"So what would you say your thesis is so far?" Tutor Questions in Writing Tutorials

Holger Limberg°, Christine Modey* & Judy Dyer*

° European University of Flensburg | Germany
* University of Michigan | USA

Abstract: Two long-standing assumptions on which writing centers operate are that individual tutoring helps students' writing development and that the actual talk of such tutoring enables such development (Bruffee, 1984; Lunsford, 1991; Gillespie & Lerner, 2008; Mackiewicz & Thompson, 2015). Questions, long thought of as one of the most important pedagogical tools, enable writing tutors to tap into students' knowledge of writing, help them clarify the writing task, advance their thoughts, and advise them indirectly on how to proceed further. Whereas writing center lore has emphasized the importance of questioning in non-directive tutorials, scholars have only recently begun to explore empirically tutors' actual use of questions more generally in tutorials, the differentiated functions of questions, and the strategic use of questions in tutorial discourse (Thompson & Mackiewicz, 2014).

In this study we present an original, empirical scheme for coding question types in writing tutorials derived from 15 writing tutorial sessions in our own corpus of the genre. We apply this functionally oriented scheme to one typical session to show how questions operate locally, how they are distributed across a session, as well as how they achieve both pedagogical and organizational goals within such interactions. The use of questions in this tutorial is compared with question use in 14 other sessions to discover patterns in tutors' questioning behavior. Our findings provide insight into how tutors' strategic use of particular question types can empower students to become more active participants in the tutorial.

Keywords: questions, coding scheme, writing tutorial, writing tutoring, case study

1.   Introduction

Discourse analytic studies of writing center interactions have been carried out for some time now, many of which focus on the domain of peer tutoring and ESL writing (Thonus, 1993, 2002; Blau, Hall, & Strauss, 1998; Williams, 2005). In the discourse research literature some important issues include structural patterns of writing center discourse (Freedman & Sperling, 1985; Freedman & Katz, 1987; Williams, 2005); the role of (peer) tutors (Trimbur, 1987; Thonus, 2001); and differences between tutorials with L1 and L2 student writers (Blau & Hall, 2002; Thonus, 2004; Williams, 2005). The institutional nature of tutorial interactions is clearly visible in their predictable phase structure, their narrow range of topics, their task-focus and goal-setting (Williams, 2005; cf. Limberg, 2010). An important part of the mechanics of these interactions, and of talk in general, is the use of questions as a basic means of structuring discourse and exchanging information and as a pivotal source of learning (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Long & Sato, 1983; Ashton-Jones, 1988; Ellis, 1993; Ehrlich & Freed, 2010). Questions, as well as their answers, form a basic sequence of talk (Schegloff, 2007). In writing tutorials, they guide students in the writing process by providing a context in which students can articulate ideas, reveal problems, and explain their approach to the writing task. Understanding the use of questions in this context provides additional insight into how writing tutors accompany students on their way to becoming more effective writers of academic papers.

Linguistic research has been interested in questions for a long time. In particular, speech act research and conversation analysis have largely contributed to our understanding about what items can serve as questions and how questions function in conversation (for an overview see Freed, 1994). The pedagogical power of questions has also been explored, especially regarding their forms and functions in the classroom (Riegle, 1976; Hargreaves, 1984; Nunn, 1999). The writing conference, or tutorial, is a form of discourse with a long-standing tradition in higher education. Both its institutional goals and organizational format make it a particular academic discourse type, notably characterized by a one-to-one setting, a dialog conducted with a writing tutor (peer or faculty) in a limited time frame without formal assessment (grading). Given these circumstances, we can assume that questions not only have a high incidence in this discourse type, but also that their functional implications are specific to this kind of talk. According to Harris (1986, p. 6), "[t]he teacher's [writing] conference role here is to encourage this exploration [of what the students want to say], to help students move through the process of discovery by talking with them, asking questions, and generally keeping up the momentum of exploration." Understanding how questions work in tutorials and how tutors use them at specific moments in the talk to "help students find their own answers" (Harris, 1986, p. 11) is a valuable source of knowledge for writing pedagogy.

Coding schemes of questions have been proposed for specific discourse domains, such as informal conversation (Kearsley, 1976; Freed, 1994) and classrooms (Riegle, 1976; Wong, 2010). Some research into questions in tutorial discourse has been conducted by Arthur C. Graesser and his colleagues in the field of cognitive psychology. They developed a coding scheme from research methods tutorials for college students and algebra tutorials for 7th graders based on the discourse context of the questions. This scheme was adapted by Thompson and Mackiewicz (2014) for writing center conferences, in what appears to be the only empirical large-scale study on questions in university writing tutorials to date. While their attempt is very promising, the study of questions in writing tutorials can be further developed if a coding system is used that is function oriented and context specific. Many researchers have argued that it is the very talk about writing that is fundamental to this discourse type. That is, the discourse of a writing tutorial both creates and reflects the writing tutorial genre, in that the tutor is modeling not only how to write but also how to talk about writing. We can therefore learn more about the function and use of questions if the tutorial talk is actually the starting point for the coding. Thus, a coding scheme was developed from original tutorial data that can be applied to other writing tutorials and can be used to replicate similar studies.

Our taxonomy is thus geared towards the particularities of the writing tutorial as a discourse genre. We take a functional, interactional approach to identifying questions, based on what tutors aim to achieve and how students respond to these questions. Moreover, the categories we develop not only integrate tutors' goals (cf. Thompson & Mackiewicz, 2014), but also reflect the discourse roles they adopt during the tutorial talk, such as reader vs. writer of the paper, as instructor vs. student, and as institutional member vs. conversation partner. This distinction offers another level of detail, which provides further insights into how tutors help students to talk about their writing.

In this article we therefore propose a new coding scheme for questions in university writing tutorials that further develops previous work on questions in tutorials (cf. Ashton Jones, 1988; Graesser, Person, & Huber, 1992; Thompson & Mackiewicz, 2014). Moreover, we present and discuss the use of questions in writing tutorials, adopting a case study approach. The example shows the distribution of questions, their pragmatic functions, and the effects they may have on the student. A case study allows us to provide a comprehensive overview of question use in tutorials as well as give a detailed account of the effects that specific questions have. It is our intention in this paper both to describe the ways in which writing tutors use questions to achieve pedagogical and organizational goals, and to examine the effects of these questions.

We contend that studying tutors' use of questions in writing tutorials can yield valuable pedagogical insights into the tangible ways in which writing center conversation actually proceeds and how it can promote students' exploration and development of their own writing. With this goal in mind, we hope to understand better how the use of questions in tutorial talk helps writers become more engaged in both the tutorial conversation and their writing itself.

2. Literature review

Questions have long been acknowledged as a primary way of structuring pedagogical discourse in classrooms. Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) initiation-response-feedback and Mehan's (1979) initiation-response-evaluation sequences are well-known discourse models in the classroom, with questions viewed as a quintessential part of transmitting information as well as organizing and monitoring learning. Yet, those who study effective learning and teaching argue that one-to-one tutoring is a powerful method of instruction because it makes possible individually tailored instruction that responds to each student's unique learning needs by creating a supportive, mutual, conversational learning environment (Fink, 2003, p. 251), by allowing the asking of the high level questions essential for the development of critical thinking (Graesser & Person, 1994), by providing a writer with targeted (specific and well-timed) feedback on learning tasks (Ambrose, Bridges, DiPietro, Lovett, & Norman, 2010), and by offering responses to a writer's ideas and personalized instruction directed toward their revision (Sommers, 2006).

The personalized nature of tutorials is reflected in the kind of conversation that occurs. The structural composition of tutorials is located somewhere between conversational turn-taking and traditional classroom interaction (Freedman & Katz, 1987, p. 77). Tutorials feature different question types asked by the tutor, which provide a set frame for the participants offering a unique opportunity to talk about students' needs and ideas (Freedman & Katz, 1987). Thonus (2002, p. 127) identifies as one necessary but not sufficient condition for successful tutorials that the turn structure closely resembles "that of 'real' conversation rather than an ask-and-advise service encounter comprised of restricted question + answer adjacency pairs." Tutorials in which "real" questions are used that openly ask for students' information and opinion are rated higher as attributes of a satisfactory outcome. However, the occurrence of question-answer patterns does not inevitably turn a tutorial into a mini-lesson. In peer tutoring, in particular, "tight sequences of organized question-answer adjacency pairs [...] are not the norm" (Williams, 2005, p. 43), although tutor questions may prevail in the larger activity of diagnosing the student paper, occurring either only at the beginning of a tutorial or throughout the whole session. The body of tutorials is composed of different sequence clusters in which problems and inconsistencies in the paper are first identified and subsequently dealt with. In this process, questions act as the primary engine of change (see Section 5 below).

Questions are multifunctional and multivalent: while they are commonly used to elicit information, they can also be used to monitor common ground in writing conferences (Graesser & Person, 1994), and can be used to convey information to, rather than elicit information from the student (e.g., reversed polarity questions) (Koshik, 2010). Questions can be used to expose students' knowledge deficits and to stimulate

their thinking with regards to ideas for improvement (see Section 5). However, although all these functions of questions are potentially useful in writing tutorials (Thompson & Mackiewicz, 2014), questions are also "endowed with inherent abilities to control and dominate" (Wang, 2006, p. 532). As an example, "display questions" (Long & Sato, 1983; Allwright & Bailey, 1991), often found in pedagogical interactions, operate more overtly in terms of topic control and turn distribution in institutional discourse than in ordinary conversation (cf. Goody, 1978). Display and other kinds of questions can also undermine egalitarianism by allowing the tutor to exert control over the agenda of the session, turning it into a kind of "inquisition" (Gillespie & Lerner, 2008, p. 37). Moreover, when tutors do not provide the support less confident or experienced students need, questions can backfire, resulting in writers' confusion or disengagement (Gillespie & Lerner, 2008). For example, long sequences of question-answer adjacency pairs, can overwhelm students, especially L2 writers, who might better absorb the information offered through showing or telling rather than questioning (Williams, 2004).

Many writing center researchers have studied questions using various classification schemes, including open-ended, closed-ended, and leading questions, as well as classifications based on questions' grammatical structure, such as either/or or wh-questions (Babcock & Thonus, 2012, p. 50). Categories like "real" questions or "closed-ended" questions (cf. Haas, 1986; Thonus, 1999) do not reveal much about their actual, phase-specific functioning in this discourse type. In fact, they do not really help writing tutors understand the differential impact of questions in getting students to talk about their paper and helping them understand the input given by the tutor. A more recent and promising attempt in this direction has been made by Thompson and Mackiewicz (2014), who recently published a paper using a coding scheme for writing tutorials, based on Graesser, Person and Huber's (1992) taxonomy from the field of cognitive psychology. Thompson and Mackiewicz's scheme is necessarily more general than ours since it was not developed specifically for, but rather adapted to, their corpus of writing tutorials. Their typology of five question types (Knowledge deficit, Common ground, Social coordination, Conversation control and Leading and Scaffolding) works with broad functional categories and takes less account than ours of how questions address different roles of speaker and addressee (as reader, writer, tutor, or student). Thompson and Mackiewicz's study shows that questions in writing center conferences serve a variety of instructional and conversational functions. Apart from this scheme, however, a systematic and detailed categorization of function-based question types used in writing tutorials does not yet exist.

Questioning constitutes a major tutoring strategy that requires further scrutiny. Our paper attempts to find out how the use of questions contributes to an interactional environment in which authentic conversations about writing are possible, (as suggested as the goal in many tutorial guidelines and handbooks,) by applying a taxonomy of questions drawn from an analysis of writing tutorial sessions from a large midwestern university's writing center to a sample tutorial. The application of this taxonomy will

provide a more nuanced picture of the use of questions as well as their functional qualities relevant to the phase in which they occur in the tutorial. Finally, the results are viewed in light of what writing center research suggests concerning tutor use of questions in facilitating student writing development.

3.   Data and methodology

Data for this study were collected over a period of several weeks in the fall of 2007 at the Sweetland Center for Writing at the University of Michigan. Seven Sweetland Writing Center faculty who were experienced and skilled professional writing tutors, all holding an MFA or Ph.D., volunteered to participate in the study. As part of their appointment, these faculty spend ten hours per week tutoring in 30 or 60 minute long writing tutorials. Student participants were recruited by posting fliers around campus and by inviting students to participate when they made their tutoring appointments. In all, 71 undergraduate participants were recruited, of which 51 were female and 20 male. Sixteen identified a language other than English spoken at home, including languages as diverse as Chinese and Albanian. More than half were first-year students (43); three were sophomores, 12 were juniors, and 13 were seniors. It should be noted that the writing center staff in our data differ from those in previous analyses of writing workshop discourse (cf. Blau, Hall, & Strauss, 1998; Thompson, 2009), as they are formally qualified faculty members rather than peer tutors, as in many other writing centers. This fact should be taken into account when considering the effects of questions in the tutorial under analysis, since it is likely to produce a less egalitarian form of discourse.

Each of the 71 tutorial sessions was audio-recorded by the participating tutor using a digital voice recorder. The sessions were then transcribed by undergraduate research assistants and checked by the researchers with the recordings. The recordings were transcribed following MICASE transcription conventions (Simpson-Vlach & Leicher, 2006) without noting the finer details of talk such as prosodic features. Our main concern in choosing the type of transcription was to increase readability by using standard orthography and to be able to indicate speaker turns clearly. Names were anonymized and replaced by letters (T for Tutor, S for Student), and line numbers added to facilitate referencing.

After the transcription was complete, the following process was followed: the researchers independently read and listened to five randomly chosen sessions, attempting to identify all questions in these sessions. After independently identifying all the questions in these five writing tutorial sessions, the researchers met to compare all those they had considered questions, and then independently started to try to categorize these questions by function. Researchers then met to compare categorization of the questions and during these discussions our final eleven categories emerged. We were then able to fine-tune the definitions of these categories so that we could train a group of undergraduate research assistants to apply the coding scheme.

The typology was then validated through five research assistants independently coding ten more writing tutorial sessions, providing a total of 15 sessions. This subcorpus of 15 coded sessions accounts for roughly 20% of the whole corpus (71 sessions). A high level of inter-rater reliability was reached concerning both the recognition of questions and in coding the question types in the 10 additional transcripts. The process of deriving the typology was very time intensive, but when used by the undergraduate research assistants did show an inter-rater reliability rate of roughly 90%, (cf. Saldaña, 2012). Below we discuss our coding scheme in more detail.

4. A typology of question types for writing tutorial discourse

When we had read and coded the initial five writing tutorial sessions a definition of what constituted a question in this context was becoming clearer. We found that an utterance may be easily recognizable or interpreted as a question by a listener, even when more obvious distinguishing features such as question words (interrogatives) are absent, but it is somewhat less easy to identify particular features that make that utterance a question. Similarly, as stated by Bolinger (1957) cited by Freed and Ehrlich (2010, p. 5), "no single linguistic criterion (e.g., syntax, intonation, sequential position) is either sufficient or necessary to define a question." It is clear that less local features such as intonation and the sequencing of utterances, lead a listener to interpret an utterance as a question. In addition, whether a listener interprets an utterance as a question or not may depend on the speech event in which the question is embedded (Levinson, 1992; Sarangi, 2010; Koshik, 2010; Babcock & Thonus, 2012). In fact, many of the questions in our data are recognizable through the presence of interrogative syntax (subject-verb inversion) or a question word (interrogative). Some, however, are not identifiable by their form, yet must still be considered as questions.

When devising our typology, in identifying questions we were concerned less with the formal properties of those questions and more with understanding the function those questions were fulfilling. The function of the question can often be seen in the effect it produces in the listener (cf. Levinson, 1983; Freed, 1994; Nunn, 1999), through how the student responds, in attempting to clarify a matter, by generating new thoughts, establishing common ground and following the tutor's guidance. Thus, a definition of questions which is based on functional, meaning-based criteria is more revealing to understanding a discourse type that is largely driven by this device (see also Graesser, Person, & Huber, 1992). The question types in our study were derived according to the primary function they were deemed to serve in the talk (see Table 1). Therefore, in view of our functional emphasis in identifying question types we adopted Hultgren and Cameron's definition of question cited by Freed and Ehrlich (2010) which defines questions as "[U]tterances that [...] 'solicit (and/or are treated by the recipient as soliciting) information, confirmation, or action" (p. 6). This definition acknowledges that a question requires a response from the listener, but that a response need not be verbally encoded. Furthermore, according to this definition a question need not be

seeking any information beyond checking that the interlocutor is following the speaker, or allowing them to continue. Such an understanding of what a question can do seemed to capture the examples we had identified as questions in our data.

As outlined above, our typology was empirically derived in order to describe our data optimally, with the main intention being to describe tutors' questions in the recorded sessions in terms of their organizational, pedagogical, social or affective functions. For example, tutors frequently asked students about the subject or topic of their piece of writing, so the question type Information Student Subject (ISS) in our classification reflects this particular function. An example of this question type is "So who has the power in the UK, the government or the people?" (202). Tutors also often seemed to be checking that the student had understood what they had just said, or that the student was willing to go along with or agree with what they were saying. Thus another question type, Confirmation Tutor Owned (CTO) reflects this function. One common example of the CTO category in many sessions is "Does that make sense?".

Classifying questions in a more formal way, either through syntactic or prosodic form, revealed little to us about their purpose or effect in the tutorial. Tag questions are a case in point. Their form may be easily detectable as canonical or invariant tag (Holmes, 1983), but their functional significance is far more diverse (see Holmes, 1983; Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, & Svartvik, 1985; Tsui, 1992). In the context of writing tutorials, the balancing of an information deficit and concomitant pursuit of mutual understanding are two essential actions performed by tags. We therefore decided to include tag questions within two major categories: CTO (Confirmation Tutor Owned) and CSO (Confirmation Student Owned). This coding by function brought us additional information concerning the ownership of the information and how frequently the tutor asked the student to confirm that either the tutor or the student had understood. Thus, the tag as an important interactive device in tutorial talk was both seen as a stimulus to engage in a reflection about the writing as well as a means to pause the turn and allow the student to process the information provided.

As we were interested in exploring the impact tutor questions had on the interaction itself, our typology recognizes that the two actors, tutor and student, play a number of roles, both with regards to one another and to the essay. These roles are negotiated and thus subject to change throughout the talk. The tutor's and student's institutional identities and positions in the university and their orientation to these respective positions remain relatively fixed in a power hierarchy. But they may also be subject to change locally, for example, through specific questions produced during the interaction. The tutor acts both as a reader of the student's essay and as an expert writer, helping the student to write more effectively. The student's primary role is as writer, but again in the tutorial they are required by the speech event to become a reader and interpreter of their own work, reflecting on and rationalizing particular decisions they have taken as writers and justifying those decisions to the tutor-as-reader. This process involves stepping back and more objectively viewing their own work in light of tutor questions and comments.

These rather complex roles are also represented in our typology. For example, in the question category of Writer Oriented (Idea Generating) the student is required by the tutor's question to adopt the role of writer and go beyond their current thinking within the paper and to generate new ideas. In the category Reader Oriented (Product) the student is required by the tutor's question to view their own writing as a reader would, analyzing the formal aspects of the paper they have written. The category of Display question was also incorporated in the typology, but only to the extent to which we were confident that the answer was already known by the tutor. This was primarily the case when formal aspects of the writing were addressed (e.g., grammar). Finally, in line with our definition of questions stated above, we included one category which has the appearance of a question, but the illocutionary force of a request (cf. "inquiries" in Graesser, Person, & Huber, 1992). Requests for actions occasionally appeared during a tutorial to induce a physical activity closely connected to the talk about a passage in the paper, therefore being important for the writing process (e.g., Do you want to try to write that sentence?).

In creating this typology our main intention was to be able to describe adequately the functions of the question types in relation to the pedagogy of writing tutorials. In addition, we strove to capture all questions that tutors used to help students with their assignment. Indeed, recently Babcock and Thonus (2012, p.50) have voiced the importance of such a study, stating "Since much of tutoring takes place through questions, an investigation of question asking and answering in the tutoring session is a valuable undertaking." At the time of data coding there existed no such typology for questions applied to writing tutorial discourse. Table 1 shows our final typology of 11 tutor question types with examples for each type taken from our data.

Table 1: Tutor Question Types in Writing Tutorials

Type	Code	Function	Examples
Information Seeking: Background	ISB	…elicit general background information about student, class or writing assignment	Have you been to Sweetland before? So what class is this?
Information Seeking: Subject	ISS	…elicit information about the subject matter of the paper	So is it also a Hebrew phrase? So who has the power in the UK, the government or the people?
Organizational (Agenda)	ORG	…discover student's concerns about assignment to set agenda for the session / tutorial	What are you concerned about? What else do you need help with how to write?
Writer Oriented: Process (Reflection)	WOR	…elicit information about student's process of conceptualizing and writing the paper (past)	Why do you think he encouraged you to put both together? What was hard about it?

Writer Oriented: Idea Generating	WOI	…encourage further thinking about the paper and to generate new ideas from points in the paper (take thinking further)	What kind of word is magic? What are some questions you still have after this experience?
Reader Oriented: Product	ROP	…make paper a better product through questioning the existing current content (referring to what is written)	Does it have an overall thesis? How should I view this draft in terms of how you have structured it?
Display	DIS	…check student's knowledge of formal aspects of writing (grammar); answer known to tutor	Why do you need a comma? What's the subject of this clause?
Permission	PER	…ask permission from the student to perform some procedural action	Can I read it out loud a little bit? Can I, can I give you an example to help maybe that'll help you understand?
Confirmation Student Owned	CSO	…ask student to confirm something for the tutor, confirm information belonging to the student	So you do have a thesis? So you're taking the essay as like having four parts, four or five parts?
Confirmation Tutor Owned	CTO	…ask student to show understanding of what tutor has just said	Does that make sense? I don't know if I agree with what he's talking about but I'm going to give him my full attention, do you know?
Request for Action	RFA	…ask student to perform some activity during the session; has illocutionary force of a directive	Can you point to me the differences when you stop summarizing and when you start analyzing? Could you circle the words that have the most bias in that sentence?

Having generated an inductive typology for representing the kinds of questions found in the data, we were interested in discovering whether certain question types were more common than others and whether they occurred in specific phases of the tutorial. Moreover, we wanted to find out how questions operate locally in the tutorial in getting students to think and talk about their writing. The following case study of a writing tutorial session illustrates how these question types are distributed and shows their range of functions in writing tutorials.

5. Case study of a writing tutorial

For the purpose of the present paper, the data of one session is used for a thorough analysis. This session was chosen because it seemed to be quite typical in the way it progressed and because it is reasonably representative in terms of the distribution of question types in our corpus, thus providing a window into writing center praxis. The

high number of questions it includes provides a rich source of examples for our analysis. In 15 sessions with five different tutors a total of 940 questions were identified. The number of questions asked by a tutor in each session ranged from 39 to 101, with our case study session being the highest at 101. These 101 questions are distributed across nine of our eleven question categories. This distribution also made this session richly illustrative, including almost every question type in our typology. The majority of the questions in our chosen session are confirmation tutor-owned questions (38 x CTO), followed by idea-generating questions (30 x WOI). Combined, they amount to 67.3% of all tutor questions in this session (see #10 in Table 2).

Table 2: Distribution of Question Types across 15 Writing Tutorials

Question category → Tutorial number ↓	ISB	ISS	ORG	WOR	WOI	ROP	DIS	PER	CSO	CTO	RFA	Total	%
#1	2	0	1	1	1	3	5	4	15	23	1	56	6.0
#2	5	1	1	2	13	4	1	4	20	41	5	97	10.3
#3	8	0	1	0	10	1	0	0	10	31	4	65	6.9
#4	5	2	2	1	11	0	0	1	7	20	2	51	5.4
#5	3	3	3	3	9	7	0	7	16	25	6	82	8.7
#6	4	0	6	1	1	0	1	5	13	36	2	69	7.3
#7	2	1	2	1	6	3	0	2	3	22	0	42	4.5
#8	7	0	1	0	6	1	0	1	12	25	0	53	5.6
#9	6	2	0	3	13	0	0	0	8	17	0	49	5.2
#10	9	0	3	1	30	12	2	0	4	38	2	101	10.7
#11	4	6	0	2	2	1	0	0	4	20	0	39	4.1
#12	8	6	1	7	10	7	0	1	7	13	0	60	6.4
#13	5	1	4	36	5	0	0	0	11	10	0	72	7.7
#14	3	1	1	4	11	13	0	2	12	11	0	58	6.2
#15	8	5	2	4	0	2	9	3	10	2	1	46	4.9
Total	79	28	28	66	128	54	18	30	152	334	23	940	100

The fact that the sample tutorial contains the largest number of questions also makes it in some parts idiosyncratic in question distribution (see Table 3). One odd distribution in this tutorial, compared to our subcorpus of 15 sessions, are CSO questions. Only 4.0% of all questions seek to confirm an assumption that lies within the student's knowledge area, whereas this category has a higher representation in the subcorpus (16.2 %). This difference suggests that this tutor may exercise more control over the course of the tutorial, apparently leaving the clarification of issues less often to the student. Further differences can be found in the frequency of WOI and ROP questions.

The interaction in the sample tutorial lasts 28 minutes of the half hour time slot for which each student appointment is scheduled. The female undergraduate student is attending an entry-level course in political science and has to write an essay for her midterm examination, comparing the political systems in three countries (Germany, France, and the UK). Since this is her first college paper, she seeks the assistance of a writing tutor. The tutor is a female lecturer who teaches first-year courses in writing and offers writing assistance to undergraduate students on a regular basis. According to the student, her basic concern is "the quality" of the paper. She also feels unsure of her

grammar and admits to having problems with the organization of paragraphs, specifically introductory and transition sentences.

Table 3: Percentages of question types in case study session compared with the average across 15 writing tutorial sessions

Transcript #10		%	Subcorpus of 15 Sessions		%
ISB	9	8.9%	ISB	79	8.4%
ISS	0	0.0%	ISS	28	3.0%
ORG	3	3.0%	ORG	28	3.0%
WOR	1	0.9%	WOR	66	7.0%
WOI	30	29.7%	WOI	128	13.6%
ROP	12	11.9%	ROP	54	5.7%
DIS	2	2.0%	DIS	18	1.9%
PER	0	0.0%	PER	30	3.2%
CSO	4	4.0%	CSO	152	16.2%
CTO	38	37.6%	CTO	334	35.5%
RFA	2	2.0%	RFA	23	2.4%
	101	100.0%		940	100.0%

The session is particularly interesting for a qualitative analysis of questions because there is a communication breakdown which appears to be both caused, as well as resolved by, the kind of questioning used by the tutor. When this situation is remedied, it seems to affect positively the trajectory of the session and the interactive behavior of the student. Despite the fact that the tutor in this session, in the view of some writing center practitioners, might be considered quite directive, her method of questioning apparently still allows the student to become more involved and take more responsibility for improving her essay.

Below we organize our analysis according to the sequential three-part structure observed in previous analyses of writing tutorials (see Thonus, 1999; Cumming & So, 1996; Williams, 2004), showing how questions perform different functions in different phases of the talk. First, we briefly describe the use of questions in the opening of the session, leading into the point in the diagnosis/problem-solving phase where the tutor's questioning leads first to student confusion, but ultimately, we argue, to a deeper understanding of writing, how to talk about writing and how writing tutorials work. Because we were interested in the discourse functions of questions rather than the tutor's intentions in asking them, the analysis was conducted by the three authors, independent from the tutor involved.

5.1   Openings

While rather short sequences of talk, especially in institutional settings, openings are neither discursively irrelevant, nor necessarily void of questions. The opening of writing tutorials seeks to perform two main tasks in a fairly short time. One is to get to know the

student and the other is to set an agenda for the tutorial by letting the student voice her concerns regarding the paper (cf. Limberg 2010, on similarities in office hour discourse). Unsurprisingly, therefore, both tasks are discursively achieved through a number of information-seeking background (ISB) questions, which elicit general background information about the student, her class, the assignment, and her previous experience with this tutoring practice.

```
[1] So what are we looking at today? (ISB)
[2] Are you taking 125 this semester? (ISB)
[3] Have you ever been here before? (ISB)
```

Organizational questions are also mostly found at the outset ([4]), but if time permits, tutors invite further issues towards the end of the session once the main agenda has been achieved ([5]):

```
[4] What are you concerned about? (ORG)
[5] Other questions? (ORG) (Session #6)
```

Given that the philosophy of a writing center focuses on the student's concerns, tutor questions like [1] and [4] above seem essential at the outset of these sessions. They allow the student to express her concerns with the paper and set an agenda for the tutorial. In this tutorial, the student's response starts broad and unspecific ("quality of it [the paper]"), before naming some language-related issues such as grammar, commas and transition sentences. The fact that this is her first time at the writing center prompts the tutor to inform the student that the focus of these tutorials is not on editing the paper (i.e., only focusing on language issues), but on "looking for the like large scale stuff" (Tutor) (cf. North, 1984). Such large-scale issues include the thesis of the paper and how individual paragraphs are linked to the writer's main idea. These are issues that this tutor notices in the student's essay.

5.2   Diagnosis/Problem-solving

Clearly, the majority of questions occur during the diagnosis/problem-solving phase of tutorials. This is a complex and sequentially convoluted phase in which different aspects of the writing are diagnosed as problematic, followed by an attempt to resolve these issues to help the student improve her paper and her writing. In this case, 82 questions (81.2%) are asked by the tutor during the diagnosis/problem-solving. Interestingly, among this bulk we can identify no permission (PER), organizational (ORG) or information-seeking subject (ISS) questions. It seems that organizational and procedural questions are not employed to advance the talk at this stage. Instead, a combination of questions operating both locally as well as globally with regard to text and writing process seem to dominate this phase.

5.2.1 Talking about topic sentences

One part of the session which is particularly interesting because questions and questioning per se become the topic of conversation, occurs about a third of the way through the tutorial. The tutor and student are talking about topic sentences. This is an aspect of the student's essay identified by the tutor as problematic, so she uses a particular example to discuss criteria for topic sentences. In this section, we also see that particular question types perform particular phase-specific functions.

The following transcripts [6-9] display a cluster of diagnosis/problem-solving sequences in which questions are used to convey information as well as activate student thought processes. The first sequence of this cluster is characterized by a number of questions operating locally, that is, they help to process given information and establish common ground, but do not leave the student much room for extensive contributions.

```
[6]
001 T:  so you're telling us these things (1.5) but you're not exactly
002     linking them over here yet (0.2) by writing really clear
003     sentences that organize those information in the paragraphs so
004 S:  okay
005 T:  I think (0.3) a thesis statement (0.9) needs to be four things
006     (0.8) and we'll talk about the thesis statement because (1.5)
007     a topic sentence I think is like a mini-thesis [statement]
008 S:                                                 [mhm]
009 T:  right? (CTO)
010     like you're breaking down this argument into little parts
011 S:  right
012 T:  and making them throughout the paper
013 S:  right
014 T:  so the four things I think a thesis statement needs to be
015     one it needs to be arguable [(0.4)] okay? (CTO)
016 S:                              [um hum]
017     (0.4)
018 T:  good
019     we got that going on here
020     (0.5)
021     two it needs to be specific
022     (2.3)
023     this specific? (CTO)
024     (0.8)
025 S:  u:m I think so
026 T:  yeah (0.4) good
```

Rather than leaving it up to the student to figure out herself how "to write really clear sentences that organize those [sic] information in the paragraphs" (ll. 2-3), the tutor offers a checklist with concrete criteria that guide the student in rewriting her topic statements. The questions in this stretch of talk are rather brief and specific (ll. 9, 15, 23). Couched in the form of tags attached to declarative statements, they function rather as a marker of involvement than as genuine ('real') questions seeking the student's view of the tutor's comments. Here they may also be used to garner support for the information provided by the tutor on how to write a successful thesis statement. The use of tags creates a dialogic space in which the student is not only a passive listener of the thoughts and ideas of the tutor, but is also encouraged to respond and evaluate the ideas (l. 25). Further, one can argue that the student's responses and evaluations not only occur in the immediate sequential context of the writing tutorial, but also at a later stage in the writing process, such as when she decides to accept them when revising the draft at home.

5.2.2 Too many questions?

In order to show the student how her topic sentences do not conform to the tutor's rather abstract criteria of being arguable, specific, clear and concise, the tutor uses examples from the student's paper to illustrate her point. In the following sequence, she begins to read aloud a topic sentence from the paper and then to check it against her stated criteria:

```
[7]
001 T: <reading> so the rise to power for each country has its
002    differences and its similarities </reading>
003    how are we doing (1.1) with arguable? (ROP)
004    (1.2)
005 S: I guess (0.3) if I like (1.8) u:m (2.6) yeah I don't know
006    if it's really like arguable
007    (0.6)
008 T: okay (0.2) why is it not arguable? (DIS)
009    is it specific? (DIS)
010    (0.5)
011 S: no it's not
012 T: no [(0.6)] so it's not arguable cause it's not specific
013 S:    [that's okay]
014 T: [right?] (CTO)
015 S: [right]
016 T: it's gonna be very hard to say (0.5) <reading> nope the rise to
017    the pow- (0.3) to power for each country (0.7) is (0.3) has no
018    differences and no similarities </reading> right? (CTO)
019 S: um hum
020 T: so (0.3) specifically (0.7) can you write a sentence that says
```

```
021     (0.3) what the differences or how the differences
022     and similarities (0.6)
023     what's the theme that kind of unites them? (WOI)
024     (1.4)
025 S:  mmh (1.0) I'm sorry
026     I'm not really sure what you're asking with all those questions
027 T:  okay (0.3) so how ho- what are some of the differences that
028     you (0.2) identify in this paragraph? (ROP)
```

The questions in this sequence refer to a specific piece of text in the student's paper, which is used as an anchor to discuss the main problem of the student's writing. The reader-oriented product (ROP) question in line 3 asks the student to check whether her topic sentence (ll. 1-2) meets the criterion of being 'arguable'. The following two questions ("Why is it not arguable?", l. 8; "Is it specific?", l. 9) serve as display questions (DIS) (cf. Allwright & Bailey, 1991), which the tutor employs to elicit from the student an explanation of why her statement is not 'arguable' (ll. 5-6). It is clear to both that the tutor is well aware of the fact that the topic sentence does not meet either of these criteria ('specific', 'arguable'), thus she prompts a response. Here we see how display questions perform a specific teaching purpose in tutorials in that they elicit information or confirmation that is obvious to the expert, but that she wants the student to express herself in order to raise awareness of what is wrong with her statement.

At this point, the student becomes confused (l. 26), likely induced by the kind of questioning that occurred before. The sequence leading towards the communicative breakdown is paved with a number of questions that mostly function on a small scale and do not leave the student much room for longer contributions. They do, however, create involvement by offering the student opportunities to process the information and indicate her understanding (at least in a minimal way). What seems to cause confusion is the tutor's request to have the student rephrase her topic sentence (ll. 20-23), using a writer-oriented idea-generating question (WOI) as a stimulus for the requested action. With the question "What's the theme that kind of unites them?" (l. 23) she leaves the domain of the paper to encourage thinking about the link between two rather broad aspects, the similarities and differences of the political positions under discussion. The student's uncertainty about how she is expected to respond at this point, both to the tutor's ROP question (l. 3) as well as to the following display questions (ll. 8,9), is already indicated by several minimal response turns before, in which she shows that she cannot pick up the thread created by the tutor (ll. 11, 15, 19). Even though the tutor tries to guide her in the process of rewriting her topic sentence of this paragraph, the attempt ends in puzzlement. The shift from questions which address a local issue (here checking criteria of her topic sentence), to a question that leaves the domain of the paper asking for a conceptual link between arguments (here: asking about a new theme) proves problematic for the student.

This confusion leads to a local problem-solving activity indirectly requested by the student (l. 26). Instead of asking more abstract idea-generating questions about the theme of that paragraph, the tutor goes back to a more local, concrete and text-immanent level of the paper. In this way, the train of thought is brought back to the paper and therefore to the student, who is the author of the text ("What are some of the differences that you identify in this paragraph?", ll. 27-28). This kind of questioning leads to a longer turn in which the student explains to the tutor the differences by which the three heads of governments of Germany, France, and the UK come to power. Bringing the question back into the student's domain, in which she has expertise, helps her to compare what she has written in this paragraph with her response to the tutor's question, thus allowing her to see more clearly a potential mismatch between what she has written and what she may have wanted to express.

The above pedagogical approach used by the tutor may be criticized as too directive by some writing center practitioners (cf. Brooks, 1995), yet it is the directive questioning itself that seems to lead to the student ultimately taking over control of her own essay. This tutor asks questions which carefully help to scaffold the student's thoughts and answers (Koshik, 2010), enabling her to perform tasks at a higher competence level than previously when she was writing alone. The student feels sufficiently confident to claim her expert status when answering the tutor's questions about the content of the essay, and also seems to take greater ownership of the writing. It may be the tutor's questioning style, the combination of the number of questions asked within a short sequence ("all those questions", l. 26) and the abrupt shift from a set of concrete questions to an abstract, idea-generating question that contributes to the student losing the thread at this point. However, what is important here is that with the resolution of the communication breakdown, the student begins to take a far more active role in the tutorial. She becomes the one asking the questions and her turns are longer than before this point in the tutorial. In short, she becomes more agentive and in control of the session. The tutor's authority, communicated via a range of scaffolding questions, empowers the student to address changes and even ask questions herself.

5.2.3 Student activation

One observation we noted in this tutorial is that the student seems to contribute more towards the talk than prior to the 'trouble' sequence. Once an understanding of "all those questions" (l. 26 in [7]) is reached, the tutor tries to embark on a new set of questions that help to generate ideas to make the arguments more clear and convincing.

We still find a stepwise process of questioning here, but the conceptual scope of these questions is broader than before:

```
[8]
001 T: okay (0.5) so without having a- a sentence that explains all
002    that stuff right? (CTO)
```

```
003     [which would which would] be a (lot of) long clunky sentence
004 S: [yeah (xxx)]
005     right.
006     (1.0)
007 T:  I'll ask a question and you see if you can write the sentence
008     that says that (0.5)
009     the (0.2) the basic the little bit of idea that you're gonna
010     explain more fully
011     (1.0)
012     which one has the most direct power? (WOI)
013     (4.3)
014 S: hm direct power?
015 T: is that the difference? (WOI)
016     or are they all kind of similar in the- in the amount of power
017     that they have over choosing the prime minister? (WOI)
018 S: like who is (0.3) exactly?
019     (0.3)
020 T: yeah like it sounds like Germany (0.3) has a little less
021     direct power right?= (CTO)
022 S: =right.
023 T: they kind of have to negotiate a[bout] (0.5) so (0.6)
024 S:                                 [right]
025    (are) England then (or) the United Kingdom would have the most
026     direct [(0.3) way] to rise to power
027 T:        [um hum]
028 S: okay so say something like um (4.0) like the rise to power
029     um should I be like really specific and like say the UK
030     has a more direct way to elect their head of government
031 T: um hm
032 S: while (1.0) or should I say like in order kind of more like
033     the UK has the most direct power than France and Germany
034 T: great [yeah]
035 S:       [some]thing like that?
036 T: yeah exactly
```

In this sequence, guidance is provided by means of more specific questions concerning the issue with topic sentences in the paper. These questions are asked to encourage the student to develop new ideas, but they set out at a specific passage in the text. Thus, they can still be considered idea generating because their main function here is to search for new ideas that do not yet exist in the paper (at least from a reader's perspective). In addition, they activate the student's input to the tutorial since they allow her to talk about specific parts of the paper. We see this engagement in lines 28ff. above, where she makes her first attempt to rephrase one of her topic sentences,

reversing the question order to request feedback (i.e., student as questioner). The success of this questioning technique can be seen in the increasing number of contributions and longer turn sequences by the student following this critical point in the tutorial:

```
   [9]
   001 S: and this one is kind of this one I kind of just
   002    listed through the country's laws and later on I'll talk
   003    about the public and then the party
   004 T: yeah
   005 S: should I have it all in the first sentence?
   006 T: [I don't]
   007 S: [it feels kind] of weird just saying it all and then we
   008    hold on while we
   009 T: right
   010    well here this sentence at the end of this paragraph I think
   011    <reading> in these cases, public opinion and party support
   012    are the main factors in deciding when the election should
   013    take place </reading> right? (CTO)
   014    so in these factors what does these cases refer to? (ROP)
   015 S: well this is talking about um Tony Blair and Gordon Brown
   016 T: right yeah
   017    so basically the way things have worked in the UK recently
   018 S: right
   019 T: so this makes much way more sense to me as a topic sentence
   020 S: okay um well what because also like in my thesis I say law
   021    [public] and then party
   022 T: [um hum]
   023    um hum
   024 S: so is it okay if my topic sentence does even like mention
   025    the law?
```

The student becomes more actively involved in generating ideas that improve her thesis statement. We can see this as she becomes the one asking the questions (ll. 5, 24-25), giving explanations of what she attempted to do in that paragraph (i.e., making it explicit to herself; ll. 1-3, 15, 20-21) and stating what she thinks would sound right (ll. 7-8). The tutor asks fewer questions than in previous parts of the tutorial, but she continues to ask and encourage the student to explain her thoughts and generate new ideas.

5.3   Closing

Prior to closing the tutorial (here about two-thirds into the talk), the focus of the diagnosis/problem-solving phase turns towards language-related issues in the paper.

This redirection not only complies with the student's concern expressed at the beginning, it also testifies to the importance of prioritizing both reader- and writer-oriented issues over language issues in the student's draft (see also Gillespie & Lerner, 2008). Only towards the end of this tutorial does the tutor start to address shortcomings that are seemingly less important. This, again, is typical of our tutorial corpus. Since grammar aspects (e.g., use of the passive voice) and stylistic choices are more concrete and less debatable, it is not surprising to find a larger number of tutor-controlled questions during this sequence with a clear teaching objective:

```
[10]
001 T: see (x) even here <reading> the timing of elections is dependent
002    upon laws public opinions support within the party (0.2) which (2.2)
003    can be see:n </reading> (0.4) who's seeing it? (DIS)
004    (0.3)
005 S: ya:h (0.5) oh
006 T: how are you gonna rewrite that one? (ROP)
007 S: (seen) (4.3) m:h (8.0) u:m
008 T: who's the subject? (DIS)
009    who's doing the seeing? (DIS)
010    there isn't one.
011    we've got to make one up.
```

The use of display questions (ll. 3, 8, 9) is not only a noticeable feature of language-focused diagnosis/problem-solving sequences; it is moreover an effective and timesaving means for the tutor to push the student towards an accepted answer. The fact that the end of the tutorial is approaching increases the pressure to work swiftly through a few more of the student's concerns. Therefore, question types that elicit clearly defined answers are an effective means to navigate through this tutorial phase.

The actual closing of this session, occurring after the student has raised another concern about her conclusion, is rather brief:

```
[11]
001 T: the solution is not to write this kind of full circle argument
002    that ends where it begins (0.3)
003    but to write this one that like starts at A and ends up
004    ending a:h (0.3) you know some place weird over here at Q
005 S: okay
006 T: you know? (CTO)
007 S: yeah
008 T: yeah? (CTO)
009    (0.4)
010 S: yeah
011    (0.4)
```

```
012 T: ask yourself why it matters
013 S: okay
```

The tutor's advice to 'ask yourself why it matters' (l. 12) is in fact more pragmatic than precise. However, it illustrates again the broader scope of questions in this discourse type, namely that students have to learn to ask themselves relevant questions when drafting, writing, and revising a paper. In total, the tutor asks only 19 questions (18.8 %) during both the opening and closing phase, while she asks 82 questions during diagnosis/problem-solving phase (81.2%). This distribution, again, testifies to the fact that questions constitute the heart of tutorial talk and are an important mechanism in the diagnosis/problem-solving phase for working out issues in the student writing and working towards solving the issues so the student can take home ideas for improvement.

6. Discussion

This article demonstrates the use of our empirically-derived typology of tutor questions through an analysis of one writing tutorial session. Such an empirically-derived scheme for writing tutorials offers a means to understand how tutors provide prompts for editing and writing development (cf. Thompson & Mackiewicz, 2014). The analysis illustrates how tutors can exploit their interactional repertoire in questioning to guide and advise students through their writing process. It also shows how questions help to advance the talk in order to meet the stated goals of the session.

Our coding scheme allows us to understand the ways in which tutors manage tutorial talk and support students' conceptualizing and drafting of an academic paper as well as their efficiency in evaluating and revising. The diversity of question types reveals that tutors draw on a rich repertoire of questions to drive the conversations that help students become better writers. Questions of this kind facilitate the interaction processes in the tutorial; indeed, tutorial discourse is structured primarily by questions. More specifically, in the tutorial analyzed here, as well as in our tutorial corpus, we see that the interplay between process-oriented questions (WOR, WOI) and knowledge-oriented questions (CTO, CSO) engages the student in conversation by activating thinking processes and at the same time helping the student to comprehend the tutor's input. The consequence of this type of questioning is that it lays the foundation for the student's subsequent revision.

The distribution of question types in this tutorial shows a preference for confirmation tutor-owned questions (CTO) and writer-oriented idea-generating questions (WOI). CTO questions are used as an interactive, engaging device with which the tutor's talk is broken down into manageable chunks, allowing students to grasp the thoughts and ideas offered and apply them to their paper. In a speech event where power is unequally distributed, especially one with a pedagogical objective, questions of this kind are not only a technique to involve the student more in the talk: they also

provide a space for thought, which can be of value later when students revise the draft at home. Additionally, tutors monitor students' reception of advice and information through the use of confirmation tutor-owned (CTO) questions. Idea-generating questions (WOI), on the other hand, assist students to rethink the conceptual content of their paper. They address the students as writers, giving them responsibility for their own writing and helping them to develop new ideas and advance thoughts, to clarify existing points and to make them more accessible to the reader. It is hoped that, following the tutor's model, students can also ask themselves questions of this type when they write future papers (cf. line 12 in [11]). The downside to tutor questions of this kind is that they are often more abstract and hypothetical, so students might become confused and be misled, which happens to the student in this tutorial (cf. line 26 in [7]). In this case, tutors can resort to more concrete and local questions that refer to a specific piece of text in the draft, which is more accessible to the student as a writer.

What we frequently find in our data is a particular mode of questioning that shows how tutors fulfill their role of input-giver while entrusting students with the responsibility to change their own writing. When intricate points in the paper are being discussed, tutors may employ a range of closely-linked questions to guide students through the process of altering an argument, rearranging the order of points in a paragraph, or establishing coherence in the text. Using a carefully scaffolded series of questions, tutors take students along little steps to create and express new ideas that might improve the paper. These questions are arranged in sequential clusters that have a common focus (e.g., make a topic sentence more clear), but they are not restricted to one question type (WOI or CTO). It is the combination of questions from different types that contributes to their effectiveness.

When comparing the authentic use and distribution of questions in the tutorials we have studied with what the research on questions in the writing tutorial literature suggests, we find many parallels and also some differences. Various question types have been described in the literature. Most frequently, we find the broad distinction between open and closed question forms, where the range of possible and accepted answers varies (Hargreaves, 1984; Blau, Hall & Strauss, 1998). Writing center handbooks recommend open-ended questions that particularly encourage students to reflect on their writing and develop or clarify their ideas (see, for example, Gillespie & Lerner, 2008). In writing tutorial practice, broad information-seeking, open-ended questions "encourage the student to respond substantively and give the teacher important information to use in guiding the teacher-learning process" (Freedman & Katz, 1987, p. 68; see also Freedman, 1987). On the other hand, Graesser and Person (1994) conclude from their research that "[t]utors should be instructed to formulate their questions with a higher degree of specification" (p. 133) to reduce confusion and misunderstanding. Thompson and Mackiewicz (2014) suggest stringing questions together because multiple questions may stimulate students' thinking by making them "think about potential ways to convey in writing the meaning that they intended" (p.

64). While a combination of different question types is also evident in our data, we have seen that inspiration and confusion lie close together so that a quantitative increase in questions can also have a negative effect on students' ability to self-explain and actively engage in the tutorial.

In our case study, the coupling of more open, process-oriented questions (WOI, WOR) with more closed, structural questions (CTO) not only organizes the tutor's talk, but also helps to coordinate the student's train of thought. The two kinds of questions create both interactional and cognitive space, for a response as well as for processing new ideas. If one expects writing tutorials to employ only open-ended questioning techniques, this tutorial may seem atypical since it does not conform to the nondirective writing tutor practice recommended in many tutor handbooks. It is rather directive and tutor-controlled, both because of the large number of questions in total (n=101) and the high number of CTO questions (n=38; 37.6%). But, in these particular circumstances, being the first writing tutorial with a faculty member for a first-year student, the high number of structural CTO questions, coupled with process-oriented WOI and WOR questions guide this student towards understanding which aspects of her writing need attention and can be revised within the given time frame. Despite its directiveness, this tutorial, in fact, empowers the writer, as can be seen during the talk when questions help to disambiguate a confusion and lead the student towards more engagement and participation in the tutorial and thereby also in her own work.

Sperling (1994) and Jones (2001) have pointed out the difficulty of establishing a causal connection between the talk during a writing conference and what students subsequently write. We, however, believe that a key factor in the connection between draft and final version of a paper is asking writer-oriented and context-specific questions. The discussion of questions in this context suggests that there is no absolute way to use specific question types to improve student essays, let alone turn novices into expert writers. Although our results are preliminary, as the analysis above has shown, context-sensitive use of questions in different phases of the interaction helps to engage students in re-thinking their writing, actively collaborating with the tutor to generate ideas and find inspiration. A tutor's development of a broad repertoire of effective questions and ability to deploy them sensitively and strategically improves the tutorial's likelihood not only of leading to an improved paper, but also to an improved writer, since awareness is the first step towards change (cf. Patthey & Ferris, 1997).

to Charles MacArthur, for their many helpful suggestions during the development of this manuscript.

References

Allwright, D., & Bailey, K. M. (1991). *Focus on the language classroom: An introduction to classroom research for language teachers*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ambrose, S. A., Bridges, M. W., DiPietro, M., Lovett, M. C., & Norman, M. K. (2010). *How learning works: Seven research-based principles for smart teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ashton-Jones, E. (1988). Asking the right questions. A heuristic for tutors. *The Writing Center Journal, 9*, 29-36.

Babcock, R. D., & Thonus, T. (2012). *Researching the writing center: Towards an evidence-based practice*. New York: Peter Lang. http://dx. doi.org/10.3726/978-1-4539-0869-3

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

Blau, S. R., Hall, J., & Strauss, T. (1998). Exploring the tutor/client conversation: A linguistic analysis. *The Writing Center Journal, 19*, 19-48.

Brooks, J. (1995). Minimalist tutoring: Making the student do all the work. In C. Murphy & S. Sherwood (Eds.), *The St. Martin's sourcebook for writing tutors* (pp. 83-87). Boston: St. Martin's Press.

Bruffee, K. A. (1984). Peer tutoring and the 'conversation of mankind'. In G.A. Olson (Ed.), *Writing centers: Theory and administration* (pp. 3-15). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Cumming, A. & So, S. (1996). Tutoring second language text revision: Does the approach to instruction or the language of communication make a difference? J*ournal of Second Language Writing, 5*, 197-226. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(96)90002-8

Ehrlich, S., & Freed, A.F. (2010). The function of questions in institutional discourse. In A.F. Freed, & S. Ehrlich (Eds.), *"Why do you ask?" The function of questions in institutional discourse* (pp. 3-19). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, K. (1993). *Teacher questioning behavior and student learning: What research says to teachers*. Paper Presented at the 1993 Convention of The Western States Communication Association, Albuquerque, New Mexico, February 13-16.

Fink, L. D. (2003). *Creating significant learning experiences: An integrated approach to designing college courses*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Freed, A.F. (1994). The form and function of questions in informal dyadic conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 21, 621-644. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(94)90101-5.

Freed, A. F., & Ehrlich, S. (Eds.) (2010). *"Why do you ask?" The function of questions in institutional discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Freedman, S. (1987). Pedagogical discourse in the writing conference. In G. Gagne (Ed.), *Selected papers on mother tongue education* (pp. 49-59). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: FORIS

Freedman, S. W., & Katz, A.M. (1987). Pedagogical interaction during the composition process: The writing conference. In A. Matsuhashi (Ed.), *Writing in real time: Modeling production processes* (pp. 58-80). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Freedman, S. W., & Sperling, M. (1985). Written language acquisition: The role of response and the writing conference. In S.W. Freedman (Ed.), *The acquisition of written language: Response and revision* (pp. 106-130). Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Gillespie, P., & Lerner, N. (2008). *The Longman guide to peer tutoring*. 2nd ed. New York: Pearson.

Goody, E.N. (1978). *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Graesser, A.C., Person, N. K., & Huber, J. (1992). Mechanisms that generate questions. In T.W. Lauer, E. Peacock, & A.C. Graesser (Eds.), *Questions and information systems* (pp. 167-187). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Graesser, A.C., & Person, N.K. (1994). Question asking during tutoring. *American Educational Research Journal, 31*, 104-137. http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00028312031001104

Haas, T.S. (1986). *A case study of peer tutor's writing conferences with students: Tutors' roles and conversations about composing*. Doctoral Dissertation. New York University. DAI 47-12A: 4309.

Hargreaves, D. H. (1984). Teachers' questions: open, closed and half-open. *Educational Research, 26*, 46-51. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0013188840260108

Harris, M. (1986). *Teaching One-to-One: The Writing Conference*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Holmes, J. (1983). The functions of tag question. *English Language Research Journal, 3*, 40-65.

Jones, C. (2001). The relationship between writing centers and improvement in writing ability: An assessment of the literature." *Education, 122*, 3-20.

Kearsley, G.P. (1976). Questions and question asking in verbal discourse: A cross-disciplinary review. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 5, 355-375. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01079934

Koshik, I. (2010). Questions that convey information in teacher-student conferences. In A. F. Freed, & S. Ehrlich (Eds.), *"Why do you ask?": The function of questions in institutional discourse* (pp. 159-186). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levinson, S. C. (1992). Activity types and language. In P. Drew, & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings* (pp. 66-100). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Limberg, H. (2010). *The interactional organization of academic talk: Office hour consultations*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/pbns.198

Long, M. H., & Sato, C. J. (1983). Classroom foreigner talk discourse: Forms and functions of teachers' questions. In H. W. Seliger, & M. H. Long (Eds.), *Classroom-oriented research in second language acquisition* (pp. 268-285). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Lunsford, A.A. (1991). Collaboration, control, and the idea of a writing center. *The Writing Center Journal,* 12(1), 3-10.

Mackiewicz, J. & Thompson, I. K. (2015). *Talk about writing: The tutoring strategies of writing center tutors.* New York: Routledge.

Mehan, H. (1979). 'What time is it, Denise?': Asking known information questions in classroom discourse. *Theory Into Practice, 18*, 285–294. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00405847909542846

North, S. M. (1984). The idea of a writing center. *College English, 46*, 433-446. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/377047

Nunn, R. (1999). The purpose of language teachers' questions. *IRAL*, 37, 23-42. http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/iral.1999.37.1.23

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

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.

Riegle, R.P. (1976). Classifying classroom questions. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 27, 156-161. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/002248717602700219

Saldaña, J. (2012). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sarangi, S. (2010). Professional values in interaction: Non-directiveness, client-centredness and other-orientation in genetic counselling. In S. Pattison, B. Hannigan, R. Pill, & H. Thomas (Eds.), *Emerging values in healthcare: The challenge for professionals* (pp. 163-185). London: Jessica Kingsley.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511791208

Simpson-Vlach, R. C., & Leicher, S. (2006). *The MICASE handbook: A resource for users of the Michigan corpus of academic spoken english*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press.

Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthart, M. R. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. London: Oxford University Press.

Sommers, N. (2006). Across the drafts. *College Composition and Communication, 58*, 246-257.

Sperling, M. (1994). Discourse analysis of teacher-student writing conferences: Finding the message in the medium. In P. Smagorinsky (Ed.), *Speaking about writing: Reflections on research methodology* (pp. 205-224). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Thompson, I. (2009). Scaffolding in the writing center: A mircoanalysis of an experienced tutor's verbal and nonverbal tutoring strategies. *Written Communication, 26*, 417-453. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0741088309342364

Thompson, I., & Mackiewicz, J. (2014). Questioning in writing center conferences. *The Writing Center Journal, 33*, 37-70.

Thonus, T. (1993). Tutors as teachers: Assisting ESL/EFL students in the writing center. *The Writing Center Journal, 13*, 13-27.

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

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

Thonus, T. (2002). Tutor and student assessment of academic writing tutorials: What is 'success'? *Assessing Writing, 8*, 110-134. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1075-2935(03)00002-3

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

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

Tsui, A. (1992). A functional description of questions. In M. Coulthard (Ed.), *Advances in spoken discourse analysis* (pp. 89-110). London: Routledge.

Wang, J. (2006). Questions and the exercise of power. *Discourse and Society, 17*, 529-548. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0957926506063127

Williams, J. (2004). Tutoring and revision: Second language writers in the writing center. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*, 173-201. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.009

Williams, J. (2005). Writing center interaction: Institutional discourse and the role of peer tutors. In K. Bardovi-Harlig, & B. S. Hartford (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics: Exploring institutional talk* (pp. 37-65). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Wong, R. (2010). Classifying teacher questions in the EFL classroom: Question types and their proper use. *TESOL in Context*, 20, 37-57.