

論文の内容の要旨

論文題目 : The Effects of Writing Tutorials on Student Revisions in a Japanese Writing Center

(日本のライティング・センターにおけるチュートリアルが学生の書き直しに与える影響)

氏名 : 中竹 真依子

In recent years, in the field of writing instruction in Japan, writing centers have drawn attention as a support service for students' writing. Writing centers provide one-on-one tutorial sessions with tutors on students' writing such as term papers, articles, and theses beyond the regular curriculum. Tutors at a writing center are mainly undergraduate or graduate students with specialized training in teaching and tutoring academic writing. The mission of writing centers is "to produce better writers, not better writing" (North, 1984, p.438). Therefore, writing centers help students to formulate their own plans for effective revisions through tutorial interactions instead of fixing students' papers. That is, a writing center is regarded as a place to foster students' autonomy as writers. Writing centers started in the 1930s in the United States and expand from the 1950s and the 1970s (Carino, 2002). To date, a considerable number of studies on writing centers have been conducted in the U.S. (e.g. Blau & Hall, 2002; Carino, 2002; Carter-Tod, 1995; Harris & Silva, 1993; Myers, 2003; Powers, 1993; Ritter, 2002; Thonus, 1995, 1998a, 1998b, 1999a, 1999b, 2001, 2002, 2004; Weigle & Nelson, 2004; Williams, 2002, 2004, 2005). In Japan, on the other hand, the first writing centers were established in 2004. Since then, the number of writing centers has been steadily growing across the country. With the increase in the number of writing centers in Japanese universities, research on writing centers in Japan has been growing year by year. However, much of the research discusses the role and administration of writing centers (Hays, 2010; Itoh, 2008; Johnston & Swenson, 2005; Johnston, Cornwell, & Yoshida, 2008; Johnston, Cornwell, & Yoshida, 2010; Johnston, Yoshida, & Cornwell, 2010; Yoshida, Johnston, & Cornwell, 2010; Yasuda, 2006), while others report the writing

center practice at an individual university (e.g., Masamune, 2009, 2012; Matsuta, 2011; Morikoshi, 2008). In the near future, as the number of writing centers in Japan continues to increase, studies on tutorial practice in Japanese writing centers will become necessary in order to provide effective tutorials with EFL writers. Although there are a few empirical studies on writing center tutorials in Japanese context (Nakatake, 2012; Sadoshima, 2009; Sadoshima, Shimura, & Ohta, 2009), to the best of my knowledge, no previous studies in Japan have attempted to link writing center tutorials with the revisions made later by students to their texts. In the U.S. or other countries as well, the majority of previous studies on writing center tutorials have focused on the interactional features of writing tutorials and there have been very few studies on the effects of writing center tutorials on students' subsequent revisions. Therefore, this study aims to investigate the effects of writing center tutorials on students' subsequent revisions. In the present study, the following research questions were formed:

- 1) What kinds of tutor feedback were offered in writing center tutorials?
- 2) What kinds of revisions were made after tutorial sessions?
- 3) How were those revisions affected by what was discussed during the tutorial session when they revise their papers?
- 4) What are the reasons for the influences?
- 5) What other factors could affect students' revisions?

The participants in this study were 12 tutors who were either native speakers of Japanese or fluent in Japanese and 20 Japanese undergraduate students enrolled in a compulsory first-year science English academic writing course. With the students' and tutors' consent, 22 tutorial sessions for L2 English writing were audio-recorded, video-recorded, transcribed, and coded by two coders and the author. In some of the 22 sessions, the tutors and the students were the same. All the sessions were conducted in Japanese. In addition to the transcripts of the sessions, the students' initial drafts and revised drafts after tutorial sessions were collected for subsequent analysis. Within a few days of submitting the revised papers, retrospective interviews were conducted with the students in order to incorporate the students' perspectives on their participation in session and to clarify the reasons for their responses to the writing center tutorials in their revision processes. In this study, ten students agreed to be interviewed. Retrospective interviews with tutors were also conducted in order to investigate their approach to tutorials (tutorial strategies) and what they were thinking during the session. Tutor interviews were usually carried out immediately after the tutorial session, but when the tutor was booked for the next tutorial session, the interview was conducted within a few days of the tutorial. Seven tutors agreed to be interviewed. All the interviews were conducted in Japanese. They were audio-recorded and later transcribed for further analysis. Before conducting retrospective interviews, I also asked both the student participants and tutors who had agreed to be interviewed to answer Thompson's (2010) questionnaires consisting of eight questions on the writing center tutorial they engaged in. The results of the questionnaire were also used as supplementary data for the following retrospective interviews. The data was collected during the summer and winter semesters of 2011

and 2012. The data analysis in this study proceeded in three phases: (1) tutor feedback offered during tutorial sessions, (2) types of revision, and (3) students' responses to writing center tutorials in their revision process. An analysis of tutoring strategies was undertaken based on the transcripts of tutorial sessions. I compared the transcripts of tutorial conversations with students' revisions and analyzed what kinds of tutoring strategies were used for each revision. In the present study, 11 tutoring strategies were identified for coding. Regarding types of revision, I compared the students' first drafts with the subsequent drafts and numbered all the identified revision changes in the text. Types of revision were classified into six categories, content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, mechanics, and style. To analyze students' responses to writing center tutorials, I compared each revision with tutorial discourse, and then made judgments as to whether each revision in the subsequent draft reflected the tutorial interactions in the session. Students' responses to writing center tutorials in their revision process were classified into four categories: Directly incorporated, Indirectly incorporated, Not incorporated, and Not discussed.

Regarding the first research question, "what kinds of tutorial feedback were offered in writing center tutorials?", Results show that tutor feedback focused most often on content (39%) followed by grammar (26%) and vocabulary (23%). This is mainly because in tutor training, tutors are instructed to start with global issues such as content, overall structure, sequence of information and then do local issues such as grammatical errors. In addition, the findings from the present study showed that the tutors used various tutoring strategies simultaneously to increase the student's active participation and to move the discussion toward more effective ways of improving their drafts. Among the tutoring strategies observed in the present study, *suggestions* and *negotiations* were most frequently used. The tutoring strategies used in this study mostly corresponded to scaffolding mechanisms in previous work on writing center tutorials (Williams, 2002, 2004; Thompson, 2009), on peer discussions (Villamil & Guerrero, 1996; Guerrero & Villamil, 2000), and on teacher-learner talk (Weissberg, 2006). Regarding the second research question, "what kinds of revisions were made after tutorial sessions?", the results showed that content revisions accounted for the highest percentage of all types of revisions, followed by vocabulary and grammar. The answers to research question three to five were discovered through interviews. As to the research questions three and four, the students' use of the tutorial discussions in revising their drafts, it was revealed that the students mostly incorporated what was discussed during the tutorial sessions but also made self-initiated revisions that were not discussed in tutorial sessions. Even students who did not follow the tutor feedback made their own decision about whether or not to incorporate their tutor feedback into their revisions. This implies that the students had ownership of their texts and made self-directed decisions on their use of tutor feedback. These findings suggest that writing center tutorials can help to foster autonomous writers. Through the analysis of the students' use of the tutorial discussions in revising their drafts, it can be assumed that individual factors are more related to whether the student makes revisions or not than the types of tutor feedback (how issues are addressed). In response to research question five, "what other factors could affect students' revisions", 1) students' English proficiency, 2) students' motivation, 3) deadline of paper

submission, 4) types of revision problems students were being asked to revise, and 5) writing center visits were observed through the interviews with the students, and indicated that these factors are interrelated with each other and can influence their revision process.

This is a case study in a specific writing center setting. Even if this study is just one situation, it provides descriptions and interpretations of one writing center in Japan which are rich enough to be made use of in future studies and to shed light on different situations. The present study informs future large-scale study with a larger corpus of varied writing center tutorials in order to explore the effective tutoring practices in writing centers, which can be adopted in tutor training. In addition, this study examined only the relationship between tutorial discussions in a session and the revisions that appeared in the subsequent draft. Future research needs to examine the long-term effects of writing center tutorials on students' writing and revision. Furthermore, the success and quality of the students' revisions were not taken into account in this study. Future research will be required to investigate the effects of writing center tutorials on revision success and the improvement of writing quality. However, it should be kept in mind that the assessment of the success and improvement of students' revision and writing should be taken into account with caution, because the mission of writing centers is producing better writers, not better writing. Assessing the improvement of students' writing, in a sense, may require writing center tutorials to improve students' papers, which seems to be contradictory to the mission of writing centers. It must be acknowledged that investigating the effects of writing center tutorials on students' revisions and writing itself might include the assessment of improvement of student writing after the tutoring, and might also be necessary to demonstrate persuasively the educational and institutional value of writing centers to public or the administration. The questions, then, arise, what is "a better writer"? and what is a good writing center tutorial in order to produce better writers, not better writing? Considering how to define a better writer and how to measure better writers can offer a good solution to the issue on the assessment of the outcome of writing center, which remains to be solved.

Although much remains unexamined regarding whether writing center tutorials can improve the quality of student writing, the present study was successful in discovering that tutorial interactions can bring some positive changes in students' revision processes: internalize tutor feedback or what was discussed during the session, reflect on their texts critically in the revision process, and become conscious of the importance of reader awareness in revision processes. These internal changes within students are important, and to make student writers self-conscious about such attitudes for writing is the role of writing center tutorials, which eventually lead to foster autonomous writers. The significance of the present study is to shed light on the importance of interaction in the process of writing and offer an insight into how interactive feedback-giving activity can contribute to the process of writing and development of student autonomy as a writer. This study was also highly valuable because very few studies have explored the effects of writing center tutorials on students' revision processes. The present study will serve as a stepping stone to further development for future writing research and writing instruction in English education in Japan.