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ABSTRACT

School and university classrooms remain the standard around the world for second language instruction. However, over the past 20 years various methods of language learning have permeated the educational landscape to include self-study textbooks, language learning software and online teachers. Some models are evidence based while others lack scientific validation. One emerging model created by educators is that of autonomous learning and through it Advising in Language Learning (ALL). ALL offers learners access to language advisors supported by a paradigm designed to help students become independent and self-directed. ALL boasts a strong research base focused on methods and strategies of advising. However, only one study suggests a model for the language advising session based on analysis of in-session discourse.

This discourse analytic study of ALL investigates verbal discourse data from advising sessions at one Japanese university. The purpose of this study is to identify how language advisors enact language advising. This study analyzes data from recordings of advising sessions with two experienced advisors and five students. In these audio-recorded advising sessions, students spoke one-on-one with advisors about their learning practices and study plans. All sessions were transcribed, coded and organized into themes. Data were first analyzed through close analysis of structure and discursive strategy with special focus on (1) discourse markers which advisors used to control flow and (2) how advisors gleaned information from students then used that information to guide reflection and planning. Theoretical lenses from sociocultural and frame semantics were then used to interpret results of the discourse analysis. Three major themes that emerged from these data were (1) gleaning information, (2) supporting, guiding, and reframing, (3) teaching and prompting.

Analysis revealed an underlying structure to the advising sessions of the two participant advisors despite differences in circumstances and approaches. Furthermore,
results not only illustrated what transpires in advising sessions but how they are orchestrated by advisors. This investigation supplements literature supporting the theoretical and evidence base of advising in language learning. Although more research is warranted, ALL is a promising approach that may help students reframe learning goals while providing necessary tools for self-regulation of language learning.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

“Yes. Of course, human always forget something, so I have to review, but my reviewing time is not enough, so, so… my studying is awful for me.” -Ai

“Just as I mentioned, I started to put my motivation at the first part, which also improved, so it makes me feel like I'm not chased by the time management, chasing the time management, chasing the deadline.” -Risa

1.1 Background

Effective language learning requires more than memorization and practice. In addition to absorbing new words and experimenting with grammatical forms, language learning requires persistence and personal growth. Learning a language is a struggle. Part of that conflict comes from new ideas, concepts and ways of thinking that are crucial to understanding another language. These issues, as they apply to new ideas from other languages, are what Agar (1994) calls cultural rich points and through them (grappling with them) students learn more about the language and culture that they are studying. However, in addition to new cultural concepts, there is often a struggle with the activity of study itself. The quote above by Ai encapsulates the feelings many students have towards learning a language: an arduous contest against oneself, trying to follow (what they have been taught) are good study habits but feeling they lack the ability, energy, or time: “my studying is awful for me.” The constant effort is draining and, without support, can turn many away from language study.

However, the endeavor to learn a language can also be rewarding. This reward goes beyond mastery of sentence forms and grammatical patterns, even beyond communication in the new language. The reward can be a deeper understanding of oneself as a learner and as a person, uncovering new ways of seeing the world and illuminating previously unquestioned conceptions. The struggle to learn can reveal the causes of stress and sources of motivation,
as it did for Risa in her enthusiastic pronouncement that she no longer felt “chased” by time management. Although some struggles and discoveries are ubiquitous, many are unique to the individual. Personalized support to overcome obstacles and achieve goals can be invaluable in both language acquisition and in life.

Language learning takes various forms and can be approached in different ways by learners. The traditional classroom and face-to-face teacher are now supplemented by (or compete with) do-it-yourself learning in the form of textbooks, online videos, computer software and smartphone applications. These resources are helpful to those that wish to supplement traditional classes, looking for extended practice or new material to meet individual needs. Moreover, the variety of choices and ease of access to software such as Duolingo appear to offer personalized learning, even for those lacking the time or money to take language classes.

However, learning a language is difficult. Many who download free dictionaries and applications with the intention to teach themselves fall short of success. Without motivation (whether that be in positive feedback or achieving a top score) guidance (in the form of what to study when, and how) and evaluation (through tests or presentations), students float rudderless in the vast ocean of language. Teachers, tutors and language classes can offer the motivation, guidance, and means of evaluation needed to help students succeed. Although phone apps and YouTube lessons may be convenient, they lack the hands-on guidance of expert teachers. Properly trained and experience language teachers offer the wind and direction to keep dedicated students on course.

The issue then, is how students find skillful teachers. Accomplishing this task can vary depending on where a potential student lives, and the time and money they can dedicate to language classes. Modern technology has made this easier with classes available online. This option makes the classroom more accessible to those with the means to pay but not the
time or ability to attend physical classes on a set schedule. Depending on the source of classes, flexible scheduling (as with the *eikaiwa* language schools in Japan) can allow busy individuals like working professionals to benefit from a teacher’s guidance.

Another option is Advising in Language Learning (ALL) or language advising. Although advisors approach learning from a different perspective than teachers, the individualized environment retains the role of the expert (most advisors are also language teachers) which is vital to efficient learning (Morrison & Navarro, 2012). Often associated with *Self-access Learning Centers* (SALC), language advisors offer a middle ground, connecting self-study to teacher guided study. ALL is designed to harness expert guidance toward helping students to become more “autonomous learners,” to become more adept at planning, assessing, and motivating themselves.

Language advising is an approach to language learning that focuses on the improvement of students’ organization and control of study habits. Though the eventual goal is language acquisition, the stated goal of language advising is to help students become better learners or to “promote learner autonomy” (Carson & Mynard, 2012, p. 13). There is much debate surrounding the idea of learner autonomy that will be covered in Chapter 2. However, it is important to note two elements with respect to ALL: (1) that language acquisition comes as a secondary goal, a consequence or result of successful study and (2) that language advisors support and guide students in some of the same ways teachers do and in other ways that teachers do not.

Language advising may be in a unique position to address many of the non-language related challenges of language learning. Such challenges are often individualized requiring personalized guidance and support to bolster perseverance and to thrive. Language advising is not a replacement for the language classroom or language teacher. Instead, it supplements them and is most effective when strategically blended.
1.2 Purpose of study

The purpose of this study is to reveal what trained advisors do in language advising sessions. Advising has the potential to provide specialized support for individual learners in one-on-one meetings. However, there has been little research into how guidance and support is accomplished in the moment-to-moment interactions of these sessions. Through analysis of session dialogue, this study seeks to describe the actions of advisors who attempt to guide and support student understanding of language learning by improving their ability to plan and study. This dissertation explores what methods advisors employ that are unique to the advising setting, as well as how language advising is enacted and how it accomplishes the goal of helping students become “autonomous.” This has led to three research questions:

1. What is Advising in Language Learning (ALL) and what is unique about it?
2. What is a successful advising session? How do advisors work to make sessions successful?
3. How do language advisors work? Dialogically, how do they enact advising?

To answer these questions, I draw on discourse analysis (Gee, 2018; Strauss & Feiz, 2014) to analyze codify and organize data from language advising sessions at a Japanese university. Recordings were collected from two experienced advisors in multiple sessions with five undergraduate students. All data were transcribed, coded, categorized and organized into themes to reveal how language advisors work.

While various studies in ALL over the last twenty years have used discourse analysis for post-session interview data (Gremmo, 2009; Mozzon-McPherson, 2007; McCarthy, 2012) minimal research has been published based on session dialogue (McCarthy, 2010). As a result, no common standards or models have been published for the analysis of language advising sessions. Furthermore, during interviews, participant advisors stated that they did not act from a set structure in advising sessions or have a session structure in mind. One advisor even suggested that applying a standard structure to the sessions might detract from
the focus on student needs. Therefore, undertaking this study as a discourse analyst required not only the identification and application of extant approaches but the creation of a language advising model.

To this end, based on the interactions in these data, I identified an underlying structure to advising session that I have labeled the *advising event* (the focus on Chapter 4), driven by a phenomenon I label *advisable issues*. This model emerged from the data with little precedent within ALL research (one exception being McCarthy, 2010 which will be discussed at length in Chapter 2). Put simply, advisable issues are the problems, issues, goals and plans explored and reified into objects of discussion by advisor and advisee during sessions. The advising event, then, is the process in which the pair of advisor and advisee investigate and resolve that problem, issue, goal or plan.

While my advising event model serves as a useful framework for ordering the data on a broad scale, it lacked a connection to advisor language and discursive practices identified at the micro level and needed to illustrate unique aspects of the advising session. At the micro level, I investigated the systematicity of interaction (Gee, 2004; Ochs, 1996; Sacks et al. 1974; Strauss, 2019; Strauss & Feiz, 2014) the use of questions (Bolden & Robinson, 2011; Heritage, 1985; Koshik, 2005; Schegloff, 1984; Stivers, 2010; Waring, 2012) and use of discourse markers (Bolden, 2009; Jucker, 1993; Nevile, 2006; Maschler, 2009; Schiffrin, 2006). To bridge the gap and better exhibit how individual practice (like asking clusters of questions) fit into the macro structure of the advising event, I adapted the macro-mezzo-micro approach from Strauss et al. (2019). The addition of a “mezzo” level of discourse themes, between the macro system of the advising event and the micro level of moment-to-moment discursive practices, perfectly illustrated the complex interactions occurring in advising sessions.
Many language advising articles and studies in the past several years have turned their attention to models of motivation and strategies for advisors to inspire students. ALL researchers have conducted studies on identity (Murray, 2013, 2014; Ushioda, 2006), positivity (Fredrickson, 2004) and self-determination theory (Shelton-Strong, 2020). This dissertation will not address motivation using these frameworks, leaving those paths to other researchers. However, understanding the advisor’s role as teacher, guide and councilor is vital to determining how advising is enacted and its potential for student development.

To answer my question of what makes an advising session successful, and to more fully understand advisors’ roles as teachers, guides, and counselors I employ the lens of sociocultural theory (Johnson & Golombeck, 2016; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Wertsch, 1985). Sociocultural theory (SCT) provides insight into what advisors aim to accomplish through guidance in advising sessions. As a theory of human development, SCT allows generalization of findings beyond a specific dataset. This allows me not only to better understand what has happened in my session data but to suggest the potential of these findings to the broader language learning community.

According to SCT, cognitive development occurs when an individual begins to internalize the semiotic tools needed to complete a task (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996). This process begins as a social activity where the tools are external, often provided by an expert. Internalization of those tools offers self-reliance to novices as they learn to guide themselves, where outside aid was formerly required. This process of movement from other-regulation to self-regulation (Lantolf and Thorne, 2006) encapsulates what advisors promote in the form of autonomy. Thus, the sociocultural lens provides insight into the psychological process of what advisors strive to accomplish and what informs their understanding of a successful session. As I will explore, to my participant advisors, a step on the path to self-regulation indicates success.
When describing a successful session, participant advisors extolled the importance of making connections to students and introducing students to new ways of thinking about learning. Although they did not couch their definitions of a success in sociocultural terms, this portrayal of successful development through connection and the reframing of novice understanding speaks to the sociocultural concept of *intersubjectivity*. Wertsch (1985) posited that the processes of establishing a similar *situation definition* and internalization of psychological tools for self-regulation were parts of the same process. This suggests that working to bring novices to define a task or activity in the same way as the expert (in this case students seeing learning as the advisors) paves the way to self-regulation. This makes intersubjectivity a valuable concept in understanding how it is that advisors help students to develop as learners.

However, instances of intersubjectivity must be understood as situated in a particular place and time and focused on the completion of a task. To understand changes of thinking from a broader perspective, conceptual metaphor theory (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980) was enlisted to compliment intersubjectivity through the theory of *frame semantics* (Fillmore, 1985, 2015) and the act of *reframing* (Lakoff, 2004, 2016; Lakoff & Wehling, 2016). Frame semantics allows for discussion and speculation on the broader effects of advising in changing student views. The potential change to students’ thinking in advising sessions extends beyond what they learn and how they learn, to underlying concepts of what learning is and what it means to be a student. As the metaphor of reframing suggests, students change their views (their understanding) from one to another. To establish an initial framing, I use Hiraga’s (2008) investigation of the underlying cultural and psychological systems (concepts) of Japanese students (also see Spring & Suarez, 2018; Turner & Hiraga, 1995, 2003; Turner et al., 2003).
1.3 Chapter descriptions

Following this introductory chapter, this dissertation is structured as follows. Chapter
2 provides a review of relevant literature to advising in language learning, as well as an
overview of the theoretical approaches to analysis. Sections 2.1 and 2.2 review research in
autonomous learning and advising in language learning as it relates to this study. Section 2.3
and 2.4 reviews research in sociocultural theory, frame semantics and frames of Japanese
education. Finally, section 2.5 provides an overview of the discourse analytic approaches
employed in this study.

Chapter 3 is dedicated to the methodology used in analysis of advising sessions. This
chapter includes a brief overview and introduction to participants, the research site, and
sources of data. Chapter 4 explains the model of the advising event along with detailed
explanation and support from data. The construct of the advising event and information in
chapter 4 is used to provide a basis for understanding the results in the following chapters.

Chapters 5 and 6 report the findings of the discourse analysis of participant advisors
Jess and Noriko in their advising sessions. Each advisor's verbal interactions are examined
through extensive reference to excerpts. Finally, Chapter 7 discusses the results of analysis
from previous chapters in light of the research questions suggesting implications for future
research.
Chapter 2: Review of Literature

2.0 Introduction

This chapter presents an overview of the theoretical background for this study and reviews the relevant research in five major areas. In the first section (2.1) I will address the field of autonomous learning as it applies to this study. Although literature on autonomous learning is vast, I will focus on the areas that led to advising in language learning. The section on autonomous learning will be followed by a description of relevant research in advising in language learning (2.2). As a smaller field, this section connects empirical research to the theoretical underpinnings of autonomous learning. The third section (2.3) will shift to a major body of literature used for analysis, that of sociocultural theory as well as how sociocultural theory has been adopted by researchers in language advising. The fourth section (2.4) provides an overview of how frame semantics, reframing, and conceptual metaphor are applied to language advising in this dissertation. The fifth section (2.5) reviews relevant discourse analysis literature that provides a scientific base for systematic analysis of language advising sessions. This chapter will conclude with a discussion on how the various elements of research are woven together in the analysis of advising sessions.

2.1 Autonomous Learning

Theories of, and approaches to, autonomous learning are sometimes mistakenly analogized to “self-instruction” or are thought to champion learning in the absence of support. At its most extreme, autonomous learning is mistakenly believed to promote learning in isolation from both experts and other learners (Little, 2000). However, mainstream autonomous learning asserts neither isolation from experts nor peers (Benson, 2006; Little, 2000). Instead, the focus is on the growth and development of a person as a learner first (Gremmo & Riley, 1995; Holec, 1981; Little 2000) instead of a focus on aspects of language
learning (e.g., verb conjugations or pronunciation). Practitioners of autonomous learning aim to develop a “psychological and cognitive capacity for meaningful learning” (Carson & Mynard, 2012 p. 13). In contrast to beliefs of learning in isolation mentioned above, practitioners of autonomous learning consider expert aid a necessity, arguing “that autonomy develops out of social interaction and interdependence.” (Little, 2000, p. 103).

Originating in the European educational reforms of the 1960s and 1970s, autonomous learning advanced the concept of adult education, and new theories of learning to address a need for teaching and learning beyond the traditional classroom environment. Autonomous learning’s roots of “learner-centeredness” can be traced to contemporary educationalists such as Brazilian educator and scholar Paolo Freire and Ivan Illich (Benson, 2001). These theories of education were further enhanced through a focus on meaning-making from research in linguistics and the humanities as well as cognitive psychology (Gremmo & Riley, 1995).

In 1971 the Council of Europe established the Modern Languages Project, working together with the newly formed Centre de Recherches et d’Applications Pedagogiques en Langues (CRAPEL) under the direction of Yves Chalon (Trim, 1978). Chalon developed constructs of learning autonomy and self-directed learning that would later be expanded by Henri Holec, who took over directorship of the CRAPEL in 1972 (following Chalon’s untimely death) and would hold the position of director until 1998. Holec built on Chalon’s work, championing the ideas of “taking charge of one’s own learning” and “learning to learn” (Hobbs & Dofs, 2015; Holec, 1981).

Benson reviewed the state of autonomous learning literature in 2006 (an update to a similar work by Benson in 2001), addressing what he described as a rapid evolution of the field. Key elements included a shift towards empirical research and a growing interest in autonomy in language learning in Asia, Latin American and Europe. He suggested that this interest in autonomy in Asia and Latin America grew from recent adoption of critical
perspectives, language as communication and social process, and sociocultural theory in those regions. By contrast, he noted that the concept of learner autonomy was unpopular in North American language education, despite a strong research base and broad interest in sociocultural theory. This is important as several researchers in learning autonomy were working to better inform their practice with insights from sociocultural theory (Little, 1991, 1998; Ushioda, 2006, 2014). The body of knowledge in advising in language learning (addressed below) has followed in the footsteps of researchers such as Little, and Ushioda to apply theories and practices from Vygotskian sociocultural theory. My work follows in this tradition.

In his concluding remarks, Benson called for researchers and writers of autonomous learning literature to shift towards empirical research. He suggested that the field reconsider its focus on advocacy and instead incorporate more theoretical approaches to learner autonomy. Indeed, more empirical research was conducted after 2006 (e.g., Jang et al., 2010; Sykes, 2011), but it has not gained the acceptance Benson hoped. Much of the field has continued to produce theoretical works on the nature of learner autonomy such as “Language Learner Autonomy: Is it Really Possible?” (Ertürk, 2016). Although the present work analyzes language advising, it also seeks to address Benson’s call for a move “towards an empirically-grounded understanding of the ways in which autonomy and the potential for autonomy vary according to factors such as age, gender, cultural context and setting” (Benson, 2006, p. 34) through a detailed analysis of language advising sessions.

2.2 Advising in Language Learning

Advising in Language Learning (ALL) practitioners diverge from the main strand of autonomous learning in their focus on single learners (or small groups) through advising dialogues. Far from casual conversation, advising dialogues involve “skillful listening and
intentional use of language employed by a learning advisor to promote a deeper awareness of the learner’s capacity for autonomy and self-directed learning” (Shelton-Strong, 2020). Though similar to autonomous learning’s stated goals and methods, Carson and Mynard (2012) argue that many practices of learner autonomy have become so mainstream as to have changed both the purpose and the direction of the field at large. Advisors contend that the traditional classroom has absorbed many theories of autonomous learning, and that the current focus has shifted to research and methods aimed at classroom teachers as a result. Articles such as “Fostering Autonomy from Within the Classroom: The Teacher’s Responsibility” (Crabbe, 1993) give validity to these assertions. Ciekanski (2007) noted that by 2000 learning autonomy had become mainstream, sighting several factors including (1) a shift in the general ideals of education to highlight the benefits of personal choice, and (2) increased sensitivity to learner agency in goal setting. These ideas championed by language autonomy, along with changes in practice, opened the door for learner centered activities, and concepts like the flipped classroom.

However, despite a shift towards learner centeredness, classroom teachers are often constrained by the requirements of their schools. They must balance student needs and adoption of new practice against the goals of the institution. Traditionally, language programs are built as a hierarchy of classes, requiring that students meet pre-set goals and standards to ascend to the next tier, built on the foundation of the tiers below. As a result, language teachers must set and enforce language acquisition standards based on learning goals. In contrast, language advising offers an environment with personalized goals. Contrary to the aim of language classes, language advising’s primary goal is to aid students in developing awareness of their own practices and the application of that knowledge to future learning (Kato & Mynard, 2016; Shelton-Strong, 2020).
ALL stresses that the advising setting allows for individualized goals, guidance on the path to those goals, and individualized signposts for assessing progress. This freedom necessitates a different type of learning from students including self-motivation. Without traditional attendance, grades, tests, and passage from one level to the next, language advising lacks motivating factors common to language education. To address this, language advising research has mainly focused on developing advisor skills such as motivation and rapport building (Gremmo & Castillo, 2006; Kato & Mynard, 2016; Kelly, 1996; Mozzon-McPherson, 2012; Mozzon-McPherson & Tassinari, 2020; Mynard 2012; Riley 1997; Thornton, 2012; Yamamoto, 2018). The result is that most studies (both empirical and theoretical) focus either on student satisfaction, advisor skill acquisition or advisor reflection. These studies, although valuable, neglect direct analysis of the advisor and student dialogues. A recent trend in ALL literature on both advising skills and advisor training is an interest in reflective dialogue following the work of philosopher and educationalist Donald A. Schön.

Schön’s most notable contribution to language advising is his theory of reflective dialogue. Schön (1987) outlines a system in which reflection is seen as two separate but related processes: reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action. In essence, Schön’s reflection-in-action is the brief moment of pause in medias res, when an action suddenly and unexpectedly requires introspection to complete. Schön draws on Arendt’s (1971) phrase “a stop-and-think” to evoke an image of reflection-in-action. By contrast, reflection-on-action happens after the conclusion of process (or action) and is more akin to common usage of the term reflection. His theory built on concepts by Dewey, suggesting that reflection was most useful to learners when performed systematically. Advising researchers adapted these ideas to advising sessions and advisor training. In both advising and advisor training, a guide draws out reflection on moments of hardship – attempting to enact reflection-on-action to instances of reflection-in-action. Schön suggested that the combination allows for the greatest
discovery and growth. One further extension of Schön’s theories evolved into Intentional Reflective Dialogue (Brockbank & McGill, 2002; Kato, 2012) which stresses the value of routine reflection and is used in advisor training. This theoretical base for motivating student reflection represents a step towards theory in the abundance of skill driven research.

Double loop learning (Argyris & Schön, 1974) is another extension of Schön’s work in reflection, developed with fellow professor and friend Chris Argyis. The theory of double loop learning states that significant cognitive growth (or the growth of a company) often requires an intermediary step. “Double-loop learning involves a change in the participants’ understanding of some fundamental aspect of the activity” (Greeno & Engeström, 2014). Argyris suggested that companies identify unquestioned traditions and consider both their value and the possibility of change. Schön focused on individuals, suggesting that the first step in absorbing more difficult information was learning how to learn it – often requiring a break with previous ways of thinking. Some language advising theorists suggest that both the process of becoming an advisor and that of learning language require double loop learning (Brockbank & McGill, 2002; Kato & Mynard, 2016). As with his theory on reflection, Schön’s double loop learning offers ALL researchers deeper theoretical foundations and the potential for a slow shift away from skills and strategies.

Despite research in a variety of areas surrounding language use and acquisition, few studies make use of discourse analysis. Those few studies that do, often focus on analysis of advisor reflections (Mozzon-McPherson, 2012). Analysis of the dialogue of advising sessions is rare and often supplemental to the purpose of advisor reflection and development (Buschner, 2020; Mozzon-McPherson, 2012). One example of a published, systematic, discourse analytic approach to the dialogue of the advising session is McCarthy’s (2010) analysis of 20 recorded advising sessions at a self-access learning center at a Japanese university. Her data (which consisted of advisor turns for eight advisors across 20 sessions)
were coded and organized into a combination of emergent and expected categories. Categories were then organized into groups that represented advising ‘skills,’ following research in counseling (mainly Kelly, 1996). The resulting findings defined a set of 31 skills (techniques and behaviors used by advisors), divided into macro and micro skills, as well as an outline for the organization of the advising session. Unfortunately, McCarthy’s unique approach to the analysis of advising language sessions, has not produced a line of research or further inquiry. Her 2010 study is sighted in a number of research papers but always in its expansion on Kelly’s classification of strategies and not for its discourse analytic approach. As with the use of Schön’s work, theory and systems take a back-seat to skills.

McCarthy did not replicate the 2010 study following its publication, changing her research focus to the investigation of advisor inner dialogue (2012, 2018). While it is possible that there was simply little interest in discourse analysis from ALL practitioners it is worth noting that in 2012 Mozzon-McPherson explicitly called for “a more systematic use of discourse analysis and discourse-based approach to professional development of advisors” (p. 59). Furthermore, Mozzon-McPherson, urged advising researchers to analyze discourse and “map” the advising session which echoed an earlier recommendation by Gremmo and Riley (1995). This dissertation intends to fill the research gap identified by Mozzon-McPherson.

2.3 Sociocultural Theory and Learning Autonomy

Vygotsky’s (1978) theories of developmental psychology have been adapted and used by supporters of autonomous learning for two decades. “The exploration of the socio-historical psychology of Vygotsky by educational psychologists is another rich source of insight into the processes that underlie the development of learner autonomy” (Little, 2000, p. 103). Benson (2006) suggested that increased interest in, and use of, Vygotskian sociocultural theory in the early 2000s aided autonomous learning in establishing a deeper foothold in
Europe and Asia. Scholars such as Little (2003) and Ushioda (2006) led the charge, suggesting that sociocultural theory offered new insights into the perspective of learner autonomy.

Sociocultural-based research in learning autonomy partly addressed a need for more empirical research. However, Benson noted in his discussion on the contributions of SCT: “Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, advocates of autonomy in language learning were at pains to distance themselves from the idea that autonomy implies individualism or learning in isolation” (2006, p. 29). He did not follow this point with examples or explanation and never made a clear statement within the article as to why this sentence was added. Though not explained, Benson’s comment was intended to address a concern of SCT in respect to learner autonomy – a belief that autonomy research was ultimately focused towards learning in isolation. In fact, a concern for learning in isolation was not the only asymmetry between theories of autonomous learning and SCT. Lantolf (2013) clarified two additional, related issues: (1) the problematic promotion of reduced time with experts and (2) the inability of novices to control the concepts necessary for efficient learning. As a branch of learner autonomy, language advising may raise the same concerns in some. The issues discussed by Lantolf, concerning learner autonomy and language advising, have not been thoroughly covered in published literature. Here I will attempt to briefly address these concerns as they apply to advising in language learning.

Promotion of minimal expert contact is problematic because it works directly against a core idea of sociocultural theory. From an SCT perspective, humans learn most effectively and efficiently with the aid of experts, and thus time spent with experts should be increased and supported where possible – not decreased (Lantolf, 2013). Sociocultural theory posits that the foundation of proper education rests in an expert’s ability to synthesize knowledge and to mediate access to that knowledge through the use of concepts in concrete activity. Of
course, isolated study, or study with minimal expert contact, can foster informal and unplanned learning (such as children at play) but is never ideal. Gal’perin (1992) suggested that “given sufficient time, motivation and the appropriate environment, it was possible for learners to eventually work out an adequate conceptual understanding, but the process is generally slow and full of errors” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 304). This leads to the second issue of controlling scientific knowledge.

Lantolf (2013) stated that when novices are forced to discover scientific knowledge through solo activity it is “often a laborious, time-consuming and error-filled process” (p. 2). Lantolf’s statement not only addresses tenets of sociocultural theory but also speaks to a common sense that it is unreasonable for students to be tasked with teaching themselves. This argument targets practices like discovery learning in classrooms, in which educators actively withhold knowledge and concepts from students so that they could discover them on their own through activity. Some in the field of learning autonomy, from the perspective of sociocultural theory, espouse the Piagetian notion that the ability to understand complex concepts exist natively within individuals – not through interactions with culture or an expert other. A proposition which is rejected unconditionally by SCT, as occluded (and often more complex) ‘scientific knowledge’ must be imparted from experts with the best knowledge that is currently available (Lantolf, 2013).

While there are members of the wider field of learner autonomy that actively support concepts such as discovery learning, or who suggest that autonomous learning is more effective than other approaches (discussed in Ivanovska, 2015) these views are not shared by all who advocate autonomous learning and advising in language learning. What ALL takes from autonomous learning is an understanding that learner’s time with experts is often limited, and to many individuals, formal classes are impossible. The reality of too little expert contact is illustrated by autonomy’s origins in devising means to help post-war
European immigrants who lacked the resources to attend desired and needed language classes.

The term advisor (over counselor, facilitator etc.), was chosen by ALL researchers to help identify language advisors as expert guides (Carson & Mynard, 2012). While dissimilar to financial advisors or academic advisors in several ways, language advisors bring expert knowledge to short interactions, aiming to impart not only the best knowledge that is available but to do so in a way that helps advisees access that knowledge later without direct intervention.

Making the best use of limited time to instill knowledge and concepts to allow for further learning seems to fit with Vygotskian concepts of mediation and not discovery learning. From one perspective, all educators work with limited time to help students. This is true both in face-to-face learning situations and when students are beyond direct guidance (relying on mediation thorough textbooks or homework for example). So, while not ideal, the reality that many in the world want or need language education but lack the means, suggests that reduced contact with experts, focused on making the best use of limited time in a one-on-one setting, may be their best course of action.

Despite concerns, learner autonomy research incorporating sociocultural theory remains a small but persistent part of the field. Similarly, sociocultural theory in advising in language learning represents only a small part of its body of research. One group of advisors and researchers based out of Kanda University of International Studies has made sociocultural theory a foundational element in their model of language advising. Kanda University publishes two in-house journals relating to advising (Relay Journal and Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal) and feature articles involving SCT research or methods (e.g., Ohara’s 2019 “A Sociocultural Approach to Learner Autonomy in the Language
Mynard’s model combines concepts and theories from several sources including sociocultural theory and constructivism. From constructivism Mynard took Fosnot’s (1996) ideas of schemata and equilibrium (developed from von Glasersfeld’s “radical constructivism” approach to Piaget’s early work). Piaget’s theory stated that new information could create disequilibrium in learners until it has been properly assimilated by reclassification or reorganization of thinking. The conceptualization behind this process is not so different than that of Argyris & Schön’s (1974) double-loop learning although more detailed in its description of cognitive structure. Argyris & Schön cite Paget’s contributions to ‘organization learning’ and it is unsurprising that the concept of double-loop learning is also included in later versions of Mynard’s model (Kato and Mynard, 2016).

Concepts from sociocultural theory formed the second pillar of Mynard’s model of language advising. She explained that key concepts from sociocultural theory helped to illuminate the interaction of the advising sessions and provided valuable psychological support for learning advisors.

The term mediation is widely used by educators, and depending on discipline and tradition, sometimes means teaching and at other times means something more akin to counseling. Vygotsky (1978) placed the concept of mediation at the very core of human cognition – without mediation humans could not have the conscious awareness that they do. Accordingly, human cognition is possible only due to ‘mediating’ symbols. Lantolf & Thorne (2006) stated “higher-order mental functions in the theory, is enabled and organized by historical and qualitative aspects of symbolic artifacts, material artifacts, and social relationships.” These psychological tools can be signs and symbols, language, or traditions.
As depicted in Figure 2.1, the process of mediation is often illustrated as a triangle in which subject and object are weakly connected (indicated with the dotted line) but connected more commonly by artifacts, concepts and activities (indicated with the solid lines). In this way, physical and psychological tools act as an in-between or medium, connecting a person to the world around them. This complex and nuanced view of a mediated world and its application is attractive to ALL researchers. Language advisors mediate student learning through their deep knowledge of both language education and learning practices. Advisors present concepts of learning (models and study practices) as well as physical tools like diagrams or worksheets to allow students access to more information (e.g., grammatical structures). SCT’s focus on concepts works well with language advising as advisors seek to help students become more autonomous – to build and internalize systems that do not require external mediation. This follows SCTs idea that “autonomy and agency are the consequences of development rather than its necessary pre-condition” (Lantolf, 2013, p. 20).

The concept of the zone of the proximal development (ZPD) is vital to the process of mediation. Lantolf and Poehner (2010) urge that more than just a theoretical lens, the ZPD is at the same time a diagnostic tool for assessing current ability and a starting point to aid learners. Much has been written discussing both the nature and usage of the ZPD. Lantolf and Thorne (2006) (as well as Lantolf & Poehner, 2014) dedicated an entire chapter to its
many manifestations in education and linguistics, noting that creative interpretations of the ZPD were broadly beneficial and warning only that the concept not be considered interchangeable with ‘assisted performance’ or ‘legitimate peripheral participation’ (Lave and Wenger, 1991).

Vygotsky’s definition of the ZPD is often paraphrased in English as “the difference between what a person can achieve independently and what he or she can achieve working in collaboration with others or with someone more expert” (Johnson, 2009, p. 19). Concerning its use in ALL, Mynard (2012) defines the ZPD in much the same way - as “the difference between what a learner can achieve unaided and what a learner can achieve with support from another person” (p. 31). She notes that the context of language advising, being a one-on-one interaction between novice and expert, is well suited to “individual ZPDs.” While this does highlight the importance of advisors engaging students with the best available psychological tools to mediate their learning (far from discovery learning) it does not speak to the dual diagnostic and mediational properties of the ZPD. However, Mynard does approach these topics in a broader sense, discussing how scaffolding, through careful use of reflective dialogue (Schön, 1987), engenders a “gradually developing and reconstructing understanding” (p. 31) of language learning by students.

Lantolf and Thorne (2006) address several considerations for use of the ZPD in language education research, including three “essential strands,” following Kinginger (2002). The three strands are: (1) skill acquisition, (2) scaffolding and (3) feedback. Kinginger’s article (as well as the chapter by Lantolf and Thorne) focused mainly on the failings of various sectors of language education to properly understand and employ the ZPD in these strands. First in the strand of skill acquisition, the ZPD is often reduced to an ‘increase in task difficulty,’ citing the use of the ZPD by some researchers (e.g., Gifford & Mullaney, 1999) as equivalent to Krashen’s input theory. Because of the interactive nature of development,
activation of the ZPD requires collaborative accomplishment of a task through co-construction. Thus, in a task that is not interactive and carefully supported by the expert, the simple addition of a new element to challenge a learner is insufficient. Second, Lantolf and Thorne (2006) address the strand of scaffolding as being incorrectly attributed to many instances of teacher aid (not mediation). In particular, this occurs in circumstances that appear to offer an active role to learners but offer no power for them to question their role or actions in their learning tasks. This is vital, as the internalization of skills requires that understanding be built from extant experience and concepts. To do this requires volition and a deeper understanding by learners of not only of what and how they are learning but why. Finally discussing feedback, Lantolf and Thorne clarify that it must be specific to the context. General or unfocused feedback may fail to engage a student’s ZPD by lacking the power to help students where they need it and leaving deeper conceptual understanding incomplete. Instead “corrective feedback and negotiation are contextualized as a collective process where the dynamics of the interactions shape the nature of the feedback” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 276). Thus, the best feedback must be determined dynamically by the expert in terms of the specific situation, task, and learner.

Advising in language learning has the potential to address each of these essential strands. The dialogue of the advising session offers an ideal context for interaction and completion of a collaborative task. In this case, study planning. Far from simply adding difficulty, advisors work together with students to aid in co-construction and evaluation of their learning plans. Advisors are trained to push students and help them set their own plans offering expert help when needed to challenge potentially bad decisions or offer new insight. Offering what help is needed, when needed, connects advisor training also to scaffolding. Far from the powerlessness Lantolf and Thorne warn of, advisors are taught to allow students to lead and to encourage student questions and address individual problems. Finally, the strand
of feedback and need for it to be specific to individual, task and context. The nature of study planning is slightly different than language learning as it can require days or weeks and often multiple enactments, and subsequent evaluation, of “planning” to perform. This suggests that the nature of the task requires feedback in much the way that it is delivered by advisors – directly when working together for initial planning then after a week or two of action.

Although there is potential for advisors to engage student’s ZPDs throughout an advising session, in these data examples will focus on its usage in the resolution phases of advising events. These are times in which advisor and student work both to co-construct a learning plan and to determine its method of enactment and the time and method of feedback (see Chapter 5, excerpt 20).

2.4 Frames, Reframing and Conceptual Metaphor

A key element in advising in language learning is changing learner’s perspectives. Advisors work to change student’s perspectives (sometimes referred to as “reshaping ways of thinking”) of what studying is, how it can be organized and what the students’ role is (Kato & Mynard, 2016). Broadly, advisors hope to empower students to see themselves as more than vessels for knowledge. Instead urging them to take the role of agentive participants in the development of their education. Doing this requires more than simply telling students to be more autonomous, or pointing them to a collection of resources in a self-access library. To enact this type of change, advisors must modify students’ concepts of how to learn, what learning is, and the role of the learner.

To illustrate how advisors in this study may change learner perspectives I draw on the concept of frames and reframing (Fillmore, 1976, 1985; Fillmore & Baker, 2015; Lakoff 2016). Frame semantics (Fillmore, 1976, 1985) is a theory of how otherwise disparate knowledge in the human mind is clustered around concepts and situated meaning. This is
what Fillmore and Baker (2015) described as “organized packages of knowledge, beliefs, and patterns of practice that shape and allow humans to make sense of their experiences.” (p. 792).

Though not part of Fillmore’s original conception of frame semantics (1976), he later incorporated principles of conceptual metaphor theory (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980), stating that certain properties of framing are most clearly visible through conceptual metaphors (Fillmore, 1985). Frame analysis offers a means of classifying those clusters of knowledge, collecting them in categories and in some cases mapping their networks (most visibly in Fillmore’s project Framenet). The number of potential frames is truly immense (Framenet currently containing over 1200 semantic frames and 13,000 “word senses”) with each interconnected to other frames. So, in a classic example - that of a restaurant frame - there is: waiter, cook, food, menu, business, service, etc. However, food, and service are part of many frames, with food itself being a semantic frame.

Importantly, accessing any part of a frame mobilizes the entire frame. Dancygier and Sweetser (2014) refer to a frame as a “prefab chunk of knowledge structure” (p. 17). In ‘prefab’ they do not mean that all the knowledge is learned together. Instead, they mean to convey that once knowledge pertaining to one part of the frame has been accessed the rest of the frame is delivered all in one piece. According to frame semantics, this process of accessing frames as a whole is what gives meaning to words in context. This is especially true in the absence of clear contextual cues. Thus, a sentence from my data, “I want to working part time” has clear meaning (despite the erroneous use of the present participle) because the word “part-time” summons the frames of work, gas stations, waiters clothing, shop attendants, and fast-food servers (and often of undergraduate life), especially in Japan. Whether this student (Ai) plans to work 10 hours a week or 40 hours, “part time job” is a
specific type of work, often taken by adolescents and young adults and delivers a set of frames representative of that.

Studying language advising through the lens of frames offers insights into students’ sources of knowledge and expectations about education. Students come to advising sessions with frames of school, studying and what it means to be a good student. Language advisors then build-on and reshape those frames. In particular, advisors must tackle how Japanese students view education and language study.

Frames such as family, home and food are similar across the world with minimal variation (Kövecses, 2005). Other frames, like medical treatment or law, can differ significantly depending on language and culture. Frames of education are similar around the world, especially in more prosperous countries. However, there are also differences. Hiraga (2008) studied Japanese graduate students at a British university and noticed differences in the ways they approached learning, education and interactions with teachers. Studying metaphors, proverbs, and the etymology of educational language in Japan, Hiraga identified four major conceptual metaphors of Japanese education: LEARNING IS A JOURNEY, LEARNING IS IMITATING THE MODEL, TEACHER IS FATHER and EXAMINATION IS COMBAT IN WAR (here noted in all capital letters in the style of CMT). Hiraga organized these as conceptual metaphors in terms of source and target ‘domain’ (following Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). Her study is unique in its investigation of a Japanese cultural perspective of students’ ideologies of what education and learning is – through conceptual metaphor. Though Hiraga did not use frames, it is recognized that Lakoff and Johnson’s original ‘domains’ can be used almost interchangeably with Fillmore’s ‘frames’ (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999; Dancygier & Sweetser, 2014). Thus, Hiraga’s discoveries form a foundation to discuss Japanese frames of learning, education and study.
Japanese students’ conceptualizations of education and study are precisely what learning advisors and Japanese universities build on in advising sessions. Although autonomous learning is more popular in Japan than in many other parts of the world, the traditional classroom still sets the standard. Frames of education are built up over years of public education in classrooms as well as instantiated in pop-culture and entertainment. Of particular significance for language advising, Japanese students build and internalize frames of language learning, especially English language learning, over six to eight years of required study in public schools. I argue here that this set of internalized conceptual metaphors is what Hiraga’s work illuminates. Furthermore, I suggest that for learning advisors, these common ways of conceptualizing study and education are a starting point. And while some ways of understanding education are unlikely to be problematic, such as ‘LEARNING IS A JOURNEY,’ others come with potential for discontinuities with language advising and autonomous learning such as ‘LEARNING IS IMITATING THE MODEL,’ ‘TEACHER IS FATHER’ and ‘EXAMINATION IS COMBAT IN WAR.’

In an extended study of American politics and political speech, Lakoff (2004, 2014, 2016) used frame semantics to organize the many ideas that underpin the thinking of major political parties and their connected ideas of conservatism and progressivism. Lakoff’s research unearthed many observations but two are of significance to this study. The first was Lakoff’s observation that changing people’s thinking is neither easy nor (deeply) fact dependent: “facts that don’t fit within our commonsensical frames will usually be ignored.” (Lakoff & Wehling, 2016, p. 80). Instead, frames center around morality and local culture and as such changing them is an involved process of engaging ideas. The second observation was that there existed two overarching models of moral politics in the United States “anchored in parenting models” (Lakoff & Wehling, 2016, p. 38), the strict father and nurturant parent. These models of morality and parenting may be applicable to advisor’s
roles (as the nurturant parent) and the Japanese education system (as the strict father) though this will require future research. Of immediate use to this study is the conclusion that reframing often requires adapting extant frames.

Lakoff (2016) observed that the two parenting models were not separate but represented a continuum. Although some individuals fell sharply to one side or the other, the majority cluster around the center – sharing frames of both nurturant parent and strict father concerning the same issue. This, Lakoff suggested, was the ground on which people’s entrenched, politicized, opinions could be approached and grappled with. Advisors too must reframe, working within a continuum of established frames for education and learning.

One example of reframing that ALL grapples with is defining what a language advisor is. The Japanese education system, as in many countries, has known roles for teachers and tutors but nothing that clearly fits the role of language advisor. Although this has not been discussed in advising literature, I suggest that how advisors must adapt students frames of teachers, tutors, and education to make a place for their role offers an illustration of Lakoff’s idea of reframing.

Advisors begin with what students understand – they must start from extant frames of education, clarifying the role of teachers and tutors. Teachers work in classrooms, teachers have classes, teachers set homework and design and grade tests. Tutors assist students enrolled in a class, help them prepare for tests and aid them in the completion of homework or the understanding of concepts that might be on a test. But advisors do not work in classes and (for the most part) do not create tests, assign homework or help students with tests and homework from other classes. Here the frames of counselor and personal trainer are enlisted. Counselors and trainers work one-on-one with clients to develop unique plans and act as guides. So, I suggest, that to create a place for ‘advisor’ in students understanding of education, advisors show how these aspects of ‘one-on-one’ and ‘unique plans’ coexist with
ideas of language teaching. Approaches to this are likely varied but addressing student meetings (one-on-one time) or extra credit work (which can be unique assignments) open a connection between the frames. This creates a continuum between know elements – a continuum between teacher on one side and counselor on the other. The advisor, sharing elements of both, and drawing from both frames, therefore can be understood. This is just one example of reframing according to Lakoff’s system. I will seek to show in future chapters how the process of reframing is a central part of the advisor’s job.

2.5 Discourse analysis

From its inception this project sought to use the tools of discourse analysis (DA) to understand the work of language advisors. Identification, unpacking and classification of discursive strategies such as questions (as interrogatives, as statements, as guiding tools etc.) and discourse markers (to assure students, to control the flow of the session, to conclude a topic etc.) were needed to illustrate these phenomena.

The term discourse analysis encapsulates various approaches designed to understand the uses, variation and systematicity of human communication. DA has been defined in a number of ways, such as by Gee (2018), who offered a simple descriptive definition as “the study of what we humans do with language and how we do it” (p. ix). Strauss and Feiz (2014) defined discourse analysis as approaches that illustrate “where micro-level instances of language and discourse combine to create, reflect and shape the broader, macro levels of meaning” (p. 4). In this definition, Strauss and Feiz express that DA is a study of the complex interaction of the systematic structures of language, intertwined with semiotic elements, cultural expectations, imagination and individual choice. Their definition suggests not only the depth and complexity of individuals but also the resultant complexity of language use as the vehicle for expression.
As discussed above, ALL researchers have used various approaches to discourse analysis over the years. However, many of these studies focused on analysis of advisor reflections (Gremmo, 2009; McCarthy, 2012; Mozzon-McPherson, 2012). While these studies offered valuable contributions to advisor education and skill building, they represented the session through advisor interpretation instead of direct analysis of dialogue. To address this Mozzon-McPherson (2012) called explicitly for “a more systematic use of discourse analysis and a discourse-based approach to professional development of advisors” (p. 59). However, scant analysis exists beyond McCarthy’s single study (2010).

McCarthy’s (2010) work on advising discourse was a collage of approaches from different disciplines. To analyze sessions, she drew on “pre-existing categories from a cross-section of specialized fields” (p. 40). She drew mainly from counseling research, adopting a coding scheme from Riley (1997) to include additional categories of advising strategies. McCarthy took a less theoretically grounded approach to discourse analysis, citing only Sinclair and Coulthard’s (1975) model of classroom discourse; the initiation-response-feedback (IRF) sequence. However, McCarthy did not make extensive use of the IRF sequence, stating that it was “difficult to adapt to a language advising situation” (McCarthy, 2010, p. 40). While McCarthy’s assessment (that such a rigid model of communication did not encapsulate advising sessions well) was insightful, it offered limited understanding of the structure of advising sessions. While she created a set of 31 strategies for advisors, McCarthy relegated to the background her illustration of a systematic unfolding of the advising session. As a result, her thought-provoking ideas appear more as a footnote.

To understand the moment-to-moment changes during advising sessions, attention to and illustration of, systematic language was vital. Excellent work in deciphering and describing linguistic systematicity has been conducted by researchers from the tradition of conversation analysis (CA) (Heritage, 1985; Koshik, 2005; Nevil, 2006; Sacks, et al., 1974).
The field of CA takes particular interest in the design of language, including how and why information is transmitted and taken up by interlocutors (Sacks, et al., 1974). Central is the principle of recipient design (which includes a wide array of phenomena) that rests on the finding that people make decisions in discourse based on how they expect their interlocutors to understand and react. Speakers of a language learn and manipulate the underlying system and expectations of discourse.

Significant to this study, CA has identified and catalogued a number of discourse markers and their uses such as ‘so’ and ‘and.’ And as a discourse marker gained some attention due to a study of its use by pilots who vocalize sequential events. Examples of this include phrases such as: “and we have reached speed” “. . . and we have lift off” “. . . and we are flying” (Nevile, 2006). Following in this vein of research, the present study uncovered consistent use of several discourse markers by advisors including “I see” and “so” which are prevalent in CA literature (Bolden, 2009; Raymond, 2010). Identification of these discourse markers in advising sessions not only contributes to understanding of what advisors are doing in their moment-to-moment responses to students (modifying their responses in terms of recipient design) but also in how they structure the session.

Another area of research supported by CA is questions. Koshik (2005) analyzed utterances that took the syntactic form of questions but were instead used to make assertions. Koshik built on earlier work by Schegloff (1984) investigating the complexities of question use. These studies also involved investigations of “B-event” statements (Heritage 1985) in which certain statements were responded to as though questions because only the recipient “has primary access to” the relevant information. This research highlighted the complexities of interaction in which statements are questions and questions are statements. The participant advisors in this study, Jess and Noriko, not only make use of “declarative questions” (Koshik, 2005) but also use statements designed to seek new information.
Finally, this study required a broader framework to understand and describe findings in relation to one another. Human discourse consists of an incredible amount of information and is often conceptualized as existing on several levels. Strauss et al. (2019) divided discourse into micro, mezzo, and macro levels. In their analysis of informal caregivers, this approach allowed for effective analysis and illustration of caregiver stance within the informative theme of “control.” Strauss et al.’s macro-mezzo-micro approach is relatively new and has not been widely applied despite its obvious benefits. Its value and application to this study will be described in the next chapter.
Chapter 3: Methodology

3.0 Introduction

This chapter describes the research methodology and data collection that forms the foundation of this study. This research included a systematic analysis of language advising at a Japanese university. The purpose of the study is to reveal what advisors do in language advising sessions. Through analysis of session dialogue, this study seeks to determine what actions are taken by advisors to guide and support students in expanding their understanding of learning and improving their ability to plan and study.

This chapter first (3.1) examines the site of study, Jogen university, and offers a brief description of its Self-Access Learning Center (SALC). Following this, the chapter introduces participant advisors and (3.2) discuss the audio recordings and semi-structured interviews that are my data. Next it discusses the preparation of data (3.3) and analytical procedures (3.4) and concludes with a brief discussion of limitations (3.5).

3.1 The research context

Table 3.1 University and Self-Access Center (SALC)

Table 3.1 provides an overview of Jogen University and its SALC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jogen University</th>
<th>Self-Access Learning Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students: 4900</td>
<td>Housed: In its own custom-built building completed in 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisors: 11</td>
<td>Some Facilities: Learning resources library, mini-stage, study rooms, café, work and meeting spaces, “edutainment” booths, English Lounge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses Related to Advising: Language advising sessions, LA01, LA02, Courses on Autonomous learning, 9:00-5:00 access to language advisors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The setting for this study is a language advising program connected to the English Language Department and Self-Access Learning Center (SALC) at a medium-sized private
university in Japan (hereafter Jogen University). Jogen is a branch campus founded in 1987 focused on language study with a current student body (undergraduate and graduate) of approximately 4900 students. Jogen university has made self-access language learning and language advising a priority and offers an impressive learning center focusing on self-access learning, language advising and independent language study resources. At the time of this study, Jogen’s SALC employed 11 language advisors who were available six days a week. Language advisors all held a master’s degree in Applied Linguistics, TESOL or a related field. Advisors are trained by the center and strove for expertise in ALL theory and practice. This language center produces and supports research on self-access learning and language advising and offered an excellent site for research into language advising.

Table 3.2- Introductory courses for language advising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module LA01</th>
<th>Module LA02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Introduction to Language Advising</td>
<td>-Continuation of LA01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-For students with no experience in language advising</td>
<td>-Can be taken multiple times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Encourage active learning</td>
<td>-Builds on skills previously learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Show basic skills for self-directed work</td>
<td>-Offers continuous support for self-study through advising sessions and written advising</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SALC conducts numerous advising sessions per week during the academic year. Additionally, the center offers an introductory advising course for new students that want to learn more about advising. This basic advising module, worth one credit hour (hereafter LA01), combines meetings and asynchronous activities to showcase the potential of self-study and language advising. LA01 is open to all students at the university as a service. This course can be followed by a continuation course (also worth one credit hour) that can be taken multiple times (hereafter LA02). According to departmental data, approximately 350
students per semester are enrolled in LA01 and LA02. Surprisingly, the number of both advising sessions and enrollment in modules has increased during the two semesters under the COVID-19 pandemic (this is similar to changes in enrollment during the pandemic documented in Davies et al, 2020).

LA01 is a 15-week introduction to language advising and autonomous learning guided and supported by a language advisor. Students and advisors work to set broad goals for language study to be focused and tested throughout the semester. Through both discussion and asynchronous written communication, activities are chosen and organized as goals to complete each week. Students submit a worksheet and reveal goals met and missed. Students also write short reflections which advisors in turn respond to in writing. There can be several iterations of this asynchronous, written, communication – with students writing responses to an advisor’s response. Students in module LA01 are encouraged to meet in person with their advisor each week but this is not required. Some students choose to complete the module via written communication. Several of these completed communications were collected. However, these documents were not analyzed and do not feature in the data discussed in this study. The asynchronous nature of this method offers interesting possibilities for future research.

The LA01 introductory course, is designed to encourage students to open themselves to the idea of language advising. They are given worksheets that aid them in goal setting, time management, and reflection on work, as well as self-evaluation. They are expected to work on each of these aspects via worksheets and to communicate with an advisor via email and advising meetings. The stated hope is that students not only begin to understand the basic concepts of advising and autonomous learning, but also continue to make use of the other language advising services.
Jogen also offers a separate course (that met once a week for the semester) on strategies of autonomous learning in a more traditional classroom setting. This course does not require the learning advisor, although it suggests language advising be used in conjunction with the class. The class meets once a week for 15 weeks and is designed to cover strategies for learning along with concepts and theories related to language advising. Student participants in the present study were all current or former LA01 students.

3.1.2 Participants

3.1.2.1 Language advisors

Table 3.3 – Language Advisors’ backgrounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noriko</th>
<th>Jess</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 20s</td>
<td>Late 20s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursuing Ed.D,</td>
<td>Masters in TESOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Like English</td>
<td>Studied Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly &amp; Empathetic</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participant language advisors for this study were selected using convenience sampling. Both Jess and Noriko were trained in ALL and considered experienced advisors that had worked at Jogen university for more than one year at the time of this study. Moreover, both were active researchers with several published articles related to their work. I had the opportunity to meet Noriko and Jess two times over the course of this study. The first meeting was in-person, together and with the head of the SALC when they volunteered to participate. The second meeting was during the interviews. For Jess this was also an in-
person meeting and conducted at the site of Jogen university. My interview with Noriko was conducted via Zoom online meeting software.

Advisor Noriko is a Japanese woman in her late 20s. At the time of the study she was an ESL teacher and advisor at Jogen university, as well as a graduate student pursuing a Ed.D. with a focus in language advising. Noriko is not a native English speaker but was highly proficient and displayed advanced knowledge of ESL grammar and composition pedagogies. In her interactions with Ai, Noriko was friendly and empathetic to the difficulties of college life. She often shared personal experiences as a way to connect with Ai.

Advisor Jess is an Australian woman in her late 20s who had two years of experience as an advisor and taught one ESL course. She earned a master’s degree in TESOL from an Australian university and studied Japanese as a second language. During advising sessions Jess avoided sharing personal experiences with students, finding other ways to build rapport. Jess was always positive but generally less empathetic to students.

3.1.2.2 Student Participants

As it relates to the advising sessions, four of the nine recordings included the pair Noriko (advisor) and Ai (student). Two recordings featured the pair Jess (advisor) and Risa (student). Finally, three recordings included advisor Jess and students Hiro, Kaori and Sayumi. Each audio recording was approximately 20-30 minutes in length.
For this study, I requested a collection of data featuring some sets of consecutive sessions with the same advisor, student pair as well as single pairing sessions. With that request as my sole input into data, session recordings were chosen by the head of the advising program from volunteer advisors. No recruiting was permitted and although I was able to meet my participant advisors, no names or other identifying information were provided in regard to the student participants. As a result, limited background and demographic information were shared about the students in the advising session recordings, beyond personal information that emerged in the dialogue. All recordings in this data set were chosen in accordance with Jogen university’s protocols for human studies (and in conjunction with Pennsylvania State University’s overview from Institutional Review Board for Human Research).

### 3.2 Data sources and collection

After all forms and meetings of both human research departments had been completed the data set included ten audio recordings, nine of which were analyzed and will be discussed in Chapters 5 and 6. One additional audio recording was included and consisted of a student and advisor pair not connected to the other recordings. This recording was not analyzed.
3.2.1 Audio recordings

Sessions were recorded by the advisors as part of their own reflective practice and were then made available for this study. Each recording was started and ended when the advisor felt ready.

3.2.2 Semi-structured interviews

In addition to the recorded language advising session, I also conducted supplementary interviews with the participant advisors to triangulate my data and deepen my understanding of the field of language advising (see appendix C for interview questions). I conducted the interviews with both advisers, asking open-ended questions to induce broad discussion and specific questions to confirm findings.

Interviews with the participant advisors were conducted to more deeply understand their expertise and their ideas regarding advising and advising strategies. The interview with Noriko concluded after an hour and a half and the interview with Jess lasted two hours. The interview with Jess was conducted in Japan at the site of Jogen University. The interview with Noriko was conducted via video chat. Both interviews were video recorded and transcribed.

Questions in the interview were focused on four major areas. First, questions were asked about their impressions of ALL and experiences as an advisor. Second, the questions elicited background information about each advisor to include their thoughts as to a structure of advising sessions. Third, questions were asked about specific instances in the recordings to
deepen my insight about their process and their perceptions. Finally, questions were asked to verify observations that emerged from my analysis (Pitney & Parker, 2009). However, my observations and analysis were not shared with advisors during interviews. Instead, questions were designed to engender extended conversation around the topics. Those answers were then used to verify and interpret my findings.

3.3 Data preparation

Unedited audio recordings were received via email then removed from email servers and stored on a secure computer. This process was part of the research protocols agreed upon. In addition, original video data from the interview with Jess was recorded and stored on the same computer. Original video from the interview with Noriko was downloaded from the Zoom server and stored on the same computer.

Included with Noriko’s recordings of sessions where her own transcriptions. Although these were used for early analysis each session’s transcript was modified to include additional information. Similarly, three of the nine advising sessions with advisor Jess and (Risa, Jess and Hiro) used rev.com for initial transcription through their automatic transcription service. This streamlined the first step of transcription and allowed for earlier analysis. The remaining two sessions were manually transcribed from the audio recordings without an earlier version. All transcripts (whether from Noriko or rev.com) were carefully reviewed, edited and expanded where necessary. For example, sections of all transcripts were re-transcribed due to missing data, errors in the initial transcription or the need for deeper representation of discursive elements (e.g., response markers during longer turns).

3.4 Analytical Procedures
The primary focus of this analysis was to determine the discursive strategies advisors
used in sessions and the purpose and effects of those strategies. A secondary goal was to
determine an underlying system and methodology to ascertain if extant theoretical models
could explain choices and actions. This follows a sociocultural approach which suggests the
focus of any data analysis is to provide insights into the experiences of learners and to
determine the effects on learners through a general theory of development (Lantolf & Thorne,
2006).

Session data were initially approached without a predetermined method or framework
for organization, coding or analysis. A recursive, open approach to early analysis was
adopted following Pitney and Parker’s (2009) CREATIVE approach to qualitative data
analysis. This involved thorough and repetitive readings of data in exploratory analysis
(Creswell, 2005) as well as labeling and thematizing data as notable elements emerged. The
process was then repeated with an eye for previously identified themes.

Concurrently, as themes emerged and were tested in preceding rounds of examination,
relevant tools for deeper analysis were identified. Of primary importance was identification
of a tool to organize the various “levels” of discourse. Early organization of themes included
specific language use such as “great, so” (to transition from reinforcement to guidance) and
broad strategies such as clearly identifying a problem before offering support. These did not
fit the same space and thus an approach for organization was needed. Strauss et al. (2019)
used a model of dividing discourse into macro, mezzo and micro levels and discovering the
ways in which “smaller” micro and mezzo level observations were visible in macro themes.
This model was adopted to better understand, as well as more accurately portray, the results
from these data. Within this macro-mezzo-micro model, data were analyzed via three main
approaches derived from research on talk-in-interaction (Sacks et al. 1974; Sidnell, 2010)
question use (Heritage, 1985; Koshik, 2005; Schegloff, 1984) and discourse markers (Jucker, 1993; Nevile, 2006; Maschler, 2009; Schiffrin, 2006).

Discourse analysis provided a deeper understanding of the activities enacted by the participant advisors but lacked explanatory power to generalize beyond these sessions. For this sociocultural theory and frame semantics were enlisted. Sociocultural theory, through the concepts of the ZPD, mediation, internalization and self-regulation, offered a means of understanding advisors’ choices from a developmental level. Similarly, to better describe advisor’s attempts to ‘provide a certain perspective’ (paraphrasing words from advisor Jess) frame semantics (Fillmore, 1985, 2015) was enlisted along with Lakoff’s (2004, 2016) method of reframing.

3.5 Limitations

The audio recordings were an unfortunate limitation of the data in this study. Without video recordings it was difficult to interpret elements such as pauses, reference to objects in the room and environmental distractions. Additionally, it would have been valuable to see facial expressions and gestures from students and advisors as they offer insight not encoded in language and prosody alone. Finally, limited data on students in recorded advising sessions made it unclear where students are in their programs or to what degree each student has worked with language advisors.
Chapter 4: The Advising Event

4.0 Introduction

This chapter provides a detailed explanation and illustration of the advising event, my model for the discursive structure of advising sessions that emerged from analysis of these data. This underlying structure is key to understanding the findings in chapters 5 and 6. My analysis follows the macro-mezzo-micro approach to analysis (Strauss et al, 2019) with this advising event structure as the macro level. The mezzo and micro levels will be the focus of analysis in the following chapters.

I will begin by briefly discussing the limited history of ALL research into the organization of advising sessions. I will then define two important terms: ‘advisable issue’ and ‘advising event.’ Second, I present a detailed explanation of the structure of an advising event with examples from my data. Understanding this structure is vital to the analysis of Noriko and Jess as advisors. Finally, I will address the potential benefits of the advising event to the field.

4.1 Previous work

In the last two decades, the field of advising in language learning (ALL) has established an emerging body of research in skills and practices related to counseling and advising (Kato & Mynard, 2016; Kelly, 1996; McCarthy, 2010; Riley, 1997). This skill-focused, evidence-based, approach has developed the young field and has generated a body of research focused on improving the efficiency of language advising and training new advisors.

One effort to establish a systematic, discourse-led, approach to the advising session was McCarthy’s (2010) analysis of 20 recorded advising sessions at a self-access learning center at a Japanese university. Her data (which consisted of advisor turns for eight advisors
across the 20 sessions) were coded and organized into a combination of emergent and expected categories. Categories were then organized into groups that represented advising ‘skills,’ following research in counseling (mainly Kelly, 1996). The resulting findings defined a set of 31 skills (techniques and behaviors used by advisors), divided into macro and micro skills, as well as an outline for the organization of the advising session. While McCarthy’s article is recognized for its contribution to skills and methods (building on Kelly’s work) it has gained little attention for its advising system or the potential of its discourse analytic approach to advising session discourse. As a result, this remains a significant gap in ALL literature.

4.2 Definition of the Advising Event and Advisable Issue

An *advisable issue* is a topic of discussion concerning a student’s study or study planning. Topics range from finding ways to increase study time during the week to selecting new vocabulary words. While the topics vary, it is important to note that not every issue broached is discussed. Each issue starts as a *potential advisable issue*. This potential advisable issue could be a topic raised by either the advisor or student. Sometimes this is done explicitly as with: “tell me your goals” or “I want to talk about my report” but is sometimes initiated less explicitly from “chat” (Eggins & Slade, 1997) “You haven’t finished? Yes, don’t worry, me neither. My assignment has been sitting on my laptop for a while.”

When potential advisable issues are suggested by students or surface during chat, they enter a period of testing, and some potential advisable issues are discarded while others are kept. Although the process of deciding what is kept is co-constructed by advisor and student it is the advisor who makes the decision by moving onto the advising event.
An advising event is the semi-structured process of discussing and resolving an advisable issue. Each phase of the advising event is described below, but can be summarized as advisors: collecting information, guiding students to discover answers and then resolving their issue in some way. At the beginning of the advising event, the advisor begins by asking questions and gaining information to better understand the student’s issues and circumstances. The advising event then progresses through a guidance phase leading to a resolution. This guidance phase can take the form of responsive mediation (Johnson & Golombek, 2016) a mini-lesson, or an attempt by the advisor to reframe a student’s understanding (Lakoff, 2016). Finally, the resolution phase has several potential conclusions including a simple acknowledgment that something was done (a test taken, or conversation enacted using certain language), or a detailed plan for action designed and agreed upon by advisor and student.

4.3 Structure of the Advising Session

Broadly, an advising session can be divided into three major phases: Opening, Body and Conclusion. The body phase itself can be further divided into three phases that make up a recursive set of interactions of advising events. The basic structure of the advising session from start to finish is a series of mini-conversations (advising events) guided by the advisor. Each advising event is co-constructed around an advisable issue, discussed, concluded and reflected on during the session. The dividing lines between advisable issues are not always explicit at the conversational level, and topics are rarely clearly segmented from earlier conversation once chosen. However, at the micro level they are divided by discourse markers and discursive strategies. The advising session is outlined in Table 4.1.
Table 4.1: The Advising Session

1. Opening – chatting and non-advising topics, concluded by a clear transition to the first advising event.

[Advising Event]

2. Gleaning Information – Use of tools, background knowledge, or previous knowledge to highlight some point of study then discover more about it through conversation.

3. Guidance and Support - Use of advising strategies, such as reflexive dialogue (Sato & Mynard, 2016), to assist and mediate experiences.

4. Resolution – resolution of the topic of discussion with a goal, new insight or a lesson that acts as a conclusion before moving to a new event on a new topic.

[Repeat steps 2-4 with new event]

5. Conclusion – Review Advising events with a focus on the results in step 4. Discuss goals and time of next meeting.

Examples of Advising Events

To illustrate the advising event, I will use two example sets to display the unfolding of the event from start to finish. Example set 1 depicts a session between advisor Jess and student Hiro. Example set 2 is derived from a session with advisor Noriko and student Ai.

Example Set 1

This first example shows the transition from an earlier conversation to an advising event. Excerpt 1 comes from is the beginning of the recording. Jess begins the advising event
with reference to Hiro’s previous session and begins by gleaning information about that session and Hiro’s learning goals.

Excerpt 1 - Opening

Jess:  We will do that then. Ok so. You’ve spoken to Ella about your language goals and your learning plan?
Hiro:  Yeah
Jess:  Did you want to talk to me a little bit about it or did you finish talking about this plan?

In this example of gleaning, advisor Jess raised the issue of goal setting and learning plans. She begins by prompting Hiro to discuss a previous session. Here, Jess aims to discover as much about the previous discussion on the topic as possible. After an aside about overwritten text, Jess returns to the targeted discussion of goals and continues to push for more information. Once Hiro has given her enough information, she decides to pursue the topic, moving from a potential advisable issue to the advising event. She does this here by repeating his two stated goals: “Ok, so fluency and vocabulary.” Following this Jess leads Hiro to think more deeply about these two goals and to decide which is primary.

Excerpt 2 - Fact Finding

Jess:  You’ve spoken to Ella about your language goals and your learning plan?
Hiro:  Yeah
Jess:  Did you want to talk to me a little bit about it or did you finish talking about this plan?

Following from the above example, Jess moves from fact-finding to guiding and supporting. The purpose of the activity discussed in excerpt 2 was to write down a single goal but Hiro selected two. Choosing a single goal (which could be changed later) is
preferable and Jess uses this opportunity to help guide Hiro’s decision making. To do this she explains more about what vocabulary and fluency could mean and how they relate to usage. With this assistance Hiro is able to choose vocabulary as a more important goal for the moment.

**Excerpt 3 – Guidance**

Hiro: And, I didn’t type here but also, um, vocabulary is a small goal
Jess: **Ok, ok so fluency and vocabulary**
Hiro: Yeah
Jess: **Now which one of these is the most important to you?** Cause fluency can mean speaking for a long time.
Hiro: Yeah
Jess: **Or just speaking.** Where as vocabulary is super important for fluency.
Hiro: Yeah
Jess: **Then you could say so is grammar, for fluency. So, are you wanting to speak for a long time? Or are you wanting to be able to communicate your thoughts clearly?**
Hiro: Um
Jess: Using the correct words
Hiro: I learn vocabulary first
Jess: Yeah, ok great. So maybe vocabulary is more your focus. But it will help you to be fluent
Hiro: Yes

This final excerpt in this example set illustrates a resolution to the advisable issue of choosing a goal. Hiro agrees to focus on vocabulary and move fluency into the background as a “second goal.” The example below also shows the transition to the second advisable issue.

**Excerpt 4 - Resolution**

Jess: Yeah, ok great. **So maybe vocabulary is more here**
Hiro: Yeah
Jess: **Your focus.** But it will help you to be fluent
Hiro: Yes
Jess: **So, fluency is like your second goal really.** Ok, and so, when you say translation you want to be a translator.
Hiro: *laughs*

... 
Jess: Translator, ok. **Do you want to work on the speaking?**
Hiro: Yeah

Following the previous example with Jess and Hiro, there is a return to the fact finding seen above in excerpt 2. The new potential issue is who Hiro has identified as practice partners. Just as in excerpt 2, this dialogue begins with broad questions to decide if
this is a good topic and to collect further information for discussion. This use of questions by Jess will be discussed extensively in Chapter 6.

**Excerpt 5 New fact finding**

Jess: So, [now] tell me about your resources. People who can speak English
Hiro: *laughs*
Jess: Who are they, where are they, who can you talk to them?

**Example Set 2**

In this example of an opening, Noriko meets Ai for the fifth or sixth time in the semester, just before the summer break. Unlike Jess and Hiro, Noriko and Ai are familiar with each other’s plans and schedules, beginning the session by casually discussing Ai’s vacation plans. The turn away from casual conversation is clearly marked by a statement that this is the final advising session of the semester and an explicit question about what Ai wants to discuss as part of the session.

**Excerpt 6 - Opening**

Noriko: For Hawaii, you just wanted to change some atmosphere?
Ai: Yes, I just wanted to change
Noriko: I like that! **Ok, so we’re going to have our final appointment this semester. So, what shall we work on?** I guess you mentioned that you want to talk about your summer plan.

Like Hiro in the excerpt above, Ai met with a different advisor the week before. The fact finding starts with some clarification of what happened in that session. In this example there is a discussion of ‘big goals’ and ‘small goals’ (discussed more in Chapter 6) that are clarified. Also, there is the use of the broad fact-finding question “Can you tell me about what you have planned so far.” This does much the same work as “tell me about your goal” in excerpt 2. Noriko’s use of questions is expanded upon in Chapter 5.

**Excerpt 7 - Fact Finding**

Ai: So, last week I couldn’t meet with you, so last week I talked with Liz, and she gave me this [worksheet to help clarify goals and make plans to achieve them].
Noriko: Awesome!
Ai: Actually, I didn’t make so many plans.
Noriko: That’s ok. Wow, this looks great! So you have a big goal for Portuguese and English?
Ai: Yes
Noriko: Awesome. Can you tell me about what you have planned so far?

In excerpt 7, advisor Noriko helps Ai describe her “target” for study. Initially, when Noriko asks a question about her “big goal”, Ai shows that she is confused as to exactly what Noriko wants. Instead of simply choosing quantity or quality, Noriko opens the dialogue to discuss what those terms mean and what they might mean to Ai’s study plans.

After discussion they conclude that Ai’s concern is about how much she is studying. In the process of this discussion they also answer the question of what kind of vocabulary – “the vocabulary of natural conversation” in excerpt 8 below.

Excerpt 8 - Guidance and support

Noriko: Um, do you have any target, like weekly target that you want to try every week, or . . .?
Ai: If the target means like, quantity, or quality . . .
Noriko: Um, it’s – I think that actually a good question. You mentioned about the quantity and quality. Umm, if you try to focus on quantity, you will probably have to study a lot-cram a lot. But at the same time you have to review a lot as well. So, it’s going to be a little bit, it’s going to be a lot of work. Are you willing to learn as many words as possible, or do you want to learn the words that actually help you in a classroom discussion.
Ai: Buy summer vacation . . . has a lot of time, so I’d like to study as many as possible
Noriko: So you’re thinking about quantity . . . at the same time, what kind of vocabulary are you focusing on?
Ai: I want to continue the vocabulary of natural conversation.

In excerpt 9, Noriko creates a resolution by summary (excerpt 9 follows directly from excerpt 8 above). She restates the advisable issues in the form of statements about what Ai wants – “you want.” This type of non-interrogative question prompts Ai’s agreement and the advisable issue is finalized with “ok, that sounds good.”

Excerpt 9 - Resolution

Noriko: Ok, just for natural conversation . . . So, not just to learn anything – any words you don’t know. Instead, you want to focus on vocabulary that would help you have a natural conversation. Okay. So, you want to try to learn more vocabulary in this semester . . .
Ai: Yeah
Noriko: Ok, sounds good.

49
The session closes with a resolution in which Noriko summarizes and restates important parts of the session. In addition, she encourages Ai and reminds her that she will be able to support her again after the summer vacation.

Excerpt 10 - Conclusion

Noriko: I see. **Well, I can feel that you have a really strong motivation, and I think your scary feeling about being, getting lazy is also coming from your strong motivations.** You don’t want to lose the opportunities, and I think that is really great, and I think that’s your strength—you are really good at keeping your motivation high—I remember you mentioned that you’re being lazy, but you never actually have lost the motivation—so I think that’s something you’re really, really good at, and I can see the skills that you have improved throughout this semester as well. So, yes, um, **I’m really excited to see you after the summer break.** If you feel like you are getting, losing motivations, just, you can send me a message. I will be here definitely next week—1st, 2nd, and 3rd. But, I will also be back after 20th. Because basically, we’re kind of on the same boat—I also—if I miss this summer, I cannot pass my class, too. So we’re on the same page. We will work really hard.

4.4 Understanding the advising session through the framework of advising events

4.4.1 Return to topics of earlier advising events

In these data most sessions resolve two or three advisable issues. However, the topics of these “resolved” advisable issues (e.g., plans to study vocabulary, trouble deciding on a book) resurface. This happens in two main cases. The first and least common in these data were when students returned to issues, without pointed provocation by advisor questions or comments. This happens only a few times. When at the end of a session student Yuna suddenly decided to change a textbook discussed earlier in the session. The case for this being the result of an extended effort at reframing is discussed in section 6.3.3. This is also the case of student Ai returning to the topic of laziness several times over the course of multiple sessions. This is discussed in section 5.3.3.

The second, and more common reprisal of topics is when the advisor returns to it, either at the conclusion of the session in the overall summery or when previous topics are also drawn back into conversation by advisors as an angle to address new issues. One
reoccurring example of this comes from Noriko’s use of “you said/you mentioned” using Ai’s earlier words to preface new questions. This discursive practice is discussed in 5.3.1.

4.4.2 Gleaning information

Questions of all types form a basis for phase two and the nature of interrogatives is perfect for the task of learning more. However, in action the process is significantly more complex. In typical conversation, statements are made in the form of questions, and questions are asked in the syntactic form of statements (like B-event Statements – Heritage, 1985; Koshik, 2005).

One major use for non-interrogative questions, is in the session summary. Advisors also use summary as a means of gleaning information and in some places, to identify or confirm information from the student (not unlike B-event statements). In others it is stated in the form of a question to glean yet newer information. Finally, simple repeating strategies are used to glean and confirm information. Advisors spend much of each advising session asking questions and making confirmation eliciting statements to glean information. As such, it is of the most time-consuming part of an event.

4.4.3 Balancing directive guidance and eliciting new information

The boarder between phase two, gleaning information, and guidance can be difficult to identify. Supportive guidance requires that the advisor first find the learner’s orienting basis then carefully monitor how they take up new concepts and modify extant concepts. To do this effectively, an advisor needs information about the student and their thinking often requiring a supposition and confirmation. Phases 2 and 3 are often iterative and follow several cycles before movement to the resolution in phase 4.
According to Kato and Mynard (2016) there are different levels of learner autonomy that advisers should be cognizant of. As the learner becomes more autonomous the role of the advisor changes. One major area of this change is in the form of guidance, or - considered differently – in the directiveness of guidance. This follows sociocultural theories ideas of mediation – a learner should always be given only the minimal amount of assistance necessary to push themselves beyond what they could do alone. This process is stressful, but transformative. In this, advisors can be understood to actively moderate how much assistance they provide to students throughout sessions. Furthermore, students who need more directive support, being at a lower level of learner autonomy (e.g., Hiro) receive more. By contrast students with a higher level of learner autonomy receive less directive support, or guidance with a “lighter touch” (e.g., Risa).

4.5 Potential value to the field

This advising event structure could offer deeper understanding of language advising and add in the training of future advisors. Though more research, testing, and validation of this tool beyond the present study is needed, anecdotal experience suggests potential for this tool to aid in the training of new advisors and for researchers seeking to better understand what occurs in sessions.
Chapter 5: Advisor Noriko

5.0 Introduction

Through discourse analysis, this chapter illustrates Noriko’s practice as an advisor in her work with student-advisee Ai. Chapter four addressed the macro level of the advising session as the advising event. This chapter will address the mezzo and micro levels following the macro-mezzo-micro approach (Strauss et al., 2019). As such, this chapter will proceed from the larger themes (ordered as they occur in the advising event: gleaning information, mediation, resolution) into examination of distinct, systematic discursive practices. The chapter is divided into the mezzo themes of (1) gleaning information, (2) supporting, guiding and reframing, and finally (3) teaching and prompting action. Mezzo themes are then divided into enacted micro-level, discursive practices. Each micro-level practice is analyzed as it illustrates and contributes to mezzo-level themes.

5.1 Background for Noriko and Ai

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noriko</th>
<th>Ai</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Japanese</td>
<td>• Japanese</td>
<td>• 4 Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Late 20s</td>
<td>• Studying English and</td>
<td>• 24/29/35/23 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Working on her Ed.D.</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>• 3 Month Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Native-like English</td>
<td>• Second year student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Experienced EFL teacher</td>
<td>• Worried that she does</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Friendly &amp; Empathetic</td>
<td>not work hard enough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and that she is always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>behind classmates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chapter focuses on advisor Noriko, a Japanese woman in her late 20s. At the time of recording her advising sessions, she worked as an advisor and English language instructor at Jogen University. During this time, in addition to her work at Jogen, Noriko was pursuing an Ed.D. with a focus in language advising, motivation and learner engagement. Noriko now works as a professor in a department of Education in a small Japanese university. Noriko is
not a native English speaker but is highly proficient and displayed advanced knowledge of teaching strategies for English grammar and composition. In her interactions with Ai, in addition to guidance and instruction, Noriko was friendly and empathetic to the difficulties of college life. Eggins and Slade (1997) concept of “chats and chunks” is useful in identifying how Noriko moved between friendly conversation and structured instruction. Noriko’s advising sessions shift smoothly between “chunks” that are highly structured and power-centered (like a classroom teacher) to “chat” that is unstructured and power-neutral (like that of a friendly conversation).

Although this chapter is an analysis of Noriko’s discourse, it is important to clarify several of Ai’s motivations. In these sessions Ai made statements such as: “I graduated from normal school, not international or something like that… some people has the better background, but I don’t have, so this free time I have to make effort and I have to catch up with everyone” and “I entered this university to improve my language skills, so if I don’t have language skills in the future, I don’t have anything.”

In the above dialogue, Ai expressed both the stress and motivation to work harder than her peers because (in her view) she did not have the same advantages as many of her classmates. It is helpful to see Ai in this light as she positions herself as a hard-working underachiever seeking to be a “good student.” To enact this role of good student, she describes completing her reading and assignments and volunteering for extracurricular activities like speech contests even when she is pressured by coursework. Ai’s concepts of a good student reflect common Japanese conceptualizations of good students, as outlined in Hiraga’s (1998) “Tao of learning: Metaphors Japanese students live by.” From this position Noriko constructs and modifies frames of education concerning being “a good student.” Through reframing, Noriko shows Ai a different approach to learning and being a good student that she did not know before. One example highlighted below is Noriko’s approach to
the entailment of “more work is better.” In this, Noriko tries to reconstruct the concept of working hard to include “having fun” and “being lazy” as sometimes good.

5.2 Gleaning information

Due to Jogen’s large faculty and online booking system, advisors often begin sessions with little or no information about a student, their study goals or their habits. However, the process of gleaning (advising event phase two) allows them to identify potential advisable issues. Unlike traditional classroom teachers, advisors do not have a set curriculum or predetermined meetings with students so as to know (or define) those student’s learning trajectory. The process of asking questions, intuiting, and confirming in the advising session allows advisors to not only to understand that learning trajectory for students’ language of study, but also dig deeper and uncover potential issues invisible to the students.

The process of gleaning information is not always clear. To access certain answers there is often a back and forth, gaining some information and then guessing or clarifying what was learned, leading to more questions. Some of this information pertains to advisees’ actions as students: what are you studying, where do you study, when do you study, etc. However, other pieces of information are to flesh-out the broader context of students’ lives: do you have a part time job? are you feeling tired at the end of the semester? what are your summer plans? Noriko asked a broad array of questions to address both areas of study and life – seeking to find out more about Ai, her study practices and her life.

Situating this section in my model of the advising event, gleaning information serves several purposes. Questions about a potential study problem or scheduling issue potentially help the advisor identify what is more or less important to discuss in a session – identifying advisable issues for the session. The advisor requires information to understand problems of which she may have no prior knowledge. Additionally, issues pertaining to the student’s life
and how that might affect study must be collected and identified by the advisor as helpful or potentially problematic elements: long train rides, part time jobs, family issues etc.

5.2.1 “So I have a question”

Noriko makes extensive use of questions of various types to glean information from Ai about study practices, her schedule, her feelings her travel plans, etc. In these data, she uses different questions to glean different types of information from Ai. Previous researchers have divided questions into different categories based either on structure or expected response. Vogt et al. (2003) separated questions into tiers ranging from ‘less powerful’ to ‘more powerful’ according to what kind of answer they required from the interlocutor. The least powerful questions were yes, no, and which. Above those were questions formed with the words who, what, where and when. Then at the top, the most powerful questions, were how and why. The authors suggest that answering ‘why’ required not only a more in-depth answer but often more introspection. Sato and Mynard (2016) suggest that a focus on powerful questions is a valuable strategy for advisors and can lead to learner development.

Buschner (2020) offered a modification to Vogt et al. (2003) with a five-part system: simple questions, what questions, how questions, why questions and powerful questions. As with Sato and Mynard, powerful questions received a separate classification with the intention of invoking deep reflection but structurally consisted of questions using ‘why’ and ‘how.’ The answers to these ‘most powerful questions’ required expanded answers, personal reflection and insight. However, within these data various questions emerged that broke these barriers. Some questions that use how required only simple answers and seemingly simple questions were both designed to, and in-fact did, elicit deep reflection.

In this dissertation, I use a system of only two broad categories of questions: closed questions and open questions. Closed question consisting of those questions whose answers
expect a response of one word or phrase – yes/no, maybe, on Tuesday, I went to the store.

The information gained from students in closed questions is minimal (often a single piece of information) and the process of answering requires little or no reflection. By contrast, open questions provoke thought and require reflection by the student. Answers to these questions might be extended utterance, stream of thought discussion as students “talk out” what they are thinking or silence. These responses are often punctuated by silence and hesitation as students grapple with the complicated nature of question and answer.

5.2.1.1 Closed Questions

Structurally these are generally yes/no who, where and when questions. Noriko’s most common structure for closed questions is “do you”:

- “Do you think three minutes is too long?”
- “Do you prefer video?”
- “I think texting and speaking are a little bit different, but do you want to work on learning both?”

Generally, Noriko asks simple questions to seek a single datum of information – day of a test, confirming class assignments, planning to go to Disney World or not, etc. Strategically, this allows Noriko to confirm details for later use. In some cases, this can be a series of simple questions to confirm a set of circumstances (filling in specific gaps of knowledge to construct a fuller, more complete picture).

**Excerpt 1**

Ai: So later, I have to study.
Noriko: **When will** you have a test next time?
Ai: Next time is... July, 20.
Noriko: Okay, so **you have time**?
Ai: Yes.
Noriko: So today, we wanted to talk about the vocabulary book. Have you been using ELLLO?

This example illustrates how Noriko uses a set of simple questions to weigh the benefits or necessity of discussing a topic. In this case she asks two questions to determine the necessity of discussing Ai’s upcoming Portuguese test. First, she asks about the date with
the simple “when will have a test next time?” making sure that it is not an immediate issue. Noriko then confirms that Ai does not feel stressed about this test with the questioning statement “okay, so you have time?” With this information, Noriko moves on to a previously agreed on topic, marked with the topic changing “so,” discussing Ai’s plans to study English vocabulary. In this way, Noriko used two simple questions to determine that the Portuguese test was not a matter of importance, or at least not enough so to displace the planned topic of English vocabulary study.

At other times this sort of inquiry, using a series of simple questions, allows Noriko to identify the new advisable issues, following the resolution of a previous issue. To do this, Noriko uses sets of simple questions to probe for potential problems in Ai’s studies or in her life, as in the following excerpt.

Excerpt 2
Noriko: I’m going to give you another, like… a weekly plan sheet. If that helps. … here you go.
Ai: *indecipherable*
Noriko: No problem.
So, what would your schedule be next week? Would you be very busy, or…?
Ai: I’m not so busy… this week.
Noriko: Okay, yea, you don’t look so stressed out.
Ai: Go to Tokyo and having dinner with my classmates of freshman English at Disney, so… it’s very good.
Noriko: Ahhh. And you started your part-time job?
Ai: Yes, I want to working part-time job, but I don’t working.
Noriko: This weekend you’re going have part-time job and you’re going to Tokyo?
Ai: I wanted to put my part-time job on Saturday, but my mother said to me, we have to go…
Noriko: Ahh, you have to go out? I see, I see, I see…
Ai: So, maybe not. This is, I want to.
Noriko: Ah, your plan? It’s not fixed yet…
Ai: So, it’s almost July.
Noriko: I know! Tomorrow’s the last day. Oh my goodness! I haven’t finished much reading, so it terrifies me.

In this excerpt, Noriko concludes the previous advising event by giving Ai a worksheet to help her enact a plan to study vocabulary through recordings. The resolution stage to that previous advising event is the transfer of the worksheet and the understanding that Ai will use it to help her in executing the plan. After Ai’s response, unfortunately unintelligible in the audio, Noriko makes a change of topic with “so” seeking a new potential
advisable issue. Her first question “would you be very busy next week?” seeks a yes or no answer to the topic of being busy. Feeling busy and overwhelmed was an issue for Ai, who struggles with working too much while also berating herself for being lazy. Although Noriko initially asked “what would your schedule be like next week” which seeks an extended response, she immediately refocused it on the idea of being busy with the simple yes or no question. When Ai responds that she will not be very busy, Noriko makes a statement to paint that in a positive light “you don’t look so stressed out.” This positive reframing of not busy will be discussed in more depth below in section 5.3.3.

Although Ai chose to reply to Noriko’s first question of “what would your schedule be like next week?” explaining plans to meet friends and go to Disneyland, Noriko attempts to move to the topic of Ai’s parttime job (using information gained from a previous session). This occurs as a series of simple questions “you started your parttime job?” “this weekend you’re going to have your parttime job?” but does not result in a topic of more extended conversation. Instead, Ai refocuses the conversation around her plans to study. Noriko takes up this topic “Ah, your plan? It’s not fixed yet.” then “I know!” to emphatically agree with Ai’s implication that time is moving fast and she has a lot to do in “its almost July.” Although this section begins as a more open discussion of upcoming events, it culminates into a discussion of schedules and summer plans that Noriko uses to conclude the session. This excerpt is illustrative of the kind of gleaning with simple questions that Noriko engages in with Ai to seek a new advisable issue to focus on. It also illustrates Noriko’s ability to move smoothly between chucks and chat.

The examples above illustrate Noriko’s use of closed questions to lead to and identify the applicability of a potential advisable issue. Additionally, in these data Noriko used closed questions to simplify topics of discussion and “nail down” specific information for further discussion. In the following excerpt Noriko prompts Ai to explain her study habits. Ai has an
upcoming Portuguese test and is spending more time studying Portuguese than English. However, she is unsure of her decision to cut back on English study and further complicates the issue by amalgamating concern over reduced study time with a concern over her methods of study. To try and unravel this Noriko focuses her concern first around quantity, asking directly – how much time do you think you need?

**Excerpt 3**

Noriko: So, study… you feel like you’re focusing too much on Portuguese—study for Portuguese… At the same time, you mentioned that you, within a limited time, you still keep learning, try to do shadowing a little bit, or listening to ELLLLO, and, so the fact that you continue doing, I think that’s really great. But you also mentioned about lack of quantity…

Ai: Yes.

Noriko: So, **how much time** do you feel you needed for this task?

Ai: Umm, so… now shadowing is only on my free time, so if it’s possible, I **want to practice it every day, at least five minutes**. So, expanding vocabulary is also, if possible, I **want to study twice a week**.

Noriko: I remember we talked about how to use your commute to use English—to learn English, and you mentioned that maybe you can use bus ride from Hongo to school to learn English. **How is that plan going?**

Ai: I think that I can’t do enough in the bus. Today, also, I planned my description, script of Portuguese, because this year also I decided participate in contest of Portuguese.

Noriko’s question “how much time” elicits a clear set of answers from Ai: “I want to practice every day, at least five minutes” and “I want to study twice a week.” Noriko helps Ai organize her thinking here through her closed question. It appears that Ai had a clear plan, but she could not express it because it was conflated with other issues. By establishing this point, Noriko and Ai have a focused topic – finding time for shadowing for five minutes a day and twice a week studying new vocabulary. Addressing this, Noriko asks about plans to study on the bus to “use your commute to use English.” Though unlikely that Noriko would have suggested shadowing on public transportation, it is possible that she planned to suggest that Ai study vocabulary on the bus. Even if this was not Noriko’s plan, she positioned herself to guide Ai’s study planning, and this is a common use of closed questions. The final question of this excerpt of “how’s that plan going” is discussed below.
5.2.1.2 Open Questions

Generally, Noriko asks open questions not to elicit information, but instead to prompt reflection or extended speech about Ai’s life and study habits. In my interview with Noriko, she stated how important she found the idea of reflection, following the model of reflective advising by Sato and Mynard (2016). Though the question forms are often simple the answers are usually extended or broken up by pauses while Ai thinks through her answers. Sometimes the response is silence. The topics that provide opportunity for open questions are often more emotional, as with the example below. In the following excerpt Noriko asks Ai why she feels scared. Ai states that her laziness scares her because she sees any waste of time as a missed opportunity.

Excerpt 4

Ai: Now I’m very lazy, so I’m really, really scary.
Noriko: Ah, you’re scared of being lazy?
Ai: Yes. I already know, very lazy I think.
Noriko: Um, what makes you scared of being lazy? I think because it’s summer break, I think it’s nice to be lazy too. Why do you feel so scared?
Ai: Um, of course, one reason is test. And, I could understand my time is very limited, so, if I miss this chance…
Noriko: So you don’t want to miss the chance?
Ai: Yes, and in this semester, I can’t spend the time to English and Portuguese like past semester, so…

This follows the resolution of the previous advising event about the topic of making good use of time. At the resolution of the previous event Noriko applauds Ai’s careful use of time: “I like how you are being so strategic—you have a strategy to improve your, um, both of your languages.” However, instead of a statement of gratitude, Ai explains her motivation – failure to use time well scares her. Noriko, surprised by the comment, first confirms the statement with a closed question “you’re scared of being lazy?” When Ai confirms, she probes deeper with the open question “why do you feel scared.” The question accomplishes two related tasks. First, it elicits a reason for her fear. Second, it prompts Ai to express her feelings of fear and address the deeper issue – her concern about how wasted opportunities
might hurt her in the future. Ai responds first by giving a reason “one reason is the test” but quickly moves to the underlying fear making the unfinished statement “if I miss this chance.” She never directly finishes this “if” statement, but the preceding discourse reveals that Ai feels that she is less prepared than her classmates. She expresses a need to constantly work harder to catch up: “some people has the better background, but I don’t have, so this free time I have to make effort and I have to catch up with everyone.” Noriko’s question asking ‘why’ she felt scared coaxed Ai to discuss her concerns and frustrations: “Because I entered this university to improve my language skills, so if I don’t have language skills in the future, I don’t have anything.” Noriko’s resolution to this event will be discussed below in the section on balancing – as she seeks to help Ai balance her concern and her motivation. What is relevant here to her use of open questions is how it elicited reflection about what Ai was truly concerned about. Though she was worried about preparing for her upcoming test, the deeper issue was a feeling of inadequacy.

5.2.2 Intuiting and Confirming

In addition to open and closed questions to glean information, Noriko uses confirmation eliciting statements and rhetorical questions. Noriko employs confirmation eliciting statements as often as question forms, in many cases pairing the two together. Working from Ai’s answers, Noriko chooses to mediate a problem, make a suggestion or perform a mini-lesson. In some cases, to do this, Noriko made a leap of logic. This follows the practice of ‘intuiting’ (Sato & Mynard, 2016), which suggests that through dialogue, advisors are able to make connections (about students’ problems) that were not stated explicitly. This insight allows advisors, always working with too little context and background information, to offer more nuanced aid than would be available from explicitly given information alone. Noriko made extensive use of this intuiting strategy - often making
educated guesses about Ai’s underlying issues pertaining to stress. Noriko sometimes prefaced these intuiting statements with the lower epistemic stance markers “I guess,” “I think” and “it sounds like.”

The following excerpt comes from the first minute of a session where Noriko and Ai discuss the rapidly approaching end of the semester. Ai breaks from this topic and interjects a comment about being lazy. Noriko initiated an advising event from this unexpected statement.

Excerpt 5
Ai: So now, it’s very near summer vacation, and I’m still very lazy I think.
Noriko: Oh, how come?
Ai: Um, I tried to finish writing report, and actually, I could finish it, but now my feeling is, I want to rest, I want to have a rest, but next week, as I said, I have a test. Then, next next week, I also have test.
Noriko: Right, I think for the next two weeks you will be very busy—taking a test and submitting a report.
Ai: Yes, and, sophomore English class, I have essay, so… very busy.
Noriko: Yea, sounds like there are so many things that you have to do. And you mentioned that you want to have more rest.
Ai: Un
Noriko: But earlier, you also mentioned that you feel lazy,
Ai: Yes
Noriko: Um . . . does it mean that you have things to do but you can’t do it?

Ai’s initial comment about summer vacation, follows naturally from previous statements, but the subject of laziness is broached unexpectedly, noted by Noriko’s change of state token “oh” before the question “how come?” After Ai’s explanation, Noriko paraphrases but substitutes “lazy” and “rest” with “very busy.” This draws a confirmation from Ai and Noriko picks up this topic of busy/lazy as an advisable issue.

Once Ai takes on the framing of “very busy” Noriko paraphrases with confirmation eliciting statements: “sounds like there are many things that you have to do” “you mentioned that you want to have more rest” “you also mentioned that you feel lazy.” Ai confirms each statement and, as with closed questions, the confirmation eliciting statements act to focus the topic. After a moment of thought, Noriko asks the closed question “does it mean that you have things to do but can’t do it?” And this leads to a lengthy advising event focused on Ai’s
concern about her use of time and feeling lazy although she works quite hard. Through the combination of confirmation eliciting statements and questions, Noriko gains a deeper understanding into Ai’s frustration and helps Ai to organize her thoughts. Ai is busy but thinks she is lazy due to stress from an upcoming test.

As is true in the example above, Noriko often offer advice while avoiding a directive tone. One way she does this is by shifting her delivery to an epistemic stance (Heritage, 2012; Strauss & Feiz, 2014) of less authority or one of less certainty. Noriko commonly employs this lower epistemic stance when intuiting and confirming, as in the example above “I think” “sounds like” and qualification through Ai’s previous statements “you mentioned.” Noriko’s use of Ai’s statements for guidance through “you said” and “you mentioned” will be addressed in the following section (5.3.1) in terms of guidance and support. As they related to gleaning information they often co-occur with Noriko’s intuiting and confirming statements.

Noriko makes jumps of logic (she must intuit beyond the information explicitly provided) to help Ai. As above, she organizes the information she has gleaned about Ai then supplements it with informed guesses. When making these educated guesses Noriko either takes a lower epistemic stance (I guess) (sounds like) or supports her intuit with Ai’s own words.

Excerpt 6

Ai: Because then I thought I won’t be able to speak English until my graduation. But still I think, so I have to study out of my classes, or not for test, but for myself… but now, I can’t study like, expanding vocabulary is very little quantity, and shadowing time is very short, so… I think I do same things again, I *unintelligible*… but now…

Noriko: Mmm, I see. Sounds like your stress comes from the fact you can’t try the activity which you really want to do for yourself, but instead you have to study for Portuguese test, which you don’t really believe is connected to your future.

Ai: If I don’t forget the things that I studied, I can live and I can satisfied, but always I forget the things that I studied past. This is big stressful things for me.

Noriko: Ah, so if you learn something, you want to be able to learn it at once?

Ai: Yes. Of course, human always forget something, so I have to review, but my reviewing time is not enough, so, so… my studying it awful for me.

Noriko: So, you feel that the time for review is lacking—you need more time to review?

Ai: So, I think it is very complicated now.
Noriko: Yes, it sounds like it’s quite, uh, quite complicated—lots of emotions within yourself, like part of you, you want to study more for what you’re interested in; at the same time, you need to study for the Portuguese test that you need to pass. And, you also feel stressed because you have forgotten about what you learned before.

Ai: Yes, so, and also, as I said, the summer vacation, I will be lazy.

Noriko: So, you feel worried? About being lazy?

Ai: Yes.

Noriko: So, I think there are mainly four things in your mind. First is, the frustration coming from your lack of study time for what you really want to do. And the second thing is about the frustrations coming from studying for the Portuguese test, which you’re not really interested in. Third is the frustration coming from yourself because you feel like you have forgotten many things because you did not review very well, and the last one is about summer vacation.

Ai: Yes.

Noriko: Well, I guess if you have four heavy rocks, you would probably feel like you would want to give up. So it’s probably the best to get rid of, or deal with some of them. I feel like the last one, summer vacation—you’re worried about being lazy during the summer—we still have about three weeks, so do you think this is urgent, or can we maybe think about it maybe once everything’s over? And I think this week there will be less students, so we can chat more—we can probably explore more resources.

Ai: So, I thought I have to talk with you about studying in summer vacation.

In the excerpt above, Noriko helped Ai sort through a number of issues that surfaced during the conversation. To do this, Noriko uses information gleaned earlier in the session “you have to study for Portuguese test, which you don’t believe is connected to your future” and new information “ah, so if you learn something you want to be able to learn it at once?”.

Adding to acts of summary and paraphrase Noriko intuits several times starting with her initial response: “sounds like your stress comes from the fact that you can’t try the activity which you really want to do for yourself.” Ai never stated this explicitly but Noriko built it from Ai’s concern that her upcoming Portuguese test. Noriko’s conclusion that Ai would like to spend more time reviewing is a combination of intuit and reframing. Since it is probably not possible for Ai to suddenly develop the ability to memorize new material with a single session of study, Noriko opts to try and reframe her problem in a way that is possible—committing more time. This intuit and reframing unfortunately seems to have been misunderstood, as Ai concludes “So, I think its very complicated now.” Ai does not take up the idea of finding more time to review. Noriko once again returns to summary and paraphrase, adding “lots of emotions within yourself” to the idea of stress. Returning to Ai’s
major concern of being lazy during the summer Noriko turns to a metaphor of heavy rocks and through this metaphor suggests that Ai needs to remove some of her psychological burden. Noriko suggests something that Ai did not expect, forgetting about summer vacation for the time-being. Ai’s response “So I thought I have to talk with you about studying in summer vacation” shows that she was deeply focused on this topic and hopped the advising session would address this. In fact, Noriko does address it by suggesting that summer study plans be put on hold to focus on completing her remaining work for the semester without additional stress.

5.3 Guiding, supporting and reframing

Guiding and supporting are primary activities for advisors. Here I will define guiding as the process by which advisors prompt students to arrive at their own conclusions to problems. Discursively guiding and supporting are enacted in several ways, including repeating and summarizing key points, clarifying facts, checking understanding, expressing empathy, challenging, and promoting reflection. Working together with the advisor, students can see their circumstances from new directions and potentially find new solutions to their problems. Reframing (Fillmore & Baker, 2015; Lakoff, 2016) offers one lens through which to understand the underlying processes of this type of guidance and will be discussed in section 5.3.3. In addition to helping students grow as more autonomous learners, advisor’s discursive strategies are designed to focus them on the needs of the individual student in front of them (instead of “students”). This carries the additional benefit of students feeling that they are “being listened to,” an important step in empathizing and building rapport (Kato & Mynard, 2016).

One of the most common areas of guidance and reframing for Ai is that of her stress over coursework and study. The guidance and reframing Noriko offers for this is mainly
aimed at supporting Ai emotionally. As a result, these acts of empathy and understanding will be analyzed in terms of how they were accomplished through guidance and reframing.

5.3.1 You said/you mentioned

Statements referring to Ai’s previous utterances come together with confirming and intuiting statements. It allows Noriko to take a low epistemic stance but still retain some authority along with statements like “I guess.” These sections of intuiting together with reference to previous statements tend to come either in phase 2 of the advising event as information gathering or in section 4, the resolution. In the resolution phase they are used to give advice as in the example below.

Excerpt 7
Noriko: But, it sounds like, as you said, the presentation time is going to be limited, meaning it’s not going to be like a long, in-depth presentation. And as I remember, you felt really satisfied—you said you were really satisfied with your presentations that you did in June, and I think that was probably the biggest achievement that you have made in the last few years. So, I would say, you only have two more weeks, and you will have second semester, so you feel like you want to improve your English skills for sophomore English class, but you will still have lots of time to make up, or overcome, or work on your weaknesses. You have summer break, and you will still have the whole of second semester. So, if I were you, I wouldn’t worry—I would probably put more effort on Portuguese studies, as you are currently doing. So, I think there’s nothing wrong putting more effort and time on Portuguese study. And I guess, when you actually did Portuguese speech contest, you looked very, very confident, and you looked very happy, so I’m so glad that you took that opportunity again. And I’m pretty sure your teachers also wanted you to try it again.

Ai: So, I have to review my studying time and time management.
Noriko: That’s right. Last time you kind of made a list of the things that you have to do. So it would be great if you can try to make the list again, then when I see you next time, maybe you can give me some updates on what you are prioritizing on. But definitely no pressure on kind of forcing yourself to have more study time for English, because, remember your biggest and most important goal for this year is probably to apply for a study abroad program in Portugal—I mean, in Portugal or Brazil. So, I guess you know what you want, but because of lots of deadlines surrounded by you, you are probably feeling really frustrated and stressed out.

Ai: Mm, thank you for listening my…
Noriko: No problem, no problem. Was my pleasure. I guess for the next few weeks, it’s probably a good idea for you to share—like tell me how you’re really feeling, because that way you can kind of clarify—what you want to and really need to work on. So it’s great that you came today…

In this example Noriko both refers to previous statements by Ai and intuits her feelings. Noriko guides, supports, and reframes over these two minutes of dialogue. She
guides Ai in explaining that she has time to add the contest to her schedule suggesting that it will make her happy. She combines guiding and supporting in reinforcing Ai’s choice to focus more on Portuguese study than English, a choice that Ai was concerned about. Noriko supports this decision and suggests that due to the upcoming study abroad that it must be the priority. Finally, Noriko reframes the Portuguese speech contest as something that will make her happy and not an extra burden. In the dialogue leading to this section, Noriko analogizes Ai’s concerns to heavy rocks that she is carrying around, suggesting that she needs to get rid of several of these rocks. However, instead of classifying this speech contest as another rock that is a source of stress (metaphorically weight), she frames it as a source of happiness, satisfaction, confidence and approval by her teachers. Instead of a metaphor of carrying a weight she frames it as an opportunity – an opportunity to gain happiness, satisfaction, confidence and teacher approval.

In the example above Noriko begins by recounting Ai’s comments “as you said” and “as I remember.” Ai’s apparent comments about the short length of the presentation and about being “satisfied” from her experience with the Portuguese speech contest, come from a previous advising session (that is not part of this dataset). Calling information from a previous session, Noriko positions her advice by reminding Ai of past statements that the presentation is not a “long in-depth presentation” and that in the previous year she felt satisfied. From that basis Noriko moves to resolve the issue and gives the advice “If I were you - I wouldn’t worry” and reinforces Ai’s choice to focus on preparation for her Portuguese test. Noriko’s positioning of herself as close to Ai “if I were you” “I would” is consistent with her analogizing her situation to Ai’s in terms of being students, struggling with schedules to complete assignments and being overwhelmed by work.

After giving Ai instructions to make a list and bring updates, Noriko returns to speaking in terms of Ai’s feelings: “I guess you know what you want” “you are probably
feeling.” This is guidance and support. Noriko’s support comes in the form of empathetic understanding of Ai’s struggles, making reference to conclusions about her feelings and offering continued support in “for the next few weeks, it’s probably a good idea for you to share—like tell me how you’re really feeling.” Her guidance is to focus on Portuguese, and not to stress about reduced English study.

5.3.2 Don’t worry, me neither

Noriko uses a strategy of discussing her own life and problems to empathize with Ai. Despite differences in what is expected of undergraduate and graduate students, Noriko found opportunities to discuss similar experiences. This openness to sympathize with Ai’s problems follows ideas of advising to build rapport and put students at ease.

In the first example (continued from excerpt 2) Noriko sympathizes with Ai’s feelings that the end of the semester is close and that they both have unfinished work. This section is not part of an advising event as there is no student issue to uncover and address. Instead, this is a section of “chat” but Noriko still makes use of the time by rapport building. This does uncover a few new pieces of information about Ai’s study habits but mainly this dialogue functions as an extended lead up to the conclusion of the session.

Excerpt 8

Ai: So, it’s almost July.
Noriko: I know! Tomorrow’s the last day. Oh my goodness! I haven’t finished much reading, so it terrifies me.
Ai: … and I promise, have to finish my… kokusai party.
Noriko: You haven’t finished? Yes, don’t worry, me neither. My assignment has been sitting on my laptop for a while, so I have to do it. I really have to do it. Tomorrow I will do it.
Ai: I finished only (san bun no ichi)… I have finished one third…
Noriko: Ah, so you to finish two third? How are you controlling the amount of time you watch a DVD? I remember you said…
Ai: Ah, now I control it.
Noriko: Ah, you control it! That’s good, you’re strong!

This excerpt comes from near the end of a session and follows an advising event about studying vocabulary. At the end of that event the tone of the discourse changed back to
a less structured chat and the two begin to discuss upcoming plans. Here Noriko emphatically jumps on Ai’s assertion that summer is quickly approaching “I know!” However, more than simply echoing Ai’s concern, Noriko uses a succession of empathic comments to express her deep concern “Oh my goodness” “it terrifies me.” Although this sudden show of personal conflict is in some ways inconsistent with Noriko’s teacher role (used minutes earlier to resolve the previous advisable issue of studying vocabulary) it is effective in eliciting information. Ai shares that she has yet to prepare for an upcoming school party. After Ai’s assertion, Noriko again replies emphatically and empathetically “don’t worry, me neither” even expressing procrastination. Drawing on past conversations in advising sessions, Noriko asks about Ai’s ability to avoid the distraction of watching DVDs testing a potential advisable issue. Despite Ai’s constant concern for being lazy and distracted from her work she gives a confident reply and Noriko praises her for this – “you’re strong.” If Noriko was considering time watching DVDs as an advisable issue it is dropped here.

This exchange shows Noriko emphatically open up to Ai about organization of time and upcoming assignments. In many ways she shows herself to be a normal, flawed, student who does not get things done on time, who procrastinates a bit and who worries about upcoming deadlines. In doing so she opened up Ai to discuss her own concerns. Following this, Ai is able to report that she had made some progress and thus Noriko not only offers evaluation and validation for a positive change in her behavior. Several times Noriko pairs compliments on Ai’s successes in behavioral change with her own thoughts and experiences, as in the excerpt below.

**Excerpt 9**

Noriko: Ah, right, right… Well, I know you’re good at managing your tasks. You always list up and prioritize, so I think it’s probably a good idea to see what you really have to do. Maybe it’s time for you to prioritize the things you need to do instead of the things you want to do. But, I always keep telling myself I still have more months or weeks, I feel like, “Summer break is almost there,” but I haven’t finished anything. But I keep telling myself I have 30 days, which is more than enough to have my things done.
In giving her own experiences, Noriko offers a model for Ai to compare and contrast against. Significantly, this is a model that Noriko can tightly control. In the example below Noriko gives examples of her own study habits, emphatically stating that she too is easily distracted when trying to study at home.

Excerpt 10
Noriko: Yes, that’s right—lots of temptations. Like, you could sleep, or you could read some magazines, Internet, using your phone—lots of temptations. How are you going to fight against those temptations?
Ai: If it’s possible, I want to go out my home, at least once a week, because last year, in summer vacation, I couldn’t study, because I wants to watch DVDs, TVs, or using YouTube.
Noriko: Yes, that’s right. There are lots of temptations. Like now, just hearing your story, I also started worrying about my summer break. So my plan, actually, is to try and come to Jogen [university campus] as much as possible. Because I live in Tokyo, so once I come to Jogen, I don’t want to leave to early. So, um, yes, I’m planning to spend time in Jogen. And there’s actually a Denny’s near my place—at Denny’s I can use WiFi and concentrate on studying. So, I will try to decide day, and time, and place of study.

The section of dialogue acts as the resolution to an advising event focused on the issue of distractions at home. Here Noriko uses her experience and her plan as an example for other places to study. She suggests both coming to school and going to a café but does so through “my plan” empathizing that she is also “worrying about my summer break.” She finishes with more advice in the guise of decisions “So, I will try to decide day, and time, and place of study.” This is a less common resolution (after the topic changes first to Ai’s upcoming test then to Noriko’s availability as an adviser) but serves many of the same purposes – summarizing the topic of the event “there are lots of temptations” and offering guidance towards addressing the problems, in this case done through Noriko’s personal study plans.

5.3.3 Balancing (reframing)

Ai’s stress to be productive is a major topic of discussion and present in all four sessions. Ai identifies herself as a student who lags behind her peers, but wants to be (and act as) a good student. In her view a good student is a student who spends a great deal of time
studying and she is quick to admit that she often does less work than she planned. Ai’s frame of a good student does not simply involve study, it idealizes constant, intensive study as a crucial element. In this framing, time not spent studying is time wasted; and Ai’s failures to meet her goals are a result of her laziness.

While Noriko is not opposed to constant study, she identifies the danger of burnout in Ai’s study habits, noting that Ai looks “stressed out” in all four sessions. To address this Noriko takes up stress and as an advisable issue in several sessions where she attempts to push Ai to reframe her concern of being lazy. By offering a new point of view she urges Ai to balance her self-image of lazy with that of being busy and stressed out. Noriko even suggests that being lazy is good sometimes.

Another major point of discussion in all four sessions is Ai’s motivation. Linked to her feelings of laziness in that she states that without an identifiable motivator (like a failed test to hang on the wall) she has trouble mustering motivation. Unlike the issue of laziness, Noriko actively works to support Ai’s search for motivation. However, what is positive motivation and what is negative pressure is a negotiated issue. Like laziness vs busyness, the balance of motivation vs pressure is negotiated in across sessions. Both offer several potential motivators, such as poor test scores and comfort in ease of chatting with classmates in English. In each interaction there is a negotiation of which activities are positive and which are negative.

5.3.3.1 Lazy vs Busy

Discussion concerning Ai’s laziness are present in all four sessions. Several examples used above to analyze different aspects of the session also included elements of discussion about laziness. In the following example Noriko tries to reframe Ai’s concern about wasting her summer vacation. To do this she moves away from the term lazy, choosing not to repeat
it. This is common across discussions of laziness as Noriko often chooses not to repeat the word. Here, as in other places, she reframes it as having “lots of things to do.”

**Excerpt 11**

Ai: Yes, so, these two week is very busy, I know, so if I enter summer vacation, **of course I’ll be very lazy**. So, my biggest problem is summer vacation.

Noriko: **Ah, okay. So right now you have lots of things to do,** and that means you have less time to study outside of classroom, or just if you want to, for example listen to ELLLO, you just don’t have time to listen to five different talks—you can listen to like several. It’s also interesting that you said the real problem is summer vacation. **So right now you have very limited time, but you continue studying.** How much are you satisfied… or how much are you happy?

Ai: I think if the maximum is 100%, I think my studying time is maybe 30%.

Noriko: 30%, wow, that’s quite low. But you are spending time on doing your assignments, or like other writing report… I also remember you talking about watching DVDs.

Ai: But, recently I haven’t watched it. So now, I’m concentrate on studying, but I don’t want to study.

Noriko: Ah, okay, so you’re actually doing it, but maybe your motivation is a little bit less than usual.

Above, Noriko tries to reframe Ai’s statement that “of course” she will be lazy. She starts by avoiding the word lazy and instead focusing on Ai’s many tasks. To reinforce that Ai is in fact working hard and not lazy, she states “so right now you have very limited time, but you continue studying.” This is in contrast to being lazy, in which a person avoids work – Ai does not avoid it, instead she continues to study despite constraints. In addition to this, Noriko tries to suggest limiting the amount of work. The comment “you don’t have time to listen to five different talks – you can listen to like several” is not unpacked further by Noriko as, instead she moves to a closed question about satisfaction, asking Ai to quantify her happiness with her studies.

In excerpt 4 (reprinted below as excerpt 12) Ai expresses her concern with her laziness and emphasizes “I already know, very lazy I think.” Though it is possible she misunderstood Noriko’s question “you’re scared of being lazy?” it is interesting that she doubles down here and identifies as “very lazy.” Unlike in other examples, Noriko takes up the term lazy here. However, instead of keeping it in the same frame as Ai, that of a bad student, she suggests that it is healthy and part of normal student life “I think because it’s summer break, I think its nice to be lazy”
Excerpt 12
Ai: Now I’m very lazy, so I’m really, really scary.
Noriko: Ah, you’re scared of being lazy?
Ai: Yes, I already know, very lazy I think.
Noriko: Um, what makes you scared of being lazy? I think because it’s summer break, I think it’s nice to be lazy too. Why do you feel so scared?

5.3.3.2 Motivation vs Pressure

Closely related to Ai’s concern about being lazy, is her active and explicitly stated search for motivation to work hard. In the following example Noriko struggles to identify what is truly motivating for Ai in a positive way and what causes greater stress. Ai identifies a source of motivation for her is a poor test score that can be visible. However, Ai states that this strategy cannot work for her English study as her conversation-based classes have no similar test sheets.

Excerpt 13
Noriko: *Reads* “Thinking the limited time between now and graduation.” Yes, um, this semester you mentioned a lot about your future plan—so you want to be an interpreter and you want to be a trilingual. So yes, having a big goal or having a future image of yourself probably becomes your motivation. What else would be motivating you?
Ai: Let’s say Portuguese—I took low score in my class of Portuguese grammar, so in that case, I stick my sheet of my answer, and then I look at, I can understand my regret if I be lazy. But in English class, not have a test, so, English class doesn’t have something like make me regret.
Noriko: Mmmm, okay, so in English class, there’s no such thing that will give you a lot of pressure… does that mean you are being really successful? So like, a writing test is a formal test or a formal assignment.
Ai: Yes, and if, let’s say test—test is the result of what I learned, of my knowledge. But conversation, speaking skill, isn’t result.
Noriko: I see. Yea, I think that’s really interesting, because you mentioned that you want to improve your conversation skill—you want to make it more natural. And I remember in the last few appointments, you mentioned that you feel really nervous surrounded by good English speakers in the classroom. Does that gives you some sort of pressure, or is this a different type of pressure you get?
Ai: Just pressure—I don’t want to talk with them in English because there a big gap. Maybe that doesn’t feel be good pressure.
Noriko: Okay, well, I think pressure can be motivation. At the same time, you could think about something more positive, like who you want to be, or the situation you want to speak more naturally. So, I guess in the classroom, you always mention about other classmates. But, let’s imagine you’re not in the classroom, but you’re speaking English—In what kind of situations would you like to be able to have more natural conversation?

Noriko tries to connect the purpose of the speaking and conversation class to its usage and suggests that the drive to achieve in conversation could be similar to Ai’s test scores.
However, it is clear that Ai has no way of seeing conversational struggles as equivalent even stating “speaking skill isn’t result.” Noriko, undeterred, aims to find a way to show Ai how she can see the struggle in conversation as a test and similar type of motivation. To begin she states that this pressure could be motivation but changes tact with “at the same time you could think about something more positive.” Noriko moves herself away from the topic of the classroom (and associated pressures) to pose the question “In what kind of situations would you like to be able to have more natural conversation?” Noriko shows a sensitivity to the stress classroom conversation brings Ai, however, it is clear that she believes there may be other situations in which this conversational evaluation might offer her similar motivation to that which she identified in hanging up her Portuguese tests.

In the following example Noriko follows-up on Ai’s statement that consistent and focused study is more important than total time. This fits well with Noriko’s actions to help Ai deal with the stresses of constantly pushing herself to work harder. During this Noriko returns to the idea of motivation.

Excerpt 14

Ai: So, first, finding best time, and too much—take care about the quantity. My idea is 10 minutes to shadowing, but if it, if I shadowing—do shadowing only 5 minutes, it will be good, so don’t think too much about the length. So try to keep studying.

Noriko: That’s right, I think—yea I think you made a really good point. Like, if we care about quantity, but not really thinking about quality, we could keep studying for a long time, but if we are not focused, or we are not sure why we are doing it, you probably start losing your target because you start lose your motivation. So, I think, even though it’s five minutes, if you know what you really want to focus on, it should be applied to a useful period of time.

Ai: And if, if I, I’ll study Portuguese too much, I won’t study English well. So, opposite way is same—if my time to spend English, I can’t study Portuguese, so the balance…

Noriko: Balance is important. And, also, you can think about something fun. Learning vocabulary is great, using English learning website is also great, but you can also use for example, your favorite movie—you can try to watch it in English, or you can try to watch Emma Interviews [perhaps the name of a television program]… something you can actually get really excited about is also very, very important.

In this example Noriko takes up Ai’s idea that quality of study is important. This is a topic that was discussed in a previous session and that Ai has taken to heart. Ai states that even if she misses her goal of 10 minutes, 5 minutes might be just fine. The more important
thing is to keep up her motivation to study. To this Noriko emphatically agrees and expands on the topic of motivation “you probably start losing your target, losing your motivation.”

Here the issue of balance is brought up directly. Ai expresses her need to balance English and Portuguese study. However, Noriko continues to focus on staying motivated. She concludes by saying that “something you can actually get really excited about” is important to good study habits.

The two concepts of laziness and motivation were first observed by Noriko in a continuation from the example (first 5.3.3.1) above. This starts by Ai saying that she is lazy but after trying to try quantifying her satisfaction (or her study time, it is possible she misunderstood) she simply states “I don’t want to study.” Her interpretation of that lack of drive to study is laziness, however, Noriko reframes it as motivation – “maybe your motivation is a little bit less than usual.” The following excerpt is a continuation from excerpt 11.

**Excerpt 15**
Noriko: So right now you have very limited time, but you continue studying. How much are you satisfied... or how much are you happy?
Ai: I think if the maximum is 100%, I think my studying time is maybe 30%.
Noriko: 30%, wow, that’s quite low. But you are spending time on doing your assignments, or like other writing report… I also remember you talking about watching DVDs.
Ai: But, recently I haven’t watched it. So now, I’m concentrate on studying, but I don’t want to study.
Noriko: Ah, okay, so you’re actually doing it, but maybe your motivation is a little bit less than usual.

In one additional example, Noriko addresses the intersection of the two points of motivation vs pressure and lazy vs busy. Ai brings them together by saying that she will be busy during summer vacation. Ai continues labeling herself as lazy, but has begun to incorporate the additional vector of motivation.

**Excerpt 16**
Ai: But, I know I will be lazy in summer vacation, so my motivation will be the biggest problem.
Noriko: Mmm… I think it’s, well summer vacation means you have freedom. So, it’s your choice—you can be lazy. I mean you, well, I guess next semester you will be busier again. So, I think it’s also important to be lazy during the semester, but you probably want to
have a good balance. And, as you said, I think motivation is quite important, and how you keep your motivation is crucial.

Ai states that she knows she will be lazy so motivation will be “the biggest problem.” In this she has shifted from simply seeing herself as lazy to looking for an answer – something to motivate her. While Noriko fully agrees that finding and maintaining motivation is important, she also complicates Ai’s changing understanding by stating that it is ok to be lazy sometimes “well summer vacation means you have freedom. So, it’s your choice-you can be lazy.” Even going on to say that being lazy during the semester is ok. Instead of pushing for only motivation or even focusing on her earlier push for Ai to see herself as busy, here she works to promote balance with motivation acting as a counterbalance to feelings of laziness.

5.4 Teaching and prompting action

Language advising separates the roles of teacher and advisor, in that advisors work with single students and promote learner autonomy while language teachers work in classrooms with groups of students and aim for improved linguistic proficiency. However, this distinction is more to carve out the place of the advisor in the busy landscape of educators, instructors, and councilors. The classroom teacher may have opportunities to work with students and focus on their development of autonomy. By the same token, advisors find opportunities to work on skill acquisition in the more traditional way of teachers. Noriko does this several times over the four sessions with Ai by enacting “mini-lessons” and by evaluating her performance in a manner common to classroom teaching.

In line with explicit teaching, prompting action is one of the advisor’s more directive strategies. Although prompting action is often stated conversationally by the advisor, it is aimed at challenging students to move beyond their comfort zones, pushing them to commit
to and enact learning plans devised during the session. Compelling a student to attempt a new learning plan (or modifying an existing plan) is often an ideal resolution to an advising session (Kato & Mynard, 2016). Furthermore, reviewing a student’s plan and its effectiveness in later sessions establishes an ongoing dialogue and learning opportunity around that plan. The success or failure of plans often becoming part of the gleaning stage of advising events in following sessions with questions like “you mentioned that maybe you can use bus ride from Hongo to school to learn English. How is that plan going?”

Sociocultural theory’s concepts of mediation and the zone of proximal development (Johnson & Golombek, 2016; Vygotsky, 1978) offer insight into how the discourse of teaching and prompting action in the advising session leads to potential cognitive development in students. Although not always the case, careful mediation by an advisor can allow students to better organize and assess their methods of study and their goals. With aid, students like Ai can develop more effective study plans and begin to internalize psychological tools for study and study planning. When acting as a teacher, opportunities for mediation and engagement of a student’s ZPD are similar to those in a classroom or one-on-one teaching. However, the concept of the ZPD can also help to explain development through prompting student action.

5.4.1 Teacher hat

Noriko takes on the role of teacher a few times through the teaching of mini-lessons. Instead of gleaning information with questions or carefully reframing Ai’s interpretations of her study and behavior, Noriko engages in teaching. In some cases, teaching moments are brief, as in the case of discussion on the active and passive voice. In the example below Ai is talking about a test she just finished and lamenting that even in Japanese she did not really
understand active and passive voice. Noriko takes this as a teaching opportunity: “passive voice is jidotai and active voice is nodotai.”

Excerpt 17
Ai: So, the test has double blank?
Noriko: Blank? Yes, fill in the blank?
Ai: I don’t know how to say… “nodotai” and “jodotai”
Noriko: Ah, passive voice… passive voice is jidotai and active voice is nodotai.
Ai: So the, change active voice to passive voice… so, number—how to read the number, so if I don’t know the word in Japanese, I could answer. But for me, I was frustrated, because I didn’t know the word in Japanese. I have to acquire the knowledge.
Noriko: MMhmm, that’s right.

Though this type of simple defining could be seen as only the most basic form of “teaching” is its much more direct and explicit than much of the dialogue that happens in advising sessions. In fact, as Ai finishes with “I have to acquire the knowledge” Noriko simply confirms that as the case – they do not go on to discuss passive voice and there is never any extended lesson, explanation or activity. Noriko chooses to leave these terms for the classroom in favor discussing Ai’s plan to study vocabulary over the past several weeks.

In other circumstances a mini-lesson can closely resemble teaching in the language classroom, complete with a question-response related to part of speech.

Excerpt 18
Noriko: Awww, okay. So you don’t have any particular dictionary you often use?
Ai: If I search Internet, the top is of course Google, but sometimes Weblio. But Weblio is sometimes not so good. So if I can’t believe this, I try to find other ones.
Noriko: Okay, because what I noticed was you write English and Japanese, which is good… you could also maybe add parts of speech. Do you know parts of speech? Because if you know what part of speech it is, it’s easier to use it in conversation—in my class we talked about the word memory today. What kind of part of speech is it, memory?
Ai: Noun?
Noriko: Noun, that’s right. One of the students said it’s a verb, so he thought “kioku suru.” But it’s easy to get confused, because Memory, Memorize, they’re in the same word family… Memory, Memorize, Memorization, or Memorable… so, if you check the dictionary, you can find a word family as well. So maybe when you watch the movie this week, you can try to think about a better way to memorize vocabulary. So that’s something to think about. You can let me know… how you learned vocabulary this week.

In the excerpt above Noriko enacts a common classroom exchange. Starting with a “do you know” question to introduce the topic Noriko segues into a mini-lesson. Noriko initiates an IRF type interaction with “What kind of part of speech is it, memory?” eliciting
the response “noun” and followed by the feedback “Noun, that’s right.” This segment concludes with Noriko stating: “this week you can try to think about a better way to memorize vocabulary” and setting up a report of progress for the following week. This type of planned progress report is one of two main ways in which Noriko prompts Ai to take action on advising events discussed during the sessions.

5.4.2 “So maybe try that and let me know next week”

For the advisor, the ideal resolution stage to an advising event is one that prompts action. This strategy urges students to commit to plans discussed during the session. In this way it not only pushes students to study but offers a testing ground for newfound knowledge and skills – in this way it is an extension of the session and represents a key method of development. Students must take the tools gained through interaction with the advisor and attempt to use them.

Understood through sociocultural theory, the student attempts to internalize the advisor’s expert knowledge of planning through conceptual tools (for some type of study task) during the advising session. Then with these new tools enact the task of the study plan with minimal support. Although the concept of the ZPD is not usually employed in this type of extended activity away from the expert, I argue that it can be applicable considering the lengthy activity of planning and enacting “studying” over the course of a week or two weeks. Use of the ZPD offers insight into how prompting students to co-construct their plans in sessions, enact them later and then discuss them in another session can lead to development of more successful and efficient study planning.

In the example above, Noriko finishes her mini-lesson on parts of speech and word families by suggesting that Ai make use of the new information during study (which involved watching a movie and noting down vocabulary from a single short scene). Although she uses
an ambiguous “so that is something to think about” it is followed by the directive “you can let me know how you learned vocabulary this week” showing she expects to discuss Ai’s use of this method in their next session. Noriko uses “let me know” three times in connection to this plan to study vocabulary. Following the previous example Noriko sums up then again makes statements to prompt action:

**Excerpt 19**
Noriko: So yes, let me know how your vocabulary learning goes. Yea, think about how you want to review, and also keep your vocabulary. It might be a good idea to check your dictionary more carefully. You can also make a weekly learning plan. But yes, and we still have more time. And you said next week won’t be so busy, so that’s a good thing.

In this excerpt Noriko sets up specific action requests with “let me know” to signal that it is a topic they will discuss – Ai will have to account for this potential activity in some way in their next meeting. Following this, Noriko suggests specific action by reviewing what was discussed “think about how you want to review” “check your dictionary more carefully” and “make a learning plan.” Although stated in a friendlier, lower epistemic, way (it might be a good idea; you can) it is clear that it will be a point of discussion and that Ai should address it. This is not “forcing” action and Noriko does not set grades or penalties. However, the threat of needing to discuss the topic in the next session offers some social pressure.

In future sessions, Noriko does not make use of the phrase “let me know.” However, she accomplishes the same task by summarizing what was discussed, including the actions and activities agreed on, then setting it clearly as a future point of discussion in the next advising session, as in the example below:

**Excerpt 20**
Noriko: Okay, so, maybe doing these two activities will give you a sense of effort and that will give you more confidence. Okay, so sounds like doing these two activities is actually very important.
Ai:  Yes, so I have to prioritize one more time
Noriko: Okay, well today’s a Wednesday, so it’s kind of the middle of the week—so I think it’s great you stopped by today to tell me about how your weekly plan is going. So, yes, are you going to try these activities for another four days?
Ai:  Okay . . .
Beyond its identification of Noriko prompting action, this excerpt offers insight into the potential activation of Ai’s ZPD in the extended task of devising and enacting a study plan. When asked about her plan, Ai responds to Noriko with the planning-related metalanguage “prioritize.” Not simply doing it, but using this specific language suggests that she has begun to internalize this tool of study planning. Addressing the critical strand of feedback, Noriko restates Ai’s plan of “doing these two activities” (shadowing and reading news articles) and how they addressed the issues they discussed – workload and motivation – concluding that they are “very important.” Finally, she clarifies when Ai will receive further feedback – after Ai has “tried these activities” for four additional days. Before moving on Noriko explicitly asks Ai to commit to her plan, receiving a (somewhat reluctant) confirmation.

5.5 Conclusion

This chapter provided systematic analysis of Noriko’s advising sessions with Ai. Following the format of the advising event three salient themes emerged: (1) gleaning information, (2) supporting, guiding and reframing, and finally (3) teaching and prompting action. Micro analysis illustrated discursive practices used both questions and confirming statement to glean information as well as supporting Ai by divulging her own problems, faults and experiences.

This chapter showed that Noriko can be an empathetic advisor able to put on a teacher’s hat to teach and test new concepts. However, her preferred method is one of asking questions to identify deeper issues then offering not only advice but emotional support. The next chapter will examine advising sessions with Jess. Jess follows the same underlying format of the advising event but approaches it differently in some ways. Jess’s sessions also
differ from Ai’s in that they are mostly single sessions with different students. A direct comparison of Ai and Noriko’s advising will be addressed in Chapter 7.
Chapter 6: Advisor Jess

6.0 Introduction

This chapter investigates the discursive practices of advisor Jess, analyzing how she organizes and orchestrates advising sessions. It is significant to note that Jess’s sessions in these data were different than Noriko’s sessions with Ai, examined in chapter 5. All but one of Jess’s sessions were with students enrolled in the LA 01/02 courses. The LA courses are one credit classes available to all students at Jogen university that offer an introduction to language advising. They serve to attract students as well as educate them as to what language advising has to offer (the LA courses are described in greater detail in chapter 4). Although the focus of Jess’s sessions was different due to the nature of these LA introductory courses, the organization of the advising event, and strategies discussed previously were still present. In this way Jess’s sessions demonstrated that there are different types of advising sessions, but the core remained the same.

This chapter will address the mezzo and micro levels following the macro-mezzo-micro approach (Strauss et al., 2019). I will proceed from the larger themes at the mezzo level into examination of distinct, systematic discursive practices at the micro level. The mezzo themes are (1) gleaning information, (2) controlling supporting and reframing, and finally (3) teaching and prompting action. Mezzo themes are divided into enacted micro-level, discursive practices, each analyzed as it illustrates and contributes to mezzo-level themes.

6.1 Background for Jess and students
Table 6.1 – Advisor Jess and Student Advisees

Table 1 offers an overview of information about advisor Jess and her four student advisees in these data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jess</th>
<th>Hiro</th>
<th>Kaori</th>
<th>Risa</th>
<th>Yuna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late 20s</td>
<td>Learning Plan</td>
<td>Conversation Journal</td>
<td>Wheel of Language Learning</td>
<td>Learning Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters in TESOL</td>
<td>Wants to be a translator</td>
<td>Studying adjectives</td>
<td>Upcoming Report</td>
<td>Studying for TOFEL ITP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced ESL/ EFL teacher</td>
<td>Stated focus of study is</td>
<td>to better express</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading Phantom of the Opera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused and Organized</td>
<td>“speaking”</td>
<td>herself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major topic of discussion</td>
<td>vocabulary study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Many misconceptions about studying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Session</td>
<td>1 Sessions</td>
<td>2 Sessions</td>
<td>1 Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 min</td>
<td>18 min</td>
<td>15/21 min</td>
<td>16 Min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advisor Jess is an Australian woman in her late 20s who worked as a language advisor for three years along with teaching ESL courses at Jogen University. Jess earned a master’s degree in TESOL from an Australian university and has studied Japanese as a second language. Her character in sessions combines stern empathy with emphatic positive feedback. Jess shows understanding to students and their problems but rarely shares details of her personal life or draws parallels between her life and theirs. She is deliberate, organized, and procedural in her control of the advising session. As a result, her advising events, and the session have well defined phases.

Four of five of Jess's advising sessions followed worksheets integral to the LA01/02 course – the Learning Plan and the Wheel of Language Learning (WoLL). The Learning Plan worksheet (appendix B) was designed to help students compartmentalize, organize and plan
out self-study in a focused manner. A similar model is discussed by Kato and Mynard (2016) in which they add that it “allows an advisor to see at-a-glance how the learner is going about his independent work” (p. 54). The Learning Plan worksheet at Jogen University is separated into four main sections. The first section of the worksheet compels students to identify of a Target Situation from which a Big Goal and Small Goal are formulated. Identifying and then writing these big and small goals obliges students to think carefully about their wants and needs in terms of language study then to concretize them by putting them into words and writing them on this worksheet. Table 6.2 demonstrates an example of situation, big and small goals adapted from an example worksheet given to LA students (see appendix B).

Table 6.2 – Learning Plan Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Situation</th>
<th>Speaking with teachers at the Practice Center and my friends on Skype</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big Goal</td>
<td>Improving daily conversation because I want teachers to understand me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Goal</td>
<td>Improving grammar, specifically past tense usage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the example above the target situations for anticipated improvement were identified as those speaking with teachers and friends in the Practice Center and on Skype. The connected goals focused on action, in this case improving conversation skills (broad) and past tense usage (focused). The assumption is that the small goal helps to achieve the big goal. So, in this example, improving past tense usage (small goal) is expected to help teachers better understand this student (big goal), which in turn is applicable to teachers at the Practice Center (target situation). In this example there is a relatively clean progression from target situation through small goal. This is not always the case with students and the interaction between these three categories is often the first point of discussion in a session and the first advisable event.
Table 6.3 combines the remaining categories from the Learning Plan worksheet and offers sample answers adapted from an example given to LA01 students (See appendix B).

Table 6.3: Example Resources Section of the Learning Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I’ll use my phone to record voice</td>
<td>I’ll re-read grammar notebook every Saturday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ll watch an episode of The Hills where people use a lot of daily conversation</td>
<td>I’ll compare my recordings from the Practice Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>I’ll try to use the past tense to talk about my semester for 15 minutes, three times a week at the Practice Center</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>I’ll listen to my favorite English Music</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the section on goals, students are asked to note various resources and study activities including materials, people, making use of what was learned, a process of review, and evaluation. Additionally, the Learning Plan worksheet asks students to identify sources of motivation. During advising sessions, Jess works through each of the resource sections one by one, asking students to explain and clarify each. Although Jess does not always address each resource box, those selected become advisable events.

The second major worksheet used in Jess’s sessions was the Wheel of Language Learning (WoLL). The WoLL is a pie-chart labeled with elements of learning, designed to compel learners to quantify their satisfaction with different areas of learning/progress in different areas (appendix A). The WoLL was adapted by Kato and Sugawara (2008) from a life coaching tool, called the Wheel of Life in coaching, used to encourage reflection and offer a concrete visualization of the different elements involved in learning (Kato &
Sugawara, 2008; Yamashita & Kato, 2012). To do this the elements of Time Management, Learning Strategy, Motivation, Learning Materials, Enjoyment of Learning and Goal-setting are included. Numbers identify the center of the circle as zero and the outer edge as 10. Students are instructed to use the values to rate their level of satisfaction, for each element, then to choose several areas to improve.

The Learning Plan and the WoLL were designed to be used both as autonomously by students and as a tool for advisors. As an advising tool they offer valuable information about students’ goals, motivations and concerns as well as a format for discussion.

6.2 Gleaning information

As with Noriko, Jess’s advising events begin by gleaning information on potential advisable issues. This is done mainly by asking questions and making confirmation eliciting statements. These strategies allow advisors to better understand students’ learning trajectories as well as uncover potential issues. Although Jess uses some of the same strategies as Noriko, she approaches them in different ways. One example of this will be discussed in the next section (6.2.1) in the way Jess uses clusters of questions. This is in contrast to Noriko, who rarely asks several questions in succession without opening the floor for Ai to respond.

6.2.1 Questions: “So how are you going to evaluate yourself?”

As in the previous chapter, questions are divided into the categories closed and open. Closed questions consist of those questions whose answers expect a response of one word or phrase – yes/no, maybe, on Tuesday, I went to the store. The information gained from students in closed questions is minimal (often a single piece of information) and the process of answering requires little or no reflection. By contrast, open questions provoke thought and require reflection by the student. Answers to these questions might be extended utterance, stream of thought discussion as students “talks out” what they are thinking or silence. These
responses are often punctuated by silence and hesitation as students grapple with the complicated nature of question and answer.

To begin, gleaning information about a topic at the beginning of an advising event, Jess often uses sets of simple questions. These clusters of questions sometimes culminate in an open question that builds on students expected answers. In this way the set of questions acts as an accelerated version of the back-and-forth interaction that often results from long sets of simple questions. Alternatively, Jess first asks an open question, which is then followed by a set of closed questions: “what do you mean by ‘in detail?’ What’s that look like? What does that sound like?”

6.2.1.1 Closed questions “Do you want to work on speaking?”

An illustration of Jess’s sets of closed questions at the start of an advising event are depicted in the excerpt below. Jess and Hiro began the session by opening an electronic version of Hiro’s learning plan worksheet. Jess noted that another advisor (Ella) spoke with him about his plan in a previous advising session and asked “did you want to tell me a little bit about it or have you finished talking about this plan?” When Hiro gave no response, Jess started the first advising event, asking him about his goals. This happened in the first two minutes of the advising session and is a common way for Jess to initiate the session.

**Excerpt 1**

Hiro: I learn vocabulary first and then I seek my fluency.
Jess: **Okay, great. So** maybe **vocabulary is more your focus**, but it will help you to be fluent. So fluent is like your second goal really. Okay. And so, so when you say translation, you want to be a translator. Do you want to be an interpreter or a translator?
Hiro: A translator.
Jess: You want to be a translator. Okay. **Do you want to work on the speaking?**
Hiro: Yeah.
Jess: **So tell me about your resources.** People who can speak English, **who were they? Where are they? How can you talk to them?**
Hiro: Like teachers, of course. And some of my friends. I said before, Ella and exchange students upstairs. They are all my resources.
Jess: Right. Exchange students are also there. So try to be, if you can, specific. Okay. Exchange. Exchange. Okay. So if you can include that here, it will be more useful to you because that way you can, if you get lost, just go, all right, who do I need to talk to? I need to talk to this person, this person, this person. With the exchange students, have you tried the language practice partners yet?

Hiro: Not yet.

Using “okay, great, so” as a discourse marker to note acceptance then transition, Jess challenges Hiro’s idea that he can have two equal minor goals – “maybe vocabulary is more your focus.” The use of the discourse marker “okay” to note acceptance of a student’s utterance then transition to advice (or another question), is one of Jess’s most common discursive moves and will be referenced again. ‘Okay’ is sometimes paired with a compliment, like “great,” to balance following critique. This is analyzed in detail below in section 6.3.4.

After confirming that Hiro wants to be a translator and not an interpreter, Jess moves on to Hiro’s target situation and big goal followed by resources and launches a set of closed questions “Who were they? Where were they? How can you talk to them?” This set of questions is an efficient way of starting an advising event as Jess will need to glean this information not only to fill out the sheet but to evaluate Hiro’s plan. Hiro takes up the first two questions in order listing several people he used English with then a location. However, he does not directly address “how.”

The use of how is as a simple question, such as “how do you open this door?” It can be answered with a simple phrase. It is not clear what answer Jess expected but perhaps it involved the Practice Center. If it was intended to focus on the Practice Center, Hiro answered the question indirectly through “upstairs” as the SALC second floor area (the only upstairs) is an English only area featuring the Practice Center. After asking Hiro to be more specific in his descriptions of ‘who’ and ‘where,’ Jess asks if he had signed up for “language practice partners” a service of the Practice Center.
This set of two or three questions is a common way for Jess to begin an advising event. Jess moves rapidly through advising events in these data, potentially addressing a greater number of issues in less time, in part to her method of clustering questions. In the first three minutes of the session Jess gleans needed information and identifies problems in Hiro’s plan – he has too many goals to focus and has not made use of a service that would be helpful to him. Although not all of Jess’s advising events are short, those that are involve these clusters of questions.

6.2.1.2 Open Questions

Jess pairs her open questions together with closed questions, sometimes using them after her initial cluster of closed questions, and in other cases before the closed questions. Other times, Jess uses clusters of open questions together, just as she does with closed questions: “what resources are you going to use? Can you tell me why you chose them?” Both are open questions as both require expansion.

Excerpt 2

Jess: In that case, let's talk about your learning plan. So, your target situation is the same.
Yuna: Yes
Jess: So, to get the 180 points on the TOFEL, and you're focusing on the reading and the vocabulary.
Yuna: Yes
Jess: Vocabulary. Okay, great. So specifically, you're looking at the, which section is it? The T2 section?
Yuna: Um, yep
Jess: Okay, great. Fantastic. So what resources are you going to use? Can you tell me why you chose them?
Yuna: Um, at first I chose a book. This is ebook, I found them *on the internet*? for reading. I need to faster my reading speed. I chose the easier one. Um and next is is, um, the examination? Yeah? This is for TOFEL ITP. And this is apps simple flash card. Um, um, I chose the mikan before but um that’s I . . I need to . . I need to pay more . . much for . . use flash cards so . . I choose the apps similar one.

In excerpt 2, Jess starts with a set of closed questions eliciting confirmation that Yuna is working to get 180 points on the TOFEL and that she is preparing for the reading section of that test. Jess’s questions are connected through the discourse marker “so” as summary and
confirmation of Yuna’s answers (Bolden, 2009; Raymond, 2010). Similar to uses of ‘okay,’ ‘so’ as a discourse marker is often employed by Jess in these data to connect it sequentially to the organization of the session as she understands it – in this case the order of items on the Learning Plan. Schiffrin (2006) described this use of ‘so’ to mark a transition from an instance of exchanging or learning information to something else. In the case of Jess, this is often to glean additional information or give advice. Alternatively, ‘so’ can be classified terms of its use as a sequential marker, similar to the use of ‘and’ by pilots who vocalizing sequential events (Nevile, 2006).

Once Jess has confirmed the focus of Yuna’s study through closed questions she uses two open questions aimed at elicitation of a list of resources and insight into her reasoning: “what resources are you going to use? Can you tell me why you chose them?” This pair of open questions elicits an extended response from Yuna who offers detailed information about her resources. Unlike the set of closed questions asked in Excerpt 1, the open questions allow expansion and access to Yuna’s logic and understanding of the situation. In her extended response, Yuna explains that she is using an ebook she found online connected to TOFEL ITP study to help her improve her reading and that she chose the easier of several choices. She adds that she started using a flashcard app for her phone but was unwilling to pay for the premium “mikan” program and instead opted for a similar, free, program. During this extended explanation Jess offers only simple response tokens: “ah,” “uh-huh,” “ok,” and “yeah.”

Understanding student’s thinking and why they make decisions is as important to language advisors as their activities. In answering these open questions, Yuna shows that she has a clear idea of why she chose the resources she did. There was no hesitation in her explanation of what book she chose and the reason she chose it – it was easier. Jess accepts
this confident answer and with a few additional small questions wraps up this advising event on “resources” and moves on to “study.”

With Kaori, just as with Yuna above, Jess uses open questions to both glean information and transition to a new advisable issue. Here Jess and Kaori appear to conclude the previous advising event concerning Kaori’s plan to study adjectives and adverbs. The discourse takes on a more conversational tone on the topic of books and movies with Kaori even asking “do you like movies?” Jess initially answers conversationally but returns to the role of adviser with an open question to begin discussion about Kaori’s plans for self-evaluation.

**Excerpt 3**

Jess: Definitely. Definitely. If you ever want to have a conversation with me about it as well, I'm more than happy for that. But after we have a conversation about the book, we can also talk about how did you feel about your speaking, maybe do some evaluation as well. So that's also an option.

Kaori: And so I would like to talk with you.

Jess: That would be great. I love learning more about new books and movies as well.

Kaori: Do you like movies?

Jess: I love movies and I love books, so they're my two favorite topics to talk about probably.

**Okay, great.** Well that sounds like you've thought really well about what you want to achieve. I love the detail, how it was specifically focused on adjectives and adverbs. That is really good. Some people don't do that, and so it shows that you've got a clear objective.

Okay. What I do want to know is, how are you going to tell that you have been successful? So how are you going to evaluate yourself?

Kaori: I think . . .

Jess: Evaluation is a little difficult

In discussing Kaori’s plans to study via movies, Jess stays focused on her role as an adviser. Kaori’s question elicits a brief stint of “chat” (Matthiessen & Slade, 2011) but Jess returns to advising through summary and compliment, using “Okay, great.” Then after her complimenting Kaori’s attention to detail, she concludes with another “Okay” and a short pause, which allows for the shift to a new topic.

In this session Kaori and Jess are not working from the learning plan worksheet (this is the only session which involves neither the Learning Plan nor the Wheel of Language
Learning) as Kaori asked to talk about her conversation journal (an assignment linked to the SALC conversation area services). However, establishing a method of self-evaluation in the session for the student to note down and is common practice. Although initially stumped by this more difficult question, Kaori suggests that she keep a diary to be checked and compared every other day (see Excerpt 19 below). Although she clearly had no plan for this previously, the open question, although surprising, induced Kaori to not only consider self-evaluation of her new plan but to concretize it. This is a benefit of open questions and this effect is what prompted Kato and Mynard (2016) to label some open questions as “powerful questions.” Powerful questions are those that force introspection and can result in insight or unconsidered ideas like Kaori’s idea for a diary here.

6.2.2 Confirming

Similar to Noriko, Jess uses confirmation eliciting statements. As with her use of open questions, Jess uses these confirming statements both to glean information and to transition to new topics. Confirmation eliciting statements in the gleaning phase are often simple and used to set up a question. In the excerpt below Jess confirms Yuna’s plans to read Phantom of the Opera “more properly” at a later date before moving on to discuss a potential issue with the length.

Excerpt 4

Jess: Then you’re gonna go back and read it more properly
Yuna: Yes
Jess: Okay, great. Have you read the Phantom of the Opera before?
Yuna: Um, no I have never read

The interaction in excerpt four illustrates how Jess uses the strategy of confirming facts before launching into a more complex issue. Jess uses this strategy with Hiro as well. In the following excerpt, from the beginning of the session, Hiro and Jess are reviewing goals.
When Hiro states that he has two small goals, Jess quickly confirms before addressing the problem of having two.

**Excerpt 5**

Hiro: And so my big goal is speaking. And my small goal is fluency. And I didn't type here but also vocabulary is small goal.
Jess: Okay. So fluency and vocabulary.
Hiro: Yeah.
Jess: Now which one of those is most important to you? Because fluency can mean speaking for a long time or speaking quickly. Whereas vocabulary is super important for fluency. But you could also say, so is grammar for fluency. So are you wanting to speak for a long time? Or are you wanting to be able to communicate your thoughts clearly using the correct words?
Hiro: I learn vocabulary first and then I seek my fluency.

The learning plan is designed to have one big goal and one supporting small goal. Hiro’s two small goals create a potential problem in terms of focus as the design aims to channel the small goal into the big goal. To help focus him, Jess offers an explanation of each possibility (vocabulary and fluency) as she sees it fitting his big goal followed by two closed questions using “are you wanting to.” Hiro quickly choses vocabulary as a primary goal and in such Jess was successful in pushing him to choose one over the other. Following the exchange in excerpt 5 Jess works with Hiro to establish a primary small goal (see excerpt 10 below).

Jess also uses confirmation to create a resolution and transition to a new topic. In the following excerpt Jess agrees to Hiro’s plan to record conversations and make comparisons (excerpt above). To establish the new advisable issue, how Hiro will evaluate his progress, Jess starts with a confirmation eliciting statement regarding his plans with “So, you are going to . . .”

**Excerpt 6**

Jess: What you could do for this study is have that conversation. Write down some vocabulary notes. Listen to the conversation a second time. Check your vocabulary notes. Did you understand that word. Was that word you used in the correct sentence. Things like this. Yes. So I’ll get you to write that in here after this conversation, okay. And so the last one we’ve got is evaluate. So you’re going to compare your older records to your newer ones. Is that correct?
Hiro: **Yeah.**
Jess: Good. How are you going to decide, yes, I have improved, or no, I haven't improved? How will you check?

This transition between events comes roughly halfway into the advising session.

Preceding this, Hiro discussed his study plans, all of which is described in Jess’s summery.

As a point of transition Jess uses the discourse marker “okay” to signal confirmation and conclusion then the continuer “and” to connect the new topic of evaluation to the previous topics by means of its place in the common organization of events (cite pilot’s use of and). As earlier, this confirmation sets up Jess’s next question – in this case a set of open “how” questions.

### 6.3 Following the plan, controlling, supporting, and reframing

Guiding and supporting are primary activities for advisors. Here I will define guiding as the process by which advisors prompt students to arrive at their own conclusions to problems. This is different to teaching (discussed below in section 6.4.1) in which the expert (teacher) introduces unknown information to a student without reference to what the student already knows, their connections or ideas pertaining to the topic. Alternatively, to guide, experts (advisors) start from a foundation of students’ extant knowledge. To do this they ask information gathering questions, summarize previous discussion and lead students to new information or understanding. In doing so, students have an opportunity to see the same set of circumstances through a different light. This process of establishing **intersubjectivity** (Wertsch, 1985) brings the student’s understanding into line with the advisors so that they “see” things from a similar perspective.

Two related methods of connecting with students are repetition and summary. Repeating and summarizing student’s words accomplishes a variety of goals that help to establish intersujjectivity: clarifying facts, checking understanding, expressing empathy,
offering another interpretation, and promoting reflection. In addition, these methods focus the advisor on attending to the needs of the individual student (instead of “students”). Finally, the student in the session knows that they are being listened to, considered a critical step in empathizing and building rapport in ALL (Kato & Mynard, 2016). These activities help advisors negotiate problems with students instead of dictating solutions.

Although guiding can be done through questions and implicit advice, it can also be more explicit without becoming teaching. When advisors guide more explicitly – as through metaphor in intentionally altering student language - I will address it as reframing. Reframing is the process by which frames of understanding are altered (Lakoff, 2016). Semantic frames (Fillmore, 1985; 2015) are a way of conceptualizing knowledge about a situation; it is how humans organize information pertaining to a particular context or topic. In this instance, students have a multitude of concepts connected to school and language learning that guide their understanding and interaction with the broader context of school (studied in terms of conceptual metaphor by Hiraga, 2008) and the specific context of self-directed study. Advisors like Jess offer new ways to consider language study that are not apparent to students (for example many are shocked that movies can be used as a tool to study language effectively, or that attempting to memorize vocabulary lists is often not a good way to learn).

A major topic of guidance and reframing in these data was motivation and will be addressed in 6.3.3. Motivation is a term that appears on both the Wheel of Language Learning and the Learning Plan and is identified as a vital element to autonomous learning (Benson, 2005; Kato & Mynard, 2016).
6.3.1 “Let’s talk about your learning plan”

In recorded sessions Jess follows the organization of the Learning Plan and Wheel of Language Learning. In this, Jess at first appears somewhat object-regulated (Lantolf and Thorne, 2008) by the Learning Plan and WoLL, allowing them to guide the progression of the sessions. By object regulated, I mean that she allowed the form of the worksheets (the tool) to dictate the flow of the session in term of advisable issues. She followed them, not “used” them. In fact in LA advising sessions, this may be the case that she is regulated by the worksheets. In her session with Risa, Jess seemed to forget the topic of ten minutes of previous conversation (Risa’s newfound motivation) when she ends a section of chat to return to the order of the Wheel of Language Learning. However, when interviewed about her process of advising, Jess mentioned nothing about these assignment sheets. Instead, her approach mirrored what is illustrated in Noriko’s sessions with Ai – a freeform conversation focused around topics gleaned from students then examined together with the student in the format outlined in my construct of the Advising Event. In this way, just as Noriko, Jess’s advising sessions are (according to her) co-constructed and student focused, and do not follow the organization of worksheets.

However, in her LA course sessions, she uses the Learning Plans, Wheel of Language Learning and two specific assignments (a conversation journal for Kaori and reflection on “notes from a recent report” for Risa) to guide conversation and topic choice for advisable issues. The following are the opening few lines of dialogue from sessions with Risa, Hiro and Yuna.
Table 6.4 - Excerpts 7A, B and C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jess</th>
<th>Risa</th>
<th>Hiro</th>
<th>Yuna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jess: Okay, so let’s have a look. So . . this here is your wheel of language learning.</td>
<td>Hiro: We will do that then. Okay. So you've spoken to Ella about your language goals and your learning plan. Did you want to tell me a little bit about it or have you finished talking about this plan? Okay. Cool, you've got words on top of words.</td>
<td>Jess: In that case, let's talk about your learning plan. So your target situation is the same.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpts 7A, B and C all occur just as the recording begins for each session and are the very first lines of dialogue. When to begin the recordings was not predetermined for Jess as she was told only to start “at the beginning but after pleasantries.” Therefore, we can consider each of these sessions to start “at the beginning” in Jess’s mind and the first thing to happen is to establish the order of one of these worksheets.

An advantage to Jess’s focus on the physical tools of the worksheets is expert guidance and demonstration as to their use. Like any tools, these worksheets are most valuable when used with a deeper understanding of them and indented method of use is not always clear. Hiro, in particular, had several issues with using the form and expectations. In excerpt 7B, Jess remarks that Hiro somehow had two sets of words transposed on top of one another and moments later Hiro revealed that he had two small goals (excerpt 5) instead of the expected one. Using the Wheel of Language Learning requires self-defined quantification of the categories with the only instruction on the worksheet is the question “What is your level of satisfaction in these 6 areas?” and a clarification that 0 is “not satisfied at all” while 10 represents “completely satisfied.” No other advice as to how such quantification works is given. However, used as a tool together with the support of the advisor, with questions like “why is your time management a four?” or “time management made the most improvement there. Tell me why it leapt form a four or five to a nine?,” the worksheet becomes a valuable
tool for reframing perceptions of study and satisfaction no matter how the quantification was conceptualized.

In the few areas of these sessions which are not guided by worksheets, Jess shows how she has internalized the organization of the learning plan and the Wheel of Language Learning. In the two larger sections of sessions where she is not directly discussing worksheet topics (working on Risa’s report notes and Kaori’s conversation journal) she still refers to the terms from these sheets. In excerpt 3, Jess asks Kaori how she will evaluate herself in terms of her plan to practice talking about movies and books she like. Although the Learning Plan is never explicitly addressed, this question of verify a method of evaluation follows the progression of the Learning Plan.

6.3.2 “Do you have any questions for me?”

Once Jess has exhausted the categories of a worksheet, or initial questions about an assignment, she elicits new topics from students by asking explicitly if they have additional questions. She does this at least once in each session and several times in some. There is little variation in her utterances to accomplish this, as it always a slight variation on “do you have any questions for me?”

The following excerpt comes from near the end of a session with Risa and is representative of Jess’s elicitation of further questions. Risa’s answer below comes in response to a question about how she will evaluate her progress and she answers that she will do so by working with her friend Sayaka.

**Excerpt 8**

Risa: We can both compare our homework
Jess: Okay
Risa: And know how we’re doing and how did we improve ourselves and check each other’s, and also. We have a lot of teachers that we can ask so, evaluate is ok.
Jess: **Okay, sounds like a good plan** using your friend to, help you with that. Yeah, good ok so. Are there any areas here that you have a question about or some concerns that you want to ask me about?
Risa:  Um . . like, I think these two (pointing to the Wheel of Language Learning)

In response to Risa, Jess uses “okay” to accept and conclude then comments and summarizes “Okay, sounds like a good plan . . .” Following this is teacher display talk in “yeah, good ok so” then the elicitation of a new topic. The self-talk contains Jess’s evaluation and although it is not know if a list was physically checked off (Risa does point to the items Motivation and Time management on something physically in front of her in the next line), it acts as a vocalization of completion. Then Jess elicits a new topic, which Risa is ready to discuss. Risa expresses a desire to further discuss the categories of motivation and time management by pointing to them on the worksheet. In fact, the session began with a discussion of time management and study on the train. This causes a return to that topic and a full advising event discussing motivation to study balanced with physical health (see discussion below in 6.3.3).

In the resolution phase of some advising events, Jess also asks if there are specific questions for that topic instead of asking broadly if the student wants to discuss any topic, as in the example above. In except 15, Jess and Yuna’s discuss Yuna’s plan to improve her reading speed. Jess offers some final advice as a resolution asks for any questions pertaining to the discussed learning plan.

Excerpt 9

Jess:  And how many pages will you read? Will it be a chapter? Two pages, one page?
Yuna:  Uhhh, yeah I check my reading speed with one page
Jess:  Okay. Great, so your going to go with one page
Yuna:  Uumm I think check reading speed is . . . one week. Every one week is best way
Jess:  Its up to you. If one week is too often try every two weeks, two weeks is not often enough. Try every three days. See what works well. Okay. So that's good. That's nice plan. Right. Is there anything on your plan that you're not a hundred percent sure about that you would like some advice on? Or do you have any other questions about your learning plan and what you need to do?
Yuna:  I think . . un. . maybe I’ll change this book

With some final closed questions Jess comes to an accepting and closing “Okay, great.” She adds a confirmation eliciting statement that receives a slightly more complex
answer to which she adds additional advice. Then another “okay” and compliment. Her statement here eliciting more questions about the learning plan is similar to other instances – even using “not a hundred percent” in several others. However, it is unique among similar statements in these data (even in this session as she asks again at the very end) in that she seems to ask the same question twice but it is intended to have separate meanings. In her final question in the excerpt above she begins it with ‘or’ suggesting that at least in her mind the second question was aimed at eliciting something different.

It is clear that the question was effective as Yuna suddenly, and unexpectedly declares that she might choose a different book to read. This was something that Jess spent time trying to convince her of in a circumspect way earlier in the session by explaining that Phantom of the Opera likely had more language (and thus new vocabulary for Yuna to learn) pertaining to “relationships between people and passion and music.” This is unlike what might be expected of her on upcoming TOFEL IPT test (what was written down as the focus of her studies). Jess never tells her to change books but does suggest that she spend the week or so and consider if the language between Phantom of the Opera and the test is different and consider if she wants to change it. That occurred approximately five minutes into the session and resolved as a topic: Jess gives her advice, concludes with her “okay? Good.” Then moves to a now topic “Okay. So, review.” Without addressing this idea of changing reading texts, Yuna suddenly reveals that she might want to switch to something else. If this is because she slowly realized over the eight minutes or so between the resolution of the topic and Jess’s question it is an excellent example of how reframing can change behavior without telling students what to do. It would be difficult to prove this and perhaps she suddenly just soured at the idea of speed reading a page of Phantom of the Opera each week. However, if the idea was put in at minute five and incubated during the conversation, allowing Yuna to come the realization that she needed to change her text, that is a big win for advisor Jess.
6.3.3 Reframing and balancing motivation

Jess tends to advise use of skills or techniques to address student problems instead of working on underlying understanding. Hiro, for example, had two small goals, which is against the idea of the large and small goals – to have two very specific and linked things to address. Instead of addressing this underlying misunderstanding of the conceptual tool of the learning plan, she explains in detail what vocabulary and fluency consist of (see excerpt 1). Although this does coax Hiro to choose one of the two, bringing him into line with expectations, it does not address his underlying misunderstanding.

Despite her tendency to offer suggestions and focus on skill or techniques, Jess does make attempts to help students reframe their understanding. Some of Jess’s attempts at reframing are successful while others are not. I will look at examples of both successful and unsuccessful reframing.

In the excerpt below Jess tries to show Hiro that his expectations for learning vocabulary are out of proportion with what most people can achieve. He suggested that to learn new vocabulary he would note and study new terms used in classes. Hiro, however, had no real plan for that or any real conception for how much work it would be to try to attempt it. To put this into perspective Jess uses a metaphor of bodies of water.

Excerpt 10

Jess: So how are you going to increase your vocabulary to then using your speaking with the others? Do you have any ideas?
Hiro: I think daily class is the most important. And so I'm going to find many vocabulary and phrase from my English class. And I use them for speaking or conversation.
Jess: Okay. That is a good idea. In your classes though, you're going to meet lots and lots of new words. So are you going to have a separate, a different notebook for the LK course where you choose some words that you want to use or want to learn?
Hiro: You mean LK?
Jess: Yeah. So for our class, because you do need to study for our course using this learning plan. So this is why I'm trying to get you to be specific. Because if you just say, oh, I'm going to learn the language in the classroom, that's like this big. You're swimming in an ocean. You need to make the ocean a pool. And then make the pool a bath tub. So you need to bring the number of words that you're learning down, down, down, down. So that you can
focus and look at them and learn them well. **Then change. Throw that bath water out, put new bath in. New load of words.**

Here Hiro states that his study plan is to note and study new words that occur during class and to get more practice using them. However, he seems to lack a method for collecting new words, such as a separate notebook. Importantly, he also does not appear to know the difficulty of what he proposes. Here Jess tries to focus on the problem of the task being too much. The ocean metaphor suggests dangerous vastness and she quickly scales it down to a pool then a bathtub.

This reframing does not seem to have been successful as Hiro insists that he has taken notes in class, that it is easy, and that the vocabulary learned is useful outside of the classroom. Jess does not push him, this is in line with ideals of language advising that students can be challenged but never forced. She tells him to go along with his plan “Yeah, okay. So that’s something you can do for study. You can use your notes from your classes for your list of new vocabulary and you can study those.” Perhaps this topic is returned to in future sessions but in this session it is not brought back up (occurs at approximately the 10 minute mark of the 31 minute session).

However, some of Jess’s attempts at reframing were taken up by students. It is important to note that the success of reframing attempts rests with both advisor and student. To prepare for the TOFEL test Yuna was trying to improve reading comprehension and vocabulary. As discussed in 6.2.2 above, Yuna was planning to study vocabulary by reading *The Phantom of the Opera*. Jess questioned Yuna about the similarity of the vocabulary in *The Phantom of the Opera* to that which would be required on her TOFEL test. Jess asked if she thought they would be similar and Yuna answered yes. Seeing the misunderstanding, Jess expresses her concern about their differences, giving some examples.
Excerpt 11

Jess: Okay, so it’s the first time for you to both read and know the story. Ok, great. Um, and my other question that I have for you is the vocabulary on the TOFEL ITP similar to the vocabulary in the Phantom of the opera?

Yuna: Uh...I think...um... yeah I think it is similar

Jess: Okay

Yuna: But, I use this books uh, word list. Only word list, I use this book. So, ah little different to use it, them.

Jess: Yes, and that's why I was asking. Because your goal here is to get a mark on a particular type of test, and the TOFEL ITP is a little more academic than the Phantom of the Opera. Some words that you learn here will be in here. And that's awesome. And maybe we'll gain some new words from the Phantom of the Opera, but if you're wanting to improve your readings for an IP, ITP type of a text, you might find it's a very different type of reading to the Phantom of the Opera, because these ones they're often, for example, emails, uh, information about nonfiction, business type of a conversation. Whereas this is more about relationships between people and passion and music and human connection. So there are some similarities, but there are also some differences. Okay. So I want you to just remember that. And if later on you decide, Ooh, it's too different. Think about what text you can read for practicing the TOFEL. Okay. So keep it for now, try it for a week or two. And if you decide that no, they are too very different texts, then change it. Okay. Come up with some ideas of how to change it okay? Good.

Yuna does not see a difference in type of vocabulary from a novel like Phantom of the Opera and what is expected on the TOFEL ITP test. Perhaps she sees them as a similar level of complexity that this book is rated similarly to books suggested to practice for the test.

Whatever the reason, she is missing the idea that the topics of items on the test are unlikely to be similar to those that occur in the book and thus require different vocabulary. Jess approaches the issue from this angle and begins to give examples “because they are often, for example, emails, uh information about nonfiction, business type of a conversation” contrasting this to “more about relationships between people and passion and music.”

Although this is not as clear an attempt at reframing as using an abstract metaphor (studying too much vocabulary is like being lost in a vast ocean) it is still a way of changing the how she sees something – in this case learning new vocabulary for a standardized test of English language skill. Whatever her initial conception of it, it did not appear to include the idea of specific vocabulary – the idea that vocabulary is contextually relevant. This is perfectly in line with frame semantics as the frame of the interaction determines much of the vocabulary
that is relevant to a situation. When taking a standardized test of English, not just any vocabulary is likely to be on the test – instead it is likely to revolve around those areas that Jess suggests - business conversations and email. Although it happens just before the end of the session, Yuna does decide to change to a different source for reading practice. This will be discussed in detail below in section 6.4.2.

One element visible across sessions was motivation. At least one point in each session Jess asks the student about their motivation – how motivated they feel to study or how they maintain motivation throughout the busy semester. This is in part due to the presence of motivation on both the Wheel of Language Learning form and the Learning Plan worksheet. However, identifying, establishing, and maintaining motivation is considered a key element in the development of the successful autonomous learner. As such it is not out of place that Jess asks each student. And indeed, identifying and maintaining motivation is a difficult task for students. Ideals of a good work ethic and motivation originate in cultural practice and memory and some student struggle to balance schoolwork and academic expectations with their social lives and physical needs (like sleep).

Risa laments to Jess that she plans to study on her two-hour train ride to school each day but ends up getting little or nothing done and feels the time is wasted. In fact, this very idea of studying on the train and “not wasting” that time is quite popular amongst Tokyites. In the excerpt below, however, Jess reframes that value of the train ride, suggesting that if Risa is tired every day on the train, that she should “listen to your body” and consider that time well spent resting if she is tired.

Excerpt 12

Jess: Four. Can you explain to me why your time management is a four?
Risa: Cause it takes me two hours to come school And during the transportation. I always, wanted to do things, on the train and I always bring something to do, but the Ill find myself falling asleep.
Jess: Falling asleep *laugh*
Risa: *laugh*
This dialogue comes from the first few minutes of Risa’s (first in these data) meeting with Jess. Following the Wheel of Language Learning worksheet, Jess notes that several categories have high scores, but that time management is only a four. Risa states that she gave herself the low score because she cannot stay awake on the train to study what she had planned to study. Jess does eventually suggest a way of studying but not initially. First, she reacts empathetically and suggests that the sleep is more important than study and that Risa should not “put too much pressure on yourself to stay awake.” Jess’s suggestion to relax and not worry about wasting her train ride of four hours a day is not a common one. Jess’s response is more holistic in its approach, in the idea that happy, healthy people are more productive.

Although Jess quickly brings this topic to resolution with a laugh and “Ok, so don’t feel worried about the train” she also finds out that Risa is working a part-time job on the weekend. The topic of time management and motivation is returned to later after Jess asks for “questions or concerns that you want to ask me about” and Risa reveals that for the first hour of her train ride to school each day she must stand. To this Jess reiterates her previous statements about not pushing to study on the train stating that sleep, diet and stress would all affect her motivation.

This conversation was clearly taken to heart by Risa as it becomes the subject of her report about “the change of my motivation and also how I became good at time
management.” The construction of this as a report for one of Risa’s classes becomes the first advising event in their second (in these data) meeting. Risa states: “I started to put my motivation at the first part, which also improved, so it makes feel like I’m not chased by the time management.” Over the course of the session she describes how her current focus has become to identify things that motivate her and the result has been that instead of worrying about deadlines she is completing work. Jess remarks “You’ve become accustomed to making goals, thinking of a plan, aiming to complete that plan. Okay, that’s great.” Risa accords that to identifying what motivates her. This is Jess’s most successful reframing in these data. It is not clear how much time passed between meetings but the second meeting is likely to have taken place in the following semester. Such a significant change in a short time is a huge success.

6.3.4 “That’s fantastic”

Rapport building is important to advisors as students who are comfortable with their advisors are more open and more trusting (get better cite from Kato Mynard). Likewise offering making students aware of problems or mistakes is critical to good advising and so these elements must be balanced. While some advisors discuss their personal lives and draw parallels to students, Jess mainly builds rapport mainly through emphatic positive comments and compliments. In one example of empathetic positive comment use, Jess uses the word fantastic 26 times over the five sessions and always in terms of positive evaluation of student’s ideas and plans. This joins positive comments like ‘great’ and ‘brilliant’ and phrases like ‘good idea.’ This is Jess’s main method of positive commentary on students answers and plans. According to the ideals of ALL, positive reinforcement is important. Jess uses these terms liberally but in two specific ways. The first is simply positive commentary and is used
to build rapport. The second is as a balancing point to a more critical comment or question to follow.

In terms of positive reinforcement, Jess uses emphatic positive terms liberally and often there will be several as Jess asks evaluative questions and responds. In first excerpt below Hiro explains that he has been meeting his goal of using the English-speaking area “upstairs” in the self-access learning center to meet with conversation partners and practice speaking English. Although Hiro’s actions are quite common for students, Jess offers positive reinforcement through the strong words “fantastic” and “brilliant.”

**Excerpt 13**

Jess: Keep trying. Keep trying. How much time do you think you can use for practicing your speaking every week?

Hiro: I usually go to upstairs twice a week.

Jess: **Oh, fantastic.** The yellow sofas or the conversation area.

Hiro: The conversation.

Jess: **Brilliant.** That's good to hear.

In this second example Risa explains that despite having to stand for an hour of her daily two-hour commute, she has managed to find an app for her smartphone that allows her to practice vocabulary while standing. In addition, Jess adds an emphatic reinforcer to “I’m finding time to reading.” Although Jess clearly gives advice addressing Risa’s concern of wasting time on the train (discussed above) it is surrounded by the strong positive comments – brilliant and fantastic.

**Excerpt 14**

Risa: I have to find something I can do on my phone

Jess: Can do on your phone. Okay, do you have any resources at the moment that you can use your phone for

Risa: Yeah like *laugh*

Jess: Ah yes, **brilliant okay.** There you go

Risa: Did it actually

Jess: Maybe try spending the first half an hour forty-five minutes doing that then because you do have to stand and you cant fall asleep but then don’t push yourself after that. Fall asleep, have a bit of a nap

Risa: *laugh* I’m, I’m now finding time to reading, to read books because

Jess: Oh

Risa: Because I have a homework and reader
Jess: **Okay fantastic**

In one final example of positive reinforcement, the excerpt below shows how Jess weaves these strong reinforcing comments into gleaning questions and advice. In each of Jess’s responses below there is an emphatic positive response, followed by a question.

**Excerpt 15**

Kaori: So I will use the sources. Once in a week I test my English on a book or movie at the conversation area.

Jess: Okay, **fantastic**. What will you do to prepare for this?

Kaori: Before I go to the conversation area, I do watch something like a movie or this.

Jess: So you're just going to watch it? Are you going to think about what you want to say, or are you just going to try and say it?

Kaori: Ah! Tell my impression. So, I . . Im, I’ll practice to tell my impression using the words I study.

Jess: That sounds **like a really good idea**. Okay, great. So what else are you going to do here? So behavioral changes?

Kaori: In every required class, for example in UAC [class] or advanced reading or English, I try to use these words.

Jess: Okay. **Great, that sounds like a good idea**. So you're practicing the words over and over and over in every opportunity you get, which is **really good**. And I **like** that you've decided to have one specific time to really, really practice giving your opinion. Now, do you have a set time for this?

Kaori: No, not yet.

Each of these strong positive and supportive comments is accepts and applauds Kaori’s statements as well as sets up questions. The first two preempt open questions which draw out some deeper thought on Kaori’s plans. She responds saying that she will prepare to discuss her opinions in the conversation area by watching movies and then practicing words that allow her to share her opinion (though she is not clear on what that practice would be). Jess’s support follows ideals of language advising to supply positive reinforcement.

Beyond simply uplifting students, Jess also uses these positive comments to set up critique. Jess uses positive comments in tandem with another comment. In the cases below, her comments set a positive mood and off-set the critical commentary. In excerpt 16 below, Jess and Risa are discussing Risa’s choice to read less difficult texts from available graded readers. Jess makes several positive comments, first about Risa’s choice to read easier text then the connected topic of how her goals are connected. This sets up her critique that Risa is
really practicing writing rather than reading. Also addressing the information on her learning plan, Jess asks how her plan to practice speaking addresses the goal of reading.

Excerpt 16

Jess: Ann of Green Gables yeah, I know it. It’s a very popular book. Um, okay. That sounds like a good strategy as well . . if . .especially since you have so much time, um that you need to spend using homework. For the graded readers it might be a good idea if you just go down that one level so that you are able to read them without too much worry. Too much hassle

Risa: Yes

Jess: Um, that is a good idea. For the moment. Well, okay let’s take a look at the plan for the moment. So your big goal is reading and your small goal is vocabulary and expression. I’ve had a look through this a few times because

Risa: *laugh*

Jess: Because you’ve mentioned the same ideas a few times. Just very quickly let’s have a look through it. So, you are going to find your three expressions per day using the Cheater’s guide to speaking English like a native and you are going to make some original sentences for them. Uh, you’re then going to use your sentences that you made with your friend to check that if you are able to use them or, not.

Risa: Un

Jess: Okay, look back on your notes, and check the meaning of the words. Ok. So, all of these are connected beautifully to your small goal

Risa: Yes

Jess: What it looks like your doing however is more along the lines of writing rather than reading

Risa: Unn . .

Jess: So, why. . So this is great, cause this is how you study them. Why did you decide to use ‘Use’ as “use the sentences that you made with your friends and teachers” cause that sounds like also a speaking activity?

In one final example of Jess using emphatic positive comments to off-set critique, we return to excerpt X above. Here Jess asks Hiro about his plans to study. She begins with the supportive comment “that is a good idea” but once it is clear that Hiro has no clear idea of how to enact this plan Jess switches to being more critical and, as discussed above tries to change his conceptions of what learning vocabulary looks like.

Excerpt 17

Jess: Okay. Well that's the point of this class. But have you found a way yet?

Hiro: Yeah.

Jess: Yeah? So how are you going to increase your vocabulary to then using your speaking with the others? Do you have any ideas?

Hiro: I think daily class is the most important. And so I'm going to find many vocabulary and phrase from my English class. And I use them for speaking or conversation.

Jess: Okay. That is a good idea. In your classes though, you're going to meet lots and lots of new words. So are you going to have a separate, a different notebook for the LK course where you choose some words that you want to use or want to learn?
Hiro: You mean LK?
Jess: Yeah. So for our class, because you do need to study for our course using this learning plan. So, this is why I'm trying to get you to be specific. Because if you just say, oh, I'm going to learn the language in the classroom, that's like this big. You're swimming in an ocean. You need to make the ocean a pool. And then make the pool a bath tub. So you need to bring the number of words that you're learning down, down, down, down. So that you can focus and look at them and learn them well. Then change. Throw that bath water out, put new bath in. New load of words.

6.4 Teaching and prompting action

In the resolution phase of the advising event the advisor aims to complete one or more of several potential tasks. Ideally, the resolution of an advisable issue comes with insight into what caused the problem, a plan of action for the student to address that problem and an organization to the plan of action to include goals and schedules. To accomplish this advisors employ a variety of tactics including challenging, goal setting, open questions and even teaching. The objective for the advisor is to provide what help they can to prepare the student to tackle the issue at hand between that advising session and the next.

Prompting action is a major goal of the resolution phase as it represents the potential for real progress towards fixing problems or concerns that students have. It is not always possible to develop a plan of action and some advising events resolve in reflection on what has been done with an idea to return to the issue in the future. Many resolve to follow the previously set plan further and continue to monitor the successes and failures of that plan. However, in each advising session in these data there is at least one resolution to new action. These vary from setting a new schedule to finding a new book to resolving to use some of the SALC’s facilities that were previously untapped.

Teaching can be a part of either phase three of the advising event, or phase four – either as guidance or as resolution. Although language advising explicitly divides up the roles of teacher and advisor, in that advisors work with single students and promote learner autonomy while teachers work in classrooms with groups of students and aim for skill
acquisition. However, this distinction is more to carve out the place of the advisor in the busy landscape of educators, instructors, councilors and pedagogues. The classroom teacher may have opportunities to work with students and focus on their development of autonomy. By the same token, advisors find opportunities to work on skill acquisition in the more traditional way of teachers. Jess does this a few times in these data by enacting what I will call mini lessons as well as by evaluating her performance in a manner uncommon in advising literature but common in classroom teaching.

In line with explicit teaching, prompting action is one of the advisor’s more directive actions. Prompting actions are aimed at pushing students to enact plans. Reviewing those plans later is often part of the gleaning stage with questions like “you mentioned that maybe you can use bus ride from Hongo to school to learn vocabulary.” Wherein the advisor can start and advising event from there.

6.4.1 Teacher hat

Drawing on her background as a teacher Jess engages several methods that are common to the ESL classroom such as recast - corrective echoing of student phrases, reformulating the utterance without errors – common in the foreign language classroom (Mitchell, Myles & Marsden, 2013). Although this technique of corrective feedback in common in the ESL classroom it is not necessarily in line with ALL literature. The idea of repeating student phrases, however, is a specifically taught strategy (Kato & Mynard, 2016). The reason for this discrepancy is that the focus of an advising session is not to improve a student’s language skills or even to provide feedback on them. Instead it is to help students plan and organize. Due to this differing focus, exact repetition or repetition of only key information is suggested, not repetition with corrections for accurate usage. However, it is language teachers that populate the ranks of learning advisors and as such practices like this
are both common and considered acceptable as long as they do not become the focus – as long as the advising session does not become a personal lecture.

Jess includes at least one mini-lesson in each of her session. These tend to come in the resolution phase of the advising event where suggestions for student activities and change come together with new information delivered in extended dialogue. Jess’s approach seems to strike a good balance as most of the sessions are not lesson-like but some part of each is and allows her to teach new ideas and concepts to students instead of only playing off their ideas and plans.

In the following excerpt Jess teaches Kaori about using a thesaurus. This comes at the end of a short advising event in which Kaori explicitly asks for help finding words to “better express her feelings” in a report she is writing. Jess starts by introducing what a thesaurus is as it is a totally new tool for Kaori. In the process of explaining its use she also introduces the words synonym and antonym, a pneumonic device for remembering them, closeness of meaning between terms (though the “relevance” function) then examples of how to use a specific online thesaurus.

Excerpt 18

Jess: I see. Okay. Would you like my recommendations now or later?
Kaori: Now.
Jess: Now? Okay. Well, my first recommendation, if you want adjectives and adverbs then have you ever used thesaurus? Now there's a very easy thesaurus on the internet. A thesaurus is like a dictionary.
Kaori: Dictionary?
Jess: But what it gives you are words that mean the same or words that mean the opposite. So think of an adjective. Any adjective.
Kaori: Beautiful.
Jess: Beautiful. Okay, so the word synonyms, do you know the word synonyms?
Kaori: I don't know.
Jess: Easy way to think about it. Synonyms mean the same.
Kaori: Oh.
Jess: Antonyms mean the opposite.
Kaori: Okay.
Jess: Okay, so S for synonyms, S for same. Okay. So you type in the word beautiful and what it gives you is a definition, pronunciation of the word. But these are all words that mean beautiful. So they have the same meaning, but what's even better about this website, is that
you can choose, for example, the length of the words. So do you want short words or do you want to know some long words, so you can change it.

Kaori:  

Jess: Yeah, it's a really good one actually. So you can choose, do you want to learn the short words, do you want to learn long words. Also, what you can do is you can change the relevance. So here you can either turn it on or turn it off. Okay. **Now relevance means how closely connected are they?** So the ones that are the darkest are the closest meaning to the word **beautiful**. These ones are similar, but maybe not quite the same nuance. Okay. And sometimes when you see very, very large words don't bother. We don't use them. They're to scientific or two too old or two four. **Okay. But words like alluring means beautiful. Oh, she's such an alluring woman, she's such a beautiful.** That's actually an exquisite plate, that's a beautiful plate. So this can be really useful for finding words that mean the same, and if you go down words that mean the opposite, antonyms. So that can help you build basically a tree. And one good way that I find I organize my vocabulary is you can do, for example, a word tree. So if you think of the word, let's say love. Okay. Go out other words that mean **love**, other words that mean love. Down this side, for example, this might be the **really fiery, passionate love.** This type of love might be between, for example, family. So you can choose categories as well. So they're all words that mean love but maybe the nuance is different, when you use them is different. So you can draw a visual map and sometimes that also helps. So that's probably my two biggest recommendations for learning more vocabulary for adjectives and adverbs specifically. And if you don't know what the word means, you can always click on the word and it will give you the definition of it as well. Plus other words that mean the same. Okay.

Kaori: Oh, very nice.

In this mini-lesson, Jess teaches Kaori about synonyms, antonyms and thesauri. She teaches not only what they are but ways to remember and to make use of them in her writing and study. Importantly, Jess also teaches that synonyms do not have the exact same meaning as one another by addressing the ‘relevance’ feature of this online thesaurus and some concept of proximity of meaning. Further she gives examples how beautiful and love can be represented differently by different synonyms.

Although lecturing is not part of most advising sessions, and extensive lecturing is most certainly frowned upon, this short lesson appears to have been both helpful and inspiring to Kaori as she comments “Its fantastic” and later resolves “I will use the thesaurus once a week I tell my English on a book or movie and the conversation area.”

Jess also used the teaching technique of recasting student’s utterances. As discussed above, this follows the advising strategy of repeating but also may turn slightly against general advising ideas due to its focus on accurate production. These are often part of the
gleaning phase of the advising event as they are times when students are the most vocal. In this way they could be seen as clarifying information. However, as is clear in the examples below, it is not due to a true need to clarify possibly misunderstood information. Instead, the goal appears to be correction of inaccurate production. The following two short excerpts are examples of Jess using of this strategy and represent two of 14 examples in these data.

In excerpt 19, Jess and Kaori are at the beginning of a new advising event. They have just finished discussing Kaori’s plan to practice using new words in the SALT’s conversation area. Jess then moves on to the connected idea of evaluating growth asking “how are you going to evaluate yourself?” When Kaori says “once in two days” Jess echoes with the small correction following her accepting and concluding “okay.”

**Excerpt 19**

Jess: So, how are you going to evaluate yourself?
Kaori: I think . . .
Jess: Evaluation is a little difficult.
Kaori: I think writing a diary or something once in a week or once in two days.
Jess: Okay. **Once every two days.**
Kaori: Yes.

In another example Jess asked for any additional questions from Risa concerning her report (as discussed above in section 6.3.3 following excerpt 11). In response, Risa asks how many examples are expected in her report and Jess responds with the closed question “how many are you thinking of using at the moment” in turn also correcting Risa’s misuse of ‘much.’ It seems this instance this less explicit form of correction was not noticed.

**Excerpt 20**

Jess: Did you have any questions about how to structure your report or any aspect of your writing?
Risa: Maybe **how much examples** do I have to put inside my report?
Jess: **How many examples** are you thinking of using at the moment?
Risa: I have my every week studying event, so... but **how much** do I have to put it in? So it's the comment I made.
Jess: Um, so I think maybe two or three examples would be perfectly fine. You've only got 500 words, so two examples might be useful.
Risa: If it is two, so maybe the very beginning and the last.
Jess: Very good.
In both examples of repeating with correction Jess simply repeats with the correction made as in the examples above. These two examples are two of many that occur in these data. Jess sometimes adds emphasis to this, as in excerpt 28 and sometimes not, as in excerpt 29. This action blurs the lines between teacher and advisor and could potentially cause problems if accuracy, not communication became the major focus of sessions. However, Jess’s sparing and sometimes unnoticed correction is a fact of ESL teachers becoming advisors. The there is a struggle of leaving a mistake like much/many or “once in two days” alone for the purposes of communication vs correcting it so the student knows.

6.4.2 “Try that and let me know next week”

For the advisor, the ideal resolution stage to an advising event is one that prompts action. Setting a time in the future for the student to show a result of that action to the advisor offers both motivation in terms of expectation and a chance for students to be recognized, complimented and supported for their activities.

In the example above, Jess discussed using a thesaurus with Kaori and offered a mini-lesson on synonyms and usage. To draw a resolution to that issue Jess suggested action. The excerpt below demonstrated the resolution phase in which Jess helped identify an app that Kaori could download on her phone and use then reminded her to “let me know via email.”

Excerpt 21

Jess: Yes, okay. Ignore that one. Dictionary maybe? From the looks of it they don't give you the relevance though. So I think this one might be the most useful version. This is both a dictionary and a thesaurus, but it gives you the pronunciation. And I think there's also some games in here as well. I've never tried it. Give it a go, if you like it, let me know via email if it's good.

Advisors often set the time to show their results as the next session. Jess does do this with a few students but also allows them to show changes or progress through email or through asynchronous assignment sheets. This tactic allowed Jess the benefits of prompting
In the following excerpt Jess and Yuna conclude the advising session discussed earlier (in excerpt 11) in which Jess failed to convince Yuna that the vocabulary in Phantom of the Opera was different than that on her upcoming TOFEL test. However, in this excerpt (22) at the conclusion of the session, when prompted for more questions about her learning plan, Yuna suddenly suggested finding another book “I think, un, maybe I’ll change the book.” To this Jess started a resolution phase.

**Excerpt 22**

Jess: Ah! Yes. So if you do change the book, just, uh, when you send me your evidence, just say, take a photo and say, Hey, I changed my book. I decided to use this one, um, write it in your reflection, because in your reflection *shuffling papers* here it is, um..

Yuna: There?

Jess: No, its not there. Anyways, in the reflection section there is the question about what will you change? Will you keep things the same? The very last one. So just mentioned it in there. **So you don't need to come and physically tell me.** But in your evaluation, or when you submit your evidence, **that's when you just tell me that you did change it and tell me why you changed it.**

Yuna: Okay

Jess: Okay? And if you feel happier because of the change or it's, you're still not a hundred percent sure about it, or if you want any recommendations, those certain sorts of things. Okay?

Yuna: Okay.

As in excerpt 21, Jess allows this prompt of action to be reported through a channel other than the next session. In this case it appears that Yuna will submit her report to Jess and thus she can use a preset space for self-evaluation on the assignment to dictate what she has done. However, despite it not being part of the following session it clearly shows Jess’s use of the strategy of prompting action by assigning an action and a deadline.

**6.5 Conclusion**

This chapter included a comprehensive discourse analysis of Jess’s advising sessions with students Hiro, Kaori, Risa and Yuna. This examination showed not just what Jess does in an advising session but how she enacts and accomplishes the activity of advising. In her
LA sessions Jess carefully follows the flow of the worksheets as is expected of her. Even when away from the worksheets (as she is in session with Kaori) she appears to have internalized the model and returns back to it. However, despite her adherence to this model she still enacts advising beyond simply asking students to repeat what was written on their sheets. Following the format of the advising session from gleaning information, through guidance to resolution, several themes emerged: (1) gleaning information, (2) following the plan, controlling, supporting and reframing, and finally (3) teaching and prompting action. Jess supports a more directive style when she deems it necessary while still allowing for less directive means when possible. In the next chapter I will directly compare Noriko and Jess’s styles to illustrate similarities and differences.
Chapter 7: Discussion

7.0 Introduction

This chapter will discuss and elaborate on my analysis of Jess and Noriko’s advising sessions. It will be supplemented with an additional advising session (with a different advisor/student pair) and with excerpts from interviews with Jess and Noriko. This analysis will inform the answers of the three research questions that have guided this research:

**Research Questions:**

1. What is Advising in Language Learning (ALL) and what is unique about it?
2. What is a successful advising session? How do advisors work to make sessions successful?
3. How do language advisors work? Dialogically, how do they enact advising?

In the follow sections each question will be answered comprehensively, drawing on findings outlined in previous chapters. The results and analysis from chapters, five (Noriko) and six (Jess) will be examined and combined with a direct comparison of styles and discursive strategies. To the analysis of Jess and Noriko’s sessions I will add analysis of an additional session with a different advisor, Mary, for the purpose of comparison. Mary is an expert advisor with more than ten years of experience and published research on the topics of autonomous learning and language advising. The comparison of advisors’ styles and choices will help to highlight variation in approaches to advising and, in the process, show that despite variation, advisors follow unique yet similar patterns of advising. In this way advising should be seen as both dynamic and systematic. This approach to discussion is intended to highlight my conclusions, how I came by them and how they are supported by data.

Following a discussion of research questions, I will present the limitations of this study and offer conclusions and ideas for future research.
7.1 Research Questions

7.1.1 RQ1: What is Advising in Language Learning and what is unique about it?

The introduction chapter outlined the theory and evidence-based components of Advising in Language Learning. To summarize, language advising is an ontological approach to language learning in which a learner meets one-on-one with a language advisor (a qualified language education expert), to discuss plans and strategies for language study. It is designed to focus attention on individual learners needs and goals. The position of language advisor combines aspects of academic advisor, private teacher, and tutor but is different than each. Finally, language advising as a practice offers another route to language acquisition for those who cannot study in traditional classrooms or afford private teachers.

Findings from the present investigation coincide with (and seek to extend) ALL theory and knowledge base. Unpacking my findings will illustrate this contribution. Clarifying advisor aims - the goals of advising sessions – is central to understanding what language advising is and what it is not. Language advising is not language teaching, and advisors are not language teachers. Instead, language advising focuses on helping students ‘learning to plan’ and ‘plan to study.’ In fact, language advisors are often language teachers but in the role of advisor, they teach learning strategies and offer support for planning and enacting those strategies. While it is also true that teacher act in the role defined here for advisors, there is no system to advise students or separation of those goals from those of teaching. The goals of language advising are different than those of a language teacher. Although an advisor’s goals for a session could include seeing a learner become more proficient in a language, it is rarely the primary goal. In most cases, the goals of language advising are the behavioral changes and conceptual changes that lead to more efficient and effective study.
To more clearly illustrate how advising goals focus on behavioral and conceptual change, I will use the lenses of frame semantics (Fillmore, 1981; 2015; Lakoff, 2016) and intersubjectivity (Wertsch, 1985) to discuss examples from the data in this study.

7.1.1.1 Reframing in language advising

The process of language advising can be seen as the process of reframing students’ views of learning. In some cases, this can be about language study tools. In her session with Hirio, Jess dissuaded him from writing down his classroom interactions (during class) to study vocabulary. Hiro did not understand how overwhelming this strategy would likely have been and how ineffective. By contrast, in her session with Kaori, Jess persuaded her that art museums could help her learn descriptive language, a tactic Kaori had never considered. Her experience with learning new words had been to memorize lists from textbooks. She had not considered how carefully adverbs and adjectives for artwork descriptions were chosen or how useful that could be for learning.

In other cases, Jess and Noriko’s reframing was aimed at how students viewed themselves as students. Noriko spent time in each of her sessions reframing Ai’s self-admonishments for being lazy. Noriko recast lazy as “busy,” “tired” and “burnt out” across multiple sessions. Through these actions (and others discussed from the findings on reframing) Jess and Noriko attempted to do more than suggest study tools or reassure a student of their hard work. Noriko’s reassurance was intended to be a foundation for building overall confidence and the change in study tools that Jess suggested, allude to broader thinking of how study could be performed.

Particular to this study, are the frames of education and learning common to Japanese students. The Japanese education system remains more traditional in terms of its study methodologies and testing expectations. Rote learning through memorization is common in
language classrooms and the goal of language learning is often to replicate memorized sentences on written tests. In one session with Ai, Noriko conducted a mini-lesson about memorization. She explained to Ai “we learn new words, 12 hours later, we only remember 50%, a week later 25% so if you have 10 words you are only likely to remember two words. It’s shocking.” The purpose of this explanation addressed both an external issue and a deeper conceptual issue, just like those examples above. On the surface it addressed the value of review, drawing on research she states that memorization is not very effective, and that review is important to retain knowledge. On the deeper, conceptual level, Noriko disputed the idea that rote memorization was a good way to study and learn.

Noriko does even more to dissuade rote memorization, enticing Ai to add deeper meaning and context to new words “do you have a particular dictionary you use often?” “you could add parts of speech” “if you know what part of speech it is, it’s easier to use in conversation” and so on. Traditional educational practices have encouraged rote memorization, but this strategy could be antithetical for language learning. Noriko avoids explicitly saying that this is bad and also stops short of telling Ai not to make word lists. Proper reframing starts by building from what people already know and believe (Lakoff, 1996). Noriko does this exactly working with Ai’s plan to make word lists but encouraging her to contextualize words by adding word meaning and suggesting that they may be easier to remember.

Another aspect of the Japanese school system that advisors actively work to reframe is that of positive and negative feedback. Hiraga (2008) outlined several key conceptual metaphors that guide Japanese student thinking, and what makes a good student. One being TEACHER IS FATHER. Hiraga explained that linguistic and cultural evidence point not only to many students seeing teachers in a parental role but that traditionally “The bond of the teacher and the student is thought of as even stronger than that of the parents and children”
(Hiraga, 2008 p. 66). However, this teacher/student relationship often lacks positivity and caring, emphasizing “the importance of seniority and authority rather than the love and affection of the family relationship.” (p.68).

Infusing positivity into sessions and monitoring student’s emotions is a high priority in ALL. However, this is not a priority in many Japanese schools. In her interview, Noriko lamented that many of her advisee students “never had that type of positive feedback” from their teachers in school. Their learning environments had consisted mainly of negative feedback, if any, from teachers. Noriko identified herself as one such student in her grammar school years, who received only negative feedback from teachers despite being a good student. She believed that some students at Jogen (and other Japanese universities) came to advising sessions mainly to be heard and were “looking for the positive side of themselves.”

Noriko’s active work to reframe students views of learning to include positivity were observed throughout her interactions with Ai. In her interview, Noriko talked about her strategy of using students’ own statements as the basis for feedback, confirming that she actively worked to remind students of successes in sessions “Hey, do you remember that time? Um, and student like to think about the positive moments they had. So, um, yeah, I normally try to remember those like great moment for a student and to bring it to the conversation.” This tactic, she believed, would shift their focus away from deadlines, concerns, and a fixation on failure and negative emotions. She worked to reframe students thinking to focus on positivity and past success instead of failure.

These examples illustrate how language advisors actively seek to reframe students’ ideas of learning. This is done to change concepts underlying learning strategies as well as those of positivity and negativity surrounding study. Conceptual metaphor theory and frame semantics are not theoretical approaches practiced and institutionalized by the ALL.
community to date. However, these approaches have the potential to offer unique insights concerning the underlying motivations and ramifications for advisors’ work.

7.1.1.2 Language advising through a sociocultural theoretical lens

Unlike frame semantics, Vygotskian sociocultural theory has been incorporated into some areas of Autonomous learning and ALL research (Benson, 2005; Little, 1991; Mozzon-McPherson, 2012; Mynard 2012). As discussed in chapter 2, however, there are concerns voiced by some in the SCT community that autonomous learning, and language advising by relation, remove a vital focus from experts and encourage learners to engage in inefficient learning (Lantolf, 2013). However, when applying ALL precepts, the advising goal is not immediate language learning. Language learning is viewed as a process requiring a systematic dialog with students to plan for individualized learning based on purpose, motivation and goal setting. As a result, the benefits and pitfalls of advising should be considered not in terms of language learning but instead in terms of learning planning.

The major activity of advising sessions is not language learning, but preparing, reporting and evaluating plans. This is what is enacted in advising sessions and thus it is these skills that the advisor is training students to imitate (imitation in the Vygotskian sense of working to replicate, not of mindless parroting) and to potentially internalize. Internalization of these skills would allow students to regulate themselves in future imitations of skills like planning and self-evaluation. Most students must learn to plan and organize their own language learning (without a set curriculum, vocabulary lists, tests and similar elements of the classroom). Thus, the activity of learning planning is a skill. A learner’s zone of proximal development can be activated by a skilled advisor and they can be mediated to complete constituent activities (like planning a self-evaluation) with aid.
From a sociocultural perspective, the activity of learning planning is what advisers are mediating in a session. Ideally, advisers work in the student’s active ZPD – questioning and provoking students to enact planning and practice choices, giving just enough aid to allow them to succeed. If not intentionally giving the minimum amount of aid for each task, broadly it is clear that Noriko and Jess were aware of the potential benefits and dangers of more or less aid to accomplish tasks such as study planning. This can be seen in many of the excerpts discussing advisor guidance in which student suggestions were taken in (often with “okay, that’s a good plan/idea”) but followed by further questions (“So then how . . .”). Students are given some positive feedback but the task is not completed, they are pushed further, pushed to answer more questions or posit new methods. This approach to making tools and affordances accessible without completing the task can be seen as active mediation. Active mediation requires intent, and it although unclear that either Jess or Noriko sought to minimize aid at each point they did guide intentionally with consideration of the values and dangers of providing different levels of aid. Turning specifically to the concept of intersubjectivity, Jess and Noriko’s actions followed discursive practices outlined by Wertsch (1985), such as abbreviation which can lead to self-regulation.

The following excerpt is near the end of a session between Jess and Risa. Jess asks how Risa plans to track the usage of a set of expressions she wants to begin using and what motivates her to study. She replies with a slice of metalanguage about study and practice that suggests more complete intersubjectivity with advisors.

**Excerpt 1**

Jess: Okay, so . . . seeing how many times you’ve used it is going to give you more motivation to keep going
Risa: Yes, it has to be visible
Jess: It has to be visible. I like that
Risa: *laugh*
Jess: That’s a very good phrase. It has to be visible
Risa: *laugh*
Here Risa used the pedagogical phrase “it has to be visible” to describe how she must find ways to record her language practice and make it explicit for it to be motivating. Leading up to this, Jess notes that on her Learning Plan, Risa wrote “write down many times I used” for motivation. Instead of attempting an extended description of her reasoning, Risa deploys a succinct pedagogical expression and Jess understands immediately, even praising her for its use. This follows directly in what Wertsch (1985) describes as abbreviation and what can lead to intersubjectivity and through that self-regulation. Risa successfully uses this term to establish intersubjectivity. The process of establishing intersubjectivity, and through it internalization of core concepts, creates the psychological tools students can use to self-regulate these same activities in the future.

Sociocultural theory suggests that the path towards self-regulation is achieved in the process of working with an expert to successfully complete a task (Lantolf & Thorne, 2008). This can be moderated in several ways by the expert, in his studies Wertsch (1985) suggests Referential Perspective - complexity of reference to objects, and Abbreviation - brevity or thoroughness of action description. The desired result of this is shared perception is understanding of activity, and a broader understanding of situation surrounding that activity and wider implications. The goal, Wertsch explained, is an intersubjectivity “when interlocutors share some of their situation definition.” Even if this were simple repetition of a phrase that she heard, and used without deeper understanding of the underlying pedagogical principles (what Rommetveit called ventriloquation) it still represents Risa working “out ahead” of her mastery which may be the first sign of internalization (Wertsch, 2007 p. 188).

In advising sessions, advisors seek to show students new ways of approaching and thinking about study – ways that they are able to enact without expert guidance.
7.1.2 RQ2: What is a successful advising session and how do advisors work towards success?

Defining the success or failure of educational endeavors is difficult. The efficacy of language advising and autonomous learning has been a focus of many articles (Benson, 2006; Hobbs & Dofs, 2015; Nesrin, 2016; Shelton-Strong, 2020) but none addresses the success of single advising sessions. Even those sources that suggest general models for learner advancement across time (Kato & Mynard, 2016; Oxford, 2001) acknowledge that progress is often not easily visible in single meetings. As a result, there are general ideas of what makes good sessions (e.g., connect to the student, promote reflection on study plans, promote action towards new goals etc.) but no common metric to rate success. To address this topic, I asked both Jess and Noriko, in interviews and personal communication, what they believed made an advising session successful or unsuccessful. Viewed through the lens of intersubjectivity, I will build on their answers and suggest a definition for a successful session.

Jess described a successful session as one in which students “came to a conclusion they were happy with” or included dialogues where students were able to share a positive story. In addition, it was an achievement when she was able to build rapport or connect with a student in some way. Similarly, Noriko described a successful session as one that “allows an advisor to connect with a learner both cognitively as well as emotionally.” She went on to say “When a learner feels comfortable opening the baggage they have in mind with the learning advisor . . .” they are more likely to share deep thoughts and feelings that allow advisors to help more effectively. It is clear from these answers, that Jess and Noriko value forging emotional bonds, learning more about student backgrounds and interests, and ascertaining and how they think.

Conversely, Noriko described an unsuccessful session as one in which students were unwilling to express their emotions. She characterized productive sessions as those that allowed the advisor to connect with students on a deeper emotional level and those that did
not as less successful. Similarly, a session was unsuccessful if it would “end up being just answering to student’s questions.” Jess’s response was similar to Noriko’s, saying that an unsuccessful session was one that ended without resolution (sometimes due to time) and in which there was nothing deeper than “answering a few questions.” She added that these resolution-less sessions sometimes occurred with students who could not “open up to new ways of thinking” who became frustrated “with their inability to understand the perspective you are providing.” She referred to students who refused to change unproductive but ingrained ways of studying – citing students who insisted on memorizing vocabulary lists from textbooks as an example. According to Jess, these sessions were some of the most difficult and draining for both advisor and student, often ending in students becoming highly self-conscious and unresponsive.

Combining these answers, it seems that several definitions of success are required. As there are several different goals for advisors in sessions it stands to reason that there are different metrics for success. Goals for advising sessions include building rapport, instilling positivity in students, challenging students to change their habits or ways of thinking and even just getting them to come back for another session. These primary goals have several similarities, focusing on the organizational, social and psychological needs of students with language learning as a secondary goal. Jess and Noriko see advising as the initial step for subsequent language learning. Both indicated that a good session is one where advisors strengthen their connection to students or help them see why they must change their study habits. Focus on metacognition, planning, building rapport, providing positive feedback (and a positive environment) and returning to advising, pull the focus firmly away from language acquisition. So, a successful session, accordingly, is not connected to progress in language learning or in a vague idea of becoming more autonomous. Instead, the prerequisite focus is on immediate organizational, social and emotional needs.
Following theories of development in autonomy and language advising, the focus on social connection and organization is designed to lead students to becoming better learners, and through that more proficient language users. A valuable theoretical lens for understanding this process is intersubjectivity, in which establishing deeper connections with learners potentially leads to self-regulation through a shared situation definition (Wertsch, 1985). If advisors gain students’ trust, and leverage that trust to push through resistance to new ideas (bringing student thinking into line with their own), advisors have established a path in which the student can begin to see as the advisor. This is the process of the interpyschological becoming the intrapsychological (Wertsch, 1985).

Defining success through intersubjectivity, echoes autonomous learning and ALL definitions of student’s success on the path to autonomy (Jang, Reeve & Deci, 2010; Kato & Mynard, 2016). These models define successful students as those that: use more teacher metalanguage, are able to switch viewpoints and able to self-evaluate. So students begin to act like advisors as they are able to see their situation more clearly from the advisor’s viewpoint. In this way greater “autonomy” connects with greater self-regulation. Kato & Mynard (2016) even suggest that thoroughly autonomous students can conduct “self-advising.” Seen through a sociocultural lens, self-advising is a student taking up the roles of both student and adviser in the me-I regulation sometimes needed for difficult tasks.

So, the successful session can be seen as one in which the advisor makes progress towards establishing more complete intersubjectivity with the student. The unsuccessful sessions then, would be those in which no new insight was gained, no resolutions or conclusions were agreed upon, and the advisor failed to establish a deeper connection with the student. Although more inquiry is required, this suggests a potential definition:

A successful advising session is one in which the student gains more complete intersubjectivity with the advisor. This could be shown through a revelation of how past
events changed them or a resolution to take action in the future. This could also be shown by students opening up emotionally and placing trust advisors.

7.1.3 RQ3: How do language advisors work? Dialogically, how do they enact advising?

Whether guided by a worksheet or the flow of conversation, there is a clearly observable advising pattern in these data. The process follows the steps of (1) gleaning information, (2) co-constructed problem solving and advisor led guidance then (3) a resolution that either prompts action, applauds success, or clearly identifies a problem for future discussion. I have investigated this at several levels following the macro-mezzo-micro approach (Strauss et al., 2019). At this macro level I identified that there is a structure to the sessions that follow the process I outline in Chapter 4 and have defined as the advising event.

The advising event allows advisors to guide students, reframing the way they think about the learning process. This includes methods of asking questions, intuiting, offering positive feedback and empathizing. At the discourse level, advising involves various strategies to glean necessary information, give advice, and prompt actions. These strategies include discourse markers such as “oh” “okay” and “great” (sometimes used together) used to verbally accepted student ideas then transition to further questions or guidance. Another often used strategy was challenging students to practice discussed strategies with “try that and we will talk about it next week”. In chapters five and six these micro level strategies were organized into themes at the mezzo level: such as using confirming statements or clusters of questions to successfully glean information from students. This is how advising is enacted.

To validate this framework beyond advisors Noriko and Jess I will apply it to another advisor and student pair. I will draw examples from a 22-minute session with advisor Mary and student Sayumi (both pseudonyms). These data also come from Jogen university and, were part of the original data set provided.
Excerpt 2: Gleaning information

Mary: So, you did Evaluate this week?
Sayumi: Yeah, and I compared the April one with new one
Mary: Yeah
Sayumi: Today I talked with [teacher] and I found many things changing or not changing
Mary: Wow! Interesting. So, you compared the recording from - when was it May? Or April
Sayumi: May
Mary: May, with the one from today. Great. What did you find?
Sayumi: I can use more vocabulary than May
Mary: Well done

Advising events start with the advisor gathering information about the topic from the student (part 2 gleaning information), just as Mary does here. She begins the recording just as Jess and Noriko did in their sessions, with a question just after starting the recording. Here Mary uses a confirmation eliciting statement to confirm that Sayumi performed the task Evaluate. Evaluate, is a self-evaluation process supported by guiding questions from a worksheet. The intention of its design was to not only teach students to evaluate their own learning but, train them to design appropriate methods of evaluation dependent on the goal and activity. Here Sayumi explained that her process of self-evaluation was to listen to and compare recordings of spoken presentations she gave in an ESL class. She compared a recent presentation to one from two months prior and found “I can use more vocabulary than May.” Just as Jess and Noriko, Mary gleaned needed information using questions “so you did Evaluate” and confirmation eliciting statements “So, you compared the recording from May.” Here she also adds positive feedback “wow, interesting” and “well done.” This leads to a short discussion about her topic choice and some guidance on the design of self-evaluation.

Later in the session Mary and Sayumi move to the topic of studying vocabulary. Sayumi revealed a plan to build her “conversational” vocabulary by reading newspapers. However, Mary disagrees with this approach and enacts phase 3 of the advising event – guidance.
Excerpt 3

Sayumi: Um...I have to, yeah I will, I will study only vocabulary learning but also popular sentences or maybe by other book or drama, or other things, teachers, conversation.

Mary: *That's a good idea.* So listening to natural English, picking up some natural phrases or expressions, then trying to use them. That sounds an interesting project as well.

Sayumi: … yeah… *I will .. read a newspaper or the another book* because I only use vocabulary books. So it is easy to read the stories but maybe I … yeah… it’s difficult to understand another sentences… so I have to make the time to meet new words other things, from other things.

Mary: I think that’s a really good point. *Do you think newspapers is the best place though? I’m not sure about newspapers.*

Sayumi: Yeah, it’s difficult…

Mary: And also *it’s not natural conversation*

Sayumi: Yeah, mmmm *what should I do?*

In this excerpt, Sayumi showed some understanding of the contextually-bound nature of vocabulary “I will read a newspaper or another book because I only use vocabulary book.” She realized that her vocabulary book was not good for natural conversations and so thought to turn to newspapers. However, since newspapers as well were not representative of the conversational “natural English” she sought, she needed a little more guidance. Mary starts with at pointed question “Do you think newspapers is the best place though?” followed by the more direct “I’m not sure about newspapers.” However, this is misinterpreted by Sayumi who replied “yeah, its difficult.” Mary then makes it clear through the explicit “it’s also not natural conversation.” Although this guidance is more direct than examples in chapters 5 and 6, it follows many of the same discursive strategies. An agreement and a compliment “I think that’s a really good point” then initial guidance in the form of a question – prodding Sayumi to consider with a “do you think” question. When it was clear that initial guidance was not enough, Mary became more explicit. Lost for direction, Sayumi then directly asks for help “so what should I do?”

Directly following excerpt 3, Mary takes up Sayumi’s request for help and turns to even more directive guidance. She works together with Sayumi towards a solution and plan of action by offering several choices. The recursive nature of the advising events sections 2
and 3 also becomes clear as Mary is forced to seek new information to make suggestions then
glean more information, and so on.

Excerpt 4

Mary: **Maybe we can go and have a look in the SALC?**
Sayumi: Yeah
Mary: You mentioned movies and dramas. Do you have any favorites?
Sayumi: My favorite is Disney movie or, yea… mmmm, do you know Gray’s Anatomy?
Mary: Yes
Sayumi: I love this drama, but I didn’t finish to watch
Mary: **So this could be your chance.**
Sayumi: Yeah (laughs)
Mary: So, I suppose what **you need is something where there is lots of conversations**
between people. Is Gray’s Anatomy good for that?
Sayumi: Yeah
Mary: OK, so maybe that’s a good one

To establish the beginnings of a plan, Mary made two suggestions: (1) to find new
material in the Self Access Learning Center library, and (2) to study dialogue from the
television show Gray’s Anatomy. There is a lengthy discussion on how to make use of
movies and television for study in which Mary introduces the ideas of watching short sections
(five minutes in length or limited to a particular scene) and using official television scripts,
often available online for free. Through this she guides Sayumi on a plan to study vocabulary
through a television show she wanted to watch. Concluding this event and the session, Mary
summarizes and prompts action as a resolution – part four of the advising event.

Excerpt 5

Mary: But it **sounds like you like Gray’s Anatomy, so on the internet you can find**
**subtitled versions.**
Sayumi: Ahh!
Mary: Look at that! So **you could read it first and see which expressions look fun to use**
and then listen to how they use it. **How many expressions would you learn every**
week?
Sayumi: How many expressions? An expression is one…
Mary: You, know like this short part
Sayumi: How many? Mmm… 10 or 15?
Mary: **Yeah, 10 is good try 10. And then try to use them.**
Sayumi: Yeah. Try to teach the conversation with teachers
Mary: **OK. That sounds like a good plan for next week. I can’t wait to hear how it goes.**
These examples from the session with Mary and Sayumi suggest that the construct of the advising event, and the strategies discursive described here to organize it, are valid beyond Jess and Noriko. This is at least true for advising sessions at Jogen university. Anecdotal evidence suggests that it is even more broadly valid but that will require future testing. So, this is at least one answer to how advisors work.

7.2 Conclusions

In this dissertation I aimed to reveal the uniqueness of ALL, define successful advising, and describe the dialogical enactment of advising sessions. Through discourse analysis, I sought to demonstrate how advising operates in advising sessions. To accomplish this, I studied the advising sessions of two advisors, Jess and Noriko and compared them to show that they employ similar strategies in different ways and arrived at similar results. In the process of analysis, it became clear that there was an underlying structure to their approach despite the lack of such a model in the literature or in advisor training at Jogen university. From these data I can conclude that Noriko and Jess approached advising in a different but convergent manner, and that advising was both dynamic and systematic, consisting of iterations of the advising event structure.

7.2.1 Dynamic and systematic, a tailored approach

Advising sessions in this study were intentional and systematic. They centered around students’ study planning and organization, motivation and pressure, and identification of learning strategies. Although surface level and issues can mask stress, self-doubt, disorganization, and ineffective learning practices. Jess and Noriko’s methods followed a path to systematically start with surface level problems and uncover deeper issues. In her interview Noriko bluntly stated that she is always trying to find “the real problem.” This was shown equally in Jess’s LA course sessions and in Noriko’s student issue guided sessions.
The focus on individual students that makes advising valuable and potentially unique as a tool for language learning is the emotional support advisors can offer. Far from a secondary or accidental service, this idea of positive support and emotional guidance is front and center in language advising. The focus on individual needs is truly a strength of language advising. For some students the need was support, Ai needed to be told that she was not lazy and for others it was structure and a little pressure. Hiro started with an awful plan for the semester but after 20 minutes he had something much better.

Mynard’s model of language advising offers three golden rules: (1) focus on the learner, (2) keep an open mind, and (3) take a neutral position (Kato & Mynard, 2016). However there is often a disconnect between theory and practice. In education this is often due to the simple realities of teaching and in language education the difficulties inherent in learning language. However, in these data Jess and Noriko’s behaviors demonstrated Kato and Mynard’s precepts. This was clear in Jess’s sessions as she worked with four different students to identify their issues. Though the LA worksheet made the overall structure of each session very similar, issues of conversation varied each time. Noriko’s close relationship with Ai (as it developed over the four sessions) illustrated a clear example of student issues to be discussed and resolved, with Noriko focused on her progress and emotions. The way Noriko wove-in past knowledge and willingness to return to subjects like Ai’s “laziness” session after session.

7.2.2 Teaching the skills students need to regulate their study habits

Personalized language advising appears to offers a powerful educational experience for language learners. An individualized window of time focused on general learning skills suggest its applicability for learners unable to take traditional classes or work with a private
tutor. In language learning, where work with an expert is so vital, this suggests a middle ground of limited and focused access.

How language advising works is a complex topic. This study looked at only a small set of issues. However, these data suggest that advising has the potential to impart self-regulatory concepts to student and allow them be more effective studying and study planning than without the support. Furthermore, in this study advisors played into intersubjectivity and reframing that helped Japanese students feel supported and see new ways of studying and learning.

This is not to say that advising sessions are more effective at helping learners than classes or that strategies devised in advising sessions are superior to traditional face-to-face education or classes guided by a teacher. Likewise, language advising is not a substitute for class instruction. However, the focused attention of an expert advisor to elicit deeper student awareness, autonomy, and self-directed learning is invaluable. Notwithstanding, as I have tried to make clear throughout this dissertation, the activity of the advisor is different than the teacher. Language advisors focus on the activities of planning, and organization with the expectation that these will lead to learning. Either as an addition to a class or in circumstances where constant expert guidance is not possible, advising may promote learner centered acquisition of language.

7.3 Future directions

The field of language advising offers a lot of potential for future research. In future iterations of session analysis, I plan to address several issues not possible here due to lack of video data. In particular, I am interested in the way advisors use pauses as the “strategy of silence” is taught to advisors and its use and effect on sessions could offer valuable new insights into the contributions of non-verbal communication in advising sessions. Along with
this, of course, would be deeper research into topics like gesture and facial expression. Whether video, audio or face-to-face I would also like to begin to better understand the student side of this dialectic. This could prove difficult as many Japanese universities are reluctant to open their doors and especially expose their students to researchers. However, perhaps with time and the right study this can be made a reality.

From a theoretical perspective, I hope this and future work will contribute to establishing a broadly accepted theory of learning and language advising. This dissertation suggests valuable insights from sociocultural theory in terms of mediation, self-regulation and intersubjectivity. Additionally, the idea that advisors can reframe students’ ideas appears quite logical to acting advisors but it’s discussing and application is currently absent in the literature. How advisors reframing student’s views of study and education calls for further investigation.

Finally, the connecting point between intersubjectivity and reframing used in this analysis raises several questions in terms of language advising. Does reframing require intersubjectivity? Does intersubjectivity lead to reframing? Does reframing lead to self-regulation? Cognitive sciences like conceptual metaphor theory interact well with Vygotsky sociocultural theory, and investigations joining the two in the past have pushed forward new ideas such as the value of embodied cognition and situated learning. Perhaps this intersection between reframing and intersubjectivity could offer further insights.
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The Wheel of Language Learning

Task 1: Where are you now?

The following wheel consists of 6 areas which are important to consider when becoming a successful learner. What is your level of satisfaction in these 6 areas?

The centre of the Wheel is ‘0’, which means you are not satisfied at all. The outer edge of the Wheel is ‘10’, which means you are completely satisfied. Look at each area and rank your current level of satisfaction.

Task 2: What would you like to work on?
Appendix B – The Learning Plan

4. Exploring a Learning Plan

1. Read Hanako’s 4-week Learning Plan below and check off the points that she has in her plan.

Target Situation: Speaking with teachers at the Practice Centre and my friends on Skype

1. Big Goal: What I WANT to focus on:
I’d like to improve my daily conversation because I want teachers at the Practice Centre to understand what I say.

2. Small Goal: What skill I NEED:
I want to improve my grammar skill. I think my weak point is grammar is tense, especially past tense and tense is important to express my ideas clearly.

Resources:
What will you use for your learning? Please write the title(s) of the resources that you will use.

- I will use the voice recorder app on my iPad.
- The Hills
- Skype
- English Grammar in Use
- Practice Centre

Use:
Practice what you studied in a target situation to improve your big goal.

- I’ll try to use past tense when I talk with teachers at the Practice Centre. I’ll speak for 15 minutes 3 times a week during lunch time.
- I’ll use Skype with my Canadian friends on the weekends. By chatting with them about my experiences, I can practice the tenses I learned.

Evaluate:
Check progress once in a while in achieving your big and small goals.

- I’ll keep a recording of my conversations with teachers at the Practice Centre. I’ll compare the recordings to see if I can use the tenses I learned more accurately than before. If I do, I can see that my grammar for speaking has improved.

Motivation: How will you keep your motivation high?
- I’ll listen to my favorite English music.
- Talking with teachers at the Practice Centre about my favorite topics is fun!
Appendix C - Advisor Questions for Semi-Structured Interview

Questions were designed to spark conversation and lead to questions that probe for greater detail.

1. Do you have a clear goal or objective that you try to achieve in each advising session?
2. How do you usually begin sessions?
3. How do you usually conclude sessions?
4. What student information do you try to collect during the session?
   a. How do you use that information in the session?
5. Beyond the beginning and conclusion, what would you say are the ‘parts’ of the advising session?
6. Is there any particular part of the session that you are particularly good at?
7. Can you describe an ‘average’ session?
8. Have you had any particularly interesting sessions?
9. About what percentage of your sessions is with students you have met for the first time?
10. How do you see the role of advisor vs the role of a teacher?
    a. Is there overlap?
11. What do you see as the purpose of the advising sessions?
12. Do you read books or articles about language education or advising in language learning?
    a. Do you have any theories of learning that guide your sessions?
13. Do you listen to the recordings of your advising sessions?
    a. Have you ever transcribed the dialogue from your sessions?
14. Do students ever explicitly express the value of the lessons to them?
    a. Can you think of an example?
    b. How often does this happen?
15. What aspects of the advising sessions do you think of valuable to most students?
16. What aspects of the advising sessions might be more or less valuable depending on the student?
17. Is there any part of the advising session process that you think might benefit from changes, either major or minor?
18. If the advising session involved two advisors instead of one, how would you split up the work?
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