

Examining EFL Writing Through Tutor–Tutee Interactions and Revisions: A Case Study of an L2 Learner in Video-Mediated Online Tutorials

Mei-Hsing Tsai^{a*}, Wei-Ting Chang^b, and Ya-ting Chiang^c

^a National Taiwan University of Science and Technology, Taipei, Taiwan

^b Taiwan Sugar Corporation, Tainan, Taiwan

^c National Taiwan University of Science and Technology, Taipei, Taiwan

**Corresponding author: Mei-Hsing Tsai, National Taiwan University of Science and Technology, e-mail: mtsai@mail.ntust.edu.tw*

Article information	
Abstract	The present study examines tutor–tutee interactions between an L2 English-speaking tutor and an L2 English-speaking tutee over a series of six video-mediated online tutorials. We employed a case study approach and utilized Mackiewicz and Thompson’s (2018) coding scheme to analyze the tutor–tutee interactions during video-mediated online tutorials and the revisions made by the tutee to his writing drafts throughout the semester. The writing tasks included two primary writing assignments, i.e., a comparison essay and a cause-and-effect essay, supplemented by four short writing exercises. Guided by Yu’s (2020) analytical approach, the findings indicate that the tutor relied on instruction and cognitive scaffolding strategies rather than motivational scaffolding strategies during the video-mediated online tutoring sessions. Moreover, the tutor initially emphasized text-level issues, but his focus shifted to sentence-level concerns as the tutorials progressed. Similarly, the tutee incorporated more sentence-level revision suggestions than text-level suggestions into his subsequent drafts. The tutee’s decisions about text revisions were influenced by the complexity of the suggestions, as well as institutional and intrapersonal factors. Over time, the tutee demonstrated changes in the quality of his English writing. These findings offer insights into the dynamics of tutor–tutee interactions during video-mediated SCMC tutorials and the tutee’s text revisions across drafts in an EFL context.
Keywords	EFL writing, video-mediated SCMC writing tutorials, writing tutoring strategies, text revisions
APA citation:	Tsai, M., Chang, W., & Chiang, Y. (2026). Examining EFL writing through tutor–tutee interactions and revisions: A case study of an L2 learner in video-mediated online tutorials. <i>PASAA</i> , 74, 65–84.

1. Introduction

Previous studies have explored writing tutorials between L1 English-speaking tutors and L1/L2 English-speaking tutees on language learning and writing development during face-to-face communication in English-as-a-second-language (ESL) contexts (e.g., Eckstein, 2016; Williams, 2004; Yu, 2020). While their specific purposes and logistical arrangements differ substantially from one context to another, tutorials are generally distinct from traditional classroom education in terms of asymmetries, the number of participants, and the manner in which participants manage knowledge. Tutor feedback is crucial for developing writing skills, but its effectiveness varies (Northcott et al., 2016; Severino & Cogie, 2016).

Personalized, specific, and timely feedback can enhance writing quality and promote interaction (Yu, 2020). Tutees are more likely to implement revisions when they actively interact with their tutors and receive specific feedback (Goldstein & Conrad, 1990; Williams, 2004). Although there is increasing research on L2 English-speaking tutors and L2 English-speaking tutees during face-to-face encounters in English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) writing tutorials (e.g., Chang, 2013; Okuda, 2019; Yang & Sun, 2012), there is still a marked lack of studies that examine tutor–tutee interactions between L2 English-speaking tutors and L2 English-speaking tutees and the tutees’ subsequent revisions during synchronous computer-mediated communication (SCMC) tutorials in EFL settings. Such research is essential for several reasons: (1) SCMC modalities are increasingly integral to language teaching environments in today’s technology-focused world; (2) L2 online writing tutorials are becoming more common; and (3) different computer-mediated modes can uniquely influence interactions, offering diverse opportunities for L2 learning (Hsu, 2022; Storch, 2011). Analyzing L2 writing tutorials through video-mediated SCMC provides essential insights for L2 educators to refine online writing tutorial designs and further enhance L2 learners’ writing proficiency. Therefore, the purpose of this case study is to provide an in-depth examination of tutor–tutee interactions and revisions in a video-mediated L2 writing tutorial. This detailed level of analysis allows L2 practitioners to assess the applicability of the findings to similar online tutoring and EFL instructional contexts.

Drawing on a case study approach and Mackiewicz and Thompson’s (2018) coding scheme, this study analyzes interactions during video-mediated online tutoring sessions and across multiple drafts to explore the relationship among tutor–tutee interactions, revisions, and changes in writing drafts in an EFL context. Adapting Yu’s (2020) analytical approach, the current study is guided by the following three main research questions:

- 1) In what ways did the tutor modify his tutoring approach when tutoring a single tutee in a video-mediated online format, especially in the context of different writing tasks?
- 2) In what ways did the tutee incorporate the tutor’s advice from the video-mediated online tutoring sessions into his subsequent drafts?
- 3) What changes did the tutee demonstrate in the quality of his writing throughout the video-mediated online tutorials?

In the subsequent section, key research areas associated with this study are elaborated upon. A detailed overview of the data collection and analytical methods is presented next. We then present the findings, followed by the discussion and conclusion.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Discussion on Approaches to Writing Tutoring:

ESL and EFL Contexts

The strategies employed by L1 English-speaking tutors for assisting L2 English-speaking writers historically draw largely from North American writing center philosophy. This philosophy prioritized text-level aspects (e.g., organization and content) over sentence-level issues (e.g., grammar and vocabulary). It also encourages a cooperative, non-directive tutoring style (Gillespie & Lerner, 2000; Moussu, 2013; Severino, 2009; Severino & Cogie, 2016). Although initially formulated for L1 English-speaking writers, these guidelines have been applied to the unique needs of L2 writers (Blau & Hall, 2002; Harris & Silva, 1993; Myers, 2003; Powers, 1993; Thonus, 1993, 2004). Harris and Silva (1993) stated that tutors working with either L1 or L2 English-speaking writers should focus on rhetorical issues before sentence-level linguistic matters. Consistent with ESL writing center philosophy, Okuda (2019) found that L2 English-speaking tutors in an EFL writing center focused more on global (text-level) aspects than sentence-level issues. However, other studies indicated that L2 English-speaking tutors in face-to-face EFL contexts often address tutees' local (sentence-level) concerns (e.g., grammar and vocabulary) more frequently (Chen, 2010; Jones et al., 2006). A third perspective suggests that distinguishing between rhetorical and linguistic issues in ESL/EFL writing might not always be feasible since they can be interconnected. Specifically, basic language issues can affect rhetorical efficacy (Blau & Hall, 2002; Myers, 2003).

Different student populations have varying expectations and preferences about writing tutorials. Compared to both L1 English-speaking students and Generation 1.5 English-speaking students, L2 English-speaking students anticipated more language support in ESL writing centers (Eckstein, 2016). In EFL contexts, tutees seem to perceive writing tutors as English-language experts and prefer sentence-level revision suggestions. However, for content and organization, tutees rely more on their peers or instructors/advisers than their tutors for content-specific advice (e.g., Chen, 2010; Yang & Sun, 2012). Unlike ESL writing tutorials, which usually take place in English, EFL writing tutorials often use tutees' first language when tutors share the local L1. This approach is supported by several scholars who highlight the benefits of peer-to-peer English writing tutorials that integrate learners' mother tongues (e.g., Chang, 2013; Nakatake, 2014; Yang & Sun, 2012). L1-medium writing tutorials can increase active participation and meaning negotiation, and therefore they support tutees' subsequent revision processes. This assists immediate writing tasks and fosters autonomous writer development (Okuda, 2019).

Previous studies on tutor–tutee interactions and teacher–student writing conferences have employed Vygotskyian sociocultural theory to explore the dynamics of social interactions (e.g., Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994; Bleakney & Pittock, 2019; Mackiewicz & Thompson, 2018; Yeh, 2016; Yu, 2020; Zhang & Zhao, 2024). Vygotsky's concept of the zone of proximal development (ZPD) emphasizes the role of social interaction in cognitive development. When L2 learners receive mediation from more competent peers, they achieve higher levels of development than would be possible by their own efforts alone (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). In the context of L2 writing tutorials, the ZPD framework suggests that collaboration and a shared commitment to intellectual inquiry can enhance a tutee's writing skills by supporting their cognition, motivation, emotions, and identity (Mackiewicz & Thompson, 2018). Drawing on

Vygotsky's concept of ZPD, Mackiewicz and Thompson (2018) developed a well-established coding scheme to analyze U.S. writing center tutors' tutoring strategies. They indicated that instruction constituted 44% of the strategies used, followed by cognitive scaffolding (34%) and motivational scaffolding (22%). Zhang and Zhao (2024) showed a comparable pattern in Chinese EFL writing centers: instruction had the highest coverage of tutor talk (44.9%), followed by cognitive scaffolding (30.2%), tutorial management (6.9%), and motivational scaffolding (6.1%). Zhang and Zhao's percentages represented coverage-based measures calculated against the total tutorial volubility (i.e., tutor and student talk combined) rather than mutually exclusive categories; they did not sum to 100% because some utterances served multiple functions.

2.2 Asynchronous and Synchronous Computer-Mediated Communication Feedback on Text Revision

Computer-mediated communication feedback on ESL/EFL writing can be characterized as the information given in response to writing via digital means that illuminates for students their current learning status or performance (Lv et al., 2021). Asynchronous computer-mediated-communication (ACMC) feedback approaches may involve tracking changes in Microsoft Word documents or providing feedback using a course-management system (e.g., Canvas or Moodle). Synchronous computer-mediated-communication (SCMC) feedback methods involve instant text messaging, video-mediated online meetings, and even screensharing (Hyland & Hyland, 2019). Several studies have examined feedback on students' learning and text revision provided by teachers and tutors via computer-mediated communication. However, ACMC feedback has received more empirical scrutiny than SCMC feedback (e.g., Kourbani, 2018; Severino & Prim, 2015; Weirick et al., 2017). For example, Kourbani (2018) investigated the influence of tutors' ACMC feedback on tutees' text revisions in an EFL context. The findings indicated that the tutors' ACMC feedback was beneficial for text revisions, particularly regarding sentence-level issues. SCMC feedback has gained more attention since becoming a common practice in language learning. Compared to face-to-face tutoring sessions, SCMC feedback is beneficial for L2 learners due to its flexibility and accessibility (e.g., Muranova et al., 2023). Although SCMC feedback takes various forms such as the text-mediated chat format, and audio-mediated and video-mediated communication, previous research has primarily examined text-mediated SCMC feedback on student writers' text revisions (Ene & Upton, 2018; Muranova et al., 2023). Ene and Upton (2018) investigated the impact of text-mediated SCMC feedback and asynchronous online feedback provided by teachers on ESL learners' text revisions. The findings indicated that the two electronic modalities contributed to high levels of incorporation of instructor feedback in student writers' texts. In addition, the authors found that the use of text-based SCMC chats and the use of asynchronous Word comments could mutually supplement and strengthen each other, and that together, these two digital methods allowed an emphasis on text-level issues. More recently, Muranova et al. (2023) explored a single text-mediated SCMC writing tutoring session, which examined the different types and occurrences of tutoring strategies used by a writing tutor and the tutee's rate of incorporating the tutor's suggestions into their text revisions in an ESL setting. The results showed that the tutee integrated a limited number of the tutor's suggestions into the text. This partial revision was prompted by factors such as the overuse of indirect

suggestion strategies and the simultaneous addressing of multiple errors. In contrast, the employment of explicit suggestion strategies facilitated greater integration of the suggestions.

While these studies shed light on how ACMC and SCMC feedback affects ESL/EFL learners' text revisions, there is still a lack of understanding regarding how video-mediated SCMC feedback influences EFL student writers' subsequent drafts. Video-mediated SCMC sessions that incorporate multimodal features enhance interaction and enable participants to engage with each other simultaneously through various means such as audio, video, or text, or other distinct features (e.g., screensharing options). Recent advances in information technology and internet bandwidth have led to increased interest in video-mediated SCMC sessions among both L2 researchers and educators. Their utilization in L2 teaching and learning is increasing, and the research community's interest in exploring their use for L2 acquisition is growing (Yen et al., 2015). However, fewer empirical studies have addressed video-mediated SCMC tutorials in EFL contexts. In this study, we explore how a tutor varied his tutoring approach when tutoring a single tutee online, how the tutee incorporated the tutor's advice during video-mediated SCMC tutorials into his subsequent drafts, and the changes the tutee demonstrated in the quality of his writing.

3. Methodology

3.1 Context of the Study

The research was conducted during the fall 2022 semester and involved video-mediated online tutorials offered in conjunction with an intermediate English writing course for non-English majors provided by a large university in northern Taiwan. The course was taught by the first author and one teaching assistant. The course aimed to equip students with essential writing skills for effective participation in English writing activities. The writing tasks included two major writing assignments (i.e., a comparison essay and a cause-and-effect essay) and four short writing assignments. For the major writing assignments, students were required to write five-paragraph essays, including an introduction, three body paragraphs, and a conclusion. They received guidance on drafting the outlines of their essays during class sessions and were subsequently tasked with completing their first drafts. These assignments allowed students a degree of choice in their topics, with options including international travel, immigration, and the impact of technology on society. For each short writing assignment, students were given 30 minutes to work on an assigned writing topic and were encouraged to write as much as possible during class. They were subsequently required to revise their first draft into a second draft as a homework assignment. For the second draft, students needed to submit a structured essay, including at least an introduction, a body paragraph, and a conclusion, in which they could apply the rhetorical aspects they learned in class. The present study followed our institutional practices for minimal-risk educational research. Specifically, the tutee's participation in the study was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained prior to data collection. The tutor received compensation for providing tutorial support. All data were anonymized. The tutorials were offered as course-based instructional support and posed no more than minimal educational risk.

3.2 Participants

The tutor in this study, Chen-Lun Wang (pseudonym), was a third-year Taiwanese undergraduate student in the university's Department of Applied Foreign Languages. He had previous experience working as a part-time tutor in a language center at the university. As a part-time tutor, he had provided English consulting, Q&A sessions, speaking practice sessions, and writing classes. His English proficiency corresponded to the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) C1 level. Because his prior tutoring experience involved explicit explanation and direct guidance, he tended to adopt a more directive stance during the tutorials. The tutor participated in a 90-minute online training session held by one of the researchers (who is also the second author) to develop mediational strategies he could use in the online tutorials and to familiarize himself with the aims of the writing course. The training session included an introduction of Mackiewicz and Thompson's (2018) tutoring strategies, a discussion of five-paragraph essays (emphasizing the required components of each paragraph such as a thesis statement and topic sentences and the way to start and end an essay) and a practice activity. In addition, the tutor was compensated 300 NT dollars (approximately 10 USA dollars) per hour for his tutoring services. The tutee, De-Wei Lee (pseudonym), was a Taiwanese undergraduate student who was recruited from the intermediate English writing course. His English proficiency corresponded to a lower intermediate level (based on a course diagnosis assessment). He had limited academic writing skills and few opportunities for academic writing outside the classroom. Prior to beginning tutoring, De-Wei Lee had only taken general English classes taught by Chinese-speaking teachers. He also had limited experience with one-to-one writing tutorials and rarely received individualized feedback on English writing. He had not taken any courses specifically focused on academic writing, and thereby he volunteered to participate in the online tutorials to receive additional support.

3.3 Data Collection and Analysis

The study involved six video-mediated online tutoring sessions conducted over Skype, during which approximately seven hours of tutoring recordings were collected. The focus of the online tutorials was the academic writing needs of the tutee. The tutee posted his second drafts of the four short writing tasks and his first drafts of the two major writing tasks on Google Docs, and the tutor thoroughly reviewed the drafts before conducting video-mediated SCMC tutoring sessions. During the video-mediated online tutorials, the tutor usually shared his screen via Skype's screensharing function and discussed the revision suggestions he had made in Google Docs with the tutee. Afterwards, the tutee revised his drafts based on the tutor's advice. All the drafts discussed in the sessions, along with the subsequent drafts submitted for the writing course, were collected. Table 1 summarizes the essays discussed during the video-mediated SCMC tutoring sessions and the subsequent revisions. Semi-structured individual interviews were conducted with the tutor and tutee after the six video-mediated SCMC tutoring sessions. The teaching strategies and the perceived effectiveness of video-mediated online tutorials were discussed with the tutor. The tutee was interviewed about his reasons for accepting or rejecting the tutor's advice and overall perception of the tutorials.

Table 1*Drafts Discussed During Tutoring Sessions and Drafts Collected Afterward*

Video-mediated online tutoring	Draft discussed during tutorials	Draft collected Afterward
T 1	Draft 1 of comparison essay	Draft 2 of comparison essay
T 2	Draft 2 of short writing assignment 1	Draft 3 of short writing assignment 1
T 3	Draft 2 of short writing assignment 2	Draft 3 of short writing assignment 2
T 4	Draft 1 of cause-and-effect essay	Draft 2 of cause-and-effect essay
T 5	Draft 2 of short writing assignment 3	Draft 3 of short writing assignment 3
T 6	Draft 2 of short writing assignment 4	Draft 3 of short writing assignment 4

Note: T1 refers to the first online tutoring session.

Following Yu (2020), we identified problematicity episodes as the unit of analysis and coded them based on text-level, sentence-level, and convention issues, with a focus on the tutor's use of mediational strategies for Research Question 1. The coding scheme for analyzing the tutor's strategies was adapted from Mackiewicz and Thompson (2018). As shown in Table 2, three categories comprising 15 tutoring strategies were examined. The telling and suggesting strategies were combined due to the direct nature of the tutor's advice in the video-mediated online tutorials.

Table 2*Coding Scheme for Tutoring Strategies*

Category	Strategy
Instruction	Telling and suggesting Explaining and exemplifying
Cognitive Scaffolding	Pumping Reading aloud Responding as a reader or a listener Referring to a previous topic Forcing a choice Prompting Hinting Demonstrating
Motivational Scaffolding	Showing concern Praising Reinforcing the tutee's ownership and control Being optimistic or using humor Giving sympathy or empathy

For Research Questions 2 and 3, we followed Yu (2020) in examining the tutee's incorporation of the tutor's advice into subsequent drafts and analyzing changes in the tutee's writing quality across drafts, respectively. To establish the reliability and quality of the data

analysis procedures, a second rater (the third author), experienced in qualitative research and English writing instruction, was engaged. The categorization of problematicity episodes achieved a Cohen's kappa value of 0.920. The coding of the tutor's strategies was also reviewed by the second rater as part of the analytic process. The coding of the tutee's incorporation rate yielded a kappa value of 0.938, and the coding of changes in writing quality achieved 0.901. Any discrepancies across all coding categories were resolved through discussion.

To enhance the rigor of the analysis, we adopted several strategies. First, the study drew on naturally occurring, video-recorded tutoring interactions, which allowed close examination of participants' moment-by-moment actions. Second, all analytic claims were grounded in the recorded interactions and supported by multiple interactional episodes rather than isolated instances. Third, we applied a coding scheme adapted from prior research (Mackiewicz & Thompson, 2018) consistently across the dataset through iterative review. Taken together, these analytic procedures and the transparent presentation of the data contribute to the credibility and dependability of the findings within this case study.

4. Findings

4.1 Research Question 1: Tutor's Tutoring Strategies

4.1.1 Issues Identified in Video-Mediated Online Tutoring Sessions

The distribution of problematicity episodes during each tutoring session is presented in Table 3. The findings reveal that tutor-initiated episodes accounted for over 78.65% of the total episodes. The tutor focused primarily on text-level issues in the tutee's initial draft of the comparison essay during the first session (T1) before shifting towards sentence-level issues in subsequent sessions (T2–T6). This prioritization of global concerns, such as organization and content, over sentence-level issues could be due to the tutor's tutoring training, in which the learning goals of the intermediate English writing course were emphasized. English writing conventions received the least attention, with only one episode occurring in session T2. The frequency of tutor-initiated text-level issues decreased over the sessions, from 11 episodes in T1 to fewer than five episodes in the remaining sessions. This decline can be attributed to the tutee's growing familiarity with rhetorical requirements as the video-mediated online tutorials progressed. On the other hand, tutor-initiated problematicity episodes addressing sentence-level issues showed an increase over time. There were two episodes in the first two sessions (T1–T2) but 41 episodes in the subsequent four sessions (T3–T6). This shift in focus from macro-level to micro-level issues was influenced by the tutee's progress on the text-level issues and the tutor's realization that linguistic errors could affect the content and logic of the text. The tutor provided guidance on grammar, word choice, and the avoidance of repetitive language. In his interview, the tutor mentioned that the tutee's writing drafts occasionally lacked clarity, which made it difficult to grasp the intended message.

Table 3*Distribution of Problematicity Episodes Across Tutoring Sessions*

	T 1	T 2	T 3	T 4	T 5	T 6	
	Comp	SW 1	SW 2	C&E	SW 3	SW 4	Total
Text-level	13	6	4	5	3	5	36
Tutor initiated	11	5	4	1	1	4	26
Tutee initiated	2	1	0	4	2	1	10
Sentence-level	0	2	11	14	14	11	52
Tutor initiated	0	2	10	12	12	7	43
Tutee initiated	0	0	1	2	2	4	9
Convention level	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Tutor initiated	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Tutee initiated	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Note: Comp denotes the comparison essay. SW1 stands for the first short writing assignment, and C&E indicates the cause-and-effect essay.

4.1.2 Tutoring Strategies Employed During Tutorials

Table 4 demonstrates the distribution of tutoring strategies employed during online tutoring sessions. Instruction was the most frequently used form of assistance, accounting for 52.80% (179) instances. Cognitive scaffolding was employed in 33.04% (112) instances, while motivational scaffolding was used in 14.16% (48) instances.

Table 4*Distribution of Tutoring Strategies Across Tutoring Sessions*

	T 1	T 2	T 3	T 4	T 5	T 6	
	Comp	SW 1	SW 2	C&E	SW 3	SW 4	Total
Instruction	30	30	28	33	26	32	179
Telling and suggesting	21	23	18	22	20	19	123
Explaining and exemplifying	9	7	10	11	6	13	56
Cognitive Scaffolding	16	21	11	17	20	27	112
Pumping	3	2	0	7	4	8	24
Reading aloud	1	0	1	1	2	7	12
Responding as a reader or a listener	4	4	4	0	6	2	20
Referring to a previous topic	4	6	0	3	2	1	16
Forcing a Choice	0	0	0	2	2	0	4
Prompting	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hinting	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Demonstrating	4	9	6	4	4	8	35

Motivational Scaffolding	8	4	15	9	6	6	48
Showing concern	2	2	2	1	2	3	12
Praising	4	2	7	4	2	1	20
Reinforcing student's ownership and control	2	0	5	4	2	2	15
Being optimistic or using humor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Giving sympathy or empathy	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

In the analyzed tutor–tutee interactions, the tutor demonstrated a preference for employing instruction strategies to address issues and provide suggestions for improvement. An example of such strategies can be seen in Excerpt 1, in which the tutor and tutee discussed one of the topic sentences in the tutee's initial draft of the comparison essay (T1).

Excerpt 1

- 1 tutor: 你這邊有講到這個非同步跟同步的線上教學方式, 但是他們都是屬於線上教學
 (tr: you mentioned the asynchronous and synchronous online teaching methods, but
 they both fall under the category of online teaching)
- 2 所以我覺得這邊的話你可以, 可能可以先選一種就好,
 (tr: so I think here, you could maybe just choose one,)
- 3 因為我們這篇重點的是比較線上跟實體兩個東西,
 (tr: because the focus of our paper is on comparing online and in-person learning,)
- 4 對, 那這樣的話會變得好像說你, 嗯, 線上的這個部分你又再
 (tr: yes, in that case, it would seem like you are, um, revisiting the online aspect again)
- 5 tutee: 又把它再
 (tr: bringing it up again)
- 6 tutor: 更細分又比較兩種, 對對對, 這樣可能會太細.
 (tr: further subdividing and comparing the two types of online learning, yes, yes, this
 might be too detailed)
- 7 tutee: 好
 (tr: okay)
- 8 tutor: 所以我覺得這樣的話, 因為, 到後面你都會有講到說, 我看一下
 (tr: so I think in this case, because later on, you will also mention, let me take a
 look)
- 9 tutee: 後面好像都是以那個非同步的教學為主
 (tr: it seems like the latter part mainly focuses on asynchronous teaching)

The tutor's feedback in this conversation exemplifies the use of instructional strategies, including telling, suggesting, and explaining. In the original draft of the comparison and contrast essay (T1), the tutee explained two online teaching methods (i.e., recorded videos and live online classes) used by his professor as the topic sentence of the second paragraph. However, the focus of the assigned essay should be on the differences between online learning and in-person learning. Rather than expecting the tutee to identify the issue with the topic sentence independently, the tutor suggested choosing one type of online teaching method (line 2) and then further explained the rationale behind the potential change (lines 3–6). As a result of receiving this instructional feedback, the tutee successfully revised the topic sentence to address the differences between online and in-person learning, specifically highlighting the convenience of reviewing.

In terms of cognitive scaffolding, the tutor frequently adopted the demonstrating strategy to guide the tutee on specific tasks or issues. An example of this can be seen in T6, in which the tutee asked about the appropriate usage of the preposition “against.” In response, the tutor provided examples of sentences incorporating “against” and shared a helpful online dictionary to offer a comprehensive definition. This demonstration aided the tutee in understanding and applying the concept, supporting his language development and problem-solving skills. Additionally, in the context of motivational scaffolding, the tutor occasionally expressed praise for the tutee. This praise was given when the tutee had done exceptional writing or was actively participating in the online tutoring sessions. For instance, in T1, the tutor commended the tutee for writing an excellent hook in the introduction. Similarly, in T3, the tutor acknowledged the tutee's correct response to a question. These instances of praise served to motivate and encourage the tutee and thereby created a positive learning environment.

The tutor's overall tutoring strategies for providing writing assistance remained consistent across specific writing tasks. It is important to note that the tutor posed many thought-provoking questions, such as how to connect sentences or enhance paragraph flow in T4-T6. This prompted the tutee to expand upon his written work, which led to more substantial discussions than in previous sessions, where the tutee's contributions were limited. Specifically, employing more pumping strategies (19 times) can be attributed to the tutee's limited understanding of how to effectively write a cause-and-effect essay and construct logical arguments. Recognizing this knowledge gap, the tutor adjusted his approach by incorporating more probing questions to facilitate the tutee's comprehension of cause-and-effect relationships and the development of coherent arguments. As a result, in the cause-and-effect essay session (T4), the tutee demonstrated an enhanced ability to discuss the implications of electric vehicles, such as electricity consumption and noise pollution mitigation. Subsequently, during the sessions focused on short writing assignments 3 and 4 (T5–T6), the tutee exhibited improved proficiency in articulating the effects of climate change on renewable energy sources such as solar power and hydropower. Additionally, the tutee presented a more coherent discussion of the reasons for prioritizing industrial progress over environmental preservation, citing factors such as human evolution and the desire for convenience.

4.2 Research Question 2: Tutee's Incorporation of Tutor Feedback

Table 5 shows that the incorporation rate for writing convention suggestions was 100%, followed by sentence-level suggestions at 93.33% and text-level suggestions at 81.82%. The high rates of incorporation (> 80%) could be attributed to the possibility that the tutee regarded

the tutor as an expert, and might have applied the suggestions knowing that his major writing assignments would be evaluated by the instructor, and the teaching assistant would grade the third drafts of his short writing assignments, as noted by Dressler et al. (2019). Additionally, suggestions on sentence-level issues and writing conventions were more likely to be incorporated into revised drafts than text-level suggestions.

Table 5

Suggestions for Change and Incorporation into Revisions

	T 1	T 2	T 3	T 4	T 5	T 6	
	Comp	SW 1	SW 2	C&E	SW 3	SW 4	Total
Text-level	11	6	4	4	3	5	33
Incorporated	8	5	4	3	3	4	27 (81.82%)
Not incorporated	3	1	0	1	0	1	6 (18.18%)
Sentence-level	0	0	10	14	12	9	45
Incorporated	0	0	9	13	12	8	42 (93.33%)
Not incorporated	0	0	1	1	0	1	3 (6.67%)
Convention-level	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Incorporated	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 (100.00%)
Not incorporated	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 (0.00%)

The post-data collection interview with the tutee revealed reasons for the lower incorporation rate for text-level suggestions. First, the tutee found that focusing on modifying individual sentences was more manageable than making substantial changes at the text level. The complex nature of some text-level suggestions posed challenges for the tutee to implement them effectively. For example, the tutor advised the tutee to provide more concrete examples or statistical data to strengthen his arguments in the body paragraphs of SW1 (T2) and SW4 (T6). Due to the complexity of these revision suggestions, which required detailed explanation and analysis, the tutee was hesitant to make significant changes. These observations highlight the difficulties that the tutee encountered in fully integrating the tutor's recommendations, especially at the text level, and emphasize the need for the tutor to provide more comprehensive support during writing tutorials. Second, the requirements for the tasks prevented the tutee from revising his writing. Specifically, to promote textual coherence, the tutor instructed the tutee to eliminate redundant or unnecessary sentences in the comparison essay (T1) and the cause-and-effect essay (T4). However, the tutee explained that these sentences were not removed to meet the word count requirements of the assignments. The variation in the incorporation rate for sentence-level suggestions can be attributed to the tutee's desire to maintain his writing style and make selective changes based on personal preferences. Despite the tutor assuming the dominant position in most instances, the tutee displayed occasional authorial agency by resisting his tutor's recommendations. For instance, in the session on short writing assignment 4 (T6), the tutor proposed the term "drain" as an alternative word for resource depletion and clarified the distinction between "drain" and "overuse [over usage]." Despite this guidance, the tutee decided to maintain the original wording and thus demonstrated that the tutee maintained the autonomy necessary to make final decisions.

The data collected from the interactions between the tutor and tutee indicate that the tutee did not always implement all of the tutor's feedback immediately in subsequent drafts. However, there is evidence suggesting that the tutee incorporated the feedback into later writing tasks, demonstrating the nonlinear and recursive nature of his writing process. For example, in T1, the tutor suggested adding a transitional phrase before a topic sentence in the comparison essay, but the tutee did not include it in the revised draft. However, in subsequent writing tasks such as short writing assignments 2, 3, and 4 and the cause-and-effect essay, the tutee did incorporate transitional phrases before topic sentences. The nonlinear and recursive nature of the tutee's writing process allowed him to revisit and revise his work based on the feedback received from the tutor. It suggests that the tutee considered the tutor's suggestions over time and incorporated them into later drafts, indicating a learning and growth trajectory in his writing skills.

4.3 Research Question 3: Tutee's Changes in Writing Quality

The primary learning objective of the intermediate English writing course for non-English majors described in the current study was to help students develop rhetorical aspects of writing skills in English. This entails developing a thorough understanding of how to organize an essay, compose an effective introduction, and create coherent body paragraphs and a conclusion. To track the changes in the tutee's writing quality of the tutee enrolled in this course, the researchers focused on text-level issues throughout the six writing assignments. In Table 6, the primary issues in each draft discussed by the tutor and tutee during tutorials are presented, together with the corresponding changes found in the tutee's texts. We assessed text quality both within a single task and between different tasks. Table 6 reveals that the tutor's feedback covered multiple areas, including introductions, body paragraphs, thesis statements, topic sentences, and supporting details. The tutee demonstrated a commitment to improvement by revising drafts and incorporating feedback. Consequently, he has improved his writing skills and produced better-quality essays. Examples of progress include improving the introduction and body paragraphs, rectifying unbalanced comparisons, and using transitional phrases and sentences to enhance writing flow. Notable changes were also observed in the tutee's ability to formulate thesis statements and topic sentences across different tasks. For instance, compared to draft 1 of the comparison essay, its subsequent draft and draft 1 of the cause-and-effect essay showed changes regarding the inclusion of thesis statements and topic sentences. In the short writing assignments, the tutee demonstrated clear progress in developing thesis statements. While the second draft of short writing assignment 1 lacked a thesis statement, subsequent drafts of short writing assignments 2, 3, and 4 included thesis statements and, in the cases of the final two assignments, showed changes in articulation. Moreover, compared to draft 2 of short writing assignment 1, the earlier versions of short writing assignments 3 and 4 exhibit better introductions and more fully developed body paragraphs. However, during the last two online tutorials, the tutor noticed that the tutee still needed to improve crucial aspects of his writing at the text level. Problems included insufficient or irrelevant supporting examples, a lack of cohesion between paragraphs, an underdeveloped conclusion, and poor writing flow.

Table 6*Changes in Text Quality (Text Level)*

Writing Tasks	Major Problems Discussed in Tutorials	Areas of Changes in the Tutee's Texts
Draft 1 of Comp	Underdeveloped introduction Underdeveloped body paragraphs Absent thesis statement Absent topic sentences Weak supporting examples	
Draft 2 of Comp		(Compared with Draft 1 of Comp) Improved introduction Improved body paragraphs Added thesis statement Added topic sentences Stronger supporting examples
Draft 2 of SW1	Underdeveloped introduction Absent thesis statement Unclear topic sentence Unbalanced comparison points Lack of objectivity Incoherence in paragraphs	
Draft 3 of SW1		(Compared with Draft 2 of SW1) Improved introduction Added thesis statement Clearer topic sentence Improved comparison points Avoided subjective tone Improved coherence in paragraph
Draft 2 of SW2	Inconsistent narrative perspective Poor flow	(Compared with Draft 2 of SW1) Present thesis statement Clearer topic sentences Better organization of body paragraphs
Draft 3 of SW2		(Compared with Draft 2 of SW2) Consistent narrative perspective Improved the flow
Draft 1 of C/E	Undeveloped body paragraphs Insufficient supporting detail of one example	(Compared with Draft 1 of Comp) Present thesis statement Present topic sentences

Draft 2 of C/E		(Compared with Draft 1 of C/E) Improved body paragraphs Added supporting detail of one example
Draft 2 of SW3	Insufficient supporting detail of one example Lack of cohesion between paragraphs Undeveloped conclusion	(Compared with Draft 2 of SW1) Better introduction Present and articulated thesis statement Clearer topic sentences Better organization of body paragraphs
Draft 3 of SW3		(Compared with Draft 2 of SW3) Added supporting detail of one example Added transition between paragraphs Improved conclusion
Draft 2 of SW4	Poor flow Off-topic detail in one body paragraph	(Compared with Draft 2 of SW1) Better introduction Present and articulated thesis statement Clearer topic sentences Better organization of body paragraphs
Draft 3 of SW4		(Compared with Draft 2 of SW4) Improved the flow Reconstructed and improved body paragraph

5. Discussion and Conclusion

This research contributes to the knowledge of L2 writing tutorials and text revision by examining six video-mediated SCMC tutoring sessions and a tutee's multiple drafts in an EFL context. Research question 1 explored how the writing task influenced tutor-identified problematicity episodes and the feedback strategies employed. Our analysis reveals that task type did not significantly affect strategies or problem identification. The tutor initially focused on content-related issues before shifting to linguistic problems. The tutor's prioritization of global concerns over sentence-level issues is consistent with ESL/EFL writing center philosophy (Gillespie & Lerner, 2000; Okuda, 2019). In post-data interviews, the tutee noted that the guidance was useful in improving writing proficiency, particularly content and structure. This differs from previous findings suggesting EFL students prefer feedback on grammar and lexical errors (e.g., Chen, 2010; Yang & Sun, 2012). This tutee's preference may reflect the course goals and his perceived weaknesses in logical organization. Our particular tutee's preference may have been influenced by the writing course's goals and his own perception of his weaknesses in logical organization. Consistent with Mackiewicz and

Thompson (2018) and Zhang and Zhao (2024), who found instruction to be the most common tutoring strategy, our analysis likewise shows that the tutor's strategies were primarily instruction-based (52.8%). The tutor acknowledged his tendency towards instruction strategies and justified them by stating that he preferred to address problems as they arose to maintain the clarity of his explanation. It appears that the decision to provide feedback was contingent on his comprehension of the tutee's intended meaning and the need to establish mutual understanding before resolving issues. In our findings, tutor-initiated problematicity episodes accounted for over 78.65% of the total, which indicates tutor-led interactions. This, combined with the primary use of more explicit strategies (i.e., telling and suggesting; explaining and exemplifying), highlights the positive role of instruction in problematicity episodes. From a sociocultural and contextual perspective, these tutor-led and explicit interactional patterns may relate to the institutional arrangements and role expectations in this course. These include tutoring positioned as instructional support, the tutor's responsibility for diagnosing problems, and the tutee's expectation for clear guidance. Therefore, our study supports Zhang and Zhao's (2024) argument that a tutor's teacher-like presence is crucial for mediation in EFL settings, particularly when learners lack the linguistic or rhetorical concepts needed to discuss their writing.

Regarding the second research question on suggestion uptake, this study identifies a connection between tutor–tutee interactions and the subsequent drafts produced by a tutee. The tutee's subsequent texts consistently reflected issues discussed during tutoring. Furthermore, suggestion complexity, task requirements, and tutee agency influenced the uptake of the tutor's advice. Our analysis shows a relatively higher uptake rate than previously observed in text-mediated SCMC formats (Ene & Upton, 2018). This likely results from video-mediated SCMC, which offers multimodal communication (visual/auditory cues, screen sharing) and improves engagement and understanding. However, this observation is based on one tutor–tutee pair's interactions and revisions. As a qualitative case study, it provides a detailed analysis via the established coding scheme. These details allow L2 educators to evaluate the applicability of the findings to similar video-mediated SCMC tutoring and EFL contexts. Future studies should include additional pairs and settings to examine if similar patterns emerge and strengthen transferability. For Research Question 3, the tutee's quality demonstrated rhetorical shifts in response to the tutor's feedback. However, challenges with text-level issues like writing flow and supporting details persisted. Throughout the semester, the tutee progressed in areas such as reducing text-level issues, incorporating feedback, and revising drafts, yet struggled with others. This aligns with Vygotsky's nonlinear view of learner development (Lantolf & Aljaafreh, 1995; Lantolf et al., 2016, Vygotsky, 1978). In other words, the tutee's diverse writing experiences support the idea that learning is a complex process of unique progressions and setbacks.

Several pedagogical implications for EFL online writing tutorials can be drawn. First, tutor training should provide guidelines on arranging tutoring sessions effectively to cover both global and local concerns as needed. For L2 learners unfamiliar with English writing organization, prioritizing text-level over sentence-level issues is crucial. This aligns with the philosophy of many ESL/EFL writing center philosophy and supports writing development (e.g., Okuda, 2019; Purdue Writing Lab, 2021). For more complex text-level revisions, tutors can provide comprehensive guidance and resources to help tutees address global concerns more efficiently. The ultimate goal, beyond addressing immediate writing concerns, is to foster the

tutee's long-term ability to think critically and revise independently (e.g., Mackiewicz & Thompson, 2018; Yu, 2020). Therefore, although instruction-based strategies promote clarity, it would be beneficial for tutors to adjust strategies to allow tutees more opportunities to reassess their linguistic and rhetorical choices before highlighting concerns. This grants them greater autonomy in proposing their own solutions. With consistent guidance, the tutee develops independent revision skills over time. At the same time, these pedagogical implications should be interpreted with caution. In online video tutorials, non-verbal cues such as eye gaze, gesture, and embodiment are relatively constrained. This may influence mediation and meaning negotiation. Additionally, technological factors (e.g., screen-sharing constraints, occasional latency, audio disruptions) may affect the pacing of interaction and tutor–tutee collaboration.

This study represents an early application of Mackiewicz and Thompson's (2018) coding scheme to analyze an L2 English-speaking tutor's strategies in video-mediated SCMC writing tutorials and to examine the students' incorporation of the tutor's suggestions in an EFL context. Results indicate that EFL online tutorials benefit the learning of L2 students' English writing. As Lee (2022) highlighted, CMC feedback plays a key role in promoting L2 writing development in a post-COVID era. Future research could examine how different types of online writing tutorials (e.g., text-mediated and video-mediated tutoring) affect tutor–tutee interactions, revision suggestions, and text revisions. Including larger and more diverse participants would provide insights to help L2 instructors enhance SCMC tutoring and improve the learning of English writing.

6. About the Authors

Mei-Hsing Tsai received her Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics from the Pennsylvania State University. She is an assistant professor of the Department of Applied Foreign Languages at National Taiwan University of Science and Technology. Her research interests include sociocultural theory, second language acquisition, online writing tutorials, multilingualism, and conversation analysis.

Wei-Ting Chang received his master's degree in Applied Foreign Languages from the National Taiwan University of Science and Technology. Currently, he is employed as a staff member at Taiwan Sugar Corporation.

Ya-ting Chiang received her master's degree in Applied Linguistics from the University of Edinburgh. She is an adjunct lecturer at the Language Center of National Taiwan University of Science and Technology. Her research interests include sociolinguistics, intercultural communication, and second language writing.

7. Declaration of AI Use

The authors used QuillBot and ChatGPT to assist in improving the language and readability of this manuscript. However, they carefully reviewed and revised the final text as needed and take full responsibility for the content.

8. References

- Aljaafreh, A., & Lantolf, J. P. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zone of proximal development. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(4), 465–483.

- Blau, S., & Hall, J. (2002). Guilt-free tutoring: Rethinking how we tutor non-native-English-speaking students. *Writing Center Journal*, 23(1), 23–44.
- Bleakney, J., & Pittock, S. P. (2019). Tutor talk: Do tutors scaffold students' revisions? *Writing Center Journal*, 37(2), 127–160.
- Chang, T.-S. (2013). The idea of a writing center in Asian countries: A preliminary search of models in Taiwan. *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, 10(2), 1–9.
- Chen, C. W.-y. (2010). Graduate students' self-reported perspectives regarding peer feedback and feedback from writing consultants. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 11(2), 151–158.
- Dressler, R., Chu, M.-W., Crossman, K., & Hilman, B. (2019). Quantity and quality of uptake: Examining surface and meaning level feedback provided by peers and an instructor in a graduate research course. *Assessing Writing*, 39(1), 14–24.
- Eckstein, G. (2016). Grammar correction in the writing centre: Expectations and experiences of monolingual and multilingual writers. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 72(3), 360–382.
- Ene, E., & Upton, T. A. (2018). Synchronous and asynchronous teacher electronic feedback and learner uptake in ESL composition. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 41, 1–13.
- Gillespie, P., & Lerner, N. (2000). *The Allyn and Bacon guide to peer tutoring*. Allyn and Bacon.
- Goldstein, L. M., & Conrad, S. M. (1990). Student input and negotiation of meaning in ESL writing conferences. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24(3), 443–460.
- Harris, M., & Silva, T. (1993). Tutoring ESL students: Issues and options. *College Composition and Communication*, 44(4), 525–537.
- Hsu, H.-C. (2022). Peer interaction and attention to form in web-based synchronous and asynchronous L2 collaborative writing. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 37(7), 1602–1631.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2019). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*. Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, R. H., Garraalda, A., Li, D. C. S., & Lock, G. (2006). Interactional dynamics in on-line and face-to-face peer-tutoring sessions for second language writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15(1), 1–23.
- Kourbani, V. (2018). Writing center asynchronous/synchronous online feedback: The relationship between e-feedback and its impact on student satisfaction, learning, and textual revision. In R. Rice & K. S. Amant (Eds.), *Thinking globally, composing locally: Rethinking online writing in the age of the global Internet* (pp. 233–256). Utah State University Press.
- Lantolf, J., & Aljaafreh, A. (1995). Second language learning in the zone of proximal development: A revolutionary experience. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 23(7), 619–632.
- Lantolf, J. P., Kurtz, L., & Kisselev, O. (2016). Understanding the revolutionary character of L2 development i Kurtz,n the ZPD: Why levels of mediation matter. *Language and Sociocultural Theory*, 3(2), 153–171.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and genesis of second language development*. Oxford University Press.

- Lee, I. (2022). Developments in classroom-based research on L2 writing. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 12(4), 551–574.
<https://doi.org/10.14746/ssl.2022.12.4.2>
- Lv, X., Ren, W., & Xie, Y. (2021). The effects of online feedback on ESL/EFL writing: A meta-analysis. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 30(6), 643–653.
- Mackiewicz, J., & Thompson, I. (2018). *Talk about writing: The tutoring strategies of experienced writing center tutors*. Routledge.
- Moussu, L. (2013). Let's talk! ESL students' needs and writing centre philosophy. *TESL Canada Journal*, 30(2), 55–68.
- Muranova, O., Koltovskaia, S., & Miller, M. (2023). A case study on the uptake of suggestions in online synchronous writing center sessions. *TESL-EJ*, 26(4), 1–20.
- Myers, S. A. (2003). Reassessing the “proofreading trap”: ESL tutoring and writing instruction. *Writing Center Journal*, 24(1), 51–70.
- Nakatake, M. (2014). Tutor feedback and student revision in an EFL writing Center. *JACET-Kanto Journal*, 1, 36–50.
- Northcott, J., Gillies, P., & Caulton, D. D. (2016). What postgraduates appreciate in online tutor feedback on academic writing. *Journal of Academic Writing*, 6(1), 145–161.
- Okuda, T. (2019). Student perceptions of non-native English speaking tutors at a writing center in Japan. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 44, 13–22.
- Powers, J. K. (1993). Rethinking writing center conferencing strategies for the ESL writer. *The Writing Center Journal*, 13(2), 39–47.
- Purdue Writing Lab. (2021). Working with multilingual student writers. Purdue e-Pubs.
<https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/writinglabcm/4>
- Severino, C. (2009). Avoiding appropriation. In S. Bruce & B. Rafoth (Eds.), *ESL writers: A guide for writing center tutors* (pp. 51–65). Heinemann Boynton/Cook.
- Severino, C., & Cogie, J. (2016). Writing centers and second and foreign language writers. In R. M. Manchón & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *Handbook of second and foreign language writing* (pp. 453–471). De Gruyter.
- Severino, C., & Prim, S.-N. (2015). Word choice errors in Chinese students' English writing and how online writing center tutors respond to them. *Writing Center Journal*, 34(2), 115–143.
- Storch, N. (2011). Collaborative writing in L2 contexts: Processes, outcomes, and future directions. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 275–288.
- Thonus, T. (1993). Tutors as teachers: Assisting ESL/EFL students in the writing center. *Writing Center Journal*, 13(2), 13–26.
- Thonus, T. (2004). What are the differences?: Tutor interactions with first-and second-language writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(3), 227–242.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Weirick, J., Davis, T., & Lawson, D. (2017). Writer L1/L2 status and asynchronous online writing center feedback: Consultant response patterns. *Learning Assistance Review*, 22(2), 9–38.
- Williams, J. (2004). Tutoring and revision: Second language writers in the writing center. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(3), 173–201.

- Yang, F.-Y., & Sun, Y.-C. (2012). The use of a writing center by non-native academic writers: A case study in Taiwan. *Taiwan Journal of TESOL*, 9(1), 1–26.
- Yeh, C.-C. (2016). EFL college students' experiences and attitudes towards teacher-student writing conferences. *Journal of Response to Writing*, 2(2), 37–65.
- Yen, Y.-C., Hou, H.-T., & Chang, K. E. (2015). Applying role-playing strategy to enhance learners' writing and speaking skills in EFL courses using Facebook and Skype as learning tools: A case study in Taiwan. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 28(5), 383–406.
- Yu, L. (2020). Investigating L2 writing through tutor-tutee interactions and revisions: A case study of a multilingual writer in EAP tutorials. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 48, 100709.
- Zhang, J., & Zhao, Y. (2024). Talking about writing in China: Examining tutor-writer interaction during individualized writing center tutorials at Chinese universities. *Linguistics and Education*, 81, 101310.