutorial to take place
from a tutee’s perspective: (a) match of motives with tutor (i.e., improve organization, conference); (b) preference for unique tutoring strategies (i.e., questioning, reading aloud), and (c) a trust in the tutor’s writing expertise coupled with a compromise of accepting their possible limitations in language expertise of their language expertise. These conditions might limit what tutors can do in helping EFL writers who are struggling. The ideas that some tutees had of non-native tutors as writing experts and native speakers as language experts might also undermine non-native speakers’ contributions to improving students’ English writing. At the end of the chapter, I suggested a reconceptualization of writing center philosophy that allows for a flexible tutoring environment where tutors can employ a wide range of mediating strategies (Villamil & de Guerrero, 1996) to help struggling writers.

### 6.2.2.3 Chapter 5: Increasing international student enrollment (IJ tutorials)

Another important task for MLU’s internationalization was increasing international student enrollment. This mission goes together with the expansion of English-medium courses, as MLU’s ten-year plan outlines an increase in international student enrollment to 20% of the total student body, by attracting more English-speaking international students. However, since most international students come to study in MLU’s humanities and social sciences departments, Japanese continues to be an important academic language for communication and academic studies. Given this context, one of the institutional challenges of taking in large numbers of international graduate students was their lack of Japanese academic literacy skills. Employing a language management perspective (Marriott, 2006; Nekvapil, 2016), Chapter 5 (IJ tutorials) pointed to contradicting motives and means to improve international student writing among Writing Center administrators, tutors, and international students themselves. The priority of Writing Center administrators was to alleviate the burden put on supervisors by having to work
on students’ writing, so that they could focus more on their own research. While international
students were also motivated to make their sentence-level writing comprehensible to their
supervisors, their post-tutorial interviews illuminated another important language management
need. They saw the benefit of the Writing Center for learning appropriate academic language
from language experts. Despite these needs, tutors were operating on their own organizational
guideline, which was to actualize the collaborative dialogue stipulated by the MLU Writing
Center philosophy. Because of this misalignment, some tutors were caught in the middle of
providing explicit instruction and serving as a peer tutor, a common dilemma for writing center
tutors (Blau & Hall, 2002; Gillam, Callaway, & Wikoff, 1994). An important implication of
these misalignments is that the collaborative writing center philosophy might be incongruent
with contemporary universities in which language support is crucial in pursing bold
internationalization initiatives. Rather than collaborative peers, tutors could play a crucial role as
language specialists in helping students’ academic socialization processes and in noting the
linguistic/sociolinguistic problems with students’ writing to inform the language management
practices of writing centers and other university services.

6.3 Contributions

6.3.1 Theoretical implications

Chapter 2 demonstrated how the conceptual framework of policy borrowing could be
used in analyzing language policy and planning (LPP) processes. Although some have written
about the popularity of certain ‘West’-based language teaching methods in non-Anglophone
countries (Butler, 2011; Ramanathan, 2005; Smit & Dafouz, 2012), the act of policy borrowing
itself has not been as frequently discussed or theorized in the field\textsuperscript{29}. By tracing policy borrowing processes, researchers could better illuminate the politics involved in the LPP process, such as why a particular policy was favored over others, who advocated it, and which aspect of the policy gained attention. In Chapter 2, by examining the power dynamics and economic motivations behind policy borrowing, I was able to illuminate the unique interactions between the global writing pedagogy, circulating discourses of a world-class university, and local language planners.

Second, this study suggests an expansion of the notion of “policy” in LPP research. The dominant topic of LPP research in university settings has been on medium of instruction policies and multilingual education (Doiz, Lasagabaster, & Sierra, 2012; Hamid, Nguyen, & Baldauf, 2013; Tollefson & Tsui, 2004). More recently, language policies that designate English as the language of scholarly publication have gained attention (Feng, Beckett, & Huang, 2013; Lee & Lee, 2013). Including educational concepts as policy enactments that are globally circulated and implemented at universities worldwide can help expand the research focus of LPP. In particular, universal educational concepts such as learner autonomy and student-centered learning are frequently implemented in university language education curricula (Altinyelken, 2011; Benson, 2007; Phan & Hamid, 2016) and need further examination. This dissertation was an attempt to examine how the educational concepts of the writing center were applied in university language planning. As a result, this study shed light on how the philosophy of “developing autonomous

\textsuperscript{29} Two exceptions are Paran (2013) and Byram and Parmenter (2012) who use the framework of policy borrowing in analyzing the global implementation Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) and Common European Framework and Reference (CEFR).
writers” caught the attention of language planners, and was used in accomplishing institutional missions.

6.3.2 Methodological implications

Much of the LPP research has focused on teachers’ actualizations of policy in pedagogy (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007; Hornberger & Vaish, 2009; Hult, 2012; Johnson, 2010; Ramanathan, 2005), while rarely including students. In Chapters 3, 4, and 5, I found that what students (in this case, tutees) brought to the Writing Center—their writings, requests for tutors, and displays of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with tutorials—were the last important pieces needed to cut through the multi-layered LPP onion (Ricento & Hornberger, 1996), which allowed me to better analyze the macro-micro connections of Writing Center’s implementation. By including students as participants, I was able to see how particular aspects of the Writing Center philosophy were taken up by students and evaluated against their writing needs for each type of tutorial (the micro-context). In Figure 6.3, which represents the layers of the LPP onion, I illustrate three significant writing center practices (“NNES tutors”, “collaborative dialogue”, “generalist tutoring”) that were confronted by students’ literacy practices/beliefs (“beliefs of English language learning”, “language learning needs”, and “disciplinary practices”) during the three tutorials, in the bottom part of the figure. For most tutees in JE tutorials, tutees’ beliefs of how an NNES tutor can improve their English writing impacted the tutorial outcome in different ways. For IJ tutorials, international students’ language learning needs seemed to be incongruent with the Writing Center philosophy of collaborative dialogue. Lastly, for JJ tutorials, students’ disciplinary literacy practices, including genre of writing, supervisor relationships, and research principles, complicated the role of a neutral, generalist tutor unfamiliar with these practices.
Since the MLU Writing Center was set up as a vehicle to realize world-class university goals—fostering global leaders/researchers, increasing the enrollment of international students, and developing employable graduates—these local literacy practices/beliefs that students brought to the writing center could be considered as possible challenges to realizing the macro policy goals of internationalizing universities in a Japanese context.

Figure 6.3 The macro-micro connections of the Writing Center implementation

6.3.3 Practical implications

Finally, this research has implications for the decision-making processes of non-Western universities in initiating appropriate first, second, and foreign language writing support/academic support services. A crucial implication drawn from this study is the role of tutors in university language policy and planning. As those who confront these realities in everyday writing center
practices, tutors are responsible literacy educators who could actively work together with administrators in finding a middle space between top-down policies and local writing needs. This study showed that MLU’s literacy realities challenged the ideal literacy situations envisioned by top-down policies. Some of these realities were international students’ language learning needs, discipline-specific literacy practices, and the dominant status of Japanese as a means of learning, teaching, and doing research. Policy making from the ground up that takes these realities into account is important to evaluate, formulate, and implement policies that are beneficial for diverse writers. By including tutee participants and multiple sources of data, this study shed light on hard-to-see issues that could better inform tutoring practices. Given the findings from Chapters 3, 4, and 5, I list pedagogical implications for the three tutorial practices (JJ, JE, IJ) in the following sections.

6.3.3.1 JJ tutorials (Support for vernacular language writing)

Among the three tutorial types, JJ tutorials best represented the tenets of writing center pedagogy. Discussing first language writing in a shared language allowed for a more meaning-focused tutorial than the JE or IJ tutorials that dealt with foreign language writing and involved more form-focused discussions. It is also interesting to note that some tutees’ perceptions aligned with the values of a generalist tutorial suggested by early writing center studies (Harris, 1992a; Norgaard, 1999; Pemberton, 1997), as seen in Tadashi’s comment that praised the safe place that his tutor provided. The congruence might be due to the fact that writing centers were originally advocated by composition scholars who had expertise in first language writing instruction (Boquet, 1999; Carino, 1996).

However, generalist tutoring alone cannot help students become full-fledged members in their disciplinary communities. Since each community has its own set of literacy practices, it is a
challenging task for tutors to approximate their tutees’ disciplinary audience. What could lead to a successful generalist tutorial is to clearly distinguish a tutor’s role from specialist tutoring by supervisors or more experienced members in the field. It is also important to inform faculty and students of these roles so that they can more effectively use writing center services.

For tutor training, discussions on the specific roles of the tutor (what they can and cannot do) and strategies to approach unfamiliar writing are indispensable for successful tutoring (Summers, 2016). An important mindset suggested in Chapter 3, was to maintain a distance from the tutees’ disciplinary audience. In order to do this, tutors would benefit from having meta-genre awareness, or a willingness to detect information about the writing that tutees bring to a tutorial. I list the following factors that tutors could gather information on:

• Audience: For whom do students typically write?
• Genre: What genres are common in their courses?
• Structure: What are the common structures of their papers?
• Research: What are some common features of the discipline’s research?

These types of questions could serve as a platform for discussing disciplinary-specific writing with tutees and inform tutorial practices.

6.3.3.2 JE tutorials (Support for writers of English as a foreign language)

Despite a few scholars’ calls for hiring more non-native tutors (Babcock & Thonus, 2012; Grimm, 2009), NNES tutors remain a minority population in North American writing centers and they have not been the focus of as much research as NES tutors. The commonality of non-native tutors in this study and in some American writing centers (Chang, 2011; Wablstrom,
2013) was the negative self-perception of their linguistic statuses in comparison to native speakers. Tutor training that questions this native versus non-native dichotomy could contribute to building tutors’ self-confidence. Several scholars have written about second language teacher education and noted ways to question the native speaker model (Brutt-Griffler & Samimy, 1999, 2001; Ilieva, 2010; Reis, 2011). In particular, critical reflections would be beneficial not just for empowering non-native tutors and forming their professional identities, but in identifying the tools and resources that could make them more confident tutors, such as the use of corpora and dictionaries (Liu, 2010). In turn, these tools could also be shared with tutees.

**6.3.3.3 IJ tutorials (International student support)**

In order to support second language writers’ academic language development, I join others in suggesting that writing center practitioners draw from second language writing research (Rafoth, 2015; Severino & Deifell, 2011; Williams & Severino, 2004). There is an important body of research on the types and effects of feedback in second language writing (e.g., Bitchener & Ferris, 2012; Ferris, 2011), which could inform tutors’ feedback practices. Dana Ferris’s work on the treatment of error in second language writing would be a place to start. In Ferris (2015), she notes principles to effectively help improve students’ writing accuracy. Some relevant points are providing explicit metalinguistic feedback, finding treatable patterns of error, strategy training on students finding their own errors, and constantly following up on their learning processes. In tutor training sessions, special attention to tutoring international students is essential (Rafoth, 2015). To provide these explicit instructions on language, tutors are required to be familiar with grammatical rules and meta-linguistic resources. Tutors could create a common error checklist gathered from their tutorials with international students and share them in tutor training sessions. Although the writing center is not exclusively a place where international
students learn a target language such as in a grammar class or a second language writing class, tutors would be better able to assist students with their writing if they were prepared to serve as language informants.

6.4 Limitations and Future Directions for Research

There are some limitations that can be pointed out in this study. This dissertation could not answer a fundamental question in writing center studies, which was the effectiveness and role of writing center tutorials on students’ writing development. Past studies attempted to assess the effectiveness of writing centers by collecting student satisfaction surveys after writing center visits, measuring correlations between writing center visits and grades, and comparing improvements in subsequent drafts (Bell, 2000, 2002; Carino & Enders, 2001; Kiedaisch & Dinitz, 1991; Leff, 1997; Lerner, 1997; Newmann, 1999; Niller, 2005; Williams, 2004). However, scholars commonly note that assessing writing center tutorials is a difficult task, especially when researchers seek immediate effects.

Several conditions limited this study to examine students’ writing development. First, only one tutorial for each tutor-tutee dyad was studied. This single-observation-interview approach for each tutorial is a limitation of this study and tutee participants’ perceptions might have changed had they returned to the Writing Center for another consultation. Both tutors and tutees might also have been more at ease with me observing and audio-recording their tutorials, had there been more opportunities to build rapport and trust over a couple of interviews. However, my decision was in part, based on the nature of writing center tutorials. Writing center tutorials are typically one-shot opportunities for tutors to demonstrate their ability to help writers; if writers think tutors cannot help them, they might never come back. Indeed, one tutee
expressed that he would never use the Center again, while several others said it would depend on how busy they were in the future.

Second, access to the research site only permitted me to stay in the field for one term (April to July). My tutee participants might have brought other types of writing had I stayed for a whole academic year (April to March). Notably, graduate students typically start writing their dissertations in their second term. Tutorials on dissertation writing may have yielded different interactions and perceptions than course assignments, due to its high-stakes nature (Aitchison & Lee, 2006). To address these two limitations, longitudinal case studies that follow a number of students’ learning trajectories through writing centers are needed to paint a more comprehensive picture of the role of writing centers on improving writing (Wardle & Roozen, 2012). This could be done by targeting students who are already regular visitors of the writing center.

Another limitation of this research was the exclusion of a particular student population that would likely to increase in non-Anglophone universities—English-speaking international students with limited proficiency in the local language. As a strategy to increase international student enrollment, non-English speaking universities often recruit international students without requiring a high proficiency in the local language through English-medium programs (Doiz, Lasagabaster, & Sierra, 2011; Huang, 2006; Rivers, 2010; Tsuneyoshi, 2005). In Japan, this student population is expected to increase due to the government’s internationalization policies and the universities’ urgency to fill the student quota with international students to deal with the shrinking domestic student population. I was not aware that MLU had many of these students until I read a survey conducted by MLU’s international student office. According to this survey conducted in 2014, among 608 international student respondents, 339 students use English for their academic studies and 286 students communicate with their supervisors in English,
particularly in the science departments. However, it was interesting that the Writing Center services were not tailored to these students, probably because the language used for tutoring was Japanese. Future research could consider the literacy practices of these English-speaking international students who have less proficiency in the local language as well as their interactions with faculty and students.

Although this study has several limitations and room for improvement, this study is novel in that it applied a policy perspective to understand the socio-political/economic backgrounds of writing centers and their impacts to local practices. I would like to continue pursuing the question of why certain policies and pedagogies are globalized in international higher education settings and refine my methodology so that I could better understand their impacts on local practices. My goal in this research journey will be to keep providing a “new lens” for educators to view taken-for-granted practices.
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Appendices

Appendix A Third Party Recruitment Letter

A.1 English Version

Printed on official Department of Language and Literacy Education letterhead

Dear [Name],

This letter is a request for your cooperation with Tomoyo Okuda’s doctoral research project, “A Case Study of a Writing Center at an Internationalized University in Japan” at [Name of University] Writing Center. Although I am the principal investigator of the study, Tomoyo Okuda will be conducting the research at your site. A description is outlined in the sections below.

The Study

In recent years, the number of Japanese universities that have implemented writing centers, a writing support service originated in the United States, is increasing. Focusing on a writing center that have adopted the original writing center philosophy, this study aims to examine the role of writing centers in an internationalized Japanese university. The following are the questions examined throughout this study.

1. How is a writing center at a Japanese university conceptualized within its institutional goal?
2. How does the writing center philosophy shape the tutor-student interactions in the tutorials?
3. What are the consequences of the tutorial interactions in terms of students’ writing and perceptions of academic literacy practices at their university?

We would appreciate your cooperation in recruiting the following two groups of participants for this study.

Participant group 1: Members of the writing center administrative team
Tomoyo would like to conduct a 30 minute-1 hour interview with 3 to 5 university staff from those who have been involved in the implementation of the writing center, who are the current writing center director/sub-director, and who are the university administrators in charge of the writing center administration. The purpose of this interview is to understand how the writing center was established and how it is situated in the university’s institutional plan.

Participant group 2: The staff in charge of tutor training, student participants and their respective tutors
For the purpose of examining the conversation of writing center tutorials and the type of changes students make after their tutorials with tutors, Tomoyo plans to take the following steps:

1. In order to attain information of the tutor’s training in the writing center philosophy, she would like to participate in your tutor training sessions and conduct a 30 minute-1 hour interview with the staff who leads the training.
2. She will recruit 4 students from each of the following 3 groups (12 participants in total): (a) Japanese students who need assistance with Japanese writing, (b) Japanese students who need assistance with English writing, and (c) international students who need assistance with Japanese writing. Furthermore, participants should fulfill these criteria:
   • those who are either an undergraduate/graduate student
   • those seek assistance on a written draft of an academic paper (written assignment, manuscript, thesis/dissertation proposal, etc.) due within the term

3. She will observe and audio-record the tutorials, then collect the drafts that the participants brought for consultation.

4. After the tutorial, she will conduct a 30-minute-1 hour interview with the tutor. (If the participant returned to the writing center for another consultation on the same academic paper, she will repeat steps 3 and 4).

5. Once the student participant submitted their papers, she will conduct a 30 minute-1 hour interview with them as well as collect the final draft of their papers that students worked on with their tutors).

**Duration of Research**

All the interviews, observation of tutorials, and audio-recording of tutorials will be conducted during Tomoyo’s visit at the [Name of University] Writing Center from April to August 2015. She will provide a summary of the research results to all participants when the study is completed. The participants’ decision whether or not to participate in this study is voluntary.

**Steps for Recruiting Participants**

If you agree to cooperate with the study, please kindly send us a letter as an email attachment addressing that you agree to support this research at your institution, including the recruitment of participants. The letter is needed for this study to be reviewed and approved by the Behavioural Research Ethics Board (BREB) at the University of British Columbia. Due to the requirement by the BREB, please use the letterhead of your institution.

Once the study is approved by the BREB, Tomoyo will electronically send invitation letters and consent forms for you to distribute to potential participants from the writing center administrative team and the staff in charge of tutor training. The following are suggestions regarding the procedures in recruiting student participants and their tutors:

• Leave a stack of my invitation letters for students to take home at the writing center. If possible, post the invitation letter on a notice board at the writing center.
• Distribute the invitation letters to those who finished tutorials at the writing center.

Tomoyo will then distribute a consent form to students who show interest in participating in the research. After the student participant schedules an appointment at the writing center, she will distribute the invitation letter and consent form to their respective tutors.

**Confidentiality**

All of the information that participants share will be kept strictly confidential. No names or identifying information whatsoever will be used on copies of individual files and recordings, and you and your institution will not be identified by name in any reports in the completed study. The
files for this research will be kept for five years, as per UBC policy, in a locked filing cabinet in my office as well as password-protected files known only to Tomoyo and myself. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us. Thank you very much for your time and kind consideration.

Sincerely,
Principal Investigator:
Ryuko Kubota
Professor, Department of Language and Literacy Education
Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia
Phone: XXX-XXX-XXX
Fax: XXX-XXX-XXX
email: XXX

Doctoral student conducting research:
Tomoyo Okuda
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Language and Literacy Education
Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia
email: XXX
A.2  Japanese Version

Printed on official Department of Language and Literacy Education letterhead

大学名ライティングセンター長  [名前] 様

研究調査の実施及び調査対象者募集への協力のお願い

拝啓 いよいよご清栄のこととお喜び申し上げます。この度は奥田朋世の博士論文研究「国際化された大学におけるライティングセンターのケーススタディー」に関して、大学名ライティングセンターにおける研究調査の実施及び本研究の調査対象者募集についてご協力下さいますよう、どうぞよろしくお願い致します。なお、この研究の主任（Principal Investigator）は私が勤めますが、貴大学での研究はすべて奥田が行います。

研究の趣旨
現在、日本の大学においてライティングセンターの設置が増えてきています。そのほとんどはアメリアのライティングセンター理念に沿ったものです。本研究は、日本の大学独自のライティングセンターの機能を探るため、以下の3つの問いを探求します。

問1．どのようにライティングセンターが貴大学の構想計画に位置付けられているか。また、ライティングセンターの理念がなぜ貴大学の教育において大切と考えられているか。

問2．ライティングセンターのチュートリアルにおいて、どのようなライティングセンター理念に沿った対話が繰り広げられているか。

問3．チュートリアルの利用者はどのようにこのサービスを受け止め、それを自身の文章に反映させるか。

つきましては、以下の二つのグループの研究調査対象者募集にご協力お願い申し上げます。

研究調査対象者1：ライティングセンター運営委員会の方々
ライティングセンターが設立された経緯や大学の構想計画において果たす役割を探るために、設立構想当時からセンターの発案に携わった教職員、現在センター運営に関わっているしゃる教職員（例：センター長、副センター長様）、大学の教育担当の方・研究企画室の方など3～5名に、インタビューを行いたいと考えております。インタビューの所用時間は30分から1時間程度を予定しております。上記の条件に該当する方々をご紹介いただけますようお願いします。
研究調査対象者2：チューター養成ご担当の教職員、ライティングセンター利用者及びチューター
ライティングセンター利用者がチューターとどのような会話をするか、また、利用者がどのように指導を受け止め、それを自身の文章に反映させるかを探るために、以下の手順を考えております。

1）ライティングセンターのチュートリアルを見学し、チューターにインタビューを行うのにあたり、チューターがどのようなトレーニングを受けてきたかを知るため、事前にチューター研修に参加させていただき、チューター研修に使用される資料も拝見します。トレーニングを行う教職員の方にインタビューを行います（所用時間：約30分間〜1時間）。

2）日本語のライティングのチュートリアルを希望する日本人学生、英語のライティングのチュートリアルを希望する日本人学生、第二言語としての日本語ライティングのチュートリアルを希望する留学生を4人ずつ、計12人募集します。以下の条件を満たす利用者を募集したいと考えております。

- 学部生または大学院生であること
- 学期中に提出する学術文章（レポート、論文、卒業・修士論文計画書など）の下書きに関しての相談がある人

3）チュートリアルを見学、録音します。その後、利用者の下書きのコピーを収集します。

4）チュートリアルの後に、チューターへインタビュー（所用時間：約30分間〜1時間）をします。（利用者が同じ学術文章に関して再度ライティングセンターを訪れる場合、3）と4）を繰り返します。）

5）利用者が学術文章を提出した後に利用者にインタビュー（所用時間：約30分間〜1時間）を行い、提出した学術文章（チューターの指導を受けて修正したもの）を見せてもらいます。

研究実施期間
すべてのインタビュー、チュートリアル見学、録音は奥田が貴大学への訪問時に行なう予定です。現在、訪問の日程は2015年4月から8月を予定しております。本研究完了後、研究結果の要旨を差し上げます。また、本研究に参加するか否かは調査対象者の任意によります。

研究調査対象者募集の手順
本研究は、調査対象者を保護するためのブリティッシュ・コロンビア大学の研究審査機関の審査を受ける必要があります。そして、その審査申請には、本研究調査にご協力下さるライティングセンター代表者の方の承諾書が必要です。もしもご協力頂けるようでしたら、お手数をおかけして大変恐縮ですが、調査対象者募集を含め、本研究調査にご協力下さる旨を記した承諾書をお書き頂き、私と奥田宛に電子メールの添付書類として送って頂けないでしょうか。なお、お手紙は、その研究審査機関の規定により、貴大学の便箋にお書き下さいますよう、お願い致します。一旦、その研究審査を通過しましたら、ご紹介いただいたライティングセンター運営メンバー及びチューター養成ご担当の教職員の方々宛に研究協力願いと同意書を奥田よりメールにてお送り致します。チューター及び利用者の調査対象者募集及び研究協力願いと同意書の配布方法につきましては、現在以下のような募集方法を考えております。

• ライティングセンターに研究協力願いのチラシを置かせていただく。可能であれば、張り紙もする。興味のある学生は、奥田にメールを送るよう、チラシに記載しておく。

• チュートリアルが終わった利用者に研究協力願いのチラシを配布する。

研究協力願いを読み、興味もってくれた学生に同意書を渡します。利用者のチューターが決まり次第、チューターにも研究の説明をし、同意書を渡します。

個人情報の保護・データの管理について
調査対象者の個人情報は決して公開することはありません。この研究調査の記録や報告書の中では、調査対象者名や大学名などすべての固有名詞に仮の名前を使います。この研究の記録は、ブリティッシュ・コロンビア大学の規定により、私と奥田しかアクセスできないパスワードや鍵で管理されたファイルに私の大学内のオフィスに5年間保管したあと、破棄します。

もしも質問や懸念事項などございましたら、以下の方へお問い合わせ下さい。ご多忙中のところお手数をおかけして誠に恐縮ですが、本研究の趣旨をご理解頂き、ご協力下さいますよう、どうぞよろしくお願い申し上げます。

敬具
平成27年1月22日

研究統括者
久保田竜子
Professor, Department of Language and Literacy
Education
Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia
Phone: XXX-XXX-XXX
Fax: XXX-XXX-XXX
email: XXX

研究調査実施者
奥田朋世
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Language and Literacy Education
Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia
email: XXX
Appendix B Invitation Letter for Writing Center Administrators

B.1 English Version

Printed on official Department of Language and Literacy Education letterhead

Invitation Letter for Writing Center Administrators

My name is Tomoyo Okuda and I am a PhD candidate in the Department of Language and Literacy Education at the University of British Columbia, Canada.

I am writing to ask you to participate in my doctoral dissertation research, Tomoyo Okuda’s doctoral research project, “A Case Study of a Writing Center at an Internationalized University in Japan” at [Name of University] Writing Center. You are being invited to take part in this study because you are one of the following: a university staff who has been involved in the implementation of the Writing Center, the current Writing Center director/sub-director, or the university administrators in charge of the Writing Center administration.

The Study

In recent years, the number of Japanese universities that have implemented writing centers, a writing support service originated in the United States, is increasing. Focusing on a writing center that have adopted the original writing center philosophy, this study aims to examine the role of writing centers in an internationalized Japanese university. The following are the questions examined throughout this study.

(1) How is a writing center at a Japanese university conceptualized within its institutional goal?

(2) How does the Writing Center philosophy shape the tutor-student interactions in the tutorials?

(3) What are the consequences of the tutorial interactions in terms of students’ writing and perceptions of academic literacy practices at their university?

Specifics of the Interview

In order to examine question (1), I would like to conduct an individual interview with you about the process of the Writing Center implementation, your opinions on the Writing Center’s contribution in relation to university’s institutional goal, and benefits to students’ learning.

Procedure of the Interview

The interview will take place at your convenience during my visit at your university between April to August. The interview will last about 30 minutes to an hour. Please review the attached consent form for more information about the study and the interview process.

If you are willing to participate in an interview, please contact the researcher via email. In your email, please indicate your preferred date and time of the interview. If you have any questions,
please do not hesitate to contact the researcher at the email addresses and phone numbers listed below.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Researcher:
Tomoyo Okuda
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Language and Literacy Education
Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia
email: XXX

Principal Investigator:
Ryuko Kubota
Professor, Department of Language and Literacy Education
Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia
Phone: XXX-XXX-XXXX
Fax: XXX-XXX-XXXX
email: XXX
B.2 Japanese Version

Printed on official Department of Language and Literacy Education letterhead

博士論文研究聞き取り調査へのご協力のお願い（教職員用）

拝啓 いよいよご清栄のこととお喜び申し上げます。カナダのブリティッシュ・コロンビア大学言語教育学部博士後期課程在籍の奥田朋世と申します。

現在、[大学名]において「国際化された大学におけるライティングセンターのケーススタディー」と題した博士論文研究に取り組んでおります。つきましては、ライティングセンターが設立された経緯や大学の構想計画において果たす役割を探るために、設立構想当時からセンターの発案に携わった教職員、現在センター運営に関わっていらっしゃる教職員、大学の教育担当の方・研究企画室の方などを対象に聞き取り調査を行いたく存じます。

研究の趣旨
現在、日本の大学においてライティングセンターの設置が増えてきています。そのほとんどはアメリカのライティングセンター理念に沿ったものです。本研究は、[大学名]を一例として日本の大学独自のライティングセンターの機能を探るため、以下の3つの課題を探求します。

問1．ライティングセンターが貴大学の構想計画の中で、どのように位置付けられているのか。
問2．ライティングセンターのチュートリアルにおいて、ライティングセンター理念に沿った対話がどのように繰り広げられているのか。
問3．チュートリアルの利用者はどのようにこのサービスを受け止め、それを自身の文章に反映させているのか。

聞き取り調査の内容
問1を探るために聞き取り調査を行います。質問内容は、ライティングセンターが設立された経緯、ライティングセンター及びライティングセンター理念が貴大学の構想計画や学生の学びに果たす役割などです。

聞き取り調査の流れ
本聞き取り調査は、調査実施者が貴大学に研究に伺う4月から8月までの間で、ご都合のいい日時に行いたいと思います。時間は30分から1時間程度を予定しております。なお、聞き取り調査の詳細につきましては、添付の同意書をご覧下さい。ご協力頂けるようでしたら、お手数ですが、電子メールにてご回答をお願い致します。その際にはインタビューに応じて頂ける日時をご指定ください。また本研究についてご質問等ございましたら、以下の調査実施者連絡先までご遠慮なくお問い合わせ下さい。
学期中でお忙しいところ大変恐縮ですが、本研究の趣旨をご理解頂き、聞き取り調査へのご協力をご検討頂けますよう、どうぞよろしくお願い申し上げます。

敬具

研究調査実施者
奥田朋世
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Language and Literacy Education
Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia
email: XXX

研究統括者
久保田竜子
Professor, Department of Language and Literacy Education
Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia
Phone: XXX-XXX-XXXX
Fax: XXX-XXX-XXXX
email: XXXX
Appendix C  Consent Form for Writing Center Administrators

C.1  English Version

Printed on official Department of Language and Literacy Education letterhead

Consent Form (For Writing Center Administrators)

Research Project Title: A Case Study of a Writing Center at an Internationalized University in Japan

This consent form explains the research project and requests your participation. Please read this form to consider your participation in the study, and if you have any questions, please contact the researcher and/or the principal investigator at the email addresses and phone numbers listed below.

Researcher: Tomoyo Okuda
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Language and Literacy Education
Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia
email: XXXX

Principal Investigator: Ryuko Kubota
Professor, Department of Language and Literacy Education
Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia
Phone: XXX-XXX-XXXX
email: XXXX

Purpose of the Study

In recent years, the number of Japanese universities that have implemented writing centers, a writing support service originated in the United States, is increasing. Focusing on a writing center that has adopted the original writing center philosophy, this study aims to examine the role of writing centers in an internationalized Japanese university.

In order to understand the process of the Writing Center implementation and functions of the Writing Center in relation to university’s institutional goal, I would like to conduct individual interviews with the university staff who has been involved in the implementation of the Writing Center, the current Writing Center director/sub-director, and the university administrators in charge of the Writing Center administration.

Research Procedure

The individual interview with the researcher will take place at your convenience during my visit at your university between April to August. The interview will last about 30 minutes to an hour and will conducted in either Japanese or English.
With your permission, the interview will be digitally recorded and transcribed to help with the data analysis process. If you consent to participate in the interview but do not wish to have the interview recorded, the interview will not be recorded. You have the right to refuse to answer any questions.

You may also be contacted for follow-up questions seeking additional information or clarification regarding the interview.

**Study Results**

The results of this study might be reported in Tomoyo Okuda’s graduate thesis and may also be published in journal articles and books.

**Benefits/Risks of the Study**

There is no monetary incentive for participating in this study. When this study is completed, you will receive a summary of the research results. There are no known risks associated with participating in the study.

**Measures to Maintain Confidentiality**

All of the information that participants share will be kept strictly confidential. No names or identifying information whatsoever will be used on copies of individual files and recordings, and you and your institution will not be identified by name in any reports in the completed study. The files for this research will be kept for five years, as per UBC policy, in a locked filing cabinet in the principal investigator’s UBC office as well as password-protected files known only to the researcher and principal investigator.

**Contact for concerns about the rights of research subjects**

If you have any concerns about your treatment or rights as a research participant, you may contact the Research Subject Information Line in the UBC Office of Research Services at (604) 822-8598 or at RSIL@ors.ubc.ca.

**Consent**

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You may end and/or withdraw at any time and without giving any reasons for your decision and without any consequences.

Your signature below indicates that you have received a copy of this consent form for your own records and that you consent to participate in this study.

_________________________   ________________________    _________________
Participant’s Signature       Printed name       Date
C.2 Japanese Version

Printed on official Department of Language and Literacy Education letterhead

同意書（教職員用）

国際化された大学におけるライティングセンターのケーススタディー

本同意書は、本研究「国際化された大学におけるライティングセンターのケーススタディー」について説明し、聞き取り調査への参加をお願いするものです。ご一読の上、ご質問等ございましたら、下記の研究調査実施者もしくは研究統括者までお問い合わせ下さいますよう、宜しくお願い致します。

研究調査実施者： 奥田朋世
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Language and Literacy Education
Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia
email: XXXX

研究統括者： 久保田竜子
Professor, Department of Language and Literacy Education
Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia
Phone: XXX-XXX-XXXX
Fax: XXX-XXX-XXXX
email: XXXX

本研究調査の目的
現在、日本の大学においてライティングセンターの設置が増えてきています。そのほとんどはアメリカのライティングセンター理念に沿ったものです。本研究は[大学名]大学を一例として日本の大学独自のライティングセンターの機能を探ることを目的としています。

つきましては、ライティングセンターが設立された経緯や大学の構想計画において果たす役割を探るために、設立構想当時からセンターの発案に携わった教職員、現在センター運営に関わっていらっしゃる教職員、大学の教育担当の方・研究企画室の方などを対象に聞き取り調査を行いたく存じます。質問内容は、ライティングセンターが設立された経緯、ライティングセンター及びライティングセンター理念が貴大学の構想計画や学生の学びに果たす役割などです。

調査手順
本聞き取り調査は、調査実施者が貴大学に研究に伺う4月から8月までの間で、ご指定する日時に行なわれます。時間は30分から1時間程度を予定しております。調査実施者との一対一のインタビュー形式で、使用言語は日本語か英語のどちらかを指定して頂きます。

インタビューは、ご承諾の上、データ分析のためにデジタル録音され、文字に起こされます。インタビューの録音を望まれない場合は、録音はいたしません。質問への回答を拒否したり、インタビュー終了後でも研究への参加を取り消すことができます。その場合、理由を説明する必要はありませんし、その決断によって何か不利なことが生じることもありません。

また、ご承諾の上、インタビュー終了後、内容を再度確認、追加質問等をさせて頂くために、調査実施者から電子メールにより連絡をさせて頂くことがあろうかもしれません。

研究調査の発表
調査終了後、本研究の内容は研究調査実施者の博士論文にて出版され、今後、学術論文や学会にて発表する予定です。

本調査へ参加することの利点およびリスク
本聞き取り調査対象者への金銭的な報酬はありませんが、研究終了後、研究結果の要旨をお送りします。また、本聞き取り調査参加に伴って起こると考えられるリスクはありません。

秘密保持・匿名性に関して
調査対象者の個人情報は決して公開することはありません。この研究調査の記録や報告書の中では、調査対象者名や大学名などすべての固有名詞に仮の名前を使います。この研究の記録は、ブリティッシュ・コロンビア大学の規定により、研究統括者と研究実施者しかアクセスできないパスワードや鍵で管理されたファイルに研究統括者の大学内のオフィスに5年間保管したあと、破棄します。

研究調査対象者の権利に関する問い合わせ先
研究調査対象者としての扱われ方や権利に関してご質問がある場合は、ブリティッシュ・コロンビア大学の研究サービスオフィスの研究対象者情報ライン（電話：604-822-8598、電子メール：RSIL@ors.ubc.ca）に連絡して下さい。

同意
本研究への参加の是非は任意です。参加を途中で辞退することも可能です。その理由が問われることは決してなく、その決断によって調査対象者に何か不利なことが生じることもありません。
以下の署名は、調査対象者が記録としてこの同意書のコピーを受け取ったことと、本研究に参加することに同意することを示します。

調査対象署名
調査対象者氏名
日付
Appendix D  Invitation Letter for Tutors

D.1  English Version

Printed on official Department of Language and Literacy Education letterhead

Invitation Letter for Tutors

My name is Tomoyo Okuda and I am a PhD candidate in the Department of Language and Literacy Education at the University of British Columbia, Canada.

I am writing to ask you to participate in my doctoral dissertation research, Tomoyo Okuda’s doctoral research project, “A Case Study of a Writing Center at an Internationalized University in Japan” at the [Name of University] Writing Center. You are being invited to take part in this study because you are currently working as a tutor at the [Name of University] Writing Center.

The Study

In recent years, the number of Japanese universities that have implemented writing centers, a writing support service originated in the United States, is increasing. Focusing on a writing center that have adopted the original writing center philosophy, this study aims to examine the role of writing centers in an internationalized Japanese university. The following are the questions examined throughout this study.

(1) How is a writing center at a Japanese university conceptualized within its institutional goal?

(2) How does the Writing Center philosophy shape the tutor-student interactions in the tutorials?

(3) What are the consequences of the tutorial interactions in terms of students’ writing and perceptions of academic literacy practices at their university?

Your Participation in the Study

Upon examining question (2), I would like your cooperation in the following two research activities: (1) allowing me to observe and audio-record your tutorial, and (2) conducting an individual interview with you asking about the tutoring strategies you used in the observed tutorial and your opinions about the Writing Center philosophy.

Procedure of the Study

I will observe and audio-record the tutorial when the tutee participant schedules his/her appointment. The interview will take place after your tutorial at your earliest convenience. The interview will last about 30 minutes to an hour. Please review the attached consent form for more information about the study and the interview process.

If you are willing to participate in the study, please contact the researcher via email. In your email, please indicate your preferred date and time of the interview. If you have any questions,
please do not hesitate to contact the researcher at the email addresses and phone numbers listed below.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Researcher:
Tomoyo Okuda
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Language and Literacy Education
Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia
email: XXXX

Principal Investigator:
Ryuko Kubota
Professor, Department of Language and Literacy Education
Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia
Phone: XXX-XXX-XXXX
Fax: XXX-XXX-XXXX
email: XXXX
D.2  Japanese Version

Printed on official Department of Language and Literacy Education letterhead

博士論文研究調査へのご協力のお願い（チューター用）

拝啓 いよいよご清栄のこととお喜び申し上げます。カナダのブリティッシュ・コロンビア大学言語教育学部博士後期課程在籍の奥田朋世と申します。

現在、[大学名]において「国際化された大学におけるライティングセンターのケーススタディー」と題した博士論文研究に取り組んでおります。つきましては、[大学名]ライティングセンターにてチューターとして働いている方々に本研究へのご協力をお願いいたします。

研究の趣旨
現在、日本の大学においてライティングセンターの設置が増えてきています。そのほとんどはアメリカのライティングセンター理念に沿ったものです。本研究は、[大学名]を一例として日本の大学独自のライティングセンターの機能を探るため、以下の3つの課題を探求します。

問1. ライティングセンターが貴大学の構想計画の中で、どのように位置付けられているか。
問2 ライティングセンターのチュートリアルにおいて、ライティングセンター理念に沿った対話がどのように繰り広げられているか。
問3 チュートリアルの利用者はどのようにこのサービスを受け止め、それを自身の文章に反映させているのか。

ご協力いただく内容
問2を探るため、以下の研究活動にご協力お願いいたします。（1）利用者とのチュートリアルの見学及び録音。（2）インタビュー（ライティングセンターとその理念に関するお考えと、見学させていただいたチュートリアルにおける指導方法の意図などをお尋ねします）。

本研究調査の流れ
チュートリアルの見学及び録音は本研究に参加する利用者が予約を入れ次第、行います。チューターの皆様へのインタビューは利用者とのチュートリアルが終わった後、ご都合が月次第行いたいと思います。時間は30分から1時間程度を予定しております。なお、調査の詳細につきましては、添付の同意書をご覧下さい。本研究についてご質問等ございましたら、以下の調査者連絡先までご連絡なくお問い合わせ下さい。

学期中でお忙しいところ大変恐縮ですが、本研究の趣旨をご理解頂き、本研究調査へのご協力をご検討頂けますよう、どうぞよろしくお願い申し上げます。
敬具

研究調査実施者
奥田朋世
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Language and Literacy Education
Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia
e-mail: XXXX

研究統括者
久保田竜子
Professor, Department of Language and Literacy Education
Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia
Phone: XXX-XXX-XXXX
Fax: XXX-XXX-XXXX
e-mail: XXXX
Appendix E  Consent Form for Tutors

E.1  English Version

Printed on official Department of Language and Literacy Education letterhead

Consent Form (For Tutors)

Research Project Title: A Case Study of a Writing Center at an Internationalized University in Japan

This consent form explains the research project and requests your participation. Please read this form to consider your participation in the study, and if you have any questions, please contact the researcher and/or the principal investigator at the email addresses and phone numbers listed below.

Researcher: Tomoyo Okuda
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Language and Literacy Education
Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia
email: XXXX

Principal Investigator: Ryuko Kubota
Professor, Department of Language and Literacy Education
Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia
Phone: XXX-XXX- XXXX
Fax: XXX- XXX- XXXX
email: XXXX

Purpose of the Study

In recent years, the number of Japanese universities that have implemented writing centers, a writing support service originated in the United States, is increasing. Focusing on a writing center that have adopted the original writing center philosophy, this study aims to examine the role of writing centers in an internationalized Japanese university. In order to examine tutorial interactions, the participation of Writing Center tutors in this research is vital.

Research Procedure

The pilot study will take place between April to August 2015. The following steps describe the study procedure:

1. I will observe and audio-record the tutorial with the tutee participant. After the tutorial, with the tutee’s permission, I will photocopy the tutee’s draft if you gave any written comments.
2. At your earliest convenience, I would like to schedule an individual interview with you to ask about specific tutoring strategies you used in the tutorial as well as your beliefs towards the Writing Center philosophy. The interview will take 30 minutes to an hour.

3. If the same tutee participant schedules another visit to the Writing Center for consultation on the same academic paper, I will repeat steps 2 and 3.

The individual interview described in Step 2 will be conducted in either Japanese or in English. With your permission, the interview will be digitally recorded and transcribed to help with the data analysis process. If you consent to participate in the interview but do not wish to have the interview recorded, the interview will not be recorded. You have the right to refuse to answer any questions.

You may also be contacted for follow-up questions seeking additional information or clarification regarding the interview.

**Study Results**

The results of this study might be reported in Tomoyo Okuda’s graduate thesis and may also be published in journal articles and books.

**Benefits/Risks of the Study**

Taking part in this study might serve as an opportunity for you to reflect on your tutoring practices. There are no known risks associated with participating in the study.

**Measures to Maintain Confidentiality**

All of the information that participants share will be kept strictly confidential. No names or identifying information whatsoever will be used on copies of individual files and recordings, and you and your institution will not be identified by name in any reports in the completed study. The files for this research will be kept for five years, as per UBC policy, in a locked filing cabinet in the principal investigator’s UBC office as well as password-protected files known only to the researcher and principal investigator.

**Payment**

There is no monetary incentive for participating in this study. When this study is completed, you will receive a summary of the research results.

**Contact for concerns about the rights of research subjects**

If you have any concerns about your treatment or rights as a research participant, you may contact the Research Subject Information Line in the UBC Office of Research Services at (604) 822-8598 or at RSIL@ors.ubc.ca.

**Consent**
Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You may end and/or withdraw at any time and without giving any reasons for your decision and without any consequences.

Your signature below indicates that you have received a copy of this consent form for your own records and that you consent to participate in this study.

_________________________   ________________________    _________________
Participant’s Signature       Printed name          Date
同意書（チューター用）

国際化された大学におけるライティングセンターのケーススタディー

本同意書は、本研究「国際化された大学におけるライティングセンターのケーススタディー」について説明し、本研究への参加をお願いするものです。ご一読の上、ご質問等ございましたら、下記の研究調査実施者もしくは研究統括者までお問い合わせ下さいますよう、宜しくお願い致します。

研究調査実施者： 奥田朋世
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Language and Literacy Education
Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia
email: XXXX

研究統括者： 久保田竜子
Professor, Department of Language and Literacy Education
Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia
Phone: XXX-XXX- XXXX
Fax: XXX- XXX- XXXX
email: XXXX

本研究調査の目的
現在、日本の大学においてライティングセンターの設置が増えてきています。本研究は、大学名大学を一例として日本の大学独自のライティングセンターの機能を探ることを目的としています。ライティングセンターにおけるチュートリアルの対話を詳細に理解するために、チューターの方々に本調査へのご協力をお願いいたします。

調査手順
本研究は4月から8月までの間に実施します。調査は以下の手順で行います:

1) 本研究に参加する利用者とのチュートリアルを見学、録音させていただきます。利用者の文章にコメントや直しを書かれた場合、利用者の承認を得てチュートリアル後にその文章を複写させていただきます。
2) チュートリアルが終わった後、ご都合がつき次第インタビュー（所用時間：約30分間～1時間）させていただきます。インタビューではライティングセンターとその理念に関するお考えと、見学させていただいたチュートリアルにおける指導の意
図などをお尋ねします。
３）もし利用者が同じ文章の相談で再度ライティングセンターに訪れた場合、１）と２）の手順を繰り返します。

２）のインタビューは、調査実施者との一対一のインタビュー形式で、使用言語は日本語か英語のどちらかを指定して頂きます。インタビューはご承諾の上、データ分析のためにデジタル録音され、文字起こされます。インタビューの録音を望まない場合は、録音はいたしません。答えたくない質問への回答を拒否したり、インタビュー終了後でも参加を取り消すことができます。その場合は、理由を説明する必要はありませんし、その決断によって何か不利なことが生じることもありません。

また、ご承諾の上、インタビュー終了後、内容を再度確認、追加質問等をさせて頂くために、調査実施者から電子メールにより連絡をさせて頂くことがあるかもしれません。

研究調査の発表
調査終了後、本研究の内容は研究調査実施者の博士論文にて出版され、今後、学術論文や学会にて発表する予定です。

本調査への参加することの利点およびリスク
本研究を通じて、ライティングセンター理念を再確認し、自らの教え方を振り返る機会が得られます。調査参加に伴って起こると考えられるリスクはありません。

秘密保持・匿名性に関して
調査対象者の個人情報は決して公開することはありません。この研究調査の記録や報告書の中では、調査対象者名や大学名などすべての固有名詞に仮の名前を使います。この研究の記録は、ブリティッシュ・コロンビア大学の規定により、研究統括者と研究実施者しかアクセスできないパスワードや鍵で管理されたファイルに研究統括者の大学内のオフィスに5年間保管したあと、破棄します。

調査対象者への報酬
調査対象者への金銭的な報酬はありませんが、研究終了後、研究結果の要旨をお送りします。

研究調査対象者の権利に関する問い合わせ先
研究調査対象者としての扱われ方や権利に関してご質問がある場合は、ブリティッシュ・コロンビア大学の研究サービスオフィスの研究対象者情報ライン（電話：604-822-8598、電子メール：RSIL@ors.ubc.ca）に連絡して下さい。

同意
本研究への参加の是非は任意です。参加を通じて辞退することも可能です。その理由が問われることは決してなく、その決断によって参加対象者に何か不利なことが生じることもありません。

以下の署名は、調査対象者が記録としてこの同意書のコピーを受け取ったことと、本研究に参加することに同意することを示します。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>調査対象者署名</th>
<th>調査対象者氏名</th>
<th>日付</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix F  Invitation Letter for Tutees

F.1  English Version

Printed on official Department of Language and Literacy Education letterhead

Interested in Participating in a Study about Writing Centers? (Token provided!)

I have to write

- A written assignment for class
- A research proposal for my thesis, etc.

in Japanese …

If so, do you want to take your academic writing to the Writing Center for consultation and participate in Tomoyo Okuda’s doctoral research project, “A Case Study of a Writing Center at an Internationalized University in Japan”?

What’s the research about?

Focusing on the [Name of University] Writing Center, this study aims to examine the role of writing centers at Japanese universities. For this purpose, Tomoyo would like to learn about your experience at the Writing Center.

Are we paid for our participation?

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be rewarded with a 2000 yen bookstore gift card.

Research Procedure

1. Please make an appointment at the Writing Center.
2. Tomoyo will observe and audio-record the tutorial with your tutor.
3. After submitting your paper, Tomoyo will conduct an individual interview (30 to 1 hour) and compare the changes you made before and after the tutorial.

**How to Contact Me**

If you are interested in this study or have any questions, please email Tomoyo. In your email, please write the following:

(a) Your name, major, year (e.g., 3rd year undergraduate)
(b) The language of your paper (Japanese or English)
(c) Information about your paper (e.g., assignment for XX class, the title of your research proposal, etc.

Tomoyo Okuda, Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Language and Literacy Education, Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia
email: XXXX
ライティングセンターに関する研究に参加してみませんか？（特典があります！）

わたしは、今学期中に日本語または英語で
- 授業のレポート
- 卒論・修論・博論の研究計画書などの学術的文章を書かなければならない！

その文章の下書きをもってライティングセンターに相談に行き、奥田朋世の博士論文「国際化された大学におけるライティングセンターのケーススタディー」の研究調査に参加してみませんか？

どんな研究？
本研究は[大学名]大学を一例として日本の大学におけるライティングセンターの役割を探ります。そのために、ライティングセンター利用者の実態を調査します。

特典は？
参加いただいた方には２０００円分の図書カードを差し上げます。

研究の流れ
1. ライティングセンターに予約を入れてください。
2. 予約当日、チューターとの文章相談のやり取りを見学・録音させていただきます。
3. 学術文章を提出した後、インタビュー（30分から1時間）を実施し、どのような箇所を修正したか見せていただきます。

連絡方法
ご興味やご質問がある場合は、電子メールでご連絡下さい。メールには以下のことを書いて下さい。
(a) 名前・専攻・学年(例:学部3年生)
(b) ライティングセンターでみてもらいたい文章の言語（日本語もしくは英語）
(c) (b)の文章の説明（例：「XX」という授業のレポート、研究計画の題名など）

連絡先：ブリティッシュ・コロンビア大学言語教育学部 博士課程 奥田朋世
メール：XXXX
Appendix G  Consent Form for Tutees

G.1 English Version

Printed on official Department of Language and Literacy Education letterhead

Consent Form (For Tutees)

Research Project Title: A Case Study of a Writing Center at an Internationalized University in Japan

This consent form explains the research project and requests your participation. Please read this form to consider your participation in the study, and if you have any questions, please contact the researcher and/or the principal investigator at the email addresses and phone numbers listed below.

Researcher:  Tomoyo Okuda  
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Language and Literacy Education  
Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia  
email: XXXX

Principal Investigator: Ryuko Kubota  
Professor, Department of Language and Literacy Education  
Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia  
Phone: XXX-XXX-XXXX  
email: XXXX

Purpose of the Study

In recent years, the number of Japanese universities that have implemented writing centers, a writing support service originated in the United States, is increasing. Focusing on a writing center that have adopted the original writing center philosophy, this study aims to examine the role of writing centers in an internationalized Japanese university. In order to examine one aspect of this, it is vital to understand how tutees change their writing as a result of tutorial interactions.

You are invited to participate in this study because you fit in the following criteria:

• You are one of the following:
  (a) A Japanese student who needs assistance with Japanese writing,
  (b) A Japanese student who needs assistance with English writing
  (c) An international students who needs assistance with Japanese writing.
• You are either an undergraduate or graduate student at XX University
• You seek assistance on a draft of an academic paper (written assignment, manuscript, thesis, dissertation, etc.) due within the term.

Research Procedure
The pilot study will take place between April to August. The following steps describe the study procedure:

4. Please schedule an appointment at the Writing Center.
5. I will schedule an appointment with you a few days before your tutorial to explain details about the study. I will then give you a questionnaire for you to fill out. Please bring this questionnaire and a copy of your draft that you plan to discuss with your tutor on the day of your tutorial.
6. I will observe and audio-record your tutorial. If the tutor writes in any feedback on your draft, I will photocopy that draft.
7. Please email me your paper when you submit it to your instructor. Then, I will conduct an individual interview with you to ask about the changes you made in your writing and your perceptions of the tutoring you received. The interview will take approximately 30 minutes to 1 hour.

*However, if your visit to the Writing Center and submission date is more than a week apart, I would like to conduct two interviews in total: one interview for asking you about your tutorial (approximately 30 minutes) and another for asking the changes you made in your final draft (approximately 30 minutes).

The purpose of the questionnaire described in Step 2 is to understand your basic background information (major, year, etc.), the type of writing you are bringing to the Writing Center, and your thoughts about the Writing Center philosophy.

The individual interview in Step 4 will be conducted either in Japanese or English. With your permission, the interview will be digitally recorded and transcribed to help with the data analysis process. If you consent to participate in the interview but do not wish to have the interview recorded, the interview will not be recorded. You have the right to refuse to answer any questions.

You may also be contacted for follow-up questions seeking additional information or clarification regarding the interview.

**Study Results**

The results of this study might be reported in Tomoyo Okuda’s graduate thesis and may also be published in journal articles and books. If your writing sample is included in the report, information that identifies the participant (e.g., your name) will be excluded.

**Benefits/Potential Risks of this Study**

Taking part in this study might serve as an opportunity for you to reflect on the benefits of the [Name of University] Writing Center to improve your writing. There are no known risks associated with participating in this study.

**Measures to Maintain Confidentiality**

All of the information that participants share will be kept strictly confidential. No names or identifying information whatsoever will be used on copies of individual files and recordings, and you and your institution will not be identified by name in any reports in the completed study. The files for this research will be kept for five years, as per UBC policy, in a locked filing cabinet in the principal investigator’s UBC office as well as password-protected files known only to the researcher and principal investigator.
Payment
You will receive a bookstore gift card worth 2000 yen for your participation. In addition, when this study is completed, you will receive a summary of the research results if it is published.

Contact for concerns about the rights of research subjects
If you have any concerns about your treatment or rights as a research participant, you may contact the Research Subject Information Line in the UBC Office of Research Services at (604) 822-8598 or at RSIL@ors.ubc.ca.

Consent
Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You may end and/or withdraw at any time and without giving any reasons for your decision and without any consequences. Your signature below indicates that you have received a copy of this consent form for your own records and that you consent to participate in this study.

_________________________   ________________________    _________________
Participant’s Signature         Printed name                  Date
G.2  Japanese Version

Printed on official Department of Language and Literacy Education letterhead

同意書(利用者用)

国際化された大学におけるライティングセンターのケーススタディー

本同意書は、本研究「国際化された大学におけるライティングセンターのケーススタディー」について説明し、本研究への参加をお願いするものです。ご一読の上、ご質問等ございましたら、下記の研究調査実施者もしくは研究統括者までお問い合わせ下さいますよう、宜しくお願い致します。

研究調査実施者： 奥田朋世
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Language and Literacy Education
Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia
email: XXXX

研究統括者： 久保田竜子
Professor, Department of Language and Literacy Education
Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia
Phone: XXX-XXX-XXXX
Fax: XXX-XXX-XXXX
email: XXXX

本研究調査の目的
現在、日本の大学においてライティングセンターの設置が増えてきています。本研究は、[大学名]を一例として日本の大学独自のライティングセンターの機能を探ることを目的としています。そのために、利用者がチューターとの対話を受けてどのように文章を修正・改善していくかの過程を見ることが必要です。

以下の条件すべてを満たす方にご協力をお願いします。

以下の３つのうち１つに当てはまる方：

☑ 日本語のライティングのチュートリアルを希望する日本人学生
☑ 英語のライティングのチュートリアルを希望する日本人学生
☑ 日本語ライティングのチュートリアルを希望する留学生

☑ [大学名]大学に通う学部生または大学院生であること
☑ 学期中に提出する学術文章（レポート、論文、卒業・修士論文計画書など）の下書きに関してライティングセンターに相談に行くつもりであること

調査手順

本研究は4月から8月までの間に実施します。調査は以下の手順で行います：
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1）ライティングセンターに予約をいれてください。
2）予約の数日前に、調査の流れを確認し、その時にアンケート用紙をお渡しします。
   予約当日にみてもらいたい文章のコピーとアンケート用紙を持ってきてください。
3）チュートリアルを見学、録音させていただきます。チュートリアルの際にチューターが文章に手書きでコメントを入れた場合、その複写をとらせていただきます。
4）チュートリアルで相談した文章を指導教員に提出した後に、提出したものを電子メールで送って下さい。その後、ご都合のいい日にインタビュー（所用時間：約30分～1時間）にご協力ください。このインタビューでは、チューターとの対話を受けてどのように文章を修正したか、また、その対話についての感想などをお尋ねします。
※ただし、ライティングセンター訪問日から提出日までの期間が一週間以上空く場合、チュートリアルの対話についてのインタビュー（30分程度）を訪問日から一週間以内に実施し、提出した後に修正箇所を聞くインタビュー（30分程度）を計2回行います。
2）のアンケートは貴方に関する基本情報（専攻、学年等）、チューターにみてもらいたい文章について、また、ライティングセンターの理念についてお尋ねします。
4）のインタビューは、調査実施者との対面のインタビュー形式で、使用言語は日本語か英語のどちらかを指定して頂きます。インタビューの録音を望まない場合は、録音はいたしません。答えたくない質問への回答を拒否したり、インタビュー終了後でも参加を取り消すことができます。その場合は、理由を説明する必要はありませんし、その決断によって貴方に何か不利なことが生じることもあります。
また、貴方の承諾の上、インタビュー終了後、内容を再度確認、追加質問等をさせて頂くために、調査者から電子メールにより連絡をさせて頂くことがあるかもしれません。

調査結果の発表
調査終了後、本研究の内容は研究調査実施者の博士論文にて出版され、今後、学会や学術論文や学会にて発表する予定です。論文や学会発表で貴方の文章の一部を掲載する場合もありますが、個人名など、個人が特定できる情報は一切載せません。

本調査へ参加することの利点およびリスク
本研究を通じて、ライティングセンターでのチュートリアルを受ける体験ができ、また今後の学生生活でどのようにライティングセンターを活用できるかを考える機会が得られます。調査参加に伴って生じるリスクはありません。

秘密保持・匿名性に関して
貴方の個人情報は決して公開することはありません。この研究調査の記録や報告書の中ででは、貴方の名前や大学名などすべての固有名詞に仮の名前を使います。この研究の記録は、ブリティッシュ・コロンビア大学の規定に従い、研究統括者と研究実施者しかアクセスできないパスワードや鍵で管理されたファイルに研究統括者の大学内のオフィスに5年間保管したあと、破棄します。
調査対象者への報酬
参加していただける場合、2000 円分の図書カードを差し上げます。また、研究終了後、研究結果の要旨をお送りします。

研究調査対象者の権利に関する問い合わせ先
研究調査対象者としての扱われ方や権利に関してご質問がある場合は、ブリティッシュ・コロンビア大学の研究サービスオフィスの研究対象者情報ライン（電話:604-822-8598、電子メール: RSIL@ors.ubc.ca）に連絡して下さい。

同意
本研究への参加の是非は任意です。参加を途中で辞退することも可能ですが、その理由が問われることは決してなく、その決断によって貴方に何か不利なことが生じることもありません。

以下の署名は、貴方が記録としてこの同意書のコピーを受け取ったことと、本研究に参加することに同意することを示します。

調査対象者署名  調査対象者氏名  日付
Appendix H  Interview Questions for Writing Center Administrators

H.1 English Version

<Questions to initiator>

1. How did you get to know the idea of the writing center?
2. Why did you think that implementing a writing center at your university was necessary?
3. Did you model your writing center referring to other universities? If so, which university?
4. What do you think of the writing center philosophy?
5. How do you think the Writing Center at your university will benefit domestic students, international students in their Japanese writing, and domestic students in their English writing?
6. How do you think the Writing Center at your university will benefit domestic students, international students in their Japanese writing, and domestic students in their English writing?
7. In your opinion, what is the future of writing centers in Japan?

<To Writing Center director/Associate directors>

1. When was the Writing Center established?
2. Could you explain the process of the implementation?
3. When were you assigned to be the director?
4. What was the process of initiating Writing Center services to Japanese and international students for English and Japanese writing?
5. What do you think of the writing center philosophy?
6. How do you think the Writing Center at your university will benefit domestic students, international students in their Japanese writing, and domestic students in their English writing?
7. How do you think the Writing Center at your university will benefit domestic students, international students in their Japanese writing, and domestic students in their English writing?
8. In your opinion, what is the future of writing centers in Japan?

<For university administrators>

1. Could you explain the process of the implementation of the Writing Center?
2. Is the writing center part of an institutional plan? If so, what is the plan and how is the writing center situated in this plan?
3. What do you think of the writing center philosophy?
4. How do you think the Writing Center at your university will benefit domestic students, international students in their Japanese writing, and domestic students in their English writing?
5. How do you think the Writing Center at your university will benefit domestic students, international students in their Japanese writing, and domestic students in their English writing?
6. In your opinion, what is the future of writing centers in Japan?
H.2  Japanese version

＜発案者用の質問＞

1. [大学名]にライティングセンターが設立された経緯を説明していただけますか。
（先生はどのようにライティングセンターの設立案をご提案されたのでしょうか。）
2. ライティングセンターというものについてはどこでどのようにしてお知りになりましたか。
（先生はフロリダで留学されていたとお聞きしましたが）
3. ライティングセンターとはどのようなところか、[参加者名]先生のお考えを聞かせていますか。
4. なぜ[大学名]大学にライティングセンターが必要だと思われたのでしょうか。
5. ライティングセンターを発案するにあたり、他の大学のライティングセンターを参考にされましたか。
（ホームページに載っている理念を見せる。）
6. この理念について、どう思われますか。
7. この理念を掲げる[大学名]のライティングセンターは日本人学部生、大学院生、教員の書く力を育てる上でどのような役割があると思われますか。留学生？
8. ライティングセンターは今後XX大学でどのような役割を果たすと思いますか。
9. 今、ライティングセンターが日本で流行っているのですが、ライティングセンターは今後日本の大学でどんどん必要になってくると思いますか。それはなぜですか。
10. 「学術文章の書き方とその指導法」の授業はどういう目的で作られたのでしょうか。
どうなったか？
11. どのようにシラバスを決められましたか。
12. 担当教員の専門分野を織り交ぜて教えられているのでしょうか。

＜ライティングセンター長・副センター長用＞

1. [大学名]のライティングセンターはいつ設立されましたか？
2. 設立された経緯を教えてください。
3. センター長・副センター長に任命された経緯を教えていただけますか。
4. 日本人学生を対象とした日本語サービスと英語サービス、また、留学生を対象とした日本語サービスがあると思うのですが、それぞれのサービスが開始された経緯を教えてください。
5. ライティングセンターの理念についてどう思われますか。
6. ライティングセンターやその理念は日本人学生、留学生の日本語、英語ライティング力を育てる上でどのような役割があると思われますか。
7. ライティングセンターは今後[大学名]でどのような役割を果たすと思いますか。
8. ライティングセンターは今後日本の大学でどのような役割を果たすと思われますか。
1. ライティングセンターが設立された経緯を教えてください。
2. ライティングセンターの発案と設立は大学の構想計画でどのような役割を果たしているのでしょうか。
3. ライティングセンターの理念についてどう思われますか。
4. ライティングセンターやその理念は日本人学生、留学生の日本語、英語ライティング力を育てると上でどのような役割があると思われますか。
5. ライティングセンターは今後[大学名]でどのような役割を果たすと思われますか。
6. ライティングセンターは今後日本の大学でどのような役割を果たすと思われますか。
Appendix I  Questionnaire for Tutees

I.1  English version

Questionnaire for “A Case Study of a Writing Center at an Internationalized University in Japan”

Notes:
1. The purpose of this questionnaire is to gain some basic information about you (major, year, etc.), the type of writing you are bringing to the Writing Center, and your thoughts about the Writing Center philosophy.
2. Your questionnaire will be kept in a locked cabin and any electronic files will be encrypted and password protected.

Name:                                  Gender:         Age:
Major:                                  Year:

1. What type of academic paper are you seeking assistance on? (written assignment for a class, a part of a manuscript, research proposal, etc):

2. What is your paper about? (the title of the paper, name of the class, etc):

3. When is the deadline for this paper?

4. Have you ever been to the Writing Center?
   Yes   /   No

5. If yes, how many times did you visit? What was the purpose of your visit(s)?
   How many times:
   Purpose of visit(s):

6. At the [Name of University] Writing Center, the tutors do not proofread your writing but rather help improve your writing through dialogue. What are your thoughts on this mission statement?

* [Research site writing center webpage]

Thank you for your cooperation!
If you have any questions, please ask Tomoyo.

Tomoyo Okuda
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Language and Literacy Education
Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia
email: XXXX
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国際化された大学におけるライティングセンターのケーススタディー

質問紙

確認事項:

1. この質問紙は、貴方に関する基本情報（専攻、学年等）、チューターにみてもらいたい文章について、また、ライティングセンター理念に対する理解を知るためのものです。
2. 質問紙は鍵のかかったファイルで保管され、電子ファイルはエンコード化され、パスワードで保護されます。

名前：________________________ 性別：_______ 年齢：_______
専攻：________________________ 学年：_______

1. ライティングセンターでみてもらいたい文章の種類は何ですか？（例：授業のレポート、論文の一部、研究計画書）
2. 文章の内容を簡単に教えてください（例：授業名、論文のテーマ、など）
3. この文章の締め切り日はいつですか？（または、いつ提出する予定ですか？）
   年  月  日
4. ライティングセンターを利用したことはありますか？：
   はい ・ いいえ
5. はいと答えた方、ライティングセンターを過去に何回、どのような目的で活用しましたか？
   回数： ______ 回
   目的：
6. ライティングセンターには、文章を添削するのではなくチューターとの対話を通して書き手の文章作成力を育成するという*理念があります。この理念についてどう思いますか。
   * [ウェブページアドレス]

ご協力ありがとうございました。
何かご質問があれば、奥田朋世（研究実施者）にお問い合わせください。

プリティッシュ・コロンビア大学言語教育学部 ドクトル課程 奥田朋世
メール：XXXXX
Appendix J  Interview Questions for Tutors

J.1  English version

Interview protocol for tutors

<Background questions>
1. What is your major, year and age?
2. When did you become a tutor?
3. Why did you think of becoming a tutor?
4. What do you like about tutoring? What do you think are challenging?
5. Where and how did you learn academic writing or how to write an academic paper?
6. Do you regard yourself good at academic writing or not?

<Questions related to beliefs towards writing center philosophy>
1. Describe your understanding of the instructional philosophy of the writing center at this university. What should be done and what should not be done?
2. How is the writing center benefiting student on campus?
3. If there is any room for improvement, how can the writing center improve?

<Questions related to the tutoring strategies and feedback in the tutorial>

(Review the structure of the tutorial based on my field notes, and ask questions about tutoring strategies)

For example…
8. You asked your tutee to read this paragraph. What were the intentions behind this strategy?
9. Why do you think this strategy is important?
10. You did not provide explicit answers on this tutee’s request. What were the intentions behind this strategy?

<Questions regarding the student (the tutee’s) and his/her writing>
1. What parts do you think the students should improve in this essay?
2. What can this student do to become a better writer from now on when he/write works on an assignment?
J.2  Japanese version

<チューターの基本情報>
1. 専攻・学年・ご年齢を教えてください。
2. いつチューターの仕事を始めましたか。
3. チューターの仕事に応募した理由を教えてください。
4. チューターの仕事は好きですか。どのようなところが好きですか。また、どのようなところが大変ですか。
5. （日本語もしくは英語の）学術文章の書き方はいつ、どこで、どうやって勉強しましたか。
6. 今はよく学術文章を書いていますか。
7. 学術文章を書くことは得意だと思いますか？苦手だと思いますか？

<ライティングセンター及びライティングセンター理念についての質問>
1. ライティングセンターのどのようなところなのか、XX さんなりに説明していただけますでしょうか？例えば利用者が来たら、どのようなことはしてよくて、どのようなことはしてはだめなのでしょうか。
2. （ライティングセンター理念を見せる）：こういう理念があると思うのですが、X さんにとってこの理念はチューターの仕事をやっていく上でどのくらい大事ですか。ライティングセンターはなぜ理念がないといけないのでしょうか。
3. 特にどのような点に賛同しますか。また、実際にセッションをやっていて難しい点はありますか。

<見学したチュートリアルに関しての質問>
では、今から見学したセッションの流れをおさらいして、セッション中、どのようなことに気をつけたのか、方略とか意図など、お聞きします。
まず、場面ごとにセッションのやりとりを分けました。X つ場面がありました。

1. 利用者の要望、セッションの目標設定の確認：X さんにとって、このセッションはどういうセッションでしたか。達成度はどれくらいか？）
2. 流れの確認をやっていきたいと思います。セッションの中で議題にあがった（話し合われた）ところをマーカーで引きました。（例：読み上げた後に、チューターもしくは利用者が気になって指摘したところと考えてもらったら良いと思います。）

チュートリアルの流れをおさらいした後、ストラテジーについて聞く例：
1. 最初に学生にこの段落を読んでくださいとおっしゃっていましたが、これにはどのような意図があったのでしょうか。
2. このストラテジーにはどのような意義があると思いますか？
3. 学生が XXX という質問をした時、あまりはっきりと答えを提示されていなかったですが、それはなぜでしょうか。
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利用者のライティングについての質問
1. この学生は今後どのような点に気をつけてペーパーを改善したら良いと思いますか。

最後に
1. ライティングセンターはX大学の学生や研究者にとってどのような役割を果たしていると思いますか。
2. 現時点で何かライティングセンターの改善点はありますか。
Appendix K  Interview Questions for Tutees

K.1  English version

<Questions regarding participant’s experience with academic writing>
1. Where and how did you learn academic writing?
2. Do you regard yourself good at academic writing or not.

<Questions regarding the writing center tutorial>
(After reviewing the main concern in writing expressed during tutorial and the advice the tutee received, I ask perceptions of tutoring strategies)
For example:

1. You were asked by your tutor to read this paragraph. What did you think about that?
2. What did you think of tutor’s feedback? (e.g., Was his/her advice helpful? Why? Why not?
3. Did the experience at the writing center change some of your views towards writing? or
   What did you learn from the tutorial?
4. Would you recommend writing center to your friends? Why? Why not?
5. What kind of things do you think the writing center can improve regarding its services?

<Questions regarding students’ revisions in their drafts>
Ask the participant to show me his/her final draft.

1. What parts of your paper did you revise in the end? Why?
2. Are there parts that you revised yourself?
3. Are there parts that you revised based on the tutors’ advice?
K.2  Japanese version

<アカデミックライティングについての質問>

1. （日本語もしくは英語の）学術文章の書き方はいつ、どこで、どうやって勉強しましたか。
2. 学術文章を書くことは得意だと思いますか？苦手だと思いますか？

＜見学したチュートリアルに関しての説明＞
全体的な感想：今回のセッションはどうでしたか？

相談にした理由と、チューターとのチュートリアルでどんなことを言われたかおさらいする。その後、チュートリアルのアドバイスや教え方についてどう思ったか聞く。
例：
1. ここでチューターに段落を読んでと言われていましたが、それについてどう思いましたか。
2. チューターのアドバイスや教え方についてどう思いましたか？（例：アドバイスはためになりましたか？）
3. 今回のチュートリアルでどういうことを学びましたか？
4. アンケートの問6：こう答えていますが、セッション受けてみて、いまもそう思っていますか。
5. ライティングセンターを友達に勧めますか。なぜそう思いますか。
6. もしライティングセンターのサービスに改善点があるとしたら、それは何でしょうか。

＜提出した文章についての質問＞
提出した文章を見せてもらう。

1. 最終的に、どのようにペーパーを直しましたか。なぜそのようになおしましたか？
2. 自分で直した箇所はありますか？教えてください。
3. チューターのアドバイスをうけて直した箇所はありますか？
でも、教育学研究科はまず大学の定員を満たしているのと留学生も相当数いて指導教員が日本語を直したりするのに結構時間取られたりしてあるいは指導教員がしない時には研究室の先輩、後輩が日本語直している、というようなことがあって[…]それ以上増やすというのは、特に何かないと、難しい…例えば、ライティングセンターで留学生の日本語を見ていて、指導教官や研究室で日本語自体を見る必要がない、であれば、もっと増やすことはできる。

論文の作り方、レポートの作成のしかたについては[…]ライティングセンターでいろんな情報を出してもらって、そういう風なリーダーシップを取ってもらいたいなとは思っていますけど。[…]まずはとにかく正常な日本語のレポートを書いてもらいたい。その次に英語の論文。でも英語の論文っていうのは日本語で正常な論文が書ければ同じ訳ですね。英語で書けない人は日本語でも書けませんから。

英語論文もここでもっと出てきますね。で、ただですね、ここもあまり具体的なことは書いてないんですよね。結局その今手始めにできそうなことだってなので人文社会科学系のアブストラクトを英文化して、公開しようとかそういったことをとりあえずやっていくという形でまあと言ってみればお茶を濁すというか。その周辺のできるところからやっていくという。実際のその研究論文を作成するための支援みたいな本当の本質というか、には触れてない。まあ、できないだろうということで。

日本人だと古事記だとそれでわかるじゃないですか。古事記を読むことを説明しないといけない、国際的に行発信する場合、と思うんですよね。だからレポジトリの人文社会科学系の論文のアブストラクトを英語にするのは意味があるなと思う一方で、そのアブストラクトがはっきり言って英語で出すと达尔そのものとは切り離して[…]それが何を言っているかを国際的に発信するためには、こういうポイントを書いてくださいとある程度先生たちが指導というか説明したりしてやるような仕組み作らないと今ままだと翻訳のままで終わっちゃってる。

このまあの学術文章を作成できる力を育む…目標はあるんだけどそのための方向をどうするのか、で、例えば第二言語の場合にそのセッションの中でそれを教えられるかっていうのはちょっと難しい面は沢山あるんじゃないけど、無理やり論文だけなら論文の英語を書くと。[…]そういうなんか手っ取り早い方法を考えないといけないといけないんじゃないかというのは常々思ってて、だから技術的な部分っていうのは大きいよね。テクニカル的な部分は大きいけどそこばっかり頭いっちゃうとこの理念忘れちゃうなっていうのはある。

Appendix L  Original Japanese Quotes

L.1 Chapter 2
L.2 Chapter 3

3^1N: 僕もやりがちだけど、読む側としてはあらかじめどんな困難かあってもらい、例を提示してもらったほうがわかりやすい。
J: 自分の思考の流れに沿って書いただけで読む側がどう思うかと考えながらとい書き方になってなかったです。
N: 困難なんてないっていう学者もいるかもしれません。何の困難があらかじめ言っておくと反論が起きにくい。

3^2N: 論文も作法のうちにあると思うんですね。論文はコミュニケーションツールだから相手を切り捨てない方がいい。言い方を見直した方がいいかも。[…]結局生産性って概念を定義しないと不毛と言えない、という批判を感じるので。
J: そりゃそうですね、はい。

3^3J: 特に変えてなくて、というのは今までそんなにゼミとかの発表では特に挑戦的とか指摘されなかったので。一応、ここでは不毛の中身というか、理論に関してのぶつけ合いとか、ここでは不毛な議論とします、と定義というか、不毛の中身加えて言ったつもりです。言いがかりなんかではないように一応したつもりではあるので。単純にこれ以外の言い方が思いつかなかったというのもあるんですけど。

3^4T: アンケートの6番で、ライティングセンターの理念があって添削するのではなく、対話を通して文章作成能力を育成するという理念があるんですが、Jさんが文章の書き方には正解がある部分とない部分があって、特に後者、ない部分については添削よりかは助言が適していると思うので妥当だと思います。っていうのは、セッションが終わった今でもそのように思います？
J: そうですね。これまでこう出てくるのを前もって、それはそれでこっちとしては楽だけど、そういうのじゃないんだとなんぞと思います[…]一緒に対話を通して考えることで、よりよい書き方というのは納得できるような書き方が見つかるのかなと思うので。そういう助言というのはいいのかなという風に思います。
T: 例えば指導教官に見せるのとチューターに対して見せるのとではどういうふうに違いますか？先生の方がこうやって直した方がいいとか？
J: 添削の比率も多いですね。でもやっぱり対話の中で、ただよい書き方に導くという方も重視していると思います。

3^5T: 面白い話題ですね。日本でも結婚できない若者は増えてきていますし日本とも共通しているところですね。でも、中国のあまり男とあまり女の問題に対して、焦点をしぼったというか、興味を持った理由は何なんですか。
K: 理由？
T: 例えば、日本の結婚の打開策こそから出そうとか。解決しようとしなくてもいいと思うんですけど […]なぜそもそもここに興味を持つんですかね。
K: […]日本ではやはり見られない光景ですね、その日本では見られない公園お見合いがなんで中国だけに存在しているのか、その人がなぜここに行くのかから始まっている。
それにはこういう理由があるんじゃあないかということで公園のまわり、公園を囲ってある社会の全体的な背景っていうのをまずちょっとここで書いた方がいいかなと思って。

T: なるほど。日本でも街コンとかあるけど、公園お見合いは確かに聞いた事がない。そう考えると、なぜそこを検討するのか、それが結果どういうことに自分としては結びつけるのかというところが知りたいな、と…背景の中にある問題の所在はわかるけど、K さんの問題の所在はつかみにくいかな、という印象はあるんですけど。

3-6 この一連の仮説があるから、これがどうなのかというのがいくつか用意した中でどれがいいのかとか一個この仮説が実証できるかどうかの調査だけでもいいんですけど、というものでいくのかなってもこの仮説が実証できるかどうかの調査だけでもいいんですけど、というのをだ。行き当たりばったり。[…]ある程度その仮説が客観的に言えるもんであれば、そのもののさしを入れてやるとどうなのかっていう反応を見ればいいと思うんですけど、今回なしで拾ってくるともっと、より自分で客観的に見つめられる視点が必要で、それをどのように持って行こうとしてのかなと。

3-7 T: お見合いにきてない人間に深圳の公園お見合いのことを聞けたら、より客観的になるかもしれない。[…]インタビューに行く行くと口とくに主観的になるじゃないですか、その場に入ると。[…]インタビュー専門じゃないけど、そういうことをすると相手は納得します。

K: なるほど。

3-8 言い訳できるようにあらかじめ調べておくくらいですからね。[…]例えばなんでこの研究するのって言われた時に、ただ僕が研究したいからです、だったら足りないじゃないですか。だから、こういうのが足りないから、足りないから、研究するんですっていうスタンスじゃないといけないと思うんですけど、じゃあ何が足りないってかっていうのをまず出して、今まで読んだの中でこういうポイントとか 2 点とかあるので、これが少ないんですよねっていうのをまず書いて、じゃあ少ないっていうのはなんでわたったのっていうのを背景ですのでまず書いてあります。

3-9 難しいですね。内容に入らないと、どう論じるかっていうのはわからない部分があるの、踏み込まざるを得ないらしい。でも踏み込んでしまったがゆえに、誤解した解釈によってさらに相談者は混乱してしまってはいけないなと思っています。やっぱりチューターは整理する立場だと思うので。内容で議論をするよりも、出ってきたものを抽出して、こう並べ替えたらどうですか、みたいなそういう形にできるのかなと。

3-10 先生とやると一回泣くというか、ね。涙されるように全部切られて、ばさばさやられて。で、もう再考してこいてということでしょう、結局。[…]やっぱりあんまり先生の前だとそこでっていうかんじじゃなくて、そこでアドバイスいただいて、吟味していきますということになりますよね。一緒に、じゃないんですよね。先生と一緒に、というよりも、その都度、行って、戻ってやって、行って戻ってっていうのが先生なのかな。
例えば理性なら理性という言葉で片付けておけばいいだろうとか。でもそれは向こうからすると、引っかかるわけですね。素朴に理性ってなんかって思うと。で、言われると、説明しますよね。でもその説明が曖昧なんですよ。だいたい多分。[...] それは、ここでしかわからないんですよね。先生の前だと勉強してい、ですけど。ここだとうまくなんとか説明しようとすると、はじめ知らないところはこれだとこれとこれだなっていう。

ただ単純に相手の考えを整理させて、整理するような手助けをするということだったら、こういう風に読まれるよういう風な誤解があるところを伝えればいいかなとか、相手が気づいていないだろうとあったら、それを伝えるったりとか、そういったことを具体的にやっていくしかないだろうなっていう風に思ってセッションをやっているかなと思います。

L.3  Chapter 4

自分が言おうと思ってたことと書かれた文章から私が読み取ったこととの違いを示す中で、なるほどこういう意味になっちゃうんで、っていう風に思ってもらえたいいなっていうのがあった

ライティングセンターというのはあくまでも自分が書きたいこегодня人と書かってもらえるのを最終的に[...] こう最終的な細かい文法っていうのはネイティブの人には任せるしかないというかそこまでここで見てると内容的なつながりとかあんまり見れなくなってしまんじゃないかかなって気がするので。

なぜダブルクオーテーションになっているんですか。
S: なんでかわからないんですけど、最初の文章は引用で単語は強調のためです。
E: ふつうとは違ったという意味をもたせたもの？
S: はい。
E: ちなみにこれはあとから定義されます？
S: してないですね。
E: 気持ちはすごくわかるんですよ。そのあとでしっかりと説明されるんだろうなって思いながら読むので。

[...]　
S: あと。
E: 単語が重要だと言いたいとしても二重オーテーションをつけるだけでなく、強調構文を使うとどこが強調されているか一目瞭然だったりとか、対比させることによってその重要性を見つけさせるとか、表現を工夫する、という方針。クオーテーションマークは基本的に直接引用してますってことを想定したものだから、直接引用されず、あとで説明されなくて、読んでいる人がわから、これなんだっけ？ってなっちゃうかもしれないなと思います。

44S: […][…]先生に見てもらうのだと先生はやっぱり自分と同じ分野の人なので私いっとう会話する中で私が何がしたいかかも知ってる人だから、ライティングセンターの人は今回の方とかは全然他分野で私がしたいとかをもともと知らない、まっさらの状態で文章を見てくださるので、なんだろう。説明不足とか、それじゃあ人に伝わらないっていうのが分かったのかすごいありがたかったですね。

T: なるほど。じゃあえっと文法見て欲しい時は？またフィリピンの友達？
S: って思います。添削とかだったらやっぱネイティブの人見てもらうかんあって。

T: それは何ですか。
S: あーなんで。ライティングセンターがそこをみないっていうのも前提にあるんですけど、うーんと、ネイティブの人だと単なるスペルのミスじゃなくてなんかこういう言い回しはしないとか、ここでその単語は使わないのとかっていうのまでちゃんとひっかかってくれるのです。

45その適切っていうのが私の感覚はネイティブの感覚とは違うので、どれが、自分でもわかってないですね。

46自爆するかんあって。

47ちょっと投げ出されたような感じになりました。

48T: わかりました。それで終わりました。それで最初の要望がこういう要望だったんだけど、どれくらい達成できたと思いますか？
R: 結局その、イディオムとかに関しては全く触れずだったのので
T: 表現の適切さ？
R: そうですね、表現の適切さ。
T: 何回か聞いてたもんね。どっちが適切ですかって。
R: だから何が適切なのか自分から、どこどこ説明しないと K さんがどっちが適切なのかもわからないかなと思って [...] だけど、メイン、話の内容のメインがその、そうですね。話の前後がメインだったんだと思います。だからちょっと要望に対しては、自分が出した要求を考えたらそこはちょっと満足度は高くなりだけど、全体でみたらなんていのかな。知らないことも [...] 気付かされたところもあったとは思っただけど。

4-9 そうですね、一貫性に関してはすごく言わせてくださって強調される構成っていう部分においてはやはり人の流れ、っていうところをすぐに見抜いてくださったので、そこ強調すべき部分なんだなっていうのを、自分がまた再確認ですよね [...] で結果時間が余ったから全部見てもらうことができたんですけど、それがさらに一貫性にもつながったのかなということもありましたけど。

4-10 M: そうですね、割と断定的に言ってくださる方があとで不安でならなくても済むかもって思いますね。それでどうやったんだろうって思い返した時に、うーん。関係するのかな。だからと言って、英語専攻の人に見てもらった場合間違ってる方もたくさんいらっしゃいますし。どれが正しいかとは言えませんね。 [...] ただ、英語を書く時に、 [...] 何かが一番伝えたかって言ったら、自分が言っていることを正しく理解してもらえることが大前提なんで。だからその、文章の流れだとか構成だとかがとっても重要になると思うんですよ。 [...] だから多分その、英語の表現みたいなのこそそこはなんかネイティブにチェックしてもらうのが一番なのかなと思いますけど。逆に、その、表現方法はやっぱり限られてしまうんですから、もっと能力のあるところを見てもらった方がいいのかな [...] 这の間の N さんだったらそういう構成的なところもすごく見せる力がありますし、そういうところで力を発揮してもらった方がいいかなって。

4-11 R: Therefore からの文は誰がやってた主語が大事ではないか。
M: はい、大統領です。
R: ですね。その主語を述べた方がいいんじゃないですか、受け身文を使う代わりに能動文で。なぜかというと前の文は主語がしっかりわかるので突然能動文から受け身文、受け身から能動文とそんなに変化しない方がいいので。主語をはっきりさせて能動文に。
M: わかりました。私ついつい受け身文にしてしまうんですよね。
R: 研究分野によってちょっと違いますけど、できるだけ受け身文しない方がいいです。受け身文にするとちょっと弱くなる。

4-12 ちょっとした先生みたいなお感じ

L.4 Chapter 5

5-1 ライティングセンターの文章検討は、チューターとの 1 対 1 の対話によって進められ、よりわかりやすい文章とするための解決策を協働的に探っていきます。指導ではな
く対話というやり方により、文章を書いた書き手自身の気付きを促すことで、書き手の
学術的文章作成力を育みます。

ライティングセンターでは、書かれた文章を添削して、文章そのものを直すのではありません。「書き手が自分自身でわかりやすい学術的文章が書けるようになる」ことを目指した支援をします。

5-2 あ、だから、今までそういうえー、書くこと、それはまあ教員が自分、ここの教員
が自分でやらないといけなかったことなんだけども、それを支援する？それをいかに効
率よく支援して、で大学の生産性をあげるかという。[…] それは学生に対しても修論
がうまく書ければそれはその分重荷を抑えられるし、卒論でも修論でも要はあの今教員
負担って増える一方なんだよね。それはなるべく減らすことはできないかという風にな
んとか提供あのサポートできればこちらは評価されるだろうよ。

5-3 日本語で書く能力を確かにつけるという意味で、このアプローチでライティングセ
ンターはいいと思うんだけど、やっぱり添削が必要かなって思って。添削って今誰がや
ってるかっていうとおそらく、同級生とか、ですよね。そうすると我々研究大学、この
ことやってる人からしてPhDの学生がそっちの留学生の日本語の添削に時間かけてる
んだったら、もっと自分の研究やれてるような部分もあるから、本当は日本語の
添削ができるような仕組みないのかなって、実は英文の校正業者の会社とかにも聞いて
るんですけど。

5-4 そうですね。多分基本的にはもう無意識レベルですけど、多分根底にはあると思
います。例えば、理念の中だと「チューターとの一対一の対話によって進められ」ってい
う所は常に心がけてますし、「よりわかりやすい文章とするための解決策を共同的に探
っていきます」っていうのも、こちらから一方的になっていう形ではしていないっていう
のは原則としても根付いているので、やってると思います。

5-5 僕なりには、添削と言ったら、プロセスとプロダクトあって、プロダクトだけ見ていてあっつことで思うんですけど、今言った書き手の意図を汲んだ添削とか、あるいはもっとちょっと協働的な対話的になって言ったプロダクト、出来
上がったものだけじゃないで、出来上がりまでの過程とか、その人のこういう意味で作
りたかったんだっていうところを吸わされて、だからああそれなんだ、まだマンな添削かなっていう。

5-6 T: 留学生に関してはなるべく添削しないようにしていますか？
K: そうですね。どちらかというと留学生には添削をせざるを得ないっていう場面は多
いと思います。
T: なるほど。その日本人学生に比べて。
K: そうですね。母語話者と違って、うまく言いたい事が言えなかったりしてるときに、
「どう直していいですかね」と聞いててもどう直していいかわからないっていう人も
居るので。そういう人には例示するのが一番いいですね。
文章を持ち込む人が何か教育的な効果を期待してる人はやっぱり少ないと。対処療法的にある問題を抱えている、解決してほしいという風に来ることが多いので、利用者がそんな前提にあるものとこちらがこのセンターで現されているものの中に大きなギャップは見られないのです。小さいギャップがあるというところで場合によっては躓くこともあります。それはやっぱり難しいと思います。

二重の役割があるなって気がしてて。一つは向こうにして書きたい文章を見てもらえる前の最終チェックに使えるし、わからないところがあったら教えてくれるし[...]うまく使ってやろうみたいな。自分が書き手として伝わるためにじゃなくて、今日の方みたいに日本語を直してもらいたろうみたいに。[...]でも僕らからしたら、それに則りつつも、できればちょっとでも向こうに自覚的になってほしい。向こうのニーズには答えるけど、その中でどこか相手が書き手としての力をあげてほしいというので。

S: 単純に添削していただくために利用し始めたが、チューターとの対話を通して自分の一番言いたいことは何なのか、自分の文章を書く時の問題点がわかるようになってすごく勉強になりました。
T: 最初はここが面白いなと思いました。
S: そうそうそう。本当に何か最初は発表のために先輩とか周りの母語話者にチェックしてもらってますけど、文章作成の授業を通してこのライティングセンターのことを知って、発表する前に一回利用しましょう。添削して貸して行ってみましたけど、ただの文法の添削じゃないという事で、自分の整理、文章作成の整理などもできるので、すごく良いと思います。

相談しながら添削してくれる。[...]なんか母語話者の感覚で「ここは間違い」「は」じゃない」という風に添削しなくて、何か何が言いたいのか言いたいことを伝えるためにここは「は」の方がいいか「が」の方がいいか。[...]そうすると自分が言いたいことはこの文だけじゃないって、他の文の言えるんじゃないか、自分も積極的を考えるっていう。

はい、今までは友達に自分の文章をみてもらうときには、ほぼ文法的なチェックが多いんです。たまにコメントもあるんですけど、[...]メールでやりとりしているので、どうしても会話をしているうちに自覚させるようなメリットがありますし、チューターさんも会話を通じて書き手の文章作成能力を育成させるという理念がありますから、啓発的な効果があります。そこがよかったと思います。自分が意識できていない部分、例えばそれに対して、とかの部分は[...]対話の中で、あと黒板に書いてもらってなるほど、という感じがしてよかったと思います。

T: ライティングセンターのチューターは例えばどういう存在ですか？
Y: 私先生さっさと言いましたね。なんか先生って感じでた。日本語の先生って感じでした。
T: なるほどね。[...]面白しなかったのが、アドバイスを全部取り入れているから。
Y: そうですか。まぁ役に立つので。私の日本語より絶対上手ですので、そのチューターは。

5-13 ただ僕がパパッと直すことはできないんですけど、一緒にこう、話しながら、一緒に考えていく感じになるんですが。

5-14 L: 理念としては非常に役に立つと思います。文章の修正だけではなくて、相手にどうしてこういうふうに修正するのか、そういう理由も教えて。 […] けど、私の場合はちょっと。時間制限がでんで。
T: なるほどね。 […] あの時間っていうのは、今回は次の日に発表だから？
L: 発表ということではなくて、論文を提出するという、締め切りがあるので。 […] 80ページかな。超える可能性もある。
T: じゃあ理念自体としてはいいけども、修論に関しては？
L: やっぱり相手の状況に従って調整する、相手の要望に応える。
### Appendix M  Transcription Conventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convention</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>A sentence final, with a falling intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,</td>
<td>A short pause in speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td>A long pause in speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[…]</td>
<td>Deleted speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[clarification]</td>
<td>Additional information to clarify meaning (inside brackets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Rising intonation, usually in a question form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“reported speech”</td>
<td>Reported speech (inside quotation marks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>