L2 Journal, Volume 17 Issue 1 (2025), pp. 1-23 Produced by eScholarship, 2025

ARTICLE

Understanding L2 Online Peer Tutoring Participation Through Response Formulations To Advice: A Case Study

MEI-HSING TSAI

National Taiwan University of Science & Technology
E-mail: mtsai@mail.ntust.edu.tw

Applying the single case analysis methodology, this study investigates how a peer tutee demonstrated his understanding of his peer tutor's advice by using a particular type of formulation, *response formulations to advice*, to negotiate the pair's participation framework in second language (L2) online peer tutorials. Although the tutor initially held the floor more often during the verbal interaction in the online tutorial, the tutee was able to move from peripheral to fuller participation by offering response formulations to advice. Two types of response formulations to advice were identified: (1) expressing the gist of the tutor's advice to indicate direct comprehension, and (2) constructing an upshot to add a new viewpoint to the previous utterance by conveying unstated information (e.g., offering an account of what was not discussed in previous discourse). The tutee's response formulations to advice provided the tutor with an opportunity to access the tutee's L2 knowledge and thereby offer more mediation to enhance the tutee's metalinguistic knowledge of the target language. The tutee's upshot formulation in particular also influenced the type of advice he received. Overall, this study highlights how peer tutees' use of response formulations to advice, enhanced by the affordances of online mediation such as real-time audio interaction, facilitates greater conversational participation and deeper engagement, which leads to more meaningful, cooperative, and effective tutorials.

INTRODUCTION

Peer tutoring is considered very valuable in L2 learning because it pairs learners with more knowledgeable peers who help the learners grow. Previous studies on learners' collaboration with more knowledgeable peers in language learning contexts have primarily emphasized face-to-face interactions (e.g., Back, 2016; Kimura, 2020, 2021; Leyland, 2020). Relatively few studies have focused on synchronous computer-mediated communication (SCMC) online peer tutoring discourse. That said, the Covid-19 epidemic has made online education and learning more prevalent among pupils. Online interaction in educational settings has also increased significantly, highlighting the need for in-depth research into the many degrees and forms of online interaction aimed to enhance language acquisition. The present study's originality lies in its exploration of formulations in L2 SCMC peer tutoring contexts, a topic that has received little attention to date. In contrast to previous research that primarily examines formulations in relation to teacher–student talk and collaborative reading activities between peers (Kapellidi, 2015; Pulles et al., 2021, 2022; Solem & Skovholt, 2017), this study emphasizes how a tutee can use response formulations to the tutor's advice to transform the participation framework in L2 online peer tutorials. In other words, although the tutor may initially guide interactions, the tutee can actively participate in tutor–tutee talk by using response formulations to advice. Talk during the peer tutoring session can be viewed as

'institutional' because the participants orient to their tutor and tutee roles rather than act as casual conversation partners. Even though the tutor and the tutee may adopt different discursive practices (e.g., social talk), revision-related episodes[1] are central: in this study, the tutor draws explicit attention to the tutee's errors in written assignments and initiates a series of revision-related sequences in order to help the tutee enhance his L2 accuracy and knowledge during one audio-mediated SCMC tutorial. Because the focus is on the tutee's language development, it is therefore understandable that tutor–tutee interactions may be directed by the tutor. However, by adopting a conversation analysis (CA) informed single-case study approach, this study demonstrates how the tutee transforms the participation framework by using response formulations to advice in revision-related sequences.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Participation Frameworks

According to Goffman (1981), participation frameworks serve to emphasize the importance of different interactional arrangements and different possibilities of participation. This conceptual paradigm shifts the focus from 'speaker' and 'hearer' to 'speaker roles', 'hearer roles,' and 'participation frameworks,' which capture the multiple levels on which the utterances are constructed to form complex social interactions. Participation frameworks highlight the importance of various interactional arrangements and different possibilities for participation (Rae, 2001). The concept of the participation framework has been applied to various discourse studies with diverse research goals, including studies on adult–child interactions (Cobelas Cartagena & Prego-Vázquez, 2019) and teacher–student interactions (Bozbıyık & Can Daşkın, 2022; Heinonen et al., 2020; Young & Miller, 2004). For example. Young and Miller (2004) investigated how an L2 English teacher–student dyad evolved from peripheral to fuller participation over a series of four face-to-face writing conferences. By the final conference, the student was performing many acts that had been originally performed by the instructor, such as identifying a problem, expressing the need for a revision, suggesting candidate revisions, and revising his essay without the teacher's direction. More recently, Cobelas Cartagena and Prego-Vazquez (2019) investigated how young children used verbal and multimodal semiotic resources to negotiate their participation frameworks with peers and adults in Galician preschools. They identified three developmental stages of sociodiscursive competence, each marked by children's use of specific verbal and multimodal resources to negotiate different roles. These studies highlight the dynamic, evolving nature of participation frameworks within pedagogical settings, and illustrate how participants used various linguistic and semiotic resources to enhance their involvement within face-to-face educational settings. In line with this body of research, the present study extends the focus on participation frameworks into the arena of L2 online peer tutorials. By linking the concept of participation frameworks to the strategic deployment of formulations in online L2 writing tutoring, the current study builds on and further elaborates how learners broaden their participation in instructional activities. The following section will explore the concept of formulations and review relevant studies in relation to the current research.

[1] Revision-related episodes refer to specific segments within the tutor–tutee interactions that explicitly focus on revising the tutee's written work. These episodes are typically initiated when the tutor identifies errors or suggests areas for improvement in the tutee's assignments.

Formulations

In conversation analysis and ethnomethodology, the term *formulations* has been understood in different ways. One common interpretation defines it as the specific way in which a referent such as an object, concept, situation, or action is expressed through words or behavior (Antaki et al., 2005; Bilmes, 2011). However, in this study, formulations refer specifically to what is achieved when a participant rephrases or reinterprets what others have said in interaction (Deppermann, 2011, p. 117; Heritage & Watson, 1979, p. 124). In other words, formulations are used to demonstrate comprehension of what has been previously stated or done in previous conversation, offering valuable insights into how participants in a conversation mutually understand each other. According to Heritage and Watson (1979), formulations can be examined in the context of a formulation–decision adjacency pair in which the formulation constitutes the first component and either an agreement or disagreement constitutes the second component. Formulations also serve as a topic organization tool, allowing participants to shift topics. This is possible because a formulation incorporates specific elements from prior statements that can then serve as focal points in subsequent conversations (Barnes, 2007). Heritage and Watson (1979) pinpointed two categories of formulations: a gist and an upshot. A gist formulation consists of a summary of the previous stretch of conversation, through which one participant demonstrates to the other participant their comprehension of the prior discussion. In contrast, an upshot formulation introduces a fresh viewpoint into the discourse by emphasizing the unspoken aspects of the prior discussion, such as inferring a conclusion from previous statements.

Formulations can take different forms depending on the interactional tasks that the participants aim to accomplish. Concerning pedagogical interactions, formulations have been primarily analyzed in relation to teacher–student talk (Kapellidi, 2015; Solem & Skovholt, 2017) and collaborative reading activities between peers (Pulles et al., 2021, 2022). The main focus has been on teachers' formulations of students' contributions in teacher-fronted classroom interactions. For example, Solem and Skovholt (2017) delineated three approaches taken by teachers when reframing pupils' contributions: summarizing, transforming, and challenging. These approaches helped establish a shared pedagogic focus and enhance student participation by creating shared understandings. More recently, Pulles et al. (2021) examined primary school students' text formulations in dialogic reading activities. They identified two types of text formulations: (1) highlighting an exact understanding of a text fragment by summarizing it, and (2) illustrating the text's relevance to the reading activity by highlighting its implications. These formulations helped children to actively participate by fostering a shared understanding and providing a platform for further discussions; consequently, reading became a more interactive and collaborative experience. Such studies provide valuable insights into the use of formulations to enhance participation in pedagogical interactions and their potential contributions to learning outcomes. However, limited research addresses how tutees employ formulations to enhance their participation in L2 online peer tutoring. To bridge this gap, the following section examines another line of studies on L2 peer tutorials.

L2 Peer Tutorials

The pedagogical practice of L2 peer tutoring has become increasingly prevalent in higher education since it has been recognized as a valuable resource for L2 learners in preparing their assignments. Previous L2 conversation analytic research has examined the moment-by-

moment interactions of dyadic or small-group tutorial sessions and explored interactional issues such as the nature and limit of expertise (Back, 2016; Skogmyr Marian et al., 2020), the role of material artifacts (Ro, 2023), and multilingual repertoires (Kimura, 2020, 2021). Additionally, an expanding line of research has investigated advice giving and receiving during one-on-one writing tutorials. These studies explored how tutors shaped their advice to encourage student acceptance (e.g., Leyland, 2021, Waring, 2007b) and how they handled instances of student resistance (e.g., Leyland, 2018, Park, 2014). Moreover, Waring investigated how tutees demonstrated advice resistance (2005) and advice acceptance (2007a) in a series of studies on peer tutoring at a graduate writing center in a U.S. university. Furthermore, Park (2017) analyzed specific turn-taking patterns, emphasizing how L2 writers used questions as a way to resist their tutors' advice.

These studies highlighted essential interactional practices that participants engaged in during advice-giving and receiving episodes and L2 tutorials in face-to-face contexts. As L2 peer tutorials increasingly take place on online platforms, it is essential to examine tutor–tutee interactions in this setting. Recent studies on online L2 tutorials have explored interactional issues such as the relationship between the complementary roles of text and voice in facilitating language learning (Nguyen & Langevin, 2016), epistemic stance management during online search sequences (Choe et al, 2022; Nguyen et al., 2022), and the role of digital in-text comments in video-mediated L2 writing tutorials (Brandt & Leyland, 2024). For example, Nguyen et al. (2022) examined the use of online search sequences in an audio-mediated vocabulary learning session on Skype between an American tutor and a Brazilian tutee. They demonstrated how the integration of interactional practices and technology-enabled search activities facilitated vocabulary acquisition. More recently, Brandt and Leyland (2024) examined video-mediated one-on-one writing tutorials between academic tutors and international L2 students at a UK university. They demonstrated how the combination of pre-written in-text comments and verbal feedback enabled the tutor to draw the student's attention to specific parts of the text in order to effectively link past, present, and future engagement with the material.

These studies have shed light on the complex ways in which tutors and tutees utilize technological tools and interactional strategies to enhance learning in online L2 tutorials. The potential of online pedagogical interactions lies in their ability to facilitate both interpersonal and affective communication and enhance other facets of social presence. L2 online peer tutoring can be used as a virtual setting for communication between tutors and tutees in different geographic locations. However, we do not know if and how L2 tutees use their understanding of advice to move from peripheral to fuller participation in audio-mediated online peer tutorials.[2] Therefore, this study empirically investigates how an L2 peer tutee negotiates the participation framework in an audio-mediated online peer-tutoring session by demonstrating his understanding of the tutor's advice.

[2] Regarding the term 'peripheral,' I chose it deliberately to align with the concept of legitimate peripheral participation, as outlined in Young and Miller's study (2004) on discourse roles in ESL writing conferences. Their research illustrated how an L2 learner initially engaged in interactions in a way that might appear peripheral (i.e., primarily responding with minimal tokens like 'yeah') but still constituted meaningful participation. By retaining the term 'peripheral,' I aim to reflect the significance of the tutee's minimal responses during interactions, where they were engaged and contributing without holding the floor. Over time, the tutee increased their verbal participation by expressing their comprehension of the tutor's advice.

Formulating Understanding of Advice

During revision-related episodes, peer tutors and tutees engage in structured communication focused on tutees' writing assignments. Although the tutor and the tutee may engage in different discursive practices during the online peer tutorial, revision-related episodes are central. The concept of advice refers to the assistance the peer tutor offers the tutee during the revision-related episode to help the tutee enhance their L2 accuracy and knowledge. This includes identifying trouble sources, suggesting revisions, justifying proposed changes, or discussing any revision-related issues. When receiving advice from tutors, tutees may need to perform the second-pair-part (i.e., offer an appropriate response to the interlocutor's preceding utterance) to demonstrate their reception or comprehension of the specific guidance and its connection to the initial advice. Within the context of online peer tutorials, the current study argues that a distinct type of formulation called a response formulation to advice is employed by the tutee to signify understanding of the tutor's advice. Formulating an understanding of the tutor's advice does not always occur in revision-related scenarios, but doing so can be used as a way of fostering deeper comprehension and active participation. Actions typified as response formulations to advice commonly manifest as paraphrases, summaries, or upshots drawn from original advice, as the following analysis demonstrates. Thus, the present study empirically analyzes formulations employed by an L2 peer tutee to enhance their engagement during an audio-mediated online peer tutoring session.

DATA & METHODS

The selected case was taken from a larger study that examined online peer tutoring sessions across one academic term in Taiwan. Informed consent was obtained from all participants for the use of their data in the study. The particular interaction examined in this study was a naturally occurring Skype audio call tutoring session. It took place between a peer tutor named Hsin-ling (a pseudonym), who was an undergraduate preservice English teacher enrolled in an English education course at a major teacher education university in southern Taiwan, and a peer tutee named Yang (a pseudonym), who was a first-year undergraduate enrolled in an English vocabulary and reading course taught by the researcher at a large university in northern Taiwan. As stipulated in the syllabus of this English vocabulary and reading course, Yang was required to complete two major writing assignments that entailed answering discussion questions in his textbook. Hsin-ling provided personalized feedback on language issues before Yang turned in his writing tasks.

After collecting the data, the researcher began by examining the recording without any predetermined interest in specific phenomena. The analysis indicated that the tutor–tutee interaction was initially characterized by the tutor's direct approach. This direct approach[3] was reflected not only in the tutor's longer turn lengths but also in the tutee's minimal acknowledgment and acceptance tokens during interaction. Although the tutor guided the institutional conversation, the tutee was able to more actively participate in tutor–tutee talk by using response formulations to advice.

[3] In this study, the term 'direct approach' refers to the tutor's initial method of interaction during the online tutoring session, where the tutor actively guides the conversation and provides detailed advice or instructions. This approach is characterized by the tutor's longer speaking turns and the tutee's minimal acknowledgment and acceptance tokens.

To examine how the peer tutee employed response formulations to advice to participate in this online language tutorial, the study used the CA approach of single case analysis. According to Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008), single case analysis entails an in-depth examination of a single conversation or a part of it with the goal of identifying different conversational techniques and mechanisms that influence and facilitate its development. The goal of the single case analysis is not to render a collection of cases that indicate recurrent patterns but to construct a persuasive and comprehensible analysis of one specific instance (Mori, 2004). In other words, the single case analysis serves as a starting point to emphasize the recurrence of a specific practice observed in various settings. Employing this approach, the present study examined one online language tutoring session. The excerpts discussed in the following sections were transcribed by employing a modified version of Jefferson's (2004) conventions, supplemented with established guidelines for capturing multilingual interactions (e.g., Hepburn & Bolden, 2012, 2017).

FINDINGS

Excerpt 1 is the first revision-related episode that reveals peer tutor's leading role. This excerpt shows the peer tutee's minimal involvement, in part through his use of continuous discourse markers (e.g., um) and an advice acceptance token (i.e., okay). The peer tutor's fuller participation is marked by her identifying a trouble source in the tutee's written sentence, giving advice, or offering an explanation and justification for revision.

Excerpt 1

```
1   tutor:  hǎo,  nà (.) wǒmen cóng nǐ  dì yī   tí      de  huídá kāishǐ.
            good  then    we   from you first question  PP  reply start
            good, let's start from your answer to the first question
2   tutee:  [um
3   tutor:  [nǐ dì yī  jù      shuō  I don' t have much free time during=
            you first sentence say   ENG SENTENCE
            your first sentence is 'I don't have much free time during'
4   tutee:  =duì
             right
             right
5   tutor:  dànshì↓ (.) during  hòumiàn(.) tōngcháng huì jiā
            but        ENG WORD  after     usually  would add
            but we would usually add something after 'during'
6           (4.0)
7           yīduàn shíjiān, lìrú       jiàrì  (.) huòshì
            a period time  for example weekends   or
            a period of time, for example, weekends or
8           [píngrì↓
            weekdays
            weekdays
9   tutee:  [o::h
10  tutor:  suǒ[yǐ↑
            so
            so
11  tutee:    [suǒyǐ
```

```
            so
            so
12  tutor:  >zhè yī biān  bǐjiào     hǎo  de<  gǎifǎ        yīnggāi shì,
            this one side relatively good ATTP  modification should  be
            the better way to modify this part should be
13          jiù  shì during       jiù   bú  yào   le.
            that is ENG WORD      just  not want  CM
            simply remove 'during'
14  tutee:  °oh°
15  tutor:  yīnwèi  nǐ hòumiàn de shíjiān nǐ shì (.) chāidiào de,
            because you after  PP time    you is     sperated ADVP
            because the time after is separated
16          jiù  shì (.) nǐ shì   píngrì  gēn  jiàrì     dōu  yǒu,
            that is      you are weekdays and  weekends  both have
            that means that you are available on both weekdays and weekends
17  tutee:  um=
18  tutor:  =kěnéng bù  yīyàng de   shí  duàn    la!
             maybe  not same   ATTP time periods EXCL
            it may be different time periods
19  tutee:  duì↓ =
            right
            right
20  tutor:  =suǒyǐ >nǐ  méiyǒubànfǎ< hěn míngquède qūfēn        píngrì
              so     you cannot       very clearly  distinguish  weekdays
             so you cannot very clearly distinguish between weekdays
21          háishì jiàrì,
            or     weekends
            or weekends
22  tutee:  °um°
23  tutor:  suǒyǐ↑ nǐ  jiù  zhíjiē  shuō nǐ méi yǒu  tài duō   de
            so     you just directly say you not have too much ATTP
            so you can directly say you don't have much
24          <kòngxián shíjiān> jiù tíng le, ránhòu nǐ  jiù  jiēxiàlái shuō
            free       time   then stop CM  then   you just continue  say
            free time and stop here, and then you just continue saying
25          nǐ  nǎxiē shíjiān(.)shì kòngxián de,  nàxiē shíjiān
            you which times     are free     ATTP which times
            which times you are available and which times
26          nǐ yǒu   qítā  de   shìqíng.
            you have other ATTP things
            you have other things [to do]
27  tutee:  okay::
```

The peer tutor and the peer tutee discuss the tutee's first sentence ("I don't have much free time during") in response to the first discussion question ("When do you have free time?") in the tutee's textbook. Specifically, the tutor reads aloud the tutee's first sentence (line 3) and then points to the trouble source, the word 'during,' while attempting to explain its usage (line 5). A long pause (4 seconds) in line 6 serves as wait time, suggesting that the tutor may have expected the tutee to complete the explanation. Because there is no response from the tutee, the tutor continues to illustrate the use of the word 'during' (lines 7–8). The tutee's discourse

marker "oh" indicates a change in his state of understanding. In lines 12–13, the tutor offers a revision suggestion to remove the word, 'during' and then provides an account of this advice (lines 15–26). In response, the tutee demonstrates listenership ("um") in lines 17 and 22 and produces the acceptance token (okay::) in line 27, which indicates the completion of the first revision-related sequence.

When participants engage in specific discourse moves that are unique to their role in an educational interaction, it highlights the asymmetrical nature of the tutor-tutee relationship. For example, the peer tutor is the primary person who evaluates the peer tutor's language outcomes, identifies trouble sources, and provides straightforward revision suggestions during tutorials. Only the peer tutor can give advice without seeking permission. The capacity to give unilateral advice is indicative of the tutor's advanced proficiency in English. This asymmetry is evident as the tutor provides critiques and guidance, whereas the tutee, in a position to learn, benefits from this expertise by receiving these insights and accepting recommendations for improvement. The type of advice sought by the tutee was feedback on writing assignments, which naturally evokes more peer tutor talk. Moreover, because the tutor had an opportunity to read the tutee's work before the online tutoring session, it is not surprising that the tutor pointed directly to the potential trouble source and then offered advice. As a result, the peer tutee's participation was limited to showing his listenership and accepting the suggested revision. It seems that the peer tutee played a relatively passive role in this first revision-related episode. However, the peer tutee attempted to take a more active role in subsequent episodes, as shown in the following excerpts. Specifically, we can see that the tutee primarily used response formulations to advice to participate in the conversation more fully.

In the context of L2 SCMC peer tutoring, response formulations to advice can be understood as instances where the tutor's advice is interpreted and articulated by the learner to demonstrate their comprehension. By using response formulations to advice, a tutee can move from peripheral to fuller participation and demonstrate their intellectual ability. There are two major practices the tutee in this study uses to illustrate his understanding of the advice: (1) the tutee shows that he understands the gist or pertinence of the tutor's guidance by summarizing the advice, and (2) the tutee demonstrates upshot formulations by providing an account of the tutor's advice or making an inference from the tutor's advice-related utterances, by articulating what has not been said or adding a new perspective to the tutor's advice. Understanding the tutor's advice is the responsibility of the tutee in the peer tutorial. The tutor in this study formulated the interaction as an attempt to help the tutee revise his answers for an English writing assignment. As understanding the tutor's advice is part of how the tutee participates in tutoring talk and shows his intellectual ability, it is understandable that the tutee's displays of understanding became prominent resources in tutoring talk. The tutee in this study primarily uses upshot formulations. These upshot formulations not only increase the tutee's involvement in tutoring talk but also prompt more peer tutor mediation, which leads to more support for learning. The following excerpts demonstrate how the tutee employs gist and upshot formulations in L2 online peer tutoring interactions.

Excerpt 2

```
33  tutor:  ránhòu zài  lái  dièr   jù,      nǐ shuō (.)I have more free time
            then  again come second sentence you say    ENG SENTENCE
            and then onto the second sentence you say, 'I have more free time'
34          on Tuesday, Thursday and Friday [because
35  tutee:                                  [um
```

36 tutor: I have a part-time job on Wednesday and weekends.
37 tutee: um
38 tutor: nǐ bǎ tā chāi chéng liǎng jù, >duì bù duì?<
you BA it break into two sentences correct not correct
did you break it into two sentences, right?
39 tutee: duì
right
right
40 tutor: because yòushì xīn de jùzi, qíshí nǐ: [kěyǐ
because again new ATTP sentence in fact you can
'because' is in a new sentence; in fact, you can
41 tutee: [°duì°
right
right
42 tutor: jiùshì(.) bǎ tā hébìng chéng yīgè jiù hǎo le.
just BA it merge into one then good CM
just merging them into one sentence would be fine
43 tutee: o:h=
44 tutor: =jiùshì Friday hòumiàn shì dòuhào, ránhòu because
just ENG WORD after is comma then ENG WORD
just put a comma after 'Friday' and then 'because'
45 jiù zhíjiē xiǎoxiě jiù hǎo le.
then directly lowercase simply good CM
can be written in lowercase
46 tutee: suǒyǐ wǒ jiù zhíjiē bǎ nàgè Friday hòumiàn de nàgè jùdiǎn kòudiào
so I just directly BA that ENG WORD after PP that period remove
so I just directly remove the period after 'Friday'
47 biàn zhíjiē biàn dòuhào.
change directly change comma
and replace it with a common
48 tutor: >duì duì duì<
right right right
right right right
49 tutee: o::h jiùshì ràng tā yǒu yīgè wánzhěngxìng de °gǎnjué°
just let it have one completeness ATTP feeling
it's about giving it a sense of completeness
50 tutor: duì
right
right
51 tutee: <bǐjiào wánzhěng>
comparatively complete
become more complete
52 tutor: duì duì
right right
right right
53 tutee: °oh°
54 tutor: yīnwèi wǒmen tōngcháng(.) kǒuyǔ shì hái hǎo,
because we usually spoken language is still good
because usually, it's fine in our spoken language
55 dànshì rúguǒ shì zài xiězuò de shíhòu because
but if is in writing ASP time ENG WORD
but when it comes to writing, 'because'

```
56          tōngcháng bùhuì fang  zài  dìyīgè  (.)zì↓
            usually   not   place at  the first   word
            is usually not placed at the beginning of the sentence
57          tā yīdìng     jiē    zài (.) mǒu    yī    jù   hòumiàn dāng yuányīn,
            it definitely connect at    certain one sentence behind as  reason
            it is always used to provide the reason for a previous statement
58          tā bùhuì(.) jiù túrán    yī  jù      yīnwèi.
            it not    just suddenly one sentence because
            it does not suddenly appear as a standalone sentence
59  tutee:  tūrán    màochū
            suddenly pop up
            suddenly pop up
60  tutor:  =zhōngwén       kěyǐ duì, zhōngwén          kěyǐ
            Chinese language can right Chinese language can
            in Chinese, you can [use it] right, in Chinese, you can [use it]
61          dàn yīngwén (.)        <bǐjiào>    bùhuì yǒu    rén yòng because,
            but English language comparatively not   have people use ENG WORD
            but in English people are less likely to use 'because'
62          kěnéng (.)huì yòng qítā de zì  qù dàitì   jiù bùhuì shì because.
            maybe will use other ATTP word go replace just not be ENG WORD
            they might use other words to replace it, so it would not be 'because'
63  tutee:  em
```

In Excerpt 2, the tutor and tutee start by examining the tutee's second and third sentences ("I have more free time on Tuesday, Thursday and Friday"; "Because I have a part-time job on Wednesday and weekends") in response to the first discussion question ("When do you have free time?") in the tutee's textbook. After reading aloud the peer tutee's written sentences, the peer tutor asks a question (did you break it into two sentences, right?) in line 38. The tutor carefully mitigates her advice delivery by using this question to draw the tutee's attention to the potential trouble source, check for alignment, and lay the groundwork for the upcoming advice-giving process. The peer tutor elaborates on the advice by suggesting a way to revise the sentence (just merging them into one sentence would be fine) in line 42. In what follows, she explains the revision in detail (lines 44–45) and the peer tutee confirms how to make changes (lines 46–47). The tutor confirms the tutee's written revision by responding with an agreement token in line 48.

More importantly, the tutee displays his understanding of the advice by immediately formulating an upshot (oh, it's about giving it a sense of completeness) in line 49 and then rephrases his upshot (become more complete) in line 51. These upshots of the formulation are the tutee's account of the tutor's advice. They add a new perspective by articulating what has not been said: the reason for the advice.[4] The upshot formulations also have interactional consequences, providing the tutor with an opportunity to access the tutee's understanding of how to use the word 'because.' It seems that the tutee may not fully understand how to use

[4] In Excerpt 2, lines 49 and 51, the tutee's responses are referred to as both upshots and accounts. The upshots are the tutee's formulations to advice that add a new perspective to the to the interaction by expressing what has not been explicitly stated. Specifically, by stating "it's about giving it a sense of completeness" in line 49 and "become more complete" in line 51, the tutee provides an account of the tutor's advice by articulating the underlying reason for the suggested revision.

'because' in English-language writing, so the tutor self-selects and elaborates on its use in lines 54–58. The tutor's utterances continue, with the tutee's utterances underscoring that in English-language writing the word 'because' cannot be used alone at the beginning of the sentence (lines 60–62). The revision sequence ends with the tutee's acknowledgement token, "em."

Though the tutee participates minimally in the first instance of the revision sequence, in this second instance, the tutee adopts a more active role. In particular, the tutee elicits the tutor's confirmation of his written revision and displays his understanding of, rather than simply takes, the tutor's advice. The tutee's fuller participation is particularly evident in his interpretation of advice (lines 49 and 51). Discursive practices in this peer tutorial function simultaneously to establish institutional and intellectual identities. Even though the tutoring session is not a class with a teacher, the peer tutor and peer tutee are in a power relationship. The tutor has epistemic authority in this online peer tutoring session: the peer tutee is less competent than the peer tutor, the peer tutee knows less than the peer tutor, and the peer tutee needs assistance from the peer tutor.[5] Yet participants are equal outside of the peer tutorial. They are peers who have different majors and different expertise. It is understandable that the tutee, who is aware of his and the tutor's expertise levels of English writing, may wish to maintain his intellectual face in the online peer tutoring session.[6]

More importantly, the tutee's display of his comprehension of the tutor's advice provides the tutor with an opportunity to access the tutee's L2 knowledge. Because the tutee's understanding of the advice does not fully align with the intended suggestion, the tutor offers a detailed explanation for the advice (lines 54–58 and lines 60–62). This elaboration on the usage of the word 'because' enhances the tutee's metalinguistic knowledge of how to use 'because' in English-language sentences, and the tutee is thus able to pinpoint the problem of misuse of the word 'because' in Excerpt 3.

Excerpt 3

```
26   tutor:  yīyàng   de   wèntí    jiù  shì  because(0.1)
             the same ATTP question that is   ENG WORD
             the same problem is 'because'
27           e:h=
28   tutee:  =yīyàng    bù     shìhé     yòng zài   jù     shǒu.
              the same  not   suitable   use  in  sentence beginning
```

[5] In this online peer-tutoring context, the tutor's epistemic authority does not represent an a priori or purely etic assumption. Rather, it emerges from how participants themselves locally construct and display the tutor's and tutee's relative knowledge and expertise. In particular, the excerpts show the tutor identifying trouble sources (e.g., grammatical errors) and elaborating on revisions, as well as the tutee's requests for confirmation or subsequent expressions of understanding. Together, these interactions establish the tutor as 'more knowledgeable.'

[6] Universities and academic forums emphasize not just knowledge acquisition but also the demonstration of intellectual competence (e.g., Tracy & Carjuzaa, 1993; Waring, 2002). In the online tutoring context of the current study, the tutee's and tutor's relative expertise in English writing is immediately visible. As noted in Waring (2002), expressing a lack of comprehension or perceived inadequacy often entails a risk to one's identity as a competent academic participant. Therefore, the tutee's motivation to maintain intellectual face may stem from their awareness of a novice identity in English writing. In order to balance this lower academic standing with a desire to demonstrate intellectual competence, the tutee makes an effort to display understanding of the advice by immediately formulating an upshot that adds new information to the advice.

```
                similarly, it is not suitable for use [alone] at the beginning of the sentence
29   tutor:     qíshí    zhè    yī tí       yīnggāi shì hái↑ (.) méiyǒu
                actually this  one question should  be  still    not
                actually, this question is not
30              nàme yánzhòng,yīnwèi tā hòumiàn shì wèn nǐ  why.
                that serious because it after   is  ask you ENG WORD
                that serious, because what follows asks you 'why'
31   tutee:     ˚um˚
32   tutor:     kǒushuō dehuà shì háihǎo, dànshì↓ rúguǒ shì xiězuò  dehuà
                spoken  COND   is okay    but      if    is  writing COND
                it's okay in spoken English, but if it's in writing
33              jiù jǐnliàng bìmiǎn.
                then try     avoid
                try to avoid [using because alone at the beginning of an English sentence]
34   tutee:     okay, yīnwèi zhè ge qíshí    kěyǐ bǎ tā dāngchéng shì
                      because this  actually can  BA it interpret as
                      because this can be interpreted as
35              tā zài wèn wǒmen wèntí,    suǒyǐ=
                it PSP ask us    question, so
                it asking us a question, so
36   tutor:     =uh-huh
37   tutee:     <hái   kěyǐ>
                still can
                it's still acceptable
38   tutor:     duì
                right
                right
```

In Excerpt 3, the tutor and tutee discuss the part of the tutee's answer ("Because i'm a little afraid of being alone") to the third discussion question ("Do you usually spend your free time alone or with other people? Why?") in the tutee's textbook. In the beginning, the peer tutor initiates the revision-related sequence by indicating that the potential trouble source is related to the word 'because.' In what follows, the peer tutee demonstrates that he has benefited from the peer tutor's detailed explanation of the usage of 'because' (similarly, it is not suitable for use [alone] at the beginning of the sentence) in excerpt 2 and that he is able to apply what he has learned in this subsequent sequence. In response, the peer tutor downgrades the seriousness of the problem by indicating that the question is a wh-question (lines 29–30) and then states that it would be acceptable to start a sentence with the word 'because' in spoken English. The tutor also indicates that it would be better to avoid using 'because' alone at the beginning of a sentence in written English. In lines 34, 35, and 37, the tutee demonstrates his understanding of the tutor's advice by offering an upshot formulation (okay, because this can be interpreted as, so it's still acceptable). In this upshot formulation, the tutee combines his understanding of the advice and the information from the question (i.e., why?) and infers that he does not need to revise the word 'because.' This upshot formulation indicates that the tutee is not just accepting the tutor's advice but critically evaluating it and integrating it with his own perspective. In the second-pair-part, the peer tutor's subsequent minimal agreement token "right" indicates that she agrees with the peer tutee's upshot formulation of his understanding of her revision talk. Excerpt 4 shows how the tutee applies gist and upshot formulations in the online tutorial.

Excerpt 4

```
1    tutor:  ránhòu   zàilái   zhèngcháng de, uh, tōngcháng (2.0) jiǎnghuà
             then   afterwards   normal   ATTP    usually         speech
             then, afterwards, normal speech usually
2            zhǐ  yǒu  shùn  gēn  bù shùn,
             only have along with not along
             has a smooth or not smooth flow
3            bùhuì £yǒu zhèngcháng bù zhèngcháng£
             not   have normal     not normal
             but not a normal or abnormal one
4            suǒyǐ↑ (.)gǎi   jiù shì  nǐ zuìhòumiàn  nàgè zì  fluently (1.0)
             so       change that is you most behind that word ENG WORD
             so you should change your last word 'fluently'
5            normally gǎi    fluently.
             ENG WORD change ENG WORD
             'normally' to 'fluently'
6    tutee:  fluently
7    tutor:  duì
             right
             right
8    tutee:  normally  gǎi     f–l-u-e-n-t-l-y.
             ENG WORD  change  ENG WORD
             change 'normally' to f-l-u-e-n-t-l-y
9    tutor:  duì
             right
             right
10   tutee:  nà  wǒ zhèyàng hòumiàn nàgè (.) nàgè fluently
             that I this way behind that     that ENG WORD
             so, for me, that word 'fluently' [located at the end of the sentence]
11           jiù yào shāndiào    duì   bù   duì?
             then need delete  correct not correct
             needs to be deleted, right?
12   tutor:  duì,   nǐ nà   yī  biān yào shāndiào.
             right you that one side must delete
             right, you have to delete that one
13   tutee:  °o:kay°
14   tutor:  ránhòu yīnwèi fluently tōngcháng shì jiǎng
             then  because ENG WORD  usually  is  speak
             then 'fluently' is usually applied to
15            duìhuà      kǒu  shuō,
             conversation oral speech
             spoken conversation
16   tutee:  um
17   tutor:  suǒyǐ <bùhuì yòng>, yīnwèi  nǐ  shì bǎ tā jiē     zài
             so     not   use    because you are BA it connect at
             so you won't use it because you place it
18           Kàn (.) yuèdú   yīngyǔ (0.3) < bàozhāng   zázhì>  hòumiàn, suǒyǐ
             read    reading English      newspapers  magazines after   so
             after reading English newspapers and magazines, so
19           [huì yǒu yī  diǎn qíguài↓
```

```
            will have a little strange
            it sounds a bit strange
20   tutee: [oh
21   tutor: yīnwèi yīnggāi shì qiánmiàn de   chat     yào fluently,
            because should  be previous ATTP ENG WORD want ENG WORD
            because it should be 'fluently' for the previous 'chat' part
22          bùshì dú yào fluently  dú   yīnggāi shì yào   dú    dǒng.
            not read want ENG WORD read should  be  want  read  understand
            it's not about reading 'fluently'; reading should be about understanding
23   tutee: dǒng,       jiùshì tā bǐjiào        bǐjiào        cháng    yòng
            understood  just   it comparatively comparatively commonly used
            understood, it is commonly used
24          zài jiù shuōhuà shàng bùhuì yòng zài dú hòumiàn.
            in just speaking on   not   use  in read after
            for speaking rather than being placed after reading
25   tutor: duì
            right
            right
26   tutee: jiùshì lèisì guànyòng    de  gàiniàn  ba
            just similar  idiomatic ATTP  idea    MP
            it seems like an idiomatic usage
27   tutor: duì
            right
            right
28   tutee: °o:kay°
```

In this excerpt, the tutor and tutee examine the tutee's written response ("I hope to be able to chat with foreigners normally and read English newspapers and magazines fluently") to the fourth discussion question ("What is your most important reason to study English?") in the tutee's textbook. After the tutor suggests changing 'normally' to 'fluently,' the tutor and tutee collaboratively reach an agreement on this revision through the tutee's repetition of the tutor's suggestion and the tutor's affirmative utterances ("right") in lines 7 and 9. The tutee subsequently initiates another revision-related sequence (so, for me, that word 'fluently' [located at the end of the sentence] needs to be deleted, right?). The tutor confirms this revision action and further explains why 'fluently' needs to be removed. In this excerpt, the tutee makes two types of response formulations to advice. First, he demonstrates his understanding of the tutor's justification (lines 14–22) by presenting a gist formulation, which entails summarizing the tutor's utterances in lines 23–24. Upon receiving the tutor's confirmation with the token "right," the tutee immediately offers an upshot formulation regarding the use of 'fluently' (line 26). This upshot formulation adds a new perspective as the tutee identifies the use of 'fluently' as an idiomatic expression. This revision-related sequence ends with the tutee's advice acceptance marker "okay." By summarizing and adding a new perspective to the guidance offered by the tutor, the tutee shows his desire to actively participate in the online tutorial. The following excerpt shows how the tutee's upshot formulation influences the advice he receives.

Excerpt 5

```
1    tutor:  ánhòu will (6.0)
             then  will
             and then 'will'
2            jiàn [yì  shāndiào.
             recommend  delete
             I recommend deleting it
3    tutee:       [huì
                   can
                   can
4            shāndiào ma?
             delete   QP
             delete?
5    tutor:  uīnwèi tāde wèntí  shì usually, (.)suǒyǐ nǐ tōngcháng
             because its problem is ENG WORD     so   you usually
             because the problem is 'usually' so what you usually
6            huì  zěnme  zuò (2.0)  >rúguǒ wǒ yòng zhōngwén wèn nǐ<
             would what  do           if   I  use  Chinese  ask you
             what would you do if I ask you in Chinese
7            nǐ tōngcháng(.)jiàrì    dōu zài gàn   má?  nǐ  yīnggāi
             you usually    weekends all in  doing what you should
             what do you usually do on the weekend? you should respond
8            huì    huí  wǒ, wǒ tōngcháng dōu huì  qù kàn   diànyǐng,
             will respond me, I usually   all will go watch movies
             to me, I usually go to the movies
9            bùhuì shuō wǒ huì↓ qù kàn   diànyǐng.
             not   say  I  will go watch movies
             you won't say I will go to the movies
10   tutee:  oh suǒ jiù (.) will     gǎi    chéng usually (0.2) ma ?
                so then    ENG WORD  change into  ENG WORD      QP
                so should I change 'will' to 'usually?'
11   tutor:  kěyǐ zhè  yàng gǎi,   huòshì (.)
             can  this way  change or
             you can revise in this way, or
12           jiùshì búyào xiě,  jiù  zhíji
             just   don't write then directly
             simply omit [will], then directly write
13           <I play badminton with my friends or family> jiù  hǎo  le.
             ENG SENTENCE                                 then fine CM
             'I play badminton with my friends or family' that will be fine
14   tutee:  o::h jiù  gèng jīngjiǎn yìxiē.
                 then more concise  some
                 it will be even more concise
15   tutor:   duì↓  will      kěyǐ, nǐ kěyǐ xuǎnzé shāndiào↓
             right ENG WORD   can  you can choose delete
             right, as for 'will,' you can choose to delete it
16           huò gǎi  chéng usually.
             or change to   ENG WORD
             or change it to 'usually'
17   tutee:  °okay°
```

```
18   tutor:  jiùshì (.) búhuì shì will      jiù  duì     le.
             just       not   is  ENG WORD  then correct CM
             as long as it's not 'will,' it's correct
19   tutee:  um
```

In Excerpt 5, the tutor and tutee review the tutee's written response ("I will play with my friend or family in my free time") to the third discussion question ("Do you usually spend your free time alone or with other people? Why?") in the tutee's textbook. The tutor directly offers advice by suggesting the tutee to delete the word 'will' in line 2. In response to the tutee's confirmation check (delete?), the tutor points out that when asked about a habitual or typical activity, like what someone usually does on weekends, the appropriate response is one that describes a routine action (i.e., I usually go to the movies) rather than expresses future intent (i.e., I will go to the movies). It seems that the tutor's explanation is not consistent with her original suggestion (i.e., deleting the word 'will'). Based on the tutor's justification of her advice, the tutee offers another candidate solution (changing 'will' to 'usually') in line 10. Note that the tutee acknowledges the tutor's epistemic authority by using a question form rather than a statement, thus specifically requesting for the tutor's confirmation or agreement. At the same time, since the tutee's proposed solution does not align with the tutor's initial advice, the use of the question mitigates the face-threatening act and specifically acknowledges the tutor's epistemic authority. In what follows, the tutor takes into consideration the tutee's contribution and incorporates his proposed solution into the first part of her response (lines 11–13). Despite the tutor's acceptance of the tutee's proposed solution (changing 'will' to 'usually' in line 10), the tutor seems to prefer her earlier advice (eliminating 'will'). She states that the tutee can directly write "I play badminton with my friends or family." In line 14, the tutee acknowledges the tutor's answer with a change of state token receipt "oh," signaling that this action is news to him. Since the tutee has realized that the tutor's preferred revision is to delete the word 'will,' he displays his upshot formulation by giving an account of the tutor's advice in line 14. This upshot formulation includes an undeclared justification: why deleting the word 'will' is a better revision action (i.e., to make the sentence more concise). The tutee does not simply provide an advice acceptance token (e.g., okay). Regarding the systematics of *preference organization* (Pomerantz, 1984; Schegloff, 2007) or what preferred next turn is expected (Macbeth, 2011), this upshot formulation is marked as a dispreferred response. The tutor may consider the tutee to be withholding acceptance. Thus, she resists insisting that the tutee follow her advice to delete the word 'will,' instead stating that the tutee can choose to use 'usually' or omit 'will' in lines 15–16. In response, the tutee produces the acceptance token, "okay." The tutor concludes this revision sequence by emphasizing that the use of the word 'will' is incorrect.

Through the tutee's fuller participation (i.e., proposing an alternative candidate revision and producing an upshot formulation), both the tutee and tutor co-construct and negotiate advice for the revision. Specifically, the tutee pays attention to the tutor and modifies his talk as it emerges, accounting for the advice the tutor is giving. With a single utterance, the tutee adapts to the kind of advice the tutor delivers through his upshot formulation. In other words, the interactional accomplishment of participation is achieved through tutee actions such as displaying an upshot formulation of the tutor's advice or requesting confirmation of a proposed revision at talk. Owing to the tutee's upshot formulation and proposed candidate revision, the tutor's advice evolves from suggesting the deletion of 'will' (lines 1–2) to incorporating the tutee's proposed revision, all the while holding firm to her initial advice.

Ultimately, she refines her advice and leaves the decision to the tutee as to whether to delete 'will' or replace 'will' with 'usually.'

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

Previous research has predominantly examined how teachers and peers use formulations (e.g., summarizing) in teacher–student talk and collaborative reading activities, which has shown that such practices promote shared understanding and enhance participation (Kapellidi, 2015; Pulles et al., 2021, 2022; Solem & Skovholt, 2017). However, less is known about how L2 tutees themselves employ formulations to foster their engagement, particularly in online tutoring contexts. Building on prior work on tutees' resistance and acceptance of tutors' advice in face-to-face L2 writing tutorials (e.g., Park, 2017; Waring, 2005, 2007a) and on the unique affordances of online tutoring platforms (e.g., Brandt & Leyland, 2024; Nguyen et al., 2022), this study seeks to bridge that gap by investigating how an L2 tutee's formulations facilitate participation during audio-mediated online peer tutorials. Specifically, the present study introduces the concept of response formulations to advice as a particular category of formulation designed by the tutee to capture the essence or outcome of the tutor's advice during L2 online tutoring interactions. In peer tutoring sessions, all types of tutee participation, whether peripheral or full, are recognized as legitimate forms of engagement. Tutees show varying degrees of participation during peer tutoring activities. This single case study provides evidence for a participation trajectory from peripheral to fuller participation. Although the tutor may lead interactions at the beginning of the online tutoring session, the tutee can more actively participate in tutor–tutee conversations by using response formulations to advice. This study identifies two types of such response formations. The first, called the gist formulation, entails the tutee's rephrasing of the tutor's advice, showing the tutor how he understands the tutor's advice. The second type, the upshot formulation, allows the tutee to add a new perspective to previous utterances by articulating previously unsaid information. These two means of demonstrating comprehension align with the two distinct conversational formulations, gist and upshot, observed by Heritage and Watson (1979). The interaction between receiving advice and attempting to display response formulations to advice reflects the tutee's evolving identity from an advice recipient to an independent thinker. Specifically, in forming upshot formulations, the tutee demonstrated not only his intellectual capacity to understand and offer an account of the advice, as seen in excerpts 2 and 5, but also the ability to infer from, critically evaluate, and synthesize the tutor's suggestion in excerpt 3. Despite the peer tutee's ongoing development as a capable peer seeking to learn the target language, these specific discursive practices demonstrate the tutee's desire to actively participate in online peer tutoring sessions, exhibit intellectual competence, and adhere to the nature of the L2 tutoring context.

When investigated from a language learning viewpoint,[7] this interaction sheds light on how the L2 tutee's interpretation and comprehension of the tutor's advice shaped the pair's

[7] This study adopts the concept that language learning is an emergent, socially situated process observable in the moment-to-moment unfolding of interaction. Drawing on the concept of 'teachables' and 'learnables' (Eskildsen & Majlesi, 2018), I posit that learning occurs as participants make certain linguistic items relevant for understanding, learning, or teaching within their interactions. These teachables and learnables are not predetermined but emerge contingently through talk that depends on the immediate context and the jointly achieved actions of the participants (Kasper & Wagner, 2018; Zemel & Koschmann, 2014). This perspective emphasizes that the learning process is publicly displayed as learners modify their interactional practices and linguistic resources in response to local contingencies (Pekarek Doehler, 2010). For instance, studies like

participation framework. This study's findings are similar to those of Pullet et al. (2021), who found that children's text formulations during reading activity can change their participation framework (e.g., shifting from an animator role to an author role) and that children collaboratively use text to build new knowledge. The analysis in this study focuses on the changes in the participation framework observed as the tutee shifted from peripheral to fuller participation by using response formations to advice. Acknowledging the tutor's advice is integral to the tutee's role. By acknowledging and understanding the guidance provided by the tutor, the tutee can effectively navigate his learning journey. In contrast to his minimal participation (mainly using discourse tokens such as 'um') at the beginning of the tutorial, the tutee's fuller participation (especially via response formulations to advice) enabled him to deepen his language knowledge with the tutor's detailed explanation of the advice. Specifically, as demonstrated in Excerpt 2, the tutee's upshot formulation prompted further mediation from the peer tutor. This led the tutee to increase his own metalinguistic awareness and apply what he had just learned to the next potential trouble source in Excerpt 3. Active participation in tutor–tutee interactions allows tutees to engage more meaningfully, cooperatively, and subjectively in online peer tutoring sessions. For example, in Excerpt 5, the tutee's proposed candidate revision and upshot formulation led the tutor to refine her advice, leaving the tutee with the choice to either remove 'will' or substitute it with 'usually.' This dynamic interaction showcases the tutee's fuller participation in shaping the advice he received. Corroborating Young and Miller's (2004) findings regarding revision talk during face-to-face writing conferences, the tutee's fuller participation enabled the tutor to act as a co-learner who adjusted her advice to complement the tutee's learning. Moreover, it is noteworthy that the absence of mutual visual access among participants (i.e., no screen-sharing or camera usage) in the L2 online tutoring setting creates opportunities for learning. Because the tutor and tutee primarily used verbal communication, the tutee was able to participate in the interactions through his interpretation of the tutor's advice (Excerpt 2). However, the tutee failed to provide correct interpretations, prompting the tutor to offer further explanations that enhance the tutee's learning. This analysis, therefore, builds on prior research (e.g., Nguyen & Langevin, 2016; Nguyen et al., 2022) by showing that computer technology infrastructure creates opportunities for language learning.

An additional noteworthy aspect of the examined interactions is that they expose the asymmetrical relationship between tutor and tutee. The tutor's role as the more knowledgeable party is interactionally achieved, as demonstrated by their identification of trouble sources and provision of advice about the target language. However, the findings of this study indicate that the tutee played a more active role, negotiating the participation framework through the use of response formulations to advice. The tutee utilized such formulations to reinterpret or expand upon the tutor's revision suggestions. Such interactions not only demonstrate the tutee's engagement with the learning process but also his capacity to influence the direction and nature of the tutoring session.

The participation practices in this specific SCMC peer tutoring activity are representative of micro-level practices for talk-in-interaction that contribute to the formation of that peer tutoring discourse. The findings suggest implications for practice. For instance, instructors who mentor peers could encourage tutees to restate or expand upon received advice. This approach would prompt them to reflect actively on feedback rather than passively

---

Hauser (2017) and Eskildsen (2018) have shown how learners progress from not knowing to understanding and actively using new language items within the same conversation and in subsequent interactions. These findings provide evidence of both immediate and long-term learning.

accepting it. By guiding tutees to formulate gist and upshot responses, instructors can help them become more autonomous learners who integrate advice more fully into their written work or language development. Although the analysis focuses on a single tutoring session between one tutor–tutee pair, it offers in-depth insight into the tutee's use of response formulations to advice in an audio-mediated SCMC context. The availability of shared visual information has been shown to enhance educational engagement by facilitating mutual focus and clarifying feedback (Brandt & Leyland, 2024). As video-mediated peer tutorials become more prevalent, future studies could explore the various interactional practices that tutees employ to adjust participation frameworks during L2 video-mediated peer tutoring sessions. Moreover, future research can conduct recall interviews with tutees to better understand how they decide to employ response formulations to advice and whether other pragmatic factors (e.g., gender roles or face issues) or individual learning styles play crucial roles during interactions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am very grateful to the two anonymous reviewers for their constructive suggestions. I would also like to express my gratitude to Editor Emily Hellmich for her insightful feedback and attentive guidance during the editing process. My sincere thanks also go to Yu-Ting Kao at National Cheng Kung University for facilitating her students' invaluable tutoring services for my students. I would also like to thank my colleague, Chih-Kai Lin, for his valuable assistance in reviewing the Chinese glosses used in the excerpts. Any remaining errors are fully my responsibility.

REFERENCES

Antaki, C., Barnes, R., & Leudar, I. (2005). Diagnostic formulations in psychotherapy. *Discourse Studies*, *7*(6), 627–647. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605055420

Back, M. (2016). Epistemics and expertise in peer tutoring interactions: Co-constructing knowledge of Spanish. *The Modern Language Journal*, *100*(2), 508–521. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12334

Barnes, R. (2007). Formulations and the facilitation of common agreement in meetings talk. *Text & Talk*, *27*(3), 273–296. https://doi.org/10.1515/text.2007.011

Bilmes, J. (2011). Occasioned semantics: A systematic approach to meaning in talk. *Human Studies*, *34*(2), 129–153. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10746-011-9189-3

Bozbıyık, M., & Can Daşkın, N. (2022). Peer involvement in dealing with teachers' insufficient response to student initiatives. *Linguistics and Education*, *69*, 101013. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2022.101013

Brandt, A., & Leyland, C. (2024). Digital in-text comments in video-mediated second language writing tutorials: A resource for linking in situ and ex situ engagement. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4733527

Choe, A. T., Nguyen, H. t., & Vicentini, C. (2022). Interactional practices to manage epistemic stances in online searches during a computer-mediated conversation-for-learning. *TESOL in Context*, *30*(2), 39–63.

Cobelas Cartagena, M. A., & Prego-Vázquez, G. (2019). Participation frameworks and socio-discursive competence in young children: The role of multimodal strategies. *Discourse Studies*, *21*(2), 135–158. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445618802656

Deppermann, A. (2011). The study of formulations as a key to an interactional semantics. *Human Studies*, *34*(2), 115–128. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10746-011-9187-8

Eskildsen, S. W. (2018). 'We're learning a lot of new words': Encountering new L2 vocabulary outside of class. *The Modern Language Journal*, *102*, 46–63. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12451

Eskildsen, S. W., & Majlesi, A. R. (2018). Learnables and teachables in second language talk: Advancing a social reconceptualization of central SLA tenets. Introduction to the special issue. *The Modern Language Journal*, *102*(1), 3–10. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12462

Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Blackwell.

Hauser, E. (2017). Learning and the immediate use (fulness) of a new vocabulary item. *The Modern Language Journal*, *101*(4), 712–728. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12429

Heinonen, P., Karvonen, U., & Tainio, L. (2020). Hand-on-shoulder touch as a resource for constructing a pedagogically relevant participation framework. *Linguistics and Education*, *56*, 100795. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2020.100795

Hepburn, A., & Bolden, G. B. (2012). *The conversation analytic approach to transcription*. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 57–76). Wiley-Blackwell.

Hepburn, A., & Bolden, G. B. (2017). *Transcribing for social research*. SAGE Publications.

Heritage, J., & Watson, D. R. (1979). Formulations as conversational objects. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 123–162). Irvington.

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation analysis*. Polity.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). John Benjamins.

Kasper, G., & Wagner, J. (2018). Epistemological reorientations and L2 interactional settings: A postscript to the special issue. *The Modern Language Journal*, *102*(1), 82–90. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12463

Kapellidi, C. (2015). The practice of (re)formulating in classroom interaction. *Pragmatics and Society*, *6*(4), 565–592. https://doi.org/10.1075/ps.6.4.05kap

Kimura, D. (2020). Enacting and expanding multilingual repertoires in a peer language tutorial: Routinized sequences as a vehicle for learning. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *169*(4), 13–25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.07.008

Kimura, D. (2021). Cooperative accomplishment of multilingual language tutorial: An intercultural pragmatics study. *The Modern Language Journal*, *105*(3), 655–678. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12719

Leyland, C. (2018). Resistance as a resource for achieving consensus: Adjusting advice following competency-based resistance in L2 writing tutorials at a British University. *Classroom Discourse*, *9*(3), 267–287. https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2018.1480966

Leyland, C. (2020). Academic writing tutorials for international students: Deferring to an expert and follow-up advice. *Language and Education*, *34*(3), 212–230. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2019.1682008

Leyland, C. (2021). The interactional construction of the academic reader in writing tutorials for international students: An advice-giving resource. *Linguistics and Education*, *61*, 100900. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2020.100900

Macbeth, D. (2011). Understanding understanding as an instructional matter. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(2), 438–451.

Mori, J. (2004). Negotiating sequential boundaries and learning opportunities: A case from a Japanese language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, *88*(4), 536–550.

Nguyen, H. t., Choe, A. T., & Vicentini, C. (2022). Opportunities for second language learning in online search sequences during a computer-mediated tutoring session. *Classroom Discourse*, *13*(2), 145–163. https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2021.2023597

Nguyen, H. t., & Langevin, A. (2016). Some interactional functions of text in a text-and-voice SCMC chat session for language learning. *International Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching*, *6*(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.4018/ijcallt.2016010101

Park, I. (2014). Stepwise advice negotiation in writing center peer tutoring. *Language and Education*, *28*(4), 362–382. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2013.873805

Park, I. (2017). Questioning as advice resistance: writing tutorial interactions with L2 writers. *Classroom Discourse*, *8*(3), 253–270. https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2017.1307125

Pekarek Doehler, S. (2010). Conceptual changes and methodological challenges: On language and learning from a conversation analytic perspective on SLA. In P. Seedhouse, S. Walsh, & C. Jenks (Eds.), *Conceptualising 'learning' in applied linguistics* (pp. 105–126). Palgrave Macmillan.

Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 57–101). Cambridge University Press.

Pulles, M., Berenst, J., Koole, T., & de Glopper, K. (2021). Text formulations as practices of demonstrating understanding in dialogic reading. *Text & Talk*, *41*(4), 515–538. https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2019-0222

Pulles, M., Berenst, J., de Glopper, K., & Koole, T. (2022). Children's discussions about texts: Integrating and evaluating practices. *Linguistics and Education*, *69*, 101051. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2022.101051

Rae, J. (2001). Organizing participation in interaction: Doing participation framework. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *34*(2), 253–278. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327973rlsi34-2_4

Ro, E. (2023). Using PowerPoint slides as a resource for coordinating understanding during presentation consultations at an L2 speaking center. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *14*(3), 579–614. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2020-0052

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction* (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press.

Skogmyr Marian, K., Henricson, S., & Nelson, M. (2021). Counselors' claims of insufficient knowledge in academic writing consultations. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, *65*(6), 1065–080.

Solem, M. S., & Skovholt, K. (2017). Teacher formulations in classroom interactions. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, *63*(1), 69–88. https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2017.1324904

Tracy, K., & Carjuzaa, J. (1993). Identity enactment in intellectual discussion. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *12*(3), 171–194. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X93123001

Waring, H. Z. (2002). Expressing noncomprehension in a US graduate seminar. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *34*(12), 1711–1731. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00047-4

Waring, H. Z. (2005). Peer tutoring in a graduate writing centre: Identity, expertise, and advice resisting. *Applied Linguistics*, *26*(2), 141–168. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amh041

Waring, H. Z. (2007a). Complex advice acceptance as a resource for managing asymmetries. *Text & Talk, 27*(1), 107–137. https://doi.org/10.1515/TEXT.2007.005

Waring, H. Z. (2007b). The multi-functionality of accounts in advice giving. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 11*(3), 367–391. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2007.00328.x

Young, R. F., & Miller, E. R. (2004). Learning as changing participation: Discourse roles in ESL writing conferences. *The Modern Language Journal*, *88*(4), 519–535. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0026-7902.2004.t01-16-.x

Zemel, A., & Koschmann, T. (2014). 'Put your fingers right in here': Learnability and instructed experience. *Discourse Studies*, *16*(2), 163–183. https://doi.org/10.1177/14614456135153

Appendix A

Transcription Symbols

Symbol	Represent
° °	soft volume
=	latched talk
[	overlapping utterance
(.)	micropause
(3.0)	duration of silence (e.g., three-second pause)
[will]	the word enclosed in brackets is added to clarify the meaning of an English translation (e.g., will)
:	stretched sound
,	continuing intonation
.	falling intonation
<u>underline</u>	emphasis
↑	step-up in pitch
↓	step-down in pitch
!	animated intonation
?	rising intonation
£	smiling voice
< >	an utterance spoken more slowly
> <	an utterance spoken more quickly or rushed

Appendix B

List of Abbreviations and Markers

Abbreviation/marker	Description
ADVP	Adverbializing particle
ASP	Aspectual particle
ATTP	Attributive particle
BA	The marker for the object affected by the action
CM	Completion marker
COND	Condition
ENG	English
EXCL	Exclamation
MP	Modal particle
PP	Possessive particle
PSP	Progressive aspect particle
QP	Question particle