

TUTORING STRATEGIES AND ROLES ADOPTED IN THE WRITING CENTERS OF
TURKEY

A MASTER'S THESIS

by

EYLEM BÜTÜNER

THE DEPARTMENT OF
TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE
BILKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

July 2003

*For my mother and father;
For encouraging me to choose the pathway leading to
the academic world*

Tutoring Strategies And Roles Adopted In The Writing Centers Of Turkey

**The Institute of Economics and Social Sciences
Of
Bilkent University**

by

Eylem Bütüner

**In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS IN TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE**

in

**THE DEPARTMENT OF
TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE
BILKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA**

**July 2003
BILKENT UNIVERSITY**

**INSTITUTE OF ECONOMICS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES MA THESIS
EXAMINATION RESULT FORM**

July 1, 2003

**The examining committee appointed by for the Institute of Economics and
Social Sciences for the thesis examination of the MA TEFL student**

Eylem Bütüner

has read the thesis of the student.

The committee has decided that the thesis of the student is satisfactory.

**Title: Tutoring Strategies and Roles Adopted in The Writing
Centers of
Turkey**

**Thesis Supervisor: Julie Mathews Aydınlı
Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program**

**Committee Members: Dr. Martin J. Endley
Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program**

**Assist. Prof. Dr. İsmail Hakkı Mirici
Kırıkkale University**

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

(Julie Mathews-Aydınlı)
Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

(Dr. Martin J. Endley)
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

(Assist. Prof. Dr. İsmail Hakkı Mirici)
Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

(Prof. Dr. Kürşat Aydoğan)
Director

ABSTRACT

TUTORING STRATEGIES AND ROLES ADOPTED IN THE WRITING CENTERS OF TURKEY

Eylem Bütüner

M.A., Department of Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Supervisor: Julie Mathews-Aydinli

Co-Supervisor: Dr. Martin J. Endley

July 2003

Writing centers are institutions that offer one-to-one writing tutorials to help writers improve their writing skills. In order to achieve this aim, tutors implement various strategies and adopt different roles within the tutorials. Writing center tutorial strategies and roles can be categorized under two prominent approaches: the collaborative and direct approach. However, most of these strategies and role are applied with English as a native language and English as a second language context. Hence, the strategies and roles claimed to be effective in these contexts may not be appropriate for English as a foreign language context.

This study's aim was to investigate the strategies that tutors in Turkey reported to implement while dealing with Turkish writers, and tutors' perceptions of which tutor roles they believed should be adopted. Tutors' rationales for their choice of strategies and tutor roles were also examined.

Out of 47 tutors, 32 tutors participated in this study from the Middle East Technical University, Bilkent University, Sabanci University, Koç University, Bilgi İstanbul University, and Has University.

The findings revealed that tutors are implementing neither solely collaborative nor direct approach practices. Rather, data results indicated that tutors have devised their own ‘eclectic’ writing center approach; a mixture of both collaborative and direct approach practices. Moreover, Turkish tutors were found to incorporate strategies not identified in either the collaborative or the direct approach. This practice seemed mainly attributable to the fact that writing clients were writing in a foreign language, English, in a Turkish-speaking community.

Tutors’ rationales for an eclectic writing center approach revolved around three main reasons: writing clients’ lack of command of English, time constraints, and writing clients’ lack of understanding of the aim of writing centers.

Keywords: Writing Center/Lab/Workshop, Tutor, Writing Client/Tutee/Writer, One-to-one Tutorial/Conference, Tutorial Strategy, Tutor role.

ÖZET

Türkiye’deki Yazım Merkezlerinde Öğretmenlerin Rolü ve Kullanılan Öğretim Stratejileri

Eylem Bütüner

Yüksek Lisans, Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğretimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Julie Mathews-Aydınlı

Ortak Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Martin J. Endley

Temmuz 2003

Yazım merkezleri yazarların (öğrencilerin) yazma becerilerini geliştirmelerine yardımcı olmak için birebir yazma dersleri veren kuruluşlardır. Bu amaç doğrultusunda, derslerde öğretmenler çeşitli stratejiler kullanır ve çeşitli roller üstlenmektedir. Yazım merkezleri ile ilgili literatür öğretim stratejileri ve öğretmen rolleri konusunda iki önemli yaklaşımı önermektedir: işbirlikçi ve direk yaklaşım. Fakat bu literatür genelde İngilizce’nin yerel dil ortamlarında ikinci dil olarak öğretimi ile ilgilidir. Bu nedenle, etkili olduğu öne sürülen strateji ve roller İngilizce’nin yabancı dil olarak öğretildiği ortamlarda uygun olmayabilir.

Bu çalışma Türkiye’deki öğretmenlerinin Türk yazarlarla çalışırken uyguladığı stratejileri araştırmıştır. Ayrıca bu çalışma yazım merkezlerinde öğretmenlerin hangi rollerin üstlenmesi gerektiği konusunda öğretmenlerin görüşlerini araştırmıştır.

Bu çalışmaya Türkiye’de altı yazım merkezinde çalışan 32 öğretmen katılmıştır. Bu yazım merkezleri şunlardır: Ortadoğu Teknik Üniversitesi,

Bilkent Üniversitesi, Sabancı Üniversitesi, Koç Üniversitesi, Bilgi İstanbul Üniversitesi, ve Has Üniversitesi.

Bulgular öğretmenlerin sadece işbirlikçi ve direkt yaklaşımı kullanmadıklarını, bu iki yaklaşımı birleştirdiklerini ortaya çıkarmıştır. Ayrıca Türk öğretmenlerin bu iki yaklaşımda da bulunmayan stratejileri kullanmadıkları belirlenmiştir. Uygulamalardaki bu farklılık büyük ihtimalle İngilizce'nin Türkçe konuşan bir topluluğa yabancı dil olarak öğretimden kaynaklanmaktadır.

Mülakat sonuçları öğretmenlerinin yazım merkezlerinde kullandıkları “karışık” yaklaşımların üç sebebinin olduğunu göstermektedir: yazarların İngilizce'yi kullanmadaki yetersizliği, zaman yetersizliği, ve yazarların yazım merkezlerinin amacını anlamamaları.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yazım Merkezleri, Öğretmen, Yazar, birebir ders, Yazım Merkezi Öğretmen Stratejileri, Yazım Merkezleri Öğretmen Roller

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank and express my appreciation to my thesis advisor, Julie Mathews-Aydinli, for her contributions, invaluable guidance and patience throughout the preparations of my thesis.

Special thanks to Dr. Fredricka L. Stoller, the director of MA-TEFL Program, for sharing not only her vast knowledge of the ELT field, but her experiences and feelings with me. She will always be a model for me. Many thanks to Dr Martin J. Endley and Dr Bill Snyder also for providing me the privilege of being their student.

I owe great thanks to Jim Bell whose feedback was always constructive and motivating.

I would like express my special thanks to my classmates İpek Bozatlı and Azra Bingöl for their invaluable support throughout the year. They were always sources of positivism and energy at the times when I felt that I had just had enough of MA-TEFL and this thesis. Thanks also to Emine Yetgin, for listening to my endless complaints throughout each and every MA-TEFL course and the process of this thesis.

A lot of gratitude goes to my beloved fiancée, Bünyamin Mengi, who also had to go through the painful process of writing a thesis with me. I want to thank him for tolerating a great deal of neglect and stress.

Finally, I am grateful the most to my beloved family who have always supported and encouraged me throughout all my academic successes (and failures).

They are the ones that injected me with the love and inspiration to learn and to believe in myself.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZET.....	vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	x
CHAPTER I:	1
INTRODUCTION.....	
Introduction.....	1
Background of the Study.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	3
Significance of the Problem.....	4
Research Questions.....	6
Key words.....	6
Conclusion.....	7
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE	8
REVIEW.....	
Introduction.....	8
Writing Center History.....	10
The Collaborative Approach.....	14
Collaborative Approach Tutoring	17
Strategies.....	
Collaborative Approach Tutor	22
Roles.....	
Questioning the Collaborative	26
Approach.....	

The Direct Approach.....	29
Direct Approach Tutoring	30
Strategies.....	
Direct Approach Tutor Roles.....	31
Conclusion.....	33
CHAPTER III:	36
METHODOLOGY.....	
Introduction.....	36
Writing Center Contexts.....	36
Participants.....	41
Instruments.....	43
Questionnaire.....	43
Interview.....	43
Procedures.....	44
Questionnaire	44
Interview	45
Data Analysis.....	45
CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS.....	47
Overview of the Study.....	47
Data Analysis Procedures.....	48
Questionnaire Part B and Interview Data	48
.....	
Most Frequently Used Collaborative Tutorial Strategies and	48
Tutors' Rationales for Their	
Implementation.....	

Least Frequently Used Collaborative Tutorial Strategies and Tutors' Rationales for Their Implementation	56
Most Frequently Used Direct Tutorial Strategies and Tutors' Rationales for Their Implementation.....	59
Questionnaire Part C and Interview Data.....	61
Most Frequently Used Collaborative Tutorial Strategies and Tutors' Rationales for Their Implementation.....	61
Least Frequently Used Collaborative Tutorial Strategy and Tutors' Rationales Its Implementation	68
Most Frequently Used Direct Tutorial Strategy and Tutors' Rationales for Its Implementation.....	70
A Direct Tutorial Strategy Implemented with Moderate Frequency and Tutors' Rationales for Its Implementation.....	72
Questionnaire Part D and Interview Data.....	74
Most Appropriate Collaborative Tutor Roles and Tutors' Rationales for Their Appropriateness.....	74
Least Appropriate Direct Tutor Role and Tutors' Rationales for Its lack of Appropriateness.....	78
Conclusion.....	79

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION.....	80
Introduction.....	80
Results and Discussion.....	81
Tutorial Strategies Implemented and Tutors' Rationales for Their	81
Implementation.....	
Tutorial Roles Perceived to Be Appropriate and Tutors'	86
Rationales	
for Their Appropriateness.....	
Pedagogical Implications.....	89
Limitations of the Study.....	90
Suggestions for Further	91
Research.....	
Conclusion.....	91
References.....	93
Appendices.....	96
Appendix A: Background Information	96
Survey.....	
Appendix B: Questionnaire	98
Appendix C: Interview	104
Appendix D: Questions Letter of	106
Consent.....	

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE

1	Year of Establishment and the Kinds of Writers Served at the Writing Centers.....	37
2	The Types of Writing the Writing/Learning Centers Handle.....	39
3	The Types of Services Provided by the Writing/Learning Centers.....	40
4	Number of Tutors in Each Writing Center and the Number of Tutors Who Responded.....	41
5	Information about Turkey's Writing Centers Tutors.....	42
6	Collaborative Tutoring Strategies Writing Center Tutors in Turkey Report to Implement Most Frequently in One-to-One Tutorials.....	49
7	Least Frequently Used Collaborative Strategy.....	56
8	Most Frequently Used Direct Strategy.....	59
9	Collaborative Tutoring Strategies Writing Center Tutors in Turkey Report to Implement Most Frequently While Dealing with Rough Drafts in One-to-One Tutorials.....	62
10	Least Frequently Used Collaborative Strategy with Rough Drafts.....	68
11	Most Frequently Used Direct Strategy with Rough Drafts.....	70
12	Moderately Implemented Direct Strategy.....	72
13	Collaborative Tutor Roles That Should Be Adopted the Most Frequently...	75
14	The Tutor Role That Should be Adopted Least Frequently.....	78

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

In most writing centers around the world, faculty and peer tutors conduct individualized conferences with the aim of producing better writers. In order to achieve this aim, tutors read (or are made to read) writing center literature about which tutoring strategies and tutor roles contribute the best to students' learning processes. However, most of the writing center literature concentrates on tutorials conducted with native speakers of English (NSE), and a few articles deal with conferences conducted with learners studying English as a second language (ESL). Most of these articles conclude with assumptions on which tutoring strategies are effective and which tutor roles are appropriate in the one-to-one context. However, particular strategies and roles that are found to be effective for NSE and ESL may not necessarily be as beneficial for learners who study English as a foreign language (EFL).

Hence, this study aims to find tutors' perceptions of which tutoring strategies are effective, and which tutoring roles are appropriate while serving EFL (Turkish) students in the writing centers in Turkey: Middle East Technical University, Bilkent University, Koç University, Sabanci University, Bilgi University and Has University.

Background of the Study

Ever since the 1970s, writing center directors have tried to define the role of writing centers (Harris, 1995). Despite the common belief that writing centers offer editing services, writing centers do not aim at improving the written product that the writing client brings in. Rather, writing centers aim to "make sure that writers and not necessarily their texts, are what get changed by instruction (76). While writing center

scholars having agreed that their goal is to improve writers, much debate has been carried out in the attempt to suggest tutoring strategies and tutor roles that will serve the goal of “produc[ing] better writers and not better texts” (North, 1995: 76).

Even though, the writing center field does not have an agreed upon typology of writing conferences or methods, writing center tutoring strategies can be broadly categorized under two main approaches, namely the collaborative approach (also referred to as the Socratic approach) and the direct approach (also referred to as the didactic approach). The collaborative approach supports a student-centered, non-direct method with the assumption that the success of a tutorial is dependent on the active behaviors of writing clients, not on the tutors (Clark as cited in Shamoon & Burns, 2001). Hence, some collaborative tutoring strategies are sitting beside students rather than opposite them, making sure that students sit closer to their paper than tutors, making students read their papers aloud so that students can hear how their papers sound, motivating writers by finding something positive to say about the writer’s paper and using leading questions so that writers can find the solution to their own writing problems (Brooks, 2001).

Even though research on collaborative learning reports its many merits (Allen, Walker & Allias, and Masse & Popvich as cited in Jones, 2001; Fitzgerald, 1994), many scholars have come to challenge this approach by favoring a more direct one. In the direct approach, tutors find themselves applying strategies such as:

telling writers what their audiences would expect rather than asking the writers to decide, answering questions about the sufficiency of the evidence provided in a particular context rather than leaving that decision to the writer, or showing writers how to say something rather than asking them what they wanted to say (Powers, 2001: 371).

Direct strategies are sometimes seen to be preferred over collaborative strategies when the tutee is a NNS in an ESL context, as research claims that NNS typically come to conferences with a different understanding of rhetoric based on their first language writing experiences (Grabe & Kaplan, and Leki as cited in Powers, 2001). The collaborative approach, however, assumes that students have the necessary writing experience to find answers to their problems (Powers, 2001).

In addition to the identification of tutoring strategies to produce better writers, writing center scholars have tried to identify tutor roles relevant to the tutorial. The roles supported by the collaborative approach dictate that tutors should adopt a more passive stance than the writing clients in the tutorial. That is, tutors function in a secondary role while writing clients actively try to improve their writing skills. However, writing clients always know that the writing tutors are there to guide the writing clients through the process of becoming a better writer. The roles supported by the direct approach on the other hand, adopt an active stance in tutorials and do not mind doing more work in the tutorial than the writing clients.

Statement of the Problem

The strategies and roles that tutors should implement and adopt in order to guide students to be better writers on a one-to-one basis at writing centers have been the topic of much discussion (Brooks, 2001; Clark, 1995; Cogie, Strain & Lorinskas, 1999; Eison, 1990; Fitzgerald, 1994; Gillespie & Lerner, 2000; Goldstein & Conrad, 1990; Harris, 1986, 2001; Hilgers & Marsella, 1992; Leahy, 1990; Meyer & Smith, 1987; Neff, 1994; North, 1995; Powers, 2001; Powers & Nelson, 1995; Shamoan & Burns, 2001). Most of this discussion revolves around the tutoring strategies and roles appropriate when dealing

with NSE, and some of the discussions deal with tutoring strategies and roles appropriate in ESL contexts. However, the field lacks research studies on which tutoring strategies and roles are effective in a setting where English is neither a first nor a second language for writing center clients, but a foreign language. Writing center research conducted in ESL contexts cannot easily be generalized for an EFL context for many reasons. For example, ESL learners are immersed in their second language. They are likely to be exposed to their second language, English, in nearly every activity in which they participate. ESL learners are usually required to communicate in their second language in and outside the classroom. However, EFL learners usually only have the chance to be exposed to English in the classroom. Once outside the classroom, EFL learners usually convert to their native language to communicate. Hence, there is probably a variation in ESL and EFL learners' English proficiency, with ESL learners likely having a stronger command of English. Thus, this study aims to find tutors' perceptions of which tutoring strategies are effective, and which tutoring roles are appropriate when serving EFL learners in the writing centers of Turkey.

Furthermore, writing center literature mainly consists of articles asserting individual writing center scholars' beliefs on which practices are the most effective in tutorials rather than empirical research exploring the practices found to be the most effective (Shamoon & Burns, 2001). Hence, the field lacks research on tutoring practices that are actually implemented in tutorials. Moreover, research is needed in order to determine the reasons why tutors implement various tutorial practices. After all, tutoring strategies and tutor roles might be implemented for reasons other than for effectiveness. For example, tutors may or may not implement various tutorial strategies due to

constraints such as time. Hence, this study aims to identify the tutorial strategies and roles actually reported to be practiced in Turkey's writing centers. Moreover, this study investigates tutors' rationales for the strategies and roles they adopt as a first step to constructing a recommended writing center approach for the Turkish writing client population.

Significance of the Problem

Due to the lack of research on tutor perceptions of effective tutoring strategies and appropriate tutor roles, and the extent to which they exploit these tutoring strategies and tutor roles when serving EFL students, the results of this study may contribute to the literature by revealing tutors' perceptions of which tutoring strategies and tutor roles are effective when conferencing with Turkish writing clients

At the local level, this study attempts to identify tutors' assumptions about effective tutoring strategies and appropriate tutor roles in the EFL context of Turkey's six writing centers. This study also sets out to determine the extent to which these tutoring strategies and roles are reported to be implemented. This information is valuable in the sense that it may provide tutors working in the writing centers in Turkey with information about which strategies and roles are believed to be effective in the EFL one-to-one writing conference. Furthermore, this study is valuable in that it may promote the construction of in-service tutorship training programs for Turkey's writing centers. The study could also contribute to the composing of a tutoring manual, which would include tutor duties and characteristics, and writing center procedures.

Research Questions

In this study, the following questions will be addressed:

1. What tutoring strategies do Turkey's writing center tutors report to implement in one-to-one tutorial while dealing with Turkish writing clients?
2. What are Turkish writing center tutors' rationales for their reported implementation of particular tutoring strategies in one-to-one tutorials with Turkish writing clients?
3. What do Turkey's writing center tutors perceive to be appropriate tutoring roles in one-to-one tutorials with Turkish writing clients?
4. What are Turkish writing center tutors' rationales for their perceptions of appropriate tutoring roles in one-to-one tutorials with Turkish writing clients?

Key Terms

Writing center/lab/workshop: A writing center is a place that aims at serving all individuals who want to write and improve their writing.

Tutor: The title given to the instructors who participate in developing the writing skills of all individuals who come to writing centers.

Writing client/Tutee/Writer: Titles given to the individuals that participate in writing center activities in order to improve their writing skills. Writing clients can be university undergraduate or postgraduate students, research assistants, and university faculty.

One-to-one tutorial/conference: One of the writing services offered by writing centers. In one-to-one tutorials, tutors help writing clients to improve clients' writing skills on a one-to-one basis. These tutorials last for approximately 40 minutes to an hour.

Tutorial strategy: A plan of action tutors follow during one-to-one conferences with the aim to develop tutees as writers.

Tutor role: The roles tutors adopt during one-to-one conferences with the aim to develop tutees as writers.

Conclusion

In brief, writing center literature seems to maintain that two writing center approaches are implemented in writing centers: the collaborative approach and the direct approach. The collaborative approach requires tutors to take a non-interventionist stance. Hence, collaborative tutorial strategies and roles aim to make writing clients active, and tutors passive. The direct approach, on the other hand, maintains that writing clients sometimes need to be directly told what needs to be improved in their writing and how. Hence, direct tutorial strategies and roles assume an interventionist stance, which creates a tutor-centered environment.

Even though it seems as if the direct approach strategies and roles are preferred to the collaborative approach while dealing with ESL clients, which strategies and roles are actually implemented in an EFL context is unknown. Moreover, the field lacks research studies in determining the rationales behind tutors' choices of strategies and roles. The determination of tutorial strategies and roles implemented in Turkey's writing centers and

tutors' rationales for their adoption may contribute to the literature by identifying the tutorial strategies and roles adopted in one EFL setting, Turkey. Moreover, this research study is valuable in that it may contribute to the construction of in-service training programs and a tutoring manual.

The following chapter first provides information about the history of writing centers. Secondly, it elaborates on the two common writing center approaches: the collaborative and direct approach. The tutorial strategies and roles adopted in each writing center approach are presented and discussed.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

A continuing debate in the field of language teaching, in particular teaching writing, has been that of the tutorial strategies and tutor roles that should be adopted in the one-to-one tutorial (also referred to as the conference) in the context of the writing center. Conferences, considered as one of the innovations of process writing (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996), are claimed to be “highly productive dialogues between writers and teachers” (Harris, 1986: 3) in which the aim is “to help the writer become a better writer, not to fix whatever particular paper the student has brought” (Harris, 2001: 272). However, upon analysis of writing center history, one can observe that the aim of writing centers was not always to produce better writers. In fact, variations in the writing center’s role, the time in which it was functioning, and the writing approach, product or process writing, popular at that particular time, resulted in differences in writing centers’ aims. Consequently, the strategies and roles adopted (and sometimes adapted) by writing center tutors differed.

In the ‘modern’ writing center, under the general consensus that the writing center should work to rear better writers rather than better corrected papers, writing center scholars and staff began to debate which tutorial strategies and tutorial roles would be the most effective in achieving this aim. Even though the writing center field does not have an agreed upon typology of writing conferences or methods, the literature overall consists of two writing center approaches, which have gained popularity in the ‘modern’ writing center: the collaborative and direct approach. Writing center literature seems to reflect

these two approaches as two separate entities (Shamoon & Burns, 2001). Nevertheless, each approach shares some common features.

This chapter reviews the related literature on writing center tutorial strategies and tutor roles in the following order. First, the history of writing centers is briefly described in order to illustrate how various tutoring strategies and tutor roles were developed according to the aim of the writing center and the writing approach they had adopted at a particular time. The chapter continues with descriptions of the two overarching writing center approaches that are generally adopted in today's modern writing centers: the collaborative approach and the direct approach. The second part of the chapter begins with an analysis of the collaborative approach, and includes a description of the strategies and tutor roles that collaborators generally follow. The third section of the chapter focuses on the direct approach. A brief description of the direct approach is followed by information on the strategies and the roles that the directionists tend to follow.

Writing Center History

What exactly is it that writing centers do? Are we running only remedial centers, places to salvage some of the “boneheads” that have been permitted to enroll (for however brief a tenure) in our institutions? Are we band-aid clinics offering clean up service for papers to be handed in? (Harris, 1995: 29).

The frustration of merely being labeled a “remedial center” or a “band-aid clinic” can be felt in the above writing center scholar's tone. Writing centers do not want to be recognized as “the place to do the dirty work of grammar,” thereby liberating classroom teachers to work on higher level writing concerns (Carino, 1995: 41). Rather, writing centers are perceived to be (and prefer to be perceived as) “nurturing helping places

which provide ... sustenance to students to help them grow, mature, and become independent” (Harris, 1995: 29).

The misconception of the writing center as “fix it” shops, as North (1995) claims writing centers are perceived to be, can be connected to the divergent labels writing centers have been given throughout their short history. In fact, Carino (1995), a long-time writing center professional, notes that the names writing centers have given themselves can be considered as metaphors reflecting their roles and functions. Carino’s writing center metaphors have been preferred over some of the simple and crude labels generally employed by the writing center field, such as the ‘old lab’, ‘clinic’, and the ‘drill ‘n kill’ places versus the modern writing center (Jim Bell, personal e-mail). Carino (1995) claims that there are three metaphors, which have been widely used to reflect the one-to-one individualized service writing centers provide to students requesting assistance with their writing: clinic, lab, and center.

Upon the advent of open admissions and the proliferation of academic facilities in American universities in the 1970s, composition teachers started to identify more and more students who had “writing deficiencies.” Hence, writing *clinics* started to become a ubiquitous characteristic of every American university and college as “remedial agencies for removing students deficiencies in composition” (Moore, 1995: 3). As the metaphor *clinic* suggests, writing clinics were observed as institutions concerned with the *diagnosis* of an individual’s writing difficulties, which was followed with suggestions of *remedial* measures (Carino, 1995; Moore, 1995). Therefore, the sense of clinic, even though encompassing great prestige for the one who diagnoses, degrades writers by placing them in a connotation (or metaphor) of illness (Carino, 1995). Writing clinic pedagogy

consisted of hundreds of worksheets practicing drills and focused on a product approach to writing. That is, clinic pedagogy ran on the belief that if deficient students were molded into talking and writing like “healthy” academicians, in that they were producing written discourse which was similar to the writing of academicians, everything was working just as it was supposed to do (Carino, 1995).

Whereas writing clinic pedagogy adopted a product-oriented approach, writing lab pedagogy preferred to emphasize a process oriented approach to writing (Carino, 1995). Nevertheless, this change still evolved under the negative connotations of the lab metaphor. Even though, writing clinic drill worksheets were largely discarded and a more student –centered approach to learning and teaching was adopted, writing lab tutors were likely to perceive their tutoring as experimenting, imposing questions and seeking for answers to problems (Carino, 1995). According to Carino, this lab metaphor reflected in a greater coordination of the writing classroom and the lab. However, this coordination resulted in the lab being the place to do supplementary work such as grammar. Hence, this so-called collaboration would liberate classroom teachers to fulfill the requirements of the new process writing approach, while the lab dealt with student writers’ grammar. In other words, writing labs were only viewed as supplements of writing courses whose students consisted of those singled out by their course instructors for a session or two of remediation (Carino, 1995; Moore, 1995). In summary, it would seem that writing labs were established to help students produce better papers, rather than better writers.

Despite employing a student-centered approach, the writing lab still only dealt with students considered to have writing deficiencies. In contrast, the *writing center* not only tends to support a tutor and writer collaborative-based approach, but also claims to

be central to all writers (Carino, 1995). That is, the writing center aims at serving individuals at all levels of writing proficiency and capability, and not only problematic students. Moreover, Carino (1995) claims that the metaphor *center* implies a sense of centeredness, revolution, and centripetal attraction. In light of this definition, writing centers indicate a movement toward empowerment by constructing activities such as training teaching assistants, and conducting faculty workshops for writing across the curriculum, offering credit courses, grammar hotlines and tutoring for standardized tests (Carino, 1995). In contrast to serving as remedial centers as writing clinics and labs did, North (1995) claims that the writing center is not intended to serve as a back up of any curriculum. Rather, the writing center aims to “make sure that writers and not necessarily their texts, are what get changed by instruction...our [the writing center’s] job is to produce better writers and not better texts” (North, 1995: 76). In brief, the writing center aims at serving all individuals who want to write and improve their writing. In contrast to the strategies used by the clinic and the lab, the writing center encompasses strategies, which reflect a collaborative nature between the tutor and the student.

As can be analyzed from Carino's (1995) writing center metaphors, a paradigm shift occurred from teacher-centered to student-centered conferences, employment of mechanical strategies and tasks to collaborative strategies and tasks, and from an emphasis on text to one on the writer. This paradigm shift in the writing center required the writing center to operate within a different educational perspective. For example, the focus on the writer rather than the text in one-to-one tutorials required for writing center tutors to treat every writer “as an individual, as a person with all her uniqueness” (Harris, 1995: 31). Thus, writing centers not only attempt to place value on each writer’s

individuality; writing centers strive to employ writers' individuality as a foundation, a basis, to offer whatever assistance possible to help improve writers' writing skills (Harris, 1995). Contemporary writing centers focus on each writer's uniqueness as a foundation to suggest, understand and implement strategies that tutors may implement and the roles that tutors may adapt or adopt. This focus on individualistic characteristics may be the reason for the diverse approaches promoted in the writing center literature and employed in writing center practice. In particular, two contemporary writing approaches have been promoted in writing center theory and practice: the Collaborative (Socratic) and Direct (Didactic) Approaches.

The Collaborative Approach

Although the term collaborative learning has only been in existence for 30 years or so, collaboration has long been a part of university life for academicians (Clark, 1995; Fitzgerald, 1994). For example, a tutor (X) may request help or advice from another tutor (Y) who happens to be more experienced on the topic that X is working on, or writers may ask other writers to review some of their early drafts for feedback. Hence, as can be derived from the examples above, the collaborative approach is based on the notion that knowledge is socially constructed (Bruffee as cited in Fitzgerald, 1994; Lunsford, 2001).

That is, as put forward by Bruffee (as cited in Fitzgerald, 1994):

If we accept the premise that knowledge is an artifact created by a community of knowledgeable peers and that learning is a social process not an individual one, then ... [l]earning is an activity in which people work collaboratively to create knowledge among themselves by socially justifying belief (11).

Research on the collaborative approach reports the many merits of collaborative learning, which Lunsford (2001) has summarized as follows:

Collaboration:

1. aids in problem finding as well as problem solving.
2. aids in learning abstractions.
3. aids in transfer and assimilation; it fosters interdisciplinary thinking.
4. leads not only to sharper, more critical thinking (students must explain, defend and adapt), but to deeper understanding of *others*. (emphasis original)
5. leads to higher achievement in general.
6. promotes excellence. “For excellence, the presence of others is always required” (Hannah Arendt as cited in Lunsford, 2001).
7. engages the whole student and encourages active learning; it combines reading, talking, writing, thinking; it provides practice in both synthetic and analytic skills. (94-95)

In spite of these many merits of collaborative learning, Lunsford (2001) calls for caution when writing centers use the word collaboration as a reflection of their tutoring philosophy. The reason for Lunsford’s caution is founded in that a truly collaborative approach is very difficult to achieve. Lunsford reports three difficulties of successfully implementing the collaborative approach. These difficulties are listed below as they reflect the characteristics of the collaborative approach.

One difficulty of implementing the collaborative approach results from the fact that “collaborative environments and tasks must *demand* collaboration” (Lunsford, 2001, p. 95) (emphasis original). That is, the collaborative task must be an authentic real world task in that all of the people participating in a particular collaborative act must really need one another to complete the task. For example, in the work place, authentic collaborative

tasks tend to consist of three main characteristics: a higher order problem defining and solving nature, a division of labor tasks, and a division of expertise tasks. Therefore, one may conclude that writing center collaborative tasks should reflect the characteristics that writers will need to use in their everyday collaborative activities.

Lunsford (2001) also calls for care in claiming that an environment or task is collaborative since establishing a collaborative environment (within a writing center) requires the determination of clear goals in which the jobs at hand are fairly distributed between all the people involved (e.g., students, tutors, administrative staff). Hence, this factor of collaborative learning “calls for careful and ongoing monitoring and evaluating of the collaboration or group process ... on part of all involved” (Lunsford, 2001: 95).

Furthermore, encouraging groups of any kind (e.g., students, tutors) to adopt or adapt the collaborative approach to establish a collaborative environment is difficult (Lunsford, 2001). To illustrate, students may reject collaborative learning, especially if they are familiar with a different approach. Hence, in order to minimize rejection of the collaborative approach, the people, and therefore tutors, involved in implementing collaborative learning need to decide on how to allow for evaluation and monitoring and how to effectively model and teach. They must also about careful listening, leadership, goal setting and negotiation – all constituents of effective collaborative learning.

In summary, adopting a collaborative approach does not make the writing center tutors’ work easier just because the traditional teacher role of informer has been eliminated. Rather, collaborative learning requires writing center tutors (and administrators) to adopt and adapt a new set of tutoring strategies and tutor roles which follow the nature of collaborative learning (depicted by Lunsford’s cautionary notes

above) in order to observe the positive benefits of the collaborative approach. Therefore, the next section of this paper focuses on the clarification of various tutoring strategies and tutor roles present in writing center literature, which support the collaborative theory.

Collaborative Tutoring Strategies

Various writing center scholars have suggested or listed strategies that tutors may implement in one-to-one writing conferences, which more or less follow the nature of the collaborative approach (Brooks, 2001; Cogie, Strain, & Lorinskas, 1999; Gillespie & Lerner, 2000; Goldstein & Conrad, 1990; Harris, 1986, 2001; Jones, 2001; Leahy, 1990; Meyers & Smith, 1987). All of these proposed strategies more or less support the goals that conferencing should develop independent writers, motivate students and respond to learner writing concerns. Brooks' (2001) article "Minimalist tutoring: Making students do all the work", which was originally published in 1991, advocates a hands-off approach to students' papers in which teachers avoid editing papers for students in favor of focusing on structure, organization, logical reasoning, and stylistic control. The strategies that Brook suggests more or less summarize the collaborative strategies available in writing center literature. Brooks (2001) divides the strategies of his minimalist tutoring model into three main forms that he labels as "basic", "advanced" and "defensive." Basic and advanced tutoring consists of collaborative strategies that can be implemented when the writer in the conference is responsive. The strategies suggested in defensive tutoring, on the other hand, serve as a contingency plan if students are not cooperative and try to push tutors into editing their work for them.

The strategies of minimalist tutoring forms state that the tutors should:

1. take a seat beside the student, not across the desk (Rationale: to show the student that the paper belongs to the student him/herself).
2. make an effort to get the student to be physically closer to his/her paper than the tutor is (Rationale: to show student that the tutor is only an observer).
3. take a seat on the student's right, if tutor is right-handed (Rationale: to avoid tutor's writing on student's paper).
4. have the student read the paper aloud to tutor, and propose that the student hold the pencil while doing so (Rationale: to avoid the uncomfortable silence while tutor reads the student paper, to actively involve the student and to help student to realize his/her own mistakes).

In advanced minimalist tutoring, the tutor should:

1. focus on success in the paper and not failure. Make it a custom to find something nice to say about every paper (Rationale: to indicate that texts can be analyzed in terms of strengths and weaknesses).
2. encourage the student to talk by using leading questions (Rationale: to show the student that the paper belongs to him/herself).
3. provide students with a discrete writing task, then leave the student for a few minutes to let the student complete the task (Rationale: to motivate the student to complete a small part of his paper by giving a deadline to finish the task).

In defensive minimalist tutoring, the tutor should:

1. make use of students' body language. For example, the tutor could physically disattach him or herself from the students' paper by slouching in his/her chair or by leaving the room.

2. be completely honest with the student. For example, the tutor could explicitly tell the writer that the paper belongs to him/her (pp. 221-223).

Leahy (1990), another firm believer in the collaborative approach, also puts forward some collaborative tutoring strategies. Leahy (1990) suggests that writing center tutors could:

1. attempt to find out about a student's writing process by asking questions such as "What sort of planning have you done on this paper so far?"
2. introduce and demonstrate various writing strategies for students' encountering writing problems. For example, the tutor could demonstrate organizational methods such as idea-mapping, if a student has become confused while trying to compose an outline
3. if the paper is in a discipline the student is unfamiliar within, explain how the student may divide the paper into manageable sections in respect to the function and content of each section (2-3)

Gillespie & Lerner's (2000) list of collaborative peer tutoring strategies resembles Brook's (2001) minimalist tutoring strategies. Gillespie & Lerner (2000) suggest that peer tutors:

1. focus on writer's development
2. start with higher-order concerns and worry about correctness last
3. ask questions
4. comment on aspects that are going well
5. keep their hands off writers' papers, and let the writers make corrections
6. ask writers their future writing plans (e.g., plans for revision)(p. 36)

In addition to these three works proposing strategies that tutors may implement, there are many other writing center scholars who directly or indirectly imply the adoption of collaborative tutoring strategies within the one-to-one tutorial context. For example, Kiedaish and Dinitz (2001) claim that while tutor knowledge about the discipline of the student's writing may be an effective aid, a lack of particular disciplinary knowledge need not be call for alarm. The reason for their conclusion that specialist information on a particular subject area is not necessary for effective teaching is probably due to their strong belief in a collaborative approach practice in which tutors tend to be less active than the writer. That is, as maintained by Brooks (2001), tutors should not explicitly tell the writer what to write. Rather, tutors negotiate with writers in order to guide writers to find the answers to their own writing concerns. Hence, specialist knowledge is not a requisite to successfully negotiate with the writer.

Another article expressing one writing scholar's belief in collaborative learning strategies is Evelyn Ashton-Jone's (1988) "Asking the Right Questions: A Heuristic for Tutors." This paper argues that tutors should engage in "Socratic dialogue" with their tutorial writers as a method of developing students' cognitive abilities. The Socratic dialogue aims at leading students to find the answers to their own problems. Tutors try to achieve this aim through determining what assistance the writer needs via a bombardment of questions related to process, problems, purpose and audience (Powers, 2001). Ashton-Jone (1988) maintains that tutors should engage in Socratic dialogue rather than adopting a more direct method in which answers are directly given to students.

Many writing center scholars support the adoption of collaborative tutoring strategies to the extent that they are broadly applied in many writing centers. However,

upon scrutiny, one realizes that this literature promotes “codes and appeals [that] seem less the product of research or examined practice”, but rather codes and appeals “of faith that serve to validate a tutoring approach which “feels right,”(Shamoon & Boons, 2001, p. 226). Although Shamoon and Burns’ statement carries considerable credibility, a few empirical research results have reported some of the collaborative tutoring strategies to be as productive as claimed to be (Freedman & Katz, 1987; Goldstein & Conrad, 1990; Jacobs & Karliner, 1977; Walker & Elias, 1987).

Freedman & Katz (1987), Walker & Elias (1987), and Jacobs & Karliner (1977), by examining the discourse of conferences, claimed to find results supporting the effectiveness of collaborative strategies in the tutorial. Freedman & Katz (1987), analyzed one conference in particular, and noted that the student supplied the direction and content of the conference through the tutor’s guiding Socratic-type questions. On the basis of this finding, Freedman & Katz hypothesized that a student’s contribution to input and content of the discourse in conferences positively affected the student’s writing. However, one may question the validity of the conclusion implied from Freedman and Katz’s observations. For example, other factors other than the student’s contribution to input and content may have constituted for the improvement in the student’s writing. Possibly, the tutor’s style appealed to the student. Maybe, the researcher’s presence, or even the student’s knowledge that s/he was being observed and tested, could result in the student producing better work than usual to save himself/herself from potential embarrassment.

Walker & Elias (1987), on the other hand, compared the discourse of conferences rated highly and poorly by students and tutors. This research reports that student-centered

conferences in which criteria for successful writing were discussed and students' work were evaluated were rated the highest. Low-rated conferences, however, were tutor-centered and consisted of multiple requests for repetition of explanations. This study has its limitations in that it only takes students' evaluations as a measurement

Another conference discourse study is Jacobs & Karliner's (1977) study, which concluded that native speaker students who engaged in exploratory talk and initiated more discussion, generated revisions with deeper analysis of the subject. In contrast, in conferences in which the tutor gave suggestions even before hearing the student's ideas, the student only revised surface level problems and did not deal with higher level writing concerns. Even though the study seems to support the implementation of a collaborative approach, it should be noted that Jacobs and Karliner (1997) provide evidence from only one case to support their argument.

All the above studies were conducted with native speakers of English (NSE). Goldstein and Conrads' (1990) research was conducted to find the effect of negotiation and input on ESL students' revision in conferences. The study reports findings similar to those of Jacobs & Karliner (1977). That is, students who negotiated meaning made revisions that improved the text in general whereas students who did not negotiate meaning either made no revisions or only surface level revisions.

Collaborative Approach Tutor Roles

If one were to ask what role a non-interventionist tutor takes on in the one-to-one conference, s/he would realize that the collaborative tutor is not only in possession of one role, but in fact many. One of the divergent hats that writing center tutors wear is that of coach (Harris, 1986). As the metaphor coach implies, the tutor as a coach "*is not* the

player but the person who stands at the sidelines watching and helping – not stepping in to make the field goal or sink the putt when the player is in trouble” (Harris, 1986, p. 35). In other words, the tutor-as-coach adopts a secondary role (Brooks, 2001; Leahy, 1990) in the conference. As a result, the coach role requires tutors to keep students focused on their own writing by adopting a passive role for themselves and encouraging students to adopt an active role. The following are some comments that the tutor-as-coach may likely produce:

You’ve done a good job of using specific details in this first paragraph.
Can you do the same thing again in your second and third paragraphs?

That sentence is hard for me to read because it’s so long. I need some
pause markers to help me see the different parts. Punctuation would help.
Where would you add some punctuation? (Harris, 1986: 35)

Tutors employ comments similar to the above to help students improve their writing. For example, tutors may guide students to identify parts in their paper that need improving and that they are strong in (Harris, 1986).

Another hat that tutors have to wear as a requisite of the collaborative approach is that of listener (Brooks, 2001; Harris, 1986, 1994, 2001). Tutors have to listen in order to hear what the student needs to know (Murray as cited in Harris, 1986). Hence, to accomplish this goal, the tutor listens for various reasons. First, before the writing process begins, the tutors may listen to what students have got to say about their own lives. Secondly, as writing begins, tutor-as-listener (Harris, 1986) may function as a fellow-writer, listening and sharing the writing problems and difficulties the student faces. Finally, as meaning becomes clearer in the paper, the tutor-as-listener focuses on lower-level writing concerns such as the mechanics of the paper. Hence, the tutor has to listen carefully to what the paper says. Nevertheless, some supporters of the collaborative

approach would not agree with tutors listening in order to focus on lower-level writing concerns. This is because the collaborative approach favors focusing on higher-level writing concerns rather than lower-level writing problems. One other reason that the collaborative approach calls for tutors to adopt the role of listener is due to its non-interventionist nature which requires tutors not to tell students what to do, but rather to listen to what students have to say about their writing. By listening to what students have to say, tutors can encourage and support students (Brooks, 2001) and form the Socratic type questions that will help students to find the answers to their own writing problems. Thus the tutor-as-listener provides the basis for another collaborative tutor role – tutor as talker.

The tutor-as-talker role has many roles in itself. First of all, the talker functions as a counselor (Harris, 1986). The counselor tries to perceive the writer as a whole by talking to the student to learn his or her previous writing experiences, motivation, attitude and composing processes. In order to achieve this aim, the counselor has to employ the counseling technique – paraphrasing or restating. By paraphrasing or restating the writing clients' words, tutors are confirming that they have correctly understood what they have said. The tutor-as-talker can also function as a commentator in the one-to-one conference (Harris, 1986; Leahy, 1990). The commentator's role, as its metaphor implies, is to comment on what students have done, are doing and should be doing. By doing so, commentators are giving students a larger perspective of what they are doing. The tutor-as-commentator helps students to discover the weaknesses and strengths in their paper, and to keep their perspective focused and connected to the whole of the paper. Furthermore, tutors-as-talkers ask Socratic type questions to guide students to find the

answers to their own problems rather than giving the answer to students' questions. Harris (2001) advocates some questions that she believes initiates students to think critically about their writing. They are; "why did you do that?" and "how did you write this paper?" (279). Finally, as the tutor functions as a talker and not a teller, the collaborative approach assumes that both participants in the one-to-one conference are on equal stands in terms of writing experience and knowledge.

Writing center literature, in addition to reporting the various roles that non-interventionist tutors should adopt, has also noted disparate roles that collaborative tutors must not adopt. The tutor-as-editor is one role that writing center collaborators are taught not to adopt in the writing center. The collaborative approach discourages tutors from writing on students' papers in any way. Training in the collaborative approach therefore trains tutors to, for example, sit on the student's right hand side if the student is right-handed, and to never hold a pen (Clark & Healy, 2001). One reason for collaborators' strong belief in not serving as an editor is again the conviction that in a writing center "the object is to make sure that writers, and not necessarily their texts, are what get changed in instruction" (North, 1995: 76). Supporters of the collaborative approach believe that by editing they are actually only improving a student's paper rather than helping the student to develop his or her writing skills.

One other role that writing center literature maintains collaborators should not adopt is that of evaluator. In the collaborative approach, tutors are taught not to evaluate the students' teachers' assignments or grades in any way. That is, the non-interventionist writing center approach has generally accepted North's (1995) dictum: "[W]e never play student-advocates in student relationships.... [We] never evaluate or second-guess any

teacher's syllabus, assignments or comments, or grades" (79). The collaborative approach aims to improve writing clients as writers, not their papers. Hence, if tutors comment on writing clients' grades, for example, this indicates that tutors are emphasizing on writing clients' papers rather than on the writing process and the writers themselves.

Questioning the Collaborative Approach

Ethics, more precisely the issue of plagiarism, in the writing center has almost always been subject to question (Clark & Healy, 2001). Even now when writing centers have become a ubiquity in universities and high schools all around the USA, academic staff still express their distress at the kind of assistance given to the students that writing centers serve. A survey conducted to observe academicians' views on whether they objected to their students being tutored generated the following response from one respondent: "My Vietnamese student who came to see you received too much help with his composition – even suggestions for ideas to be incorporated into the paper" (as cited in Clark & Healy, 2001).

To avoid comments like the above from faculty, many writing centers have embraced the non-interventionist collaborative/process approach to tutoring. Writing centers' commitment to the implementation of collaborative approach strategies such as asking Socratic questions rather than telling, and making sure that writers rather than the tutors hold a pen, may actually be an indirect way to assure faculty that help in writing centers does not constitute plagiarism (Clark & Healy, 2001). Hence, the non-interventionist collaborative approach has not only become preferred writing center practice, but virtually the only writing center approach (Clark & Healy, 2001). Reflecting the approach's dominance, this policy has been referred to as a "bible" (Shamoon &

Burns, 2001), “mantras” (Blau as cited in Clark & Healy, 2001) and “dogma” (Clark, 1995).

During the process of ensuring that writing centers are making sure that “writers, and not necessarily their texts, are what get changed by instruction” (North, 1995: 76), the limitations of the collaborative approach may have been overlooked. The non-interventionist approach overlooks the possibility that some students and especially non-native English speaking students (Powers, 2001) may prefer or benefit from a more interventionist and direct approach whose implementation could be ethically justified (Clark & Healy, 2001; Shamon & Burns, 2001). In fact, research reports that direct feedback is essential in the learning process especially when it comes to ESL and EFL learners.

Lightbown and Spada (1999) suggest that simply negotiating is not sufficient in promoting second language learning, and hence in promoting second language writing. Rather, classroom data from a number of studies suggest that form-focused instruction and corrective feedback provided in a communicative context are more effective than only focusing on meaning (and therefore, negotiation). Especially if the English language feature being dealt with is unfamiliar to the non-native English learner, Lightbown and Spada (1999) maintain that it may be necessary to provide explicit information on how English contrasts with the learner’s native language.

One research study to assess the effectiveness of direct feedback was conducted by Lyster and Ranta (as cited in Larsen-Freeman, 1995). Lyster and Ranta’s research results obtained from Canadian French Immersion Programs indicate the importance of direct and explicit feedback. Lyster and Ranta’s study reported that the classes that

received explicit feedback in contrast to the classes that received implicit feedback were more likely to lead to corrected versions of original utterances.

Another study conducted by Doughty in 1991 (as cited in Lightbown & Spada, 1999) dictated the effectiveness of direct instruction rather than implicit instruction. Doughty's study reported that learners who had received instruction (in relative clause formation) outperformed the learners who had not received any instruction.

Despite such research results, the collaborative approach seems to advocate that no form of direct feedback, such as telling writers that their sentences are incorrect, or instruction such as directly giving the rules of a particular grammar feature, is appropriate. Moreover, the collaborative approach claims that writers do not need guidance on lower-level writing concerns such as grammar. However, as put forward by Doughty, instruction promotes language accuracy, which is an important feature of academic writing in particular.

Some writing scholars (Clark, 1995; Clark & Healy, 2001; Shamon & Burns, 2001) have recognized the benefits of being more direct in the tutorial, and advocate that tutors should be direct in their feedback and instruction when necessary. Hence, the direct approach has become a popular alternative writing center approach to the non-interventionist collaborative approach, especially when dealing with ESL and EFL learners. Non-native English speakers in particular argued the need of direct feedback and instruction in order to learn what is considered to be accurate in the English language.

The Direct Approach

In an attempt to understand the experience of learning to write, research on social and cognitive development has indicated that “directive tutoring, a methodology completely opposite our current [non-interventionist collaborative] tutoring practices, is sometimes a suitable and effective mode of instruction” (Shamoon & Burns, 2001: 225).

Deborah Burns (Shamoon & Burns, 2001) reports on one of the teacher-centered direct conferences she had with her professor during the completion of her M.A thesis:

The most helpful writing tutoring I ever received at the university came from the director of my master’s thesis. I wrote what I thought was a fairly good draft of my thesis, then shared it with my director for comments. I remember, at first, being surprised at the number of problems my director found with my draft. He added transitions when needed, showed me how to eliminate wordiness, and formalized my vocabulary. In addition, he offered specific suggestions for rewriting entire paragraphs, and he always pointed out errors where I had lost focus. ... After I watched my director work with my text, and after I made the necessary changes, my thesis and other academic writing was much less of a mystery to me (229).

This type of direct tutoring shows certain parallels with Vygotsky’s work on the relationship between development and learning in children. According to Vygotsky, the most important learning occurs at “the zone of proximal development” (ZPD) which he defines as “the distance between the actual development level as determined by independent problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers” (as cited in Clark, 1995: 92). Hence, as put forward by Clark (1995, 2001), Vygotsky’s concept of the proximal zone indicates that tutors in order to help students to develop their writing skills should work on “functions that have not yet matured, but are in the process of maturation, functions that will mature tomorrow, but are currently in an embryonic state” (as cited in Clark, 1995, p. 92).

Vygotsky's ZPD implies that tutors should provide writing clients with information that they lack and need. For example, ESL and especially EFL learners do not have the same command of the English language as NSE do. ESL and EFL learners may also lack knowledge of the English language that NSE intuitively possess. Hence, ESL and EFL learners presumably, since they do not have the same language competence and experience to base their negotiations on. Therefore, as implied by Vygotsky, an adult or more capable peer (the tutor) can help the learner develop (language) functions that have not fully developed yet. Various strategies and roles are suggested by the direct approach in order to promote writing skills that need to be developed in the writing clients.

Direct Approach Tutoring Strategies

The direct approach consists of various strategies that may be employed in the one-to-one conference. To illustrate, in order to develop "functions that have not yet matured, but are in the process of maturation" (as cited in Clark, 1995, p. 92), tutors are advised to model the strategies a tutor believes their writing clients need to master. For example, a tutor could model how to develop examples, correct an incorrect sentence, paraphrase a sentence or two, and to correct the spelling of a few words if students are encountering problems such as these (Clark, 1995). As a result, students should then be able to model their tutors if they encounter similar writing problems in the future. Harris (as cited in Clark & Healy, 2001) advocates modeling as an effective method to help students learn invention and editing. Her rationale for modeling was based on the results she reached after a case study conducted with a novice writer. In this case study, Harris grew frustrated with the limited results that freewriting was generating with her student.

Hence, she reached out for a new strategy; modeling. For her student, Harris modeled the writing process, brainstorming, writing non-stop, and then reversed roles with her student. The student tried to imitate the behavior he had observed from Harris. After three such direct sessions, Harris reported that her student was showing a noticeable amount of improvement in his writing.

In addition to imitation, the direct approach calls for the employment of other strategies that are completely in opposition to collaborative strategies as proposed by Brooks (2001). For example, if necessary, the tutor is called upon to set the agenda of the conference, and to give answers to students' problems rather than reply with a question to a student's question. Moreover, the direct approach suggests that tutors deal with lower level writing concerns if that is the kind of help the writer needs, and to actually hold a pen and use that pen on the student's writing. In brief, the direct approach seems to imply that tutors break all the rules of the collaborative approach if that is how writing clients are going to work the most efficiently.

Direct Approach Tutor Roles

The above strategies of the direct approach call for tutors to adopt a number of different tutor roles in the one-to-one conference. To begin with, since the direct approach believes in the effectiveness of a teacher-centered conference, one hat that direct tutors wear is that of teller or informant. The tutor-as-teller in the direct approach is much different from the tutor-as-talker in the collaborative approach. That is, the tutor-as-teller does not function as a counselor, commentator or asker of Socratic-type questions, but functions as a "hander-down" of knowledge from a more experienced and knowledgeable person to a less experienced and knowledgeable one (Shamoon & Burns,

2001). This information is passed on to students in an intrusive, direct and product-oriented manner by the tutor-as-teller. However, tutors' being "intrusive, directive and product-oriented" (Shamoon & Burns, 2001: 230) is not perceived to be an indication of power or voice, but rather as a transmission of "those aspects of practice which had remained unspoken and opaque" (Shamoon & Burns, 2001: 230). That is, by telling, the direct approach does not believe that tutors are superior in knowledge to writing clients. Rather, tutors are helping writing tutors to develop writing skills that they lack by providing direct feedback and instruction. Powers (2001) is another supporter of the role of teller in the one-to-one conference, especially when the student at hand is an ESL student. She maintains that the Socratic approach to conferencing is not applicable to ESL writers since the collaborative approach assumes that students have the necessary writing experience to find answers to their problems. However, since ESL students generally do not have the necessary cultural, rhetorical and linguistic information which native speakers intuitively possess, tutors conducting conferences cannot expect ESL students to find answers to questions with which they may be completely unfamiliar. Hence, the tutor may have to function as a cultural, rhetorical and linguistic informant when dealing with ESL students.

One other hat that the direct approach requires its tutors to wear is that of model. The direct approach assumes that imitation leads to improvement of students' writing skills since imitation enables freedom of expression (Shamoon & Burns, 2001). The earlier cited Harris study reports on how the researcher appealed to a model role when she realized that she needed a better technique than freewriting. Harris came to feel that there was no better way to convince a writing client that writing "is a process that

requires effort, thought, time and persistence... to go through all that writing, scratching out, rewriting and revising” (Harris as cited in Shamoon & Burns, 2001, p. 235).

Tutor-as-diagnostician is one other role that tutors may adopt in the direct conference (Clark, 1995; Harris, 1986). In the teacher-centered conference, in which the tutor does not find editing an unethical practice, the tutor by talking with writing clients about their writing concerns, diagnoses the problems they may have and then directs or shows them how to abolish these problems in order to improve the paper and writing clients’ writing skills.

Conclusion

First of all, brief information about writing centers was given. Writing centers’ titles in each era reflect their respective aim. The writing clinic aimed at solving the writing problems that writing clients had. Only writing clients that had writing problems were ‘admitted’ to the writing clinic to have their problems solved by more experienced writers- tutors. The writing lab was also for writers who had writing problems. However, the writing lab adopted a more student-centered approach than the writing clinic. The modern writing center is different from the clinic and the lab in that it aimed at serving writers at all levels of writing proficiency. Moreover, the writing center aimed at improving writers, not the written products writers were bringing to writing centers. In light of this aim, writing center literature promotes two writing center approaches: the collaborative and direct approach.

The collaborative approach maintains that tutorials need to be client-centered, and non-direct. That is, in order for writing clients to improve themselves as writers, they need to be active in the tutorial, and the tutors need to be passive. Thus, the collaborative

approach encourages tutors to adopt strategies such as negotiating and question asking which results in writing clients finding the answers to their own writing concerns. Research conducted to identify the merits of the collaborative approach indicated that a collaborative environment resulted in better learning and writing. Nevertheless, most of this research was conducted in a NSE context. Only a few of these studies were based on an ESL population. Thus, if the same research were conducted in an EFL context, the results might arguably vary. One reason for this variation could stem from the language input EFL writing clients would likely require in tutorials. However, the collaborative approach seems to suggest that tutors should not deal with lower-order writing concerns such as grammar and punctuation since tutors are not editors. There would probably even be a variation between ESL and EFL writing clients since EFL clients are exposed to even less English than ESL writing clients. Hence, ESL clients would probably have a better command of English than the EFL learners who usually only have the opportunity to employ English in the classroom.

In light of potential weaknesses of the collaborative approach, some writing scholars have promoted the direct approach, which advocates the merits of sometimes telling clients what and how to improve their writing. In contrast to the collaborative approach, the direct approach supports a tutor-centered, and interventionist setting. Hence, the direct approach supports the implementation of strategies such as telling and modeling, and roles such as teller. Even though there is limited research conducted about the direct approach, research in second language acquisition indicated improvement in the immersion class learners' language abilities that had received direct feedback.

Although not indicated directly by writing center literature, it seems as if the collaborative approach is not as appropriate as claimed to be when implemented in an EFL context. EFL learners are communicating in a language, which they generally use in the classroom only. Hence, they are likely to have problems in writing at both the lower (e.g., sentence level) and higher level (e.g., paragraph level). NSE, on the other hand, do not have to worry significantly about language problems since they are communicating in their native language. Thus, it seems as if a direct approach may be more suitable for EFL clients.

In the next chapter, the research tools and the methodological procedures followed in order to gather the data will be discussed. Additionally, information about the setting and the participants will be provided.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The focus of this study was on Turkish writing center tutors' (TT) claims of the tutoring strategies they implement in the one-to-one tutorial when dealing with EFL Turkish students, and the rationales behind their claims. Moreover, the present study aimed to examine these tutors' claims of which tutor roles they believed should be adopted in the one-to-one tutorial.

This chapter first focuses on the contexts and participants of this study, which is followed by a description of the instruments used to find the answers to the above questions. The next section lists the procedures gone through by the researcher while implementing the study instruments. Finally, this chapter ends with a section, which describes how the data collected were analyzed.

Writing Center Contexts

The tutors contributing to this study are from all six of the established writing centers in Turkey: the Academic Writing Center (AWC) at the Middle East Technical University (METU), Bilwrite at Bilkent University, the Sabanci University Writing Center (SUWC) at Sabancı University, the Language Resource Center (KoçLRC) at Koç University, the Language Resource Center (BilgiLRC) at Bilgi Istanbul University, and the Writing Center (WC) at Has University. All of the universities in which the writing centers are located are English-medium schools. Hence, the writing dealt with in the one-to-one tutorial sessions at the writing centers is in English as well. METU is a state university whereas the other five universities are private institutions.

In order to collect the necessary background information about the setting of each writing center a background information survey (see Appendix A) was prepared and e-mailed to each writing center coordinator. As the BilgiLRC did not have a coordinator at the time of the study, one of the tutors working in BilgiLRC volunteered to complete the survey to the best of her best ability. Unfortunately, she was unable to provide an answer to the questions in the questionnaire about the kinds of writing her writing center's clients brought to conferences.

Table 1 below presents the year in which each writing center was established and the category of writers the writing centers serves.

Table 1

Year of Establishment and the Kinds of Writers Served at the Writing Centers

	Year Established	Writers Served			
		Students taking English Courses	Undergraduate Courses	Graduate Students	University Faculty
AWC	2001 February		X (Only 4 th year students)	X	X
BilWrite	1996	X	X	X	X
SUWC	2000 September	X	X	X	
KoçLRC	1996	X	X		X
BilgiLRC	2001	X	X		
WC	2002	X	X		X

As can be seen from Table 1, most of the writing centers are very new, except for Bilwrite and KoçLRC. All of the writing centers provide writing center services to undergraduate students, although METU's AWC only provides one-to-one writing

conferences to help undergraduate students to write CVs and letters of intent if they are applying for jobs or want to continue their academic studies. Moreover, all of the writing centers except for the AWC provide extra help to students taking English courses. Only three of the writing centers, AWC, Bilwrite and SUWC, offer tutorial sessions to graduate students. AWC, in fact, focuses its services on graduate students rather than on undergraduate students, which distinguishes the AWC from the other writing centers.

Table 2 below reflects the type of writing each writing center deals with in the tutorial sessions. This information is very important as the tutorial strategies a tutor implements and the roles a tutor adopts in the tutorials may vary in respect to the kind of writing that is being dealt with.

Table 2

The Types of Writing the Writing/Learning Centers Handle

		AWC	Bilwrite	SUWC	KoçLRC	Has
Types of Writing	Proposal Writing	X	X	X	X	
	Cover Letters	X	X	X		X
	Business Letters	X	X			X
	Resumes / CVs	X	X	X	X	X
	Conference Papers	X		X	X	
	Journal Articles	X		X	X	X
	Scientific Reports	X	X			
	Lab Reports	X	X	X	X	
	Research Papers	X	X	X	X	X
	Term-Papers	X	X	X	X	X
	Dissertations	X	X	X		
	Theses	X	X	X		
	Other: 1. Computer tutorials		X			
	2. Formal and Informal Presentation Skills		X		X	
	3. Book Chapters				X	

Note. This information was unavailable from Bilgi University's writing center

As can be seen from Table 2, cover letters, resumes/CVs, research papers, and term papers are the four kinds of writing that all the writing centers deal with. The AWC deals with all of the writing type varieties stated in Table 3. The reason for this is probably due to the population it aims to serve; fourth year undergraduate students,

graduate students and academic faculty. The wide variety of writing dealt with may also be due to the variety of faculties and departments within METU.

Table 3 presents information on the types of services the writing centers provided at the time the study was conducted.

Table 3

The Types of Services Provided by the Writing/Learning Centers:

		AWC	Bilwrite	SUWC	KoçLRC	BilgiLRC	WC
Services Provided	One-to-One Tutorials	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Group Tutorials	X	X	X			
	Workshops		X		X		X
	Quiet Study Area	X	X			X	X
	Writing Contests				X		
	Materials (handouts)	X	X	X		X	X
	Computer Lab		X				

All of the writing centers in Turkey provide their writing clients with one-to-one tutorials to assist writing clients in their writing process. Even though all writing centers offer this service, the duration of the tutorials varies from writing center to writing center. Tutorial durations vary from 30 minutes to an hour. All of the writing centers also have materials or handouts, which they distribute to the writing clients when the need occurs. Group tutorials do not seem to be very common within the writing centers. Only three of the writing centers in Turkey, AWC, Bilwrite, and SUWC, offer group tutorials to their writing clients. Some of the writing centers, namely, AWC, Bilwrite, and WC offer workshops to writing clients, which are not always about writing skills. Some of these workshops are about reading, and oral presentation skills.

Participants

The participants of this study were the tutors working in the writing centers of Turkey in the spring semester of the 2002-2003 academic year. Out of the 47 questionnaires distributed, 32 of the tutors completed and returned the questionnaires. Table 4 below illustrates the total number of tutors in each writing center at the time of the study, and the number of completed questionnaires received from each writing center.

Table 4

Number of Tutors in Each Writing Center and the Number of Tutors Who Responded

	AWC	Bilwrite	SUWC	KoçLRC	BilgiLRC	WC
Total Number of Tutors	11	12	4	4	15	1
Total Number of Tutors Who Participated in the Study	11	8	4	4	4	1

As indicated in Table 4, the entire population of tutors from AWC, SUWC, KoçLRC, and WC contributed to the study. Even though the BilgiLRC had the highest tutor population, the AWC had the highest return rate of 11 questionnaires. The WC, as a newly established writing center, had only one tutor at the time of the study.

Table 5 below provides information about the tutors working in each writing center who completed a questionnaire. The table includes information about the total number of hours of experience each tutor had, whether tutors had received any form of tutor training or not, the tutors' first language, and the tutors' title within the writing center; i.e. faculty or peer tutor. A faculty tutor is a tutor who normally also teaches (English courses) at the university. A peer tutor, on the other hand, is, as its name implies, a third or fourth year university student working part-time as a writing tutor.

Even though most faculty tutors work at their writing centers full-time, many of them tutor part-time on top of a normal or reduced teaching load.

Table 5

Information about the Turkey's Writing Center Tutors

	Hours of Training Experience					Training		First Language		Tutor Title	
	51-100	101-200	210-300	301-500	Over 500	Yes	No	Turkish	English	Faculty Tutor	Peer Tutor
AWC	5	4	1	1	-	10	1	10	1	11	-
BilWrite	-	-	2	-	6	8	-	4	4	8	-
SUWC*	-	-	-	-	3	2	1	2	2	3	1
KoçLRC	2	-	-	1	1	2	2	1	3	3	1
BilgiLRC	3	1	-	-	-	1	3	4	-	4	-
WC	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	-
TOTAL	10	5	3	2	10	24	7	21	11	30	2

Note. * - missing values

As can be seen from Table 5, most of the TTs have either limited experience (51-100 hours) or extensive experience (over 500). Moreover, the majority of TTs' first language is Turkish. Furthermore, faculty tutors (30) composed the majority of the tutor population. As for tutorial training, the majority of tutors have been exposed to some kind of training. The AWC and Bilwrite, for example, provide tutorial training.

AWC's training lasts approximately five hours, and is spread over a two-day period. AWC tutors reported that they considered this five-hour session, not really as training, but only as an orientation. For the first day of 'training,' the tutors were distributed prominent writing center articles to read, which the tutors critically discussed between themselves. On the second day of training, tutors who had worked previously shared their tutorial experiences with the new tutors.

Bilwrite provides 10 hours of in-service training to all their tutor staff. This training is similar to that at AWC, in that tutors discuss some writing center articles. In addition, however, Bilwrite's training includes video-recordings of tutorials. After watching these video-recordings, tutors discuss the parts of the tutorial and how to successfully conduct the parts of a tutorial.

Instruments

A questionnaire (see Appendix B) and an interview served as the instruments in this study.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire consisted of four sections. The aim of the first section was to collect the necessary background information of TTs such as the number of hours of tutorial experience, tutorial training, first language and whether the TT is a faculty tutor or a peer tutor. The second section of the questionnaire used Likert scale questions to collect data on TTs' claims of the general tutoring strategies that can be used with any kind of writing. The third section was similar, but focused on tutoring strategies used while working with clients' rough drafts. The two sections were divided because writing clients do not tend to bring rough drafts. That is, writing clients tend to bring in what they assume to be final drafts that need some final touches. Finally, the fourth section also used Likert scale questions to explore which tutor roles they believed should be adopted in the one-to-one tutorial.

Interview

A total of four interview questions (Appendix C) were prepared for the five tutors (P1, P2, P3, P4, and P5) randomly selected from the 32 participants who responded to the

questionnaire. However, since the interview was semi-structured, additional questions were asked to the participants according to the answers received.

Procedures

Questionnaire

In order to make sure that the items in the questionnaire were clear and understandable, the questionnaire was piloted in the last week of March with ten METU AWC tutors who had tutored at the AWC prior to this study, but who were not tutoring at the time of the study. The AWC tutor pilot groups were given a week to return the questionnaires to the researcher. Their constructive feedback was taken into consideration in the process of rewording items, adding new ones, modifying ambiguous wordings, and deleting the items that were irrelevant to the purpose of the study. Additionally, grammatical mistakes were corrected and instructions were modified.

The researcher contacted the coordinators of each writing center through personal contact (AWC and Bilwrite), e-mail (SUWC and WC), and phone (KoçLRC) in order to get approval to distribute the questionnaires. Since BilgiLRC did not have a coordinator, permission to distribute the questionnaires was requested and granted from the Bilgi Istanbul University Freshman Year English chairperson. Having learnt the number of tutors tutoring in each writing center, the researcher distributed the questionnaires. The questionnaire was distributed via hand to AWC and Bilwrite on 14th April, 2003. Since KoçLRC, and SUWC are located in Istanbul, questionnaires were posted to them on the 14th April, 2003. BilgiLRC and WC were e-mailed questionnaires on the 21st of April. The coordinators of AWC, Bilwrite, SUWC, and KocLRC distributed, collected, and posted the questionnaires back to the researcher.

All of the questionnaires included consent forms (Appendix D) which indicated that tutors' completion of the form would be considered as their approval to use their data in the researcher's study. This consent form also informed participants that they might be called for a follow-up interview. Tutors were not required to provide their names on the questionnaire in order to increase the reliability of the questionnaire. In fact, each participant was provided an envelope in which they sealed their questionnaire on completion in case they were worried about their coordinator seeing their responses.

Interview

After receiving all the questionnaires, the researcher e-mailed the coordinators and the tutor who had volunteered to help with the study at BilgiLRC to obtain the names of the tutors who had completed the questionnaires. Then, the researcher randomly chose five participants from this list of names to be her interview participants. All the participants were female and, hence, are referred to as she or her throughout this study.

The researcher then e-mailed the randomly chosen participants and asked them for an interview appointment. All of the randomly chosen tutors accepted the invitation to participate in the interviews. Hence, appointments were made for the 21st and 22nd May, 2003 with the participants in Istanbul. The Ankara interviews were conducted on 27th and 29th May, 2003. One of the participants replied to the interview questions via e-mail on 10th June, 2003.

Data Analysis

The questionnaire was analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics. The first part of the questionnaire (part A) was analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. The Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS 10.0) was used to

compute the frequencies and percentages for all four questions in part A. The second question referring to tutors' training details, however, was described. Parts B, C, and D of the questionnaire were also analyzed quantitatively using SPSS. Frequencies and percentages of every question were computed.

The interview transcript data were analyzed through categorization. In order to find out the recurring patterns in data collected through interviews, the researcher examined the data. While examining the data, the researcher was interested in the patterns related to the collaborative and direct writing center approaches. More specifically, the interviews were analyzed according to the strategies and roles that tutors claimed to practice the most and least frequently listed in the questionnaire.

CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS

Overview of the study

The purpose of the analysis was to identify the strategies tutors report to implement in one-to-one tutorials in the writing centers of Turkey. Furthermore, the analysis aimed at pinpointing tutors' perceptions of which roles are appropriate in one-to-one tutorials. Finally the analysis aimed at presenting these tutors' rationales behind their claims for the strategies they report to implement and their beliefs of which tutor roles are appropriate.

The participants of this study were 32 tutors working in the six writing centers of Turkey in the 2002-2003 academic year. As a first research tool, 45 tutors were distributed questionnaires, 32 of which were returned. As a second means of data collection, six tutors were selected randomly, and interviewed individually.

The results obtained from the analysis of questionnaires and interviews are presented in three sections below. In the first section, part B of the questionnaire is analyzed under three main subcategories: collaborative approach strategies, direct approach strategies, and strategies that cannot be categorized as either collaborative or directive. Within each of these subcategories the strategies have been categorized in respect to which strategies are used the most and the least frequently. Rationales for why the tutors report to either use the tutorial strategies frequently or rarely are also provided. The second section is similar to the first section in that part C of the questionnaire is examined under the same three subcategories collaborative, directive, and neither collaborative or directive. Part C, however, is examined with the aim to determine the most frequent and least frequent tutorial strategies that are implemented while dealing

with rough drafts in the one-to-one tutorial session. The third section is also divided into three subsections to determine whether the tutor roles that tutors should adopt are collaborative, directive, or neither collaborative or directive. Each subsection is divided according to the most and least frequently adopted tutor roles. As in the first and second session, interview data are presented to express the reasons for the tutors' choices of most and least appropriate tutor roles.

Data Analysis Procedure

Questionnaire Part B and Interview Data

The second part of the questionnaire, part B, sought to partially answer the first research question, which was "What tutoring strategies do Turkey's writing center tutors report to implement in one-to-one tutorials while dealing with Turkish writing clients?" Interview data, on the other hand, examined the rationales behind tutors' claims on the tutorial strategies that they implement the most and least frequently. The data obtained from both the questionnaire and the interviews are categorized in respect to whether the strategies support the collaborative or direct approach. Some of the strategies cannot be categorized under either approach.

Most Frequently Used Collaborative Tutorial Strategies and Tutors' rationales for their Implementation

The tutorial strategies covered in questions 1, 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d, 5a, 9, 13, and 14 are the most frequently used collaborative strategies, with a majority of the participants claiming to either implement these strategies always or often. Table 6 presents the frequencies and percentages of the most frequently implemented strategies in rank order.

Table 6

Collaborative Tutoring Strategies Writing Center Tutors in Turkey Report to ImplementMost Frequently in One-to-One Tutorials

Rank	Questions (part B)	Always	Often	TOTAL	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	TOTAL
1	Q 13	23 71.9 %	8 25 %	31 96.9 %	1 3.1%	0 0%	0 0%	1 3.1%
2	Q 2b	22 68.8 %	9 28.1 %	31 96.9 %	1 3.1%	0 0%	0 0%	1 3.1%
3	Q 1	27 84.4 %	3 9,4 %	30 93.8 %	1 3.1%	1 3.1%	0 0%	2 6.2%
4	Q 2d	22 68.8 %	8 25 %	30 93.8 %	2 6.3%	0 0%	0 0%	2 6.3%
5	Q 14	21 65.6 %	9 28.1 %	30 93.7 %	1 3.1%	1 3.1 %	0 0%	2 6.2%
6	Q 2a	20 62.5 %	9 28.1 %	29 90.6 %	2 6.3%	1 3.1 %	0 0%	3 9.4%
7	Q 2c	18 56.3 %	11 34.4 %	29 90.6 %	2 6.3%	1 3.1%	0 0%	3 9.4%
8	Q 9*	17 53.1 %	12 37.5 %	29 90.6 %	2 6.3 %	0 0%	0 0%	2 6.3%
9	Q 5a	13 40.6 %	15 46.9 %	28 87.5 %	4 12.5%	0 0%	0 0%	4 12.5%

Note. Q13 - try to create a warm atmosphere

Q2b - ask questions to find out the writing clients' writing concerns

Q1 - sit near the writing client, not across the desk

Q2d - ask questions to lead writing clients to focus on the problematic features of their papers

Q14 - negotiating meaning with writing clients

Q2a - ask questions to find out about the writing clients' writing process

Q2c - ask questions to help writing clients to find the answers to their own problems

Q9 - deal with higher order concerns before lower order concerns

Q5a - paraphrase what the writing client has said to make sure that the tutor has understood what the writing client said

* - missing values

As can be observed in Table 6, questions 13, 2b, and 1 are the most frequently applied collaborative tutorial strategies. These three strategies can be seen as contributing to the setting of the tutorial atmosphere. Clearly, implementation of strategy 13, “try to create a warm atmosphere,” indicates that tutors believe in the importance of creating a low-stress, relaxed environment in which to work together with the client. This may be due to the fact that the tutorial is different from the classroom, in which students tend to be evaluated and graded, whereas in tutorials tutors tend not to evaluate the person with whom they are working.

Interview results also confirm that the tutors believe in the many merits of setting a warm atmosphere in the tutorial session. Three of the interview participants commented on the necessity of establishing a warm atmosphere in the tutorial session:

I think it [the tutorial] should be a friendly atmosphere. So, I think we shouldn't, a tutor, let's say, make the client feel like he is being tested by the tutor. If the tutor talks like a friend, then the client feels more relaxed, and will be able to ask questions if necessary, if he has something in mind. And, try to correct it together in a more friendly way, in a more relaxed way (P1).

There is always a warm atmosphere in the writing center. ...because some people, especially people wanting to apply for a master's degree or something like that have anxiety problems. So, I remember, once doing this psychotherapy with one of the students [So] we talked for about 30 or 40 minutes and then she left. And, then she came back to the other day. And, she said that that she was very happy to talk to me.... at least they feel comfortable. So I was happy (P4).

...I do smile a lot, ... I think Turkish students become more independent/outspoken in a warm atmosphere (P5) .

As can be seen from the above three comments, establishing a warm atmosphere produces multiple benefits, from the client being relaxed enough to ask questions (P1) to becoming a more independent person (P5). One of the reasons why tutors emphasize the

development of a relaxed atmosphere may arise from the fact that the writing clients are writing in their second or third language. Hence, tutors most probably find it important to support writing clients going through the difficult process of expressing themselves in a language in which they do not possess native competency (P5).

Asking questions to find out writing clients' writing concerns, strategy 2b, may also contribute to the establishment of the setting of the tutorial atmosphere. The following extract puts forward the importance given by one of the interview participants to establishing the writing clients' expectations of the tutorial session by asking clients questions to learn their writing concerns:

And then he then, he has to keep in mind why he is here.... Yes. In fact, [question part B 2] b.... That's the most important. The intention part. The intention. Why he is he here. Why he is coming. What does his need. What we would do here (P1).

As can be observed in P1's comment, by asking questions to find out writing clients' writing concerns, she guides writing clients to set their goals for the tutorial session. Hence, by setting the goals for the tutorial, she would be setting the tutorial atmosphere. P1 tries to set the tutorial atmosphere by indicating to writing clients that they are in control of the content of the tutorial. In other words, the tutor (P1) indicates that the writing client is expected to be active in the tutorial, not the tutor.

"Sitting near the writing client, not across the desk" is another collaborative strategy which contributes to the development of the tutorial setting. Similar to P1 above, one interviewee in her comment about her use of this strategy seemed to imply that she used this strategy as a method to show writing clients that they would be working together on the paper. In other words, by sitting next to the writing client s/he seemed to be indicating that both the writing client and the tutor would be working with the paper:

I believe that [sitting next to the client, not across the desk] is important because you have to sit next to each other so that you can discuss something and we can look at the paper together. And, in this way, either he is reading, or I'm reading. ... whoever is reading, the other one is following with the eyes. So that whenever we stop and talk about it, we know where we are and if there are any problems about that (P1).

As can be seen from the excerpt above, the interviewee has indicated multiple times that the activities that are conducted in the tutorial are not solely done by the tutor. Simply, by sitting next to the student from the beginning of the tutorial, the tutor is setting her/his expectations of how a tutorial is conducted; collaboratively.

The questionnaire results (questions 2d, 14, 2c, 2c, and 5a) and interviews conducted also seem to highlight the general importance given to the establishment of mutual understanding between the writing client and the tutor via question asking, negotiating, and paraphrasing. That is, interviews pointed out that tutors asked questions, negotiated, and paraphrased to a great extent in order to eliminate misunderstandings that could possibly occur between the tutor and the writing clients.

Tutors have acknowledged various reasons for asking writing clients questions, and paraphrasing to eliminate the misunderstandings that may arise in the one-to-one writing conferences with Turkish students. However, although all of the interviewees comment on the importance of negotiation, none of them have discussed why they find it important. This is perhaps because they believe that negotiating is a combination of asking questions and paraphrasing.

To begin with, tutors maintain that they ask many questions, especially at the beginning of a tutorial, in order to understand the writing client's writing concerns. By doing so, the tutors believe that they will be more effective in helping the writing client

with their writing. The following interview excerpts exemplify the importance assigned to asking questions in order to conduct successful conferences:

And, I usually ask questions beforehand, before we start correcting it. To make it clear for me what the lecturer expects from the client. To make sure that I'm leading him to the correct direction (P2).

...I do ask questions to have a brief idea about what she is planning to do, or trying to do in that paper. Because I think if I don't ask that I may not understand fully what he is trying to do or I may misunderstand. So, I may not be a very good guidance there maybe. If there is a problem, maybe I won't be able to catch that because I have a different idea in my mind. So, for that reason, to be able to find out whether we're thinking of the same things, I ask some of the questions (P3).

... to be able to understand things, and sometimes to guide the person, you have to ask questions (P3).

... I think that asking questions is very useful because you guide the person. Even if he cannot think of any hidden aspects of the paper, something happens and they start coming to their minds. So, I think it is a good idea (P4).

As can be seen from the above four excerpts, each tutor participant is aware that she must fully understand the writing concerns of the client. Once the tutor comprehends the needs of the writing client, she can provide the necessary guidance to help clients to overcome their writing problems. An analogy may be drawn between this understanding and classroom teaching in that classroom teachers should determine the needs of their students before they construct a syllabus.

Another reason why tutors attribute acute importance to question asking may be due to the vast variety of departments from which the writing clients attend the writing center. As a result, the tutors find themselves dealing with subject content that they are not familiar with. As reported by P3 and P4:

I use this [asking questions] frequently because clients that come to our writing center are from very different departments and I don't always

know their topic. And, while we are talking about the topic, I also have to find out what he wants you to focus on for example. What his aim is. But, I have a general picture of everything, and it's easier for us to move on from there (P3).

Because we [tutors] can't know the subject's specific content. Or it's a bit difficult for me to understand whether he is talking about the right things or the wrong things. So, he briefly explains the subject of the paper, and accordingly I have a look at the paper. If I have queries, I ask them (P4).

As can be observed in the above excerpts, not knowing the topic of the writing clients' paper is a problem that is solved through the tutor asking many questions about the subject content of the paper. Through these questions the tutors try to avoid any misunderstandings that may occur through being foreign to the subject matter of the paper.

In order to limit misunderstanding between the tutor and the writing client, paraphrasing was also a strategy that was frequently implemented and discussed in the interviews. Two of the participants mentioned that they used paraphrasing to reduce miscomprehension due to language mistakes at the sentence and paragraph level:

I read a sentence, and if it is not clear to me, I ask the client what he or she meant in that sentence (P2).

When there is a problem I ask him to paraphrase the paragraph or the sentence, if there is a misunderstanding we work on that (P4).

Even though, paraphrasing is considered to be a collaborative strategy, collaboratists would not agree on dealing with meaning at the sentence level. However, the tutors in Turkey, as can be seen in the two excerpts above, believe that they should help writing clients to improve or clarify the meaning they want to express. The fact that tutors do work at sentence level with their Turkish writing clients is most probably because the writing clients are writing in a foreign language. Hence, unlike native

English speakers, Turkish writing clients will need language help to express their intended meanings at the sentence level.

One of the interviewee participants advocated that she found paraphrasing to be an effective method while setting the goals of the conference. By paraphrasing the goals of the writing conference, she would reach a consensus with the writing client on what to work on in the tutorial since “the students usually mean something, but it doesn't mean the thing, the real thing what is in their minds” (P1). As a result, the interviewee participant avoided confronting future misunderstandings about what the writing client wanted to do in the tutorial session by paraphrasing the goals.

Moreover, paraphrasing was claimed to be an effective strategy to eliminate miscomprehension problems arising from English being writing clients’ second or third language. As expressed by one of the interviewees:

I sometimes paraphrase what the client said because sometimes I understand something different. However, he has tried to mean something different. Sometimes it is a Turkish translation etc. It is not always the same what we understand from the same sentence. So, I paraphrase it sometimes. And, I ask what he meant sometimes instead of paraphrasing [it myself] (P3).

As can be seen from P3’s comment, another problem writing clients encounter due to writing in a foreign language is that they try to write in English as they would in their native language. As mentioned in P3’s comment, Turkish students have the tendency to directly translate Turkish sentences into English. Turkish proverbs are especially a problem, since when directly translated into English, the sentence no longer expresses the meaning that the writing client had intended it to mean.

A lack of understanding of the subject matter has been reported as another reason for tutors to use paraphrasing as a tutorial strategy:

So, the client is talking ..., what his topic is. Especially if I'm not familiar with. ... sometimes I'm not clear about what he is trying to do. Then like by paraphrasing and rephrasing in Turkish or English. I try to get them to understand what I understand from their papers, from their sentences (P3).

The wide variety of subject matter tutors have to deal with in the tutorials results in the tutors implementing various strategies to understand the topic of the writing dealt with. One of these strategies is paraphrasing. Through paraphrasing, tutors make sure that the tutor and the writing client have the same understanding of the paper being dealt with.

Least Frequently Used Collaborative Tutorial Strategies and Tutors' rationales for their Implementation

The tutorial strategy covered in question 10, "talk less than the writing client" is the least frequently used collaborative strategy. The majority of the participants claimed to either implement this strategy only sometimes, or rarely (see Table 7).

Table 7

Least Frequently Used Collaborative Strategy

Question (part B)	Always	Often	TOTAL	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	TOTAL
Q10	2 6.3%	9 28.1%	11 34.4%	15 46.9 %	6 18.8 %	0 0 %	21 65.7 %

Note. Q10 - talk less than the writing client

As can be seen from table 7 above, 21 (65.7%) participants out of 32 claimed that they did not talk less than the writing client. In other words, 21 participants reported that they talked more than the writing client. Hence, the results in table 7 report that tutors in Turkey are somewhat more likely to adopt the directstrategy of talking more than the writing client rather than the collaborative strategy which asserts that the writing clients should do most of the talking. Even though not stated by any of the interview

participants, this situation may result from writing clients not having the necessary writing skills foundation on which discussions can be based in the tutorial. That is, since the writing clients do not have the necessary (academic) writing skills, the tutors may be discussing the necessary (academic) writing aspects that clients' papers should include. For example, tutors may have to spend minutes explaining what a topic sentence is and where it is usually placed.

Another reason that could explain tutors' talking so much could be the lack of professional in-service training in many of the writing centers. Since most of the tutors are not trained on how to encourage the writing client to talk more, the tutors are perhaps implementing the strategies that they normally use in the classroom. That is, they are perhaps explaining to writing clients what is expected of them in academic writing for example, and how to achieve these expectations.

In addition to these possible explanations, the interviews conducted with five participants identified specific reasons why tutors preferred to talk more than the writing clients. Analysis of the interviews conducted indicated that one of the reasons the tutors talk more was that English was a foreign language for the writing clients. According to the interview participants, writing and talking in English is problematic for writing clients:

And, then I don't think I talk less than the writing client. They usually don't want to talk especially when it is English....I try to make them talk more, but if I feel that they do not attempt, I just leave them (P2).

I try to make them talk more, but if I feel that they do not attempt, I just leave them. Also many ESL writers do not have a wide range of vocabulary, so I do suggest alternate ways of expression (P5).

As can be seen from the two comments above, English being a foreign language for the writing clients makes it difficult for the clients to explain their writing concerns. Hence, one might discuss the effectiveness of using English as the means of communication in one-to-one tutorials. Moreover, as stated by P5, sometimes tutors give writing clients language information which increases the time the tutor is talking. P5 feels as if the suggestions she is providing are beneficial for the writing clients. Hence, by talking more, she believes she is adding to the effectiveness of the tutorial.

Time limitations appeared to be another reason why tutors talked more than the writing clients. As stated by one of the interviewees:

They are not comfortable with talking a lot. Maybe, the time is limited. Just half an hour is not enough for them to do that (P2).

P2 appears to be uncomfortable with letting the writing client talk as there is so much to accomplish before the tutorial ends. It actually seems as if P2 sees writing client talk as an unnecessary part of the tutorial – something which can only occur if time allows. In fact, many of the other interviewees imply that they cannot really let their writing clients talk as the collaborative approach suggests, not because they find it unnecessary, but because the time is limited. Hence, both tutors and writing clients tend not to want to spare their precious tutorial time with writing clients talking about their writing.

Some of the strategies tutors use in the tutorials such as paraphrasing, and question asking result in the tutor talking more than the writing client. The following excerpt exemplifies how much time one of the interviewees has to spend asking questions in order for the client to benefit from the tutorial:

We [tutors] don't talk little. I always ask questions. Unless, I ask questions some of them cannot benefit from the tutorial (P3).

P3's comment above clearly implies that tutors find themselves talking more than the writing clients due to the nature of the tutorial strategies that they implement. Maybe, for example, due to writing clients' lack of English competency, the tutor finds her or himself rephrasing the questions that they are asking. Moreover, if the writing client does not feel confident in the language they are speaking in, the client might be giving brief replies to the questions asked by the tutor. As a result, the tutor has to create another question almost as soon as she has finished asking the previous question.

Most Frequently Used Direct Tutorial Strategies and Tutors' rationales for their Implementation

The majority of the participants maintained that they always or often implement the tutorial strategy, "focusing writing clients' attention to weak features the tutor finds in their writing." Thus, this strategy is the most frequently applied direct approach tutorial strategy. Table 8 displays the frequencies and percentages for this strategy.

Table 8

Most Frequently Used Direct Strategy

Questions (part B)	Always	Often	TOTAL
Q 11	11 34.4 %	15 46.9 %	26 81.3 %

Note. Q11 - focus writing clients' attention to the weak features tutors find in clients' writings

As can be observed in table 8, 26 (81.3%) participants out of 32 advocated that they tend to "focus writing clients' attention to the weak features that the tutors themselves find in the paper being worked on." This strategy supports the direct approach

since the collaborative approach suggests that writing clients diagnose their own weaknesses, not the tutor.

The interviews produced interesting results in that two of the participants gave the same reason for focusing writing clients' attention on the weak features the tutors identified in their papers. Two of the interview participants articulated that they only focused writing clients' attention on mistakes that were repeatedly made throughout the paper:

I usually focus the writing client's attention to the weak features I find in the writing. ...if the mistake is too common. I mean, if they frequently repeat the mistake, then I stop at one point, and tell them "this is done this way, this is done this way" (P2).

We do focus on the weak features and.... If there are common weaknesses, like a structure or in higher things maybe. In, I don't know, organizing their ideas etc, then I focus on them. If it's not something common, if it's not done repeatedly, then we don't focus on anything like that. We just move on and correct on the way (P3).

As can be seen from P3's comment, "like a structure or in higher things maybe," tutors tend to focus on weaknesses both on higher level order writing concerns (e.g., organization, meaning), and on lower level order writing concerns (Language, spelling). Another interview participant also emphasized that s/he focused writing clients' attention to both high and low writing issues:

I usually focus the writing client's attention to the weak features I find in the writing. Sometimes it's the, something organizational. They frequently have difficulty in combining sentences and in transitional phrases. Or usage in commas. All kinds of punctuation (P2).

Even though interviewees P2 and P3 express that they deal with both high and low order writing concerns, from their responses one can argue that they both seem to attend more to lower order, language-based, writing problems. P3, in her response above,

first utters that she focuses writing clients' attention to structure weaknesses and then, "higher things maybe" are focused on. Although P3 talked about organizational weaknesses before language-level weaknesses, P3 only elaborated on the sentence level weaknesses that s/he dealt with. This may be an indication that tutors (and writing clients) find accuracy to be more important than meaning.

Questionnaire Part C and Interview Data

The second part of the questionnaire, part C, as with part B of the questionnaire, aimed at answering the first research question, "What tutoring strategies do Turkey's writing center tutors report to implement in one-to-one tutorial while dealing with Turkish writing clients?" Part B of the questionnaire dealt with tutorial strategies that could be implemented in all tutorial sessions. However, part C of the questionnaire dealt with the strategies that could be applied while dealing with rough drafts only. The interviews aimed at answering research question two: "What are Turkish writing center tutors' rationales for their reported implementation of tutoring strategies in the context of a one-to-one tutorial while dealing with Turkish writing clients?"

Most Frequently Used Collaborative Tutorial Strategies and Tutors' rationales for their Implementation

The tutorial strategies covered in questions 4, 7b, 7e, and 7g are the most frequently used collaborative strategies while dealing with rough drafts, with a majority of the participants claiming to implement these strategies always or often. Table 9 below presents the frequencies and percentages of the most frequently implemented strategies in rank order.

Table 9

Collaborative Tutoring Strategies Writing Center Tutors in Turkey Report to Implement

Most Frequently While Dealing with Rough Drafts in One-to-One Tutorials

Rank	Questions (part C)	Always	Often	TOTAL	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	TOTAL
1	Q7e	23 71.9 %	7 21.9 %	30 93.8 %	1 3.1%	0 0%	1 3.1%	2 6.2%
2	Q4	20 62.5 %	8 25 %	28 87.5 %	3 9.4%	0 0%	1 3.1%	4 12.5%
3	Q7b	15 46.9 %	12 37.5 %	27 84.4 %	3 9.4%	1 3.1%	1 3.1%	5 15.6%
4	Q7g	11 4.4 %	15 46.9 %	26 81.3 %	3 9.4%	1 3.1%	2 6.2%	6 18.7%

Note. Q7e– discussing strategies to help writing clients improve the coherency and unity of their papers
 Q4– praising aspects of the paper that are going well
 Q7b- discussing strategies to help writing clients to organize their ideas
 Q7g- discussing strategies to help writing clients to proofread and edit their own work

As can be seen in table 10, Q7e, a strategy which focuses on developing higher order writing skills, ranked first out of not only the collaborative strategies, but all of the strategies listed in part C of the questionnaire. Another strategy which emphasizes the importance that tutors attribute to higher order writing skills can be identified in the high frequency in which the strategy reflected in question 7b is implemented. Nevertheless, the interviewees did not have many positive comments to make about discussing writing strategies that aimed at improving higher level writing issues such as unity, coherency and organization.

There was only one positive comment about higher skill writing strategies. This one interviewee supported the teaching of these high level writing skills because of her

belief in the merits of process writing. That is, the tutor believes in the benefits of writing multiple drafts:

I really insist on checking these brainstorming, outlining, err, strategy. Whether they know or not. Whether they are aware of their existence or not. ... I really like rough drafts. It really means so much to me as a teacher. I mean, err, I find lots of things to talk on with the student. So, I'm giving really a good time on it. So that, after rough draft they can finalize what they are writing. They, most students really do not need a second draft (P1).

As can be observed from P1's comment, she insists on emphasizing the writing strategies that support the process writing approach such as brainstorming and outlining. These two strategies both help the writing client to organize their ideas. It seems as if P1 emphasizes organizational writing skills as they provide writing clients the chance to discuss what they want to write in their papers. In other words, rather than working on mechanical-like exercises such as editing and proofreading, this particular tutor prefers more process-oriented like tasks. As a result of implementing process-oriented tasks, the tutor believes that she has helped the writing client to grasp the complexity of writing which will help the client to produce his or her final written draft quicker. That is, by negotiating with writing clients on how one writes rather than telling them what to write, the tutor is developing the writer, not simply improving the paper.

In contrast to this one positive comment above, most of the interviewees did not comment about the strategies reflected in questions 7e and 7b, presumably because they did not find them important enough to discuss. Some of the interviewees did discuss these strategies briefly; however, none of them talked positively about discussing writing strategies to develop higher-level order writing skills in that they either found them unimportant or unnecessary.

One of the reasons why tutors did not expose writing clients to strategies 7e and 7b was because writing clients were not coming to the writing center with rough drafts.

As reported by P3:

Usually they have done something, and they come with the product. And, unfortunately, usually the students come at the last moment. So, we don't have time to think about how we should do the drafting, etc. We usually come, they come with the product. So, we just go over the product (P3).

This is probably due to the writing clients' continuing belief that the writing center is a place for their papers to be edited. In light of P3's comment above, it also seems as if some of the tutors fulfill this particular expectation of the writing clients.

Another reason for tutors' lack of use of the strategies reflected in questions 7e, 7b is directly linked to the previously stated reason: writing clients do not bring rough drafts. Some of the tutors, for example, believe that helping them to organize their ideas (Q 7b), is a strategy that has to be implemented at the beginning of the writing process:

...if it's a draft, as I said, we don't always have drafts, but we can discuss strategies if they are at the beginning, and these are really helpful. As I said, this is usually not the case most of the time. So, I don't get the chance of going over most of the strategies a lot (P3).

Hence, since tutors believe that writing clients that have brought "final drafts" have already gone through the process of organizing their content, for example, do not feel as if it would be beneficial to make them go through this process once again. Clearly, many Turkish writing clients are not coming to writing centers to improve themselves as writers as the collaborative approach suggests is ideal. Rather writing clients seem to want a "quick fix" as North (1984) would claim. Moreover, it seems as if the time limits of the tutorials actually forces the tutors to actually "just check and correct" (P2).

Strategy 7g, discussing strategies to help writing clients to proofread and edit their own work, is another writing strategy that 26 (81.3%) tutors have claimed to implement very frequently. However, as with the higher order writing strategies, interviews indicated that development of proofreading and editing strategies is spared limited or no time. As maintained by P1:

... to proofread and edit their own work is just, really taking time for tutorials, in tutorials, I mean. Why? Why do you just want them to edit all their work. It's, I mean, yeah, it's a very useful study. They can edit what they did. But, this is not the aim of the tutorial. This shouldn't be the aim. Aah, this shouldn't be one of the ermm, parts of the tutorial. ... You can only have another session for that. I mean, it cannot be the part of the tutorial, all the tutorial. For example, one hour you are just having a tutorial. You cannot give time to this proofreading part in the tutorial (P1).

As put forward by P1 above, she clearly indicates that time should not be spared on proofreading and editing strategies. This may be due to her belief that corrections at the sentence level are not her duty, but the clients'. Hence, proofreading and editing could be done "at home" (P1) by the client individually. Clearly, P1 believes that discussing strategies for proofreading and editing is not collaborative. It is an individual activity for the student, and hence, not a part of the tutorial in P1's perspective.

Nevertheless, P1 is aware of writing client needs. As a result, P1 does practice proofreading and editing strategies in the tutorial if a writing client expresses that she wants to do so:

I can give another tutorial session for proofreading. ... I have, you know, a checklist. We are together. We are deciding on the weak points together. I mean, sentence by sentence, we are going. And then, we are trying to find out errr some certain points to be considered. For example, errmm, the flow of the ideas. Grammar, for example. Err, connections between the ideas, and, you know, some certain things (P1).

As can be observed in P1's comment, she models to clients how proofreading and editing can be accomplished with the help of a checklist. This checklist focuses on both sentence and paragraph level writing issues. Moreover, the tutor ascertains that the proofreading and editing is being done collaboratively, not solely by the tutor as if she were an editor.

One of the interview participants also indicated that proofreading strategies should be a part of the tutorial. However, she stated that she did not discuss proofreading strategies with writing clients. Rather, she tended to tell the writing clients which parts needed to be edited:

In some cases, for example, the tutee comes with such English mistakes and you just have to sit down and work with those first of all. And, it's like you're editing. "Why did you say this?" "There should be a comma." "The tense is wrong."... [This] shouldn't be [done] frequent[ly]. They should work on the editing themselves or we could teach them to edit maybe, and model there (P3).

As can be seen from P1's earlier comment, she believes in applying the collaborative strategy of teaching writing clients how to proofread and edit rather than doing it herself. Nevertheless, P3 suggests using a more direct strategy, modeling, as a strategy to teach clients how to edit and proofread. Even though P1 thinks that modeling for writing clients how to proofread and edit is effective in the tutorial, P1 seems to not often do it. This may be due to three reasons: lack of time, writing clients' editing expectations that "force" the tutor to edit, and lack of tutor in-service training which results in tutors not knowing how to best develop writing clients. Moreover, in some writing centers faculty tutors are expected to tutor on top of their teaching load. Thus, tutors may be tired or may not enjoy their duties at the writing center. As a result, tutors

may just be editing for writing clients as it is arguably easier to edit rather than to teach editing skills.

The second most frequent collaborative strategy, praising aspects of the paper that are going well (Q4), supports the previous observation that tutors attribute importance to the setting of a warm atmosphere in tutorials. As put forward by one of the interviewees, the tutorial is not a graded session. Hence, since the aim is not to evaluate the writing skills of writing clients, but to help them improve clients writing concerns, P5 “always begin[s] and end[s] the session with praise and empathy.”

Tutors also tend to praise when they want to indicate to the students the strong points of writing clients’ papers:

I usually praise aspects of the paper that are going well. Some of the students have a good grammar. Some of them have excellent ideas. ... if there are really good points on the paper, I usually praise them (P2).

praise aspects of the paper. I always do that. Whenever something is good, well-explained, well-organized, I always praise that (P3).

Tutors claim to focus on clients’ strong points as well as their weak points. P2 claims to praise strong points in clients’ papers because she wants to increase clients’ self-confidence. Therefore, even if there are only minor strengths in the paper, some tutors report that they still try to praise them as much as possible (P3). If tutors do not do this, writing clients will feel as if they cannot do anything correct. It is possible to see in this practice of praising further support – conscious or not – for a collaborative approach. By only pointing out weak features of a paper, tutors would seem to suggest that they are superior to tutees. Such an attitude contradicts collaborative approach claims that the tutor and tutee should be equal.

Least Frequently Used Collaborative Tutorial Strategy and Tutors' Rationales for Its Implementation

The tutorial strategy covered in question 1, “asking the writing client to read their paper aloud to me,” is the least frequently used collaborative strategy while working with rough drafts. The majority of the participants claimed to implement this strategy sometimes, rarely, or never (see Table 10).

Table 10

Least Frequently Used Collaborative Strategy with Rough Drafts

Question (part C)	Always	Often	TOTAL	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	TOTAL
Q1	4 12.5%	5 15.6%	9 28.1%	8 25%	10 31 %	5 15.6 %	23 71.6 %

Note. Q1 - ask the writing client to read their paper aloud to the tutor

Brooks (2001) would be disappointed to learn that tutors do not encourage writing clients to read aloud, as the results in Table 10 report. Brooks (2001) would also probably be disappointed by the reasons some of the interviewees gave for not implementing this strategy. As expressed by P3:

And, it [making the writing client read aloud] is also getting the client to work at the moment. Of course, if you are just reading, and he is listening, that is quite passive for him. However, when it starts for me to work, I find that not very reasonable. I mean, I don't know if that is a rule to make them read. It's just making the client work, making the client work, just for the sake of working, making them work (P3).

Brooks (2001) would definitely disagree with P3's idea that making the tutee do most of the work is unnecessary. Nevertheless, P3 makes a strong argument in her claim that it is not effective to make the tutee work just for the sake of working. There should be a goal

in every task that occurs within the tutorial. The goal of this particular strategy should aim at improving the tutee as a writer, not just at making the tutee active.

Tutors stated other reasons for not asking the tutee to read their papers aloud. One reason is that tutors are racing with time. The following excerpts report the time constraints that prevent tutors from implementing strategy Q1:

Usually, I do the reading. And, the reason is that I read faster (P3).

I don't do this [ask the writing client to read their papers aloud] very often because as I told you we have a time problem. When they [writing clients] start reading, instead of, for example, looking, let's say, at five pages, we can only just have a look at two pages (P4).

Even though time seems like a problem that could be solved simply by increasing the duration of tutorials, interview data implies that tutors will still not ask tutees to read aloud. As maintained by two of the interview participants:

When I read it, I understand it much easily (P3).

If it is a CV or letter of intent or something like that. If they [writing clients] don't feel the need to read it out loudly in front of the audience in the future. ... I don't ask push them [to read their papers aloud to me] (P4).

The first problem, not understanding a text when read aloud by someone else, is a problem commonly faced by many people, not only tutors. If the tutor cannot understand the text, the tutor will not be able to guide the tutee appropriately. Hence, it may be logical that P1 does the reading herself rather than letting the client read the paper. P4's comment may have credibility when considering that writing clients are using a foreign language in their own country. Hence, clients usually do not have many opportunities to speak in English in the community. Their inexperience or lack of practice in doing so, results in the clients being afraid to speak in English. As stated by P2:

It's *hard* [emphasis] to make them read their paper aloud. Maybe it is hard for them to communicate in English (P2).

If this is the case, P2 seems to feel that there is no need to force writing clients to speak in English. After all, the aim of the writing tutorial is to improve the writing client as a writer, not a speaker.

Most Frequently Used Direct Tutorial Strategy and Tutors' Rationales for Its Implementation

The majority of the participants maintained that they always or often implement the tutorial strategy of "telling writing clients which features of their writing need to be improved." Thus, this strategy is the most frequently applied direct tutorial strategy.

Table 11 displays the frequencies and percentages for this strategy.

Table 11

Most Frequently Used Direct Strategy with Rough Drafts

Question (part C)	Always	Often	TOTAL	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	TOTAL
Q8	18 56.3%	9 28.1%	27 84.4%	4 12.5%	1 3.1%	0 0%	5 15.6%

Note. Q8 - tell writing clients which features of their writing needs to be improved

As the results show in Table 11 above, the majority of the participants, 27 (84.4 %), indicate that they tend to tell writing clients what to do, rather than lead them to find the answer themselves. Even though questionnaire results have indicated the popularity of this strategy, interviews showed that at least one tutor does not want to admit that she uses this strategy. The following series of excerpts reveal the contradictions in P3's understanding of her own approach, and what she apparently does in the tutorial:

"Telling them what to improve." I never tell them. I never do the corrections myself. I think we need to do it together (P3).

Here P3 maintains that she never tells tutees what to improve. However, many of P3's subsequent comments seem to contradict with this particular claim:

[I] almost never [make corrections on writing clients' papers]. I mean it has been so rare. I usually tell them. They take notes, etc (P3).

...then I may help them by telling them. Or, let's say that there is a repeated organizational problem.... then at the end, I may say "Your main problem was actually this and this", after solving everything at the end of the session (P3).

And, I try to tell them what they should do etc (P3).

...it's like you're editing. "Why did you say this?" "There should be a comma." "The tense is wrong" (P3).

This particular tutor perhaps did not want to admit that she sometimes tells writing clients what to do since "telling" is not often seen as a proper practice in writing centers. The reason why the tutor found herself telling writing clients what to do is because, as mentioned above, "they sometimes need clues while working" (P3). In other words, at times clients need to be given the answer rather than guided to find the answer themselves. That the tutees are speaking in a foreign language likely contributes to their need for "clues". As put forward by P5:

I also point out rhetorical strategies – Turkish's expansive [sic] nature, different uses of the semi-colon, and organization strategies of both languages (P5).

Hence, as can be seen from the excerpt above, the rhetorical differences between English and Turkish cause problems for writing clients. If writing clients are not aware of these differences, then it is arguably useless to expect tutees to understand that they have made a mistake and correct it themselves. Expecting writing clients to be aware of the mistakes and correct them themselves is a collaborative strategy that is probably quite effective

when the language of the writing is the clients' native language. When this is so, clients are usually aware of the language mistakes they have made because it does not sound or look correct. However, in the writing centers of Turkey, clients are writing in a second or third language, not in their mother language.

A Direct Tutorial Strategy Implemented with Moderate Frequency and Tutors' Rationales for Its Implementation

Strategy question two, "making corrections on writing clients' papers," is a second direct strategy which was claimed to be implemented fairly frequently. Table 12 presents the results for this strategy.

Table 12

Moderately Implemented Direct Strategy

Question (part C)	Always	Often	TOTAL	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	TOTAL
Q2	5 15.6 %	10 31.3 %	15 46.9 %	7 21.9 %	6 18.8 %	3 9.4 %	16 50.1%

Note. Q2 - make corrections on writing client papers

The results for this strategy are in fact fairly evenly distributed, suggesting that making corrections on clients' papers is a strategy that is implemented at moderate frequency. Even though the interview participants did not discuss this strategy much, one interviewee claimed that she made grammatical corrections on writing clients' papers sometimes:

I correct the grammatical mistakes. For example, the phrasal verbs they use. The wrong pronoun or whatever. If they use an adjective instead of a noun. That kind of mistakes I correct (P2).

It is noteworthy that although P2 has mentioned that she makes grammatical corrections, she has not mentioned writing on the tutees paper to correct weaknesses at the meaning level. This may be because it is possible to discuss meaning-level misunderstandings, and therefore, the tutor does not feel she has to make the corrections. In other words, the reason why the above tutor directly makes grammatical corrections on the paper rather than applying a more collaborative approach may stem from the perception that it is difficult to negotiate on grammar rules of a language. Rather than negotiating, the tutor probably finds it easier to diagnose and correct the grammatical mistake herself.

One of the interviewees expressed her dislike for correcting writing clients' papers:

We do make corrections on the client's paper. But, I don't do that myself. I don't write them myself. I, we talk about, and they usually take notes, and make the corrections. Whether it is a meaning thing, an organizational thing, a grammatical thing ... (P3).

However, P3's reasons for not making the corrections are quite different from the rationale that some collaborative approach supporters provide. For example, the collaborative approach claims that the writing clients should be doing the correcting because it is their paper and they should be active in the tutorial. P3, however, maintains that she does not make any corrections because tutees may misunderstand the notes that she takes on their papers:

I don't want to be the corrector there directly. So, if I put his paper in front of me, and start correcting, I may just, you know, lose control, and start correcting everything. Like, without discussion, you know, like the teacher there. So, I don't want that to happen. That's the first reason. And, secondly, people understand from different notes different messages. So, if I do the correction there. If I put the arrows and underline, and etc, maybe later he or she will not be able to remember and just get lost. What did we talk about here, etc. So, he or she has to think about it himself and do it in his own personal way (P3).

Questionnaire Part D and Interview Data

The final section of the questionnaire, part D, aimed at answering the third research question, which was What do Turkey's writing center tutors perceive to be appropriate tutoring roles in the one-to-one tutorials with Turkish writing clients? Interview data, on the other hand, examined the answer to the fourth research question; "What are Turkish writing center tutors' rationales for their perceptions of appropriate tutoring roles in one-to-one tutorials with Turkish writing clients?" The data obtained from both the questionnaire and the interviews are categorized in respect to whether the strategies support the collaborative or direct approach.

Most Appropriate Collaborative Tutor Roles and Tutors' Rationales for Their Appropriateness

The tutor roles covered in questions 1, 3, 20, and 12 in the questionnaire were reported to be the collaborative tutor roles that should be adopted the most frequently with a majority of participants claiming that tutors should always or often adopt them. Table 13 presents the frequencies and percentages of the tutor roles which should be adopted the most frequently.

Table 13

Collaborative Tutor Roles That Should Be Adopted Most Frequently

Rank	Roles (part D)	Always	Often	TOTAL	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	TOTAL
1	R12	21 65.6%	7 21.9%	28 87.5%	3 9.4%	0 0%	1 3.1%	4 12.5%
2	R3	18 56.3%	10 31.3%	28 87.5%	4 12.5%	0 0%	0 0%	4 12.5%
3	R10	21 65.6%	6 18.8%	27 84.4%	3 9.4%	1 3.1%	1 3.1%	5 15.6%
4	R1	19 59.4%	8 25%	27 84.4%	4 12.5%	1 3.1%	0 0%	5 15.6%

Note. R12 – Guide
R3 – Question Asker
R10 – Friend
R1 – Coach

As can be seen from Table 12, 28 (87.5%) participants indicated that the tutor roles Guide and Question Asker should be adopted the most frequently. Friend and Coach have also been approved as suitable tutor roles, as indicated by the results in Table 12. What is interesting about these four roles, and therefore the above results, is that they are all related to one another. That is, according to the collaborative approach, in order to be an effective Guide, tutors have to be Question Askers, a Friend, and a Coach.

Although Guide ranked first as the tutor role that should be adopted the most frequently, the interview participants focused significantly on the role of Question Asker:

I think asking questions is also very important. ... I mean, of course, to be able to understand things, and sometimes to guide the person, you have to ask questions. ... Question asker. I think question asker is important, and it should be frequent (P3).

As indicated by P3, tutors believe in the importance of asking questions in order to understand writing clients' writing concerns, and therefore to guide them effectively.

Nevertheless, P3 believes that there should be a balance to question asking:

I feel like a tutor has to be careful about the balance.... if you keep asking them, and you keep pushing them to find out what was wrong, and how you should see it, I think, they may feel a little tense about that (P3).

P3 feels that tutors should be careful about the number of questions that should be asked due to her belief that tutors "shouldn't leave everything; put all the burden on the client" (P3). Rather than making tutors work intensively throughout the whole tutorial, at times the tutor can provide answers to some of the clients' writing problems, and tell them some of their weaknesses.

Another interesting comment made about question asker indicated a non-native and native English speaker difference. As put forward by one of the Turkish interviewees:

...especially when the tutor is American or is not Turkish, and the student is Turkish. Definitely, the tutor should be a question asker. Because the thinking is different in Turkish, and in English. If I don't understand a sentence in English, then I ask it to the students. I ask what you mean in this sentence, and she cannot explain it in English. Then, I switch to Turkish. And, immediately when I say that sentence in Turkish, I understand what she wants to mean. But, she uses the wrong words. And, if it was an American, the American would not be able to understand it (P2).

As maintained by P2, the fact that clients frequently translate Turkish sentences into English results in English sentences that are incomprehensible even though the grammar may be perfect. A native English speaker, who does not know Turkish well, may have difficulty in understanding the message the client is trying to express. Hence,

as put forward by P3, native English speaker tutors would have to ask more questions in order to figure out what the writing clients were trying to say.

Interviewees' comments about the role Friend are also interesting. Although 21 participants claimed that they always believe the tutor should be a friend, interview participants report that it is not always appropriate to adopt this role as tutor:

Well, a friendly atmosphere is, well, ... of course, there should be a friendly atmosphere. But, when you don't know the limit, and you are too friendly, you cannot do your job. They just start saying "Oh OK, but there I don't want to use that, I used this word, and I'll use that word" and you can't be helpful (P3).

As can be seen from the above comment, P3 believes that the tutorial will not be effective if the tutor is too friendly. In fact, she thinks that she will lose control of how the tutorial progresses. Her fear is clearly an indication that she is the person who decides what will be worked on in the tutorial. That is, P3 seems to prefer a more direct approach when it comes to tutoring and tutor roles.

Another tutor expressed her disapproval in being too friendly. However, her rationale for her disapproval lies in Turkish perceptions of gender roles. As reported by P5:

Many of our students, particularly males, come from conservative areas of the country. For me to behave very informally or overly friendly (like a peer) would violate their understanding of gender roles and thus inhibit any progress during the tutorial session. I try to be supportive but in a strictly professional way, so my role is well defined to them (P5).

As can be observed from the above comment, when tutorials are conducted with Turkish writing clients P3 ensures that she is not too friendly. However, she perhaps would be less cautious about how friendly she was, for example, when dealing with American students, whose perceptions of gender roles may not be as conservative as Turks'.

Hence, the collaborative role, Friend, despite the high frequency obtained in the questionnaire, proves to be a tutor role that needs to be adopted with caution in Turkey. In other words, tutors need to be careful about how friendly they are in order to conduct an effective tutorial.

Least Appropriate Direct Tutor Role and Tutors' Rationales for Its Lack of Appropriateness

The tutor role Evaluator was reported to be the direct tutor role that should be adopted the least frequently, with a majority of participants claiming that tutors should sometimes, rarely, and never adopt it. Table 14 presents the results of this strategy.

Table 14

The Tutor Role That Should be Adopted the Least Frequently

Roles (part D)	Always	Often	TOTAL	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	TOTAL
R9	2 6.2%	1 3.1%	3 9.4%	7 21.9%	4 12.5%	18 56.3%	29 90.7%

Note. R9 - Evaluator

As can be seen from Table 14, 29 (90.7%) participants of 32 claimed not to find the role of evaluator appropriate. Interview results confirmed the results obtained in Table 14. One of the interviewees maintained that it was unethical to evaluate writing clients as she found grades to be subjective:

I don't say anything about the grade.... The grade varies from person to person. I don't believe it's objective. It's not so objective, the grades. Some teachers look for specific things, and if they are in the paper, it is OK with them. And, the paper will get an A. But, it was reading it, it would get a C because the ideas weren't very clear or very well thought. Or, just vice versa (P2).

As can be seen above, P2 avoids discussing the grades of papers because she believes that evaluation of writings differs from person to person. Hence, P2 avoids creating incorrect perceptions, hopes and disappointments in the writing clients by not telling them what grade she would assign to their papers. Moreover, as maintained by the collaborative approach, the writer is the focus in the writing center, not the writing text (Harris, 2001; North, 1995). Hence, by not evaluating the paper and guessing the grade the paper might receive, P2 is ensuring that the focus is on the writer and not the writing.

Another interview participant stated that she did not believe in the appropriateness of the role Evaluator as it was not her job to do the evaluation:

I don't want to evaluate the paper. So, I think in general, we shouldn't be an evaluator either. We are just a guide there. And, the evaluation is left to the client and his teacher, or the place where he is going to write the paper to, whatever (P3).

Hence, as can be seen from P3's comment above, P3 perceives her role to be different from that of the teacher. Her aim is not to evaluate what the writing client has produced. Rather, she believes that the tutors' aim is to improve the client as a writer as much as possible in the little time that they share in the tutorial.

Conclusion

In the data analysis chapter, both the questionnaire and the interview data were analyzed. The questionnaire was analyzed quantitatively and the interviews qualitatively, categorized according to the strategies and roles listed in the questionnaire administered to the TTs.

In the next chapter, the findings of this study and the pedagogical implications for the tutorial strategies and roles practiced are discussed.

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION

Introduction

This study investigated the tutorial strategies that TTs report to implement in one-to-one writing tutorials and the rationales for the implementation of these strategies. Furthermore, it questioned TTs' perceptions on which tutor roles are the most appropriate while dealing with Turkish writing clients and why.

One reason for investigating these subjects was to identify the tutorial strategies implemented and tutor roles adopted in the writing centers of Turkey. The tutorial strategies and tutor roles reportedly adopted in the writing centers of Turkey were investigated in order to gain insights into which tutorial strategies and tutor roles may be considered the most effective while dealing with Turkish writing clients. In order to understand which strategies and roles are the most effective, the tutors were requested to indicate the frequency in which they applied various tutorial strategies. Also, tutors were asked to indicate the frequency in which they believed particular tutor roles should be adopted. Finally, the tutors' rationales for their choices were explored so as to help support possible recommendations for particular tutorial strategies and roles to adopt when dealing with Turkish writing clients.

Another reason for investigating this topic was to contribute to the literature on the kind of tutorial strategies and tutor roles adopted in one EFL context: English medium university writing centers in Turkey. As stated by Shamoon & Boons (2001), there has been more propaganda on which codes and appeals are effective in writing tutorials rather than empirical research. Hence, this study was hoped to contribute to the writing center literature in general in that its findings are based on research rather than on

personal beliefs. Moreover, as there is no indication that anyone has conducted research to examine the strategies and roles adopted and tutors reasons for adopting these strategies and roles in an EFL context, this study may help to fill a gap in the literature in this regard.

In this chapter, the research questions are presented and the results of the study are discussed in the light of these questions. Pedagogical implications, limitations of the study, and suggestions for further research are also presented.

Results and Discussion

Tutorial Strategies Implemented and Tutors' Rationales for Their Implementation

In response to the first research question, which is “What tutoring strategies do Turkey’s writing center tutors report to implement in one-to-one tutorial while dealing with Turkish writing clients?,” the questionnaire results showed that in general, tutors preferred to use collaborative strategies over direct ones. In fact, 13 collaborative strategies were claimed to be used always or often by 80% or more by the participants. The interviews conducted to answer the second research question, “What are Turkish writing center tutors’ rationales for their reported implementation of particular tutoring strategies in one-to-one tutorials with Turkish writing clients?,” also indicated that these collaborative approaches were adopted to guide writing clients to improve themselves as writers, not only to improve the writing texts. Nevertheless, some of the collaborative strategies were implemented for reasons, which tend to be more related to the direct approach rather than the collaborative approach.

Part B of the questionnaire indicated that the collaborative strategies most frequently applied by tutors in conferences in general are; trying to create a warm

atmosphere (96.9%), asking questions to find out writing clients' concerns (96.9%), and sitting near the client, not across the desk (93.8%) respectively. All these three strategies contribute to the setting of the tutorial atmosphere. The reported aim of these strategies is to help establish a relaxed setting in which questions can be asked by the writing clients, and in which writing clients do not feel as if they are being tested; two aspects that collaborative tutorials should possess as suggested by Gillespie & Lerner (2000). Moreover, one of the tutors claimed that by asking writing clients their writing concerns, she would be guiding them to determine the goals of the tutorial, one of the essential features of a collaborative tutorial as put forward by Harris (1984) and Lunsford (2000). Brook's (2001) strategy, sitting next to the writer rather than opposite him, was adopted for reasons similar to those suggested by Brooks; to show the writer that the tutorial is a collaborative process in that the tutor and the writing client really need one another to complete the task (Lunsford, 2001).

Part C of the questionnaire indicated four most frequently applied collaborative strategies. Three of these strategies focused on the discussion of writing strategies and the last strategy emphasized the importance of praise. Even though the questionnaire results indicate the high frequency in which writing strategies are discussed, interviews indicated that tutors did not do so frequently for the following reasons:

1. writing clients tend to bring in final drafts
2. time constraints (since writing clients come to the writing center a day or two before the deadline)
3. writing clients expect corrections to be made, not discussions

As can be seen from above, interview results indicate that writing clients tend to see writing centers as “fix-it up shops” as claimed by North (1995).

Other frequently implemented collaborative strategies were question asking and paraphrasing. These strategies were used as tools to handle the foreign subject matter that writing clients bring in from their departments. By frequently asking questions and paraphrasing writing clients’ utterances, tutors maintained that they become familiarized with the topic of the writing. Hence, as claimed by Kiedaish & Dinitz (2001), tutor knowledge of the discipline could be helpful in that tutors might save precious tutorial time that could be spent negotiating the clients’ strengths and weaknesses. However, as put forward by the collaboratists, lack of this specialist knowledge is no call for distress if the tutee is being active in the tutorial. Hence, data results have confirmed Kiedaish & Dinitz’s (2001) statement that discipline knowledge is helpful, but not essential in order to be an effective tutor.

Only four direct approach strategies were stated to be implemented frequently in the writing tutorial. These strategies in rank order were telling writing clients which features of their writing need to be improved (84.4%), focusing writing clients’ attention to weak features the tutor finds in writing clients’ writings (81.3%), not asking writing clients to read aloud their papers (71.6 %), and talking more than the writing client (65.7%).

Tutors maintained that they tell clients their weaknesses only when they see errors being frequently made, which the collaborative approach suggests is appropriate. However, tutors indicate that the mistakes frequently made are at the language level. Hence, the tutors are supporting the direct approach in that they are answering writing

clients' needs, whether they are regarded as higher level writing concerns or lower level ones. The reason tutors are probably focusing tutees' attention to their weaknesses rather than guiding tutees to find their own mistakes is because the writing clients are not accustomed to a approach in which tutees are on an equal stand with the tutors, as put forward by Lunsford (2000). Furthermore, tutees may be rejecting a more collaborative approach of being asked to themselves find and correct their mistakes, as they are accustomed to having their teachers diagnose and correct their mistakes (Lunsford, 2000).

The collaborative strategy of asking writing clients' to read aloud their paper, having been claimed not to be used frequently, indicates that tutors adopt the more direct strategy of the tutor herself reading the paper either silently or out loud. Contradictory to Brooks' (2001) claim that clients should be made to read their papers aloud, one of the interview participants claimed it was useless to apply this strategy just for the sake of making the client work.

Interview results indicated that tutors frequently talk more than the tutee, even though only 21 participants stated so in the questionnaire. One of the reasons tutors gave for talking more was that their clients find it difficult to speak in a foreign language, English. Unfortunately, writing center literature suggests no solution for this problem. Hence, maybe new tutorial strategies need to be devised in order to help writing clients deal with the difficulties of working in a foreign language. For example, maybe using Turkish as the language of communication could be an effective strategy to implement.

Another reason why tutors claim to talk a lot is because they feel that they have to explain the nature of the English language, as their clients are not native English

speakers. The reason why tutors feel the need to explicitly explain to clients the language issues that clients lack competency in may be related to Vygotsky's "zone of proximal development." At the basic level, the "zone of proximal development" was Vygotsky's response to his investigations into the relationship between learning and development, specifically, the relationship between what a child can do independently and what s/he can achieve in collaboration with others. If we draw on this understanding and relate it to the tutoring relationship, it indicates that tutors may be helping tutees develop "functions that have not yet matured, but are in the process of maturation" (Vygotsky as cited in Clark, 1995: 92). In other words, if the tutee is not aware of what is correct or incorrect, the tutor should explain to the student or model the correct application. Only in this manner will tutees be able to later apply the correct application when necessary.

One interesting result reflected in the questionnaire was that the direct strategy of making corrections on writing clients' papers was claimed to be implemented at moderate frequency. Tutors tend to make corrections on tutees' papers at the sentence-level. The direct approach would not criticize tutors' correction of language errors on tutees' papers since the direct approach maintains that a tutor's aim is to serve the writing clients' needs. If tutees need help in improving the language structures they have used, the direct approach states that tutors should serve that need.

Tutors claim not to make corrections. However, they do not object to making corrections in order to ensure that they encompass a passive role in the tutorial. Rather, one tutor claimed that she never writes on the tutees' papers in order that tutees do not misunderstand the comments she has made. Hence, in terms of this strategy, it seems as if

tutors have more of a tendency towards the approach in that they do not think it is unethical, or plagiarism if they write on clients' papers (Clark & Healy, 2001).

Tutorial Roles Perceived to be Appropriate and Tutors' Rationales for Roles'

Appropriateness

In response to the third research question, which is "What do Turkey's writing center tutors perceive to be appropriate tutoring roles in one-to-one tutorials with Turkish writing clients?," the questionnaire results showed that tutors believed that collaborative tutor roles should be adopted. None of the direct approach tutor roles were considered as the most appropriate as reported in the questionnaire. Nevertheless, the interviews conducted to answer the fourth research question, which is "What are Turkish writing center tutors' rationales for their perceptions of appropriate tutoring roles in one-to-one tutorials with Turkish writing clients?" indicated that tutors' rationales were not necessarily collaborative. Rather, in many cases, the tutors' rationales for the adoption of collaborative-based roles were in fact in support of the direct approach.

In all, four collaborative tutor roles were claimed by the participants to be the most appropriate to adopt while dealing with Turkish writing clients. These roles were Guide (87.5%), Question Asker (87.5%), Friend (84.4%), and Coach (84.4%). Nevertheless, as mentioned before, the rationales provided by the tutors for their choice of appropriate tutor roles tended to support the norms of the direct approach.

To begin with, for Question Asker, one tutor claimed that the tutor should be careful about asking questions too much. This particular tutor thought that tutors should sometimes let the tutees be passive in that tutees should sometimes be directly given the information that they need. This belief completely contradicts with collaborative

approach supporters, especially with Brooks (2001), who claims it is imperative to always keep the tutee active and the tutor passive.

According to one tutor, native English speaker tutors should ask questions more than Turkish native speaker tutors due to the incorrect translations that Turkish writing clients make. Turkish speaking tutors can generally understand the meaning writing clients' incorrect English is trying to express using their knowledge of Turkish. However, tutors who do not know Turkish will have to ask many questions to understand what writing clients are trying to say. Due to the lack of research in an EFL context no comments have been made about this situation.

As for the role Friend, as with Question Asker, interviews reported rationales for the appropriateness of the role Friend that supported the direct approach rather than the collaborative approach. Many tutors indicated that they were friendly with writing clients. Nevertheless, tutors claimed to have limits in their friendliness towards clients. One important reason given for the setting of limits was to avoid misinterpretations of gender roles. That is, one female tutor was conscious that if she were too friendly with her conservative male students, her tutorial would be ineffective, as she would have violated their gender role perceptions. This situation may be held as proof that some of the tutorial strategies, especially the collaborative ones, may be applicable in, for example, an American context, but not in other countries like Turkey. Hence, tutors should be cautious in advocating the effectiveness of certain tutor roles based on research results that have been obtained in a native-speaker context. There may even be differences between an ESL and EFL context. For example, the amount of English the ESL writer encounters is likely to be much more than the EFL writer. Hence, it may be

assumed that the ESL writer's command of English is much stronger than the EFL writer's. What is effective in an ESL context, is probably not as effective when applied to one's own situation.

In conclusion it seems as if TTs do not adopt a solely collaborative or direct approach. Rather, tutors not only implement what they believe to be the best of the collaborative and the direct approaches, but also implement the strategies and roles that they believe to be the most appropriate in their present working conditions. In brief, it seems as if TTs have created an 'eclectic' writing approach to tutoring. The reason why TTs have had to create an eclectic approach is probably due to the fact that Turkish writing clients are writing in a foreign language in an EFL context. Thus, writing clients need input and guidance on lower-level writing issues such as grammar and punctuation. Since writing clients are writing in a foreign language, they face writing problems at the sentence level in addition to problems at the paragraph and essay level. Thus, unlike NSE, Turkish writing clients need input on the mechanics of the English language. Furthermore, in order to deal with higher-level writing concerns, such as meaning, writing clients might feel the need to express themselves in their native language, as it is generally easier to discuss such issues in the language one is familiar with and confident in. Another reason for TTs' creation of an eclectic approach lies in the time constraints that TTs have to compete with. Due to time limits, TTs find themselves providing answers to their writing clients' writing concerns that writing clients might have been able to find for themselves after a little negotiation. Finally, writing clients generally are not aware of the aim of writing centers, and hence, the kinds of services it offers to writers. Thus, writing clients usually attend tutorials near the end of their writing process.

As a result, tutors cannot practice various tutoring strategies as writing clients have come to have their papers edited, not to discuss the ideas in their papers.

Pedagogical Implications

Results obtained from the questionnaire indicate that even though there is a consistency in TTs' reports on the tutorial strategies they implement and the tutor roles that they believe are appropriate, interviews reflect some discrepancies for tutors' rationales for their indication of strategies and roles. This indicates that tutors may not be fully aware of the benefits and disadvantages of adopting various tutorial strategies and tutor roles. Rather tutors seem to be implementing strategies and adopting roles based on a combination of information from ESL and native speakers of English (NSE) based research, as well as on their own practical experience. Rather than relying completely on the ESL and NSE based writing center articles available in Turkey, each writing center should conduct a needs analysis in order to construct a tutor in-service training course appropriate to their context. In this training course, tutor trainees should be asked to discuss the various strategies and roles in application in the writing centers around the world, and then to discuss the outcomes that these strategies and roles might produce in their own context. Moreover, tutor trainees should be encouraged to propose new strategies and roles that may have positive learning outcomes for Turkish writing client.

A majority of TTs claim that they cannot implement strategies and adopt tutor roles that they believe will be beneficial for the writing clients due to time constraints. Hence, the tutorial duration should be increased to at least one hour, or writing clients should be allowed to register for two successive sessions if the sessions are about half an hour long. Moreover, faculty tutors generally tutor in the writing center on top of their own teaching load. Hence, TTs are racing with time. If possible, in order to lessen the burden of TTs

from these time constraints resulting from an intensive workload, writing centers should consider employing a full-time tutor staff, rather than a part-time staff.

Another reason TTs claim that that they cannot implement strategies and adopt tutor roles that they believe will be beneficial for the writing clients is because of writing clients' incorrect perceptions of the writing center. Writing clients are coming to writing centers at the end of their writing process, expecting tutors to tell them what their mistakes are to correct them. To counter such misconceptions, writing centers should establish outreach programs to inform possible writing clients about the services that they provide and do not provide. Educating prospective writing clients about the centers' own aims may result in a body of writing clients who will request writing center services not only to get their papers corrected, but rather to improve themselves as writers.

Limitations of the Study

The first limitation of this study is that no tutorial observations were conducted by the researcher to understand whether the tutors actually do implement the tutorial strategies that they claim to. Similarly, the researcher could not understand whether the writing tutors actually adopt the tutor roles they indicated as appropriate, because observations were not done.

The study also has limitations with regards to inter-coder reliability. The interviews were analysed by using categorisation and these categories were determined by the researcher. Had additional raters been used, a broader range of interpretations may have been discovered.

Suggestions for Further Research

This study investigated the tutorial strategies and tutor roles adopted in one-to-one tutorials when dealing with Turkish writers. However, tutorial session observations to understand whether the tutors actually do what they reported to do in the questionnaire and interviews were not conducted. Thus, further research can be carried out to understand whether and how the tutors do what they report to do through tutorial observations. Observations may also help reveal the effectiveness of strategy use and tutor adoption.

This study has indicated that the strategies and roles that are effective in an ESL and ENL context may not be effective in an EFL context. Hence, replication studies of writing center research done in ESL/ENL contexts could be conducted. For example, writing clients' perceptions of their tutors' effectiveness in terms of the strategies tutors are implementing and the roles they are adopting. The tutors' perceptions of effective tutorial strategies and tutor roles and writing clients' perceptions of effective tutorial strategies and tutor roles can be investigated and the results can be compared to identify whether there are any differences.

Conclusion

The results of the study indicated that even though tutors claimed to implement tutorial strategies of a largely collaborative nature, tutors' rationales for the implementation of these collaborative strategies in some cases supported the direct approach philosophy. Tutors' choices of appropriate tutor roles were all collaborative. However, their rationales for their choices of appropriate tutor roles again sometimes reflected a direct approach tendency in the tutors. Furthermore, data results suggested that

tutors also implement strategies that are not discussed in either the collaborative or direct approach. Hence, rather than TTs adopting a collaborative or direct approach, they appear to be creating a new 'eclectic' writing center approach that combines what they seem as the effective strategies and tutor roles of both the collaborative and direct approaches, as well as other strategies which tutors find to be effective and appropriate.

REFERENCES

- Ashton-Jones, E. (1988). Asking the right questions: A heuristic for tutors. *The Writing Center Journal*, 9(1), 29-36.
- Brooks, J. (2001). Minimalist tutoring: Making the student do all the work. In R. W. Barnett & J. S. Blumer (Eds.), *The Allyn and Bacon guide to writing center theory and practice*. (pp. 219-224). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Carino, P. (1995). What do we talk about when we talk about our metaphors: A cultural critique of clinic, lab and center. In C. Murphy & J. Law (Eds.), *Landmark essays on writing centers*. (pp. 37-46). Davis, CA: Hermagoras.
- Clark, I. L. (1995). Collaboration and ethics in writing center pedagogy. In K. L. Dahl (Ed.), *Teacher as writer: Entering the professional conversation*. (pp. 89-96). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Clark, I. L., & Healy, D. (2001). Are writing centers ethical? In R. W. Barnett & J. S. Blumer (Eds.), *The Allyn and Bacon guide to writing center theory and practice*. (pp. 242-259). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Cogie, J., Strain, K., & Lorinskas, S. (1999). Avoiding the proofreading trap: The value of the error correction process. *The Writing Center Journal*, 19(2), 7-32.
- Eison, J. (1990). Confidence in the classroom: Ten maxims for new teachers. *College Teaching*, 38(1), 21-25.
- Fitzgerald, S. H. (1994). Collaborative learning and whole language theory. In J. A. Mullin & R. Wallace (Eds.), *Inter-sections: Theory practice in the writing center* (pp. 11-18). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Freedman, S. & Katz, A. (1987). Pedagogical interaction during the composing process: The writing conference. In A. Matsuhasi (Ed.), *Writing in real time: Modeling production processes* (pp. 58-80). New York: Academic Press.
- Gillespie, P. & Lerner, N. (2000). *The Allyn and Bacon guide to peer tutoring*. Needham Heights, MA: Longman.
- Goldstein, L. M. & Conrad, S. M. (1990). Student input and negotiation of meaning in ESL conferences. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24(3), 443-460.
- Grabe, W. & Kaplan, R. B. (1996). *Theory and practice of teaching writing*. New York: Longman.
- Harris, M. (1986). *Teaching one-to-one: The writing conference*. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English.

- Harris, M. (1995). What's up and what's in: Trends and traditions in writing centers. In C. Murphy & J. Law (Eds.), *Landmark essays on writing centers*. (pp.27-36). Davis, CA: Hermagoras.
- Harris, M. (2001). Collaboration is not collaboration is not collaboration: Writing center tutorials vs. peer-response groups. In R. W. Barnett & J. S. Blumer (Eds.), *The Allyn and Bacon guide to writing center theory and practice* (pp. 272-287). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hilgers, T. L., & Marsella, J. (1992). *Making your writing program work: A guide to good practices*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Jacobs, S. & Karliner, A. (1977). Helping writers to think: The effect of speech roles in individual conferences on the quality of thought in student writing. *College English*, 38, 489-505.
- Jones, C. (2001). The relationship between writing centers and improvement in writing ability: An assessment of the literature. *Education*, 122(1), pp 3+. Retrieved October 15, 2002, from EBSCOHOST database on the World Wide Web: <http://www.ebsco.com>.
- Keidaisch, J. & Dinitz, S. (2001). Look back and say "So what": The limitations of the generalist tutor. In R. W. Barnett & J. S. Blumer (Eds.), *The Allyn and Bacon guide to writing center theory and practice* (pp. 260-271). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1995). On the teaching and learning of grammar: Challenging the myths. In Eckman, F. R., Highland, D., Lee, P. W., Mileham, J., & Rutkowski Weber, R. (Eds.). *Second language acquisition theory and pedagogy* (pp. 131-150). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Leahy, R. (1990). What the college writing center is – and isn't. *College Teaching*, 38(2), 43-48.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1999). *How languages are learned* (rev. ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lunsford, A. (2001). Collaboration, control, and the idea of a writing center. In R. W. Barnett & J. S. Blumer (Eds.), *The Allyn and Bacon guide to writing center theory and practice* (pp. 92-99). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Meyer E., & Smith, L. Z. (1987). *The practical tutor*. Oxford: Oxford University.

- Moore, R. H. (1995). The writing clinic and the writing laboratory. In C. Murphy & J. Law (Eds.), *Landmark essays on writing centers*. (pp. 3-10). Davis, CA: Hermagoras.
- Neff, J. (1994). Learning disabilities and the writing center. In J. A. Mullin & R. Wallace (Eds.), *Inter-sections: Theory practice in the writing center* (pp. 81-95). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- North, S. M. (1995). The idea of a writing center. In C. Murphy & J. Law (Eds.), *Landmark essays on writing centers*. (pp. 71-86). Davis, CA: Hermagoras.
- Powers, J. P., & Nelson, J. V. (1995). L2 writers and the writing center: A national survey of writing center conferencing at graduate institutions. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4, 113-138.
- Powers, J. K. (2001). Rethinking writer center strategies for the ESL writer. In R. W. Barnett & J. S. Blumer (Eds.), *The Allyn and Bacon guide to writing center theory and practice* (pp. 368-275). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Shamoon, L. K., & Burns, D. B. (2001). A critique of pure tutoring. In R. W. Barnett & J. S. Blumer (Eds.), *The Allyn and Bacon guide to writing center theory and practice*. (pp. 225-241). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Walker, C. P., & Elias, D. (1987). Writing conference talk: Factors associated with high- and low-rated writing conferences. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 21, 266-285.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

BACKGROUND INFORMATION SURVEY

1. What is the title of your writing/learning center?
2. When was your writing/learning center established?
3. How many people comprise the conferencing staff in your writing/learning center?

4. Which of the following categories of writers does your writing center serve?
(Check all that apply.)
____ students taking English courses
____ undergraduate students
____ graduate students
____ university faculty
____ other (please specify) _____
5. What kinds of services does your writing/learning center provide? (Check all that apply.)
____ individualized writing tutorials
____ group writing tutorials
____ workshops
____ quiet study area

____ handouts

____ other (please specify) _____

6. Approximately, how many writing conferences did your writing/learning center conduct during the academic year 2001-2002?

7. Approximately, how many writing clients did your writing/learning center serve?

8. Please check the kinds of writing your writing clients bring to conferences at your writing/learning center. (Check all that apply.)

____ proposal writing

____ cover letters

____ business letters

____ resumes / CVs

____ conference papers

____ journal articles

____ scientific reports

____ lab reports

____ research papers

____ term-papers

____ dissertations

____ theses

____ other (please specify) _____

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

PART A

1. Approximately how many hours have you tutored in a learning/writing center?

(e.g., 7 hours/week x 30 weeks/year x 3 years = 630 hours)

2. Did you receive any training for working effectively with writing clients (the writers whom the tutors work with in tutorials, e.g., students, faculty)?

_____ Yes _____ No

If yes, please describe briefly the format and the approximate number of hours of formal training you have received (e.g., inhouse workshops 30 hours and conferences 10 hours = 40 hours).

3. What is your first language?

_____ Turkish

_____ English

_____ Other (please specify) _____

4. Please check the following category you belong to.

_____ Faculty tutor (a teacher tutoring a writing client)

_____ Peer tutor (a student tutoring a writing client)

PART B

Please read the following prompt and check (x) how often **you** implement the following strategies. Please do not forget that there is no right or wrong strategy in writing center literature. Therefore, there is no right or wrong answer. The aim of this section of the questionnaire is to find out what strategies are really implemented in tutorials conducted with Turkish writing clients, not what you are told to do by your supervisors.

While conducting one-to-one writing conferences with Turkish writing clients, I...		Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
1	sit near the writing client, not across the desk.					
2	ask questions to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. find out about the writing client's writing process (e.g., What sort of planning have you done on this paper so far?). 					
	b. find out the writing client's writing concerns.					
	c. help writing clients to find the answers to their own problems.					
	d. lead writing clients to focus on the problematic features of their papers.					
	e. find out about the writing expectations of the teacher/professor who assigned the writing client paper.					
3	refer writing clients to my writing center's handouts.					
4	explain to the writing client how the tutorial session works.					

While conducting one-to-one writing conferences with Turkish writing clients, I...		Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
5	paraphrase what the writing client has said a. to make sure that I have understood what the writing client said.					
	b. to allow writing clients to hear how their message is being interpreted by a reader/listener.					
6	tell writing clients what grade I think they will receive for their paper.					
7	greet the writing client in Turkish					
8	conduct the tutorial in Turkish.					
9	deal with higher order writing concerns before lower order concerns (e.g., to deal with the meaning expressed in the paper before working at sentence level).					
10	talk less than the writing client.					
11	focus writing clients' attention to weak features I find in their writing.					
12	make the writing client set the goals for the conference.					
13	try to create a warm atmosphere.					

While conducting one-to-one writing conferences with Turkish writing clients, I...		Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
14	negotiate meaning with writing clients (e.g., an interactive discussion between the writing client and tutor in which the writing client's and tutor's views are shared to reach a consensus on how certain features in the paper can be changed).					

PART C

Please read the following prompt, and check (x) how often **you** implement the following strategies while dealing with Turkish writing clients' rough writing drafts. The aim of this section of the questionnaire is to find out what strategies are really implemented in tutorials conducted with Turkish writing clients' rough drafts, not what you are told to do by your supervisors.

While working on ROUGH DRAFTS with Turkish writing clients one-to-one writing conferences, I...		Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
1	ask the writing client to read their paper aloud to me.					
2	make corrections on writing client papers.					
3	decide what aspects of the paper will be worked on in the tutorial.					
4	praise aspects of the paper that are going well.					
5	ask what they plan to do next at the end of a session.					
6	try to make writing clients implement standard English writing conventions					

While working on ROUGH DRAFTS with Turkish writing clients one-to-one writing conferences, I...		Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
7	discuss strategies for effective writing such as strategies for writing clients:					
	a. to get started (e.g., brainstorming, mapping).					
	b. to help them organize their ideas (e.g., outlining).					
	c. to help them cope with writing anxiety					
	d. to improve the clarity of their sentences.					
	e. to improve the coherency and unity of their papers.					
	f. to cite and document sources.					
	g. to proofread and edit their own work (e.g., reading aloud, locating the thesis statement in their paper).					
8	tell writing clients which features of their writing needs to be improved (e.g., You don't have a thesis statement. You need to write one).					
9	tell writing clients that they can leave and that I will make the necessary corrections to their papers.					

PART D

Please read the following prompt, and check (x) how often you believe the following tutor-roles **should** be adopted when dealing with Turkish writing clients in the one-to-one tutorials.

An effective writing tutor while dealing with Turkish writing clients SHOULD take on the following tutor-roles:		Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
1	Coach (takes secondary role, but guides writing clients to focus on parts of their papers that need improving)					
2	Listener (listens approximately 50% or more throughout the whole tutoring session)					
3	Question Asker (asks many questions to understand the writing clients' problems and to guide writing clients to find solutions to their writing problems)					
4	Teller (tells writing clients what they should do to improve a paper)					
5	Model (models what writing clients need to do)					
6	Diagnostician (identifies writing clients' needs and writing problems)					
7	Talker (does 50% or more of the talking in the tutoring session)					
8	Editor (makes the necessary corrections on the writing client's paper or tells the writing client what corrections need to be made on the paper for better results)					

An effective writing tutor while dealing with Turkish writing clients SHOULD take on the following tutor-roles:		Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
9	Evaluator (makes evaluative assessments on the quality of the paper)					
10	Friend (creates a warm atmosphere, establishes rapport)					
11	Negotiator (decides together with the writing client what will or will not be done)					
12	Guide (leads writing clients in various ways to help them find solutions to their writing concerns)					
13	Goal Setter (decides what will or will not be done in a particular tutoring session)					
14	Specialist (is knowledgeable about the topic of the writing client's writing)					
15	Strategy adapter (changes tutoring strategy as required)					

Thank you. You have completed the questionnaire.

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Please take a look at the tutorial strategies in part B and part C of the questionnaire. Could you please identify the strategies you apply the most frequently and tell me why you do so?
2. Please take a look again at the tutorial strategies in part B and part C of the questionnaire. This time could you please identify the strategies you apply the least frequently and tell me why you do so?
3. Please take a look at the tutor roles in part D of the questionnaire. Could you please identify the tutor roles which you believe should be adopted the most frequently and tell me why you believe so?
4. Please take another look at the tutor roles in part D of the questionnaire. This time could you please identify the tutor roles which you believe should be adopted the least frequently and tell me why you believe so?

APPENDIX D

SURVEY COVER LETTER

Dear writing/learning center colleague,

I, Eylem Bütüner, am currently enrolled in the MA TEFL Program at Bilkent University. The aim of my research study is to learn about what strategies Turkish writing/learning center tutors report implementing in the one-to-one tutorial and the rationales that lie behind these reports. The study does NOT aim to find out what strategies tutors have been told to implement. Moreover, I am investigating Turkish writing/learning center tutors' perceptions on which tutor roles are effective to adopt in the one-to-one tutorial and their rationales for their perceptions.

This information is valuable in the sense that it will provide writing center scholars and tutors working in writing/learning centers with information about which strategies are practiced, and the roles that are believed to be effective in an EFL one-to-one conference context. Furthermore, this study may promote the construction of in-service tutorship training programs in the writing centers of Turkey. The study could also contribute to the composing of a tutoring manual, which would include tutor duties and characteristics, and writing center procedures.

This questionnaire is the first phase of the study. The second phase will be in the form of interviews. These will be held with teachers selected randomly. The personal information provided will be kept strictly confidential in any report or article deriving from the data you provide.

Please e-mail your replies to eylemb@bilkent.edu.tr upon completion of the questionnaire.

Your completion of this questionnaire will be considered as indication of your consent to use the data provided for the completion of this study.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact my thesis advisor, Dr. Mathews-Aydınlı or me.

Thank you in advance for your help and cooperation.

Eylem Bütüner
MA TEFL
Bilkent University, Ankara
Tel: 0533 3134981
eylemb@bilkent.edu.tr

Dr. Julie Mathews-Aydınlı
MA TEFL
Bilkent University, Ankara
Tel: (0312) 290 2015
julie@bilkent.edu.tr