



A Journal of Undergraduate Research in  
Writing & Rhetoric and the Digital Humanities

# Patterns of Speech in Garret Center Tutoring

Lindsey Wright

Created in Mark Hall's  
Fall 2019 ENC 4275 class

## Abstract

As a writing center tutor, my job is to create learning opportunities for student writers. In this work, I used one of my tutoring sessions as a case study and examined the effect my rhetoric had on creating those opportunities. Using a transcript created using Magdalena Gilewicz and Terese Thonus' method of close vertical transcription, I looked for patterns in both my and the writer's use of elements of discourse as defined by Laurel Johnson Black and Gilewicz and Thonus. Significant patterns emerged in our use of backchanneling, topic initiation, and descriptions of uncertainty. In framing this analysis with Andrea Lunsford's three writing center styles, I found my rhetoric created a Garret Center rather than a Burkean Parlor. Based on this research, I plan to be more direct with writers in future sessions, including using more imperatives and being less hesitant to initiate topics.

In her book *Between Talk and Teaching: Reconsidering the Writing Conference*, Laurel Johnson Black uses transcript analysis to study the elements of discourse present in student-teacher writing conferences. The goal of a student-teacher writing conference is a one-on-one session, in which the teacher helps the student. In her research, however, Black finds many patterns of speech that work contrary to this goal. These patterns are not present because the teachers are deliberately working to inhibit student learning; the teachers are unaware of the effect their speech is having on the students they work with. This is because they have not taken a step back to examine their patterns of speech and the effects those patterns have on the students they work with (Black).

While different from a student-teacher writing conference, writing center sessions also suffer from a disconnect between a tutor's goals and their patterns of speech. My goal as a writing center tutor is to facilitate learning for the writer. I often find myself feeling unsure after my sessions, wondering if I am achieving

this goal. To find out, I recorded one of my sessions to use as a case study of my writing center speech. I then transcribed this session using Gilewicz and Thonus' method of close vertical transcription, capturing "the reality that several speakers may share a channel... [and adding] rich detail for interpretation of writing center interaction" (30). Through the analysis of this transcript, I aim to take a step back—as Black did—and examine whether my patterns of speech are helping me achieve my goal of student learning or inhibiting me.

In addition to using the elements of discourse defined by Black, Gilewicz and Thonus to analyze my transcript, I also intend to analyze it through the lens of Andrea Lunsford's styles of writing center. In her piece "Collaboration, Control, and the Idea of a Writing Center," Lunsford writes about three kinds of writing centers: Storehouse Centers, Garret Centers, and Burkean Parlors. She defines Storehouse Centers as "tend[ing] to view knowledge as individually derived and held, and they are not particularly amenable to collaboration, sometimes actively hostile to it" (Lunsford 5). While knowledge is viewed as exterior in a Storehouse Center, Garret Centers are the opposite, with knowledge viewed "as interior, as inside the student, and the writing center's job [is] helping students get in touch with this knowledge, as a way to find their unique voices, their individual and unique powers" (Lunsford 5). Lunsford holds the third style, the Burkean Parlor, above the others. Lunsford claims that Burkean Parlor Centers, which utilize a style of tutoring with an emphasis on collaboration, are necessary to "meet the demands of the twenty-first century" (8).

Garrett Centers are "informed by a deep-seated attachment to the American brand of individualism" (Lunsford 5), and emphasize the writer as holding individual knowledge that only they can access on their own. However, Lunsford found in her research that the data supported what students had been telling her for years; "their work in groups, their collaboration, was the most important and helpful part of their school experience" (5). As such, Lunsford advocates for writing centers to strive to act as Burkean Parlors, while also acknowledging that creating a collaborative environment is "damnable difficult" (6). In my analysis, I will examine what patterns of speech create what style of tutoring, based off of Lunsford's definitions. I hope to identify patterns that can be used to create the troublesome Burkean Parlor, with the intention of applying them to my future tutoring sessions.

In my case study of writing center speech, I worked with a writer who wanted help with a paper for her theatre class. It was a show paper analyzing *Sweat*, a play she saw at UCF. She had already written her paper a week or so before coming to the writing center; she just wanted someone to look it over before she submitted. During the session, I was able to establish good rapport with the writer by making conversation with her based on our shared knowledge of theatre. I also encouraged the writer by frequently backchanneling—making sounds to show I was actively listening—throughout the session, encouraging her as she worked through her problems on her own. As I was letting the writer be in control, she engaged in the most topic initiation, using her knowledge of the class

and the paper she had written to direct the session. The writer and I both used questions throughout the session. I used leading and scaffolding questions, which are queries designed to encourage the writer to think, in an attempt to facilitate learning. However, the writer frequently responded to these questions with descriptions of uncertainty, an indication that my questioning was ineffective. When the writer would in turn ask me questions, I responded with my own descriptions of uncertainty, hesitant of just giving her the answer and not allowing her to learn for herself. My patterns of speech in this session created a Garret Center session, where I spent the entire time encouraging the writer and prompting her with questions instead of creating opportunities for her to learn.

I started off the session by establishing rapport with the writer, creating a relationship based on our shared interests. As she was pulling up her paper for us to look at, we talked about different shows we had seen or wanted to see.

10 T: What show did you go see?

11 W: Sweat

12 T: Oh (.) I wanted to see that but I like just never got around to it

13 W: I liked it (.) I'm glad I went to see it because

14 W: it was really good

15 T: I just went and saw a Gentleman's Guide to Love and Murder (.)

Ten out of ten

16 W: I tried to buy a ticket and I couldn't, 17 W: it was all sold out and I really wanted to go

18 T: Oh it was so good, that was my second time too like

19 T: not here, I saw it in like the spring somewhere else and I was like ooh it's back I need it

20 W: I want to see it

At this point, the session was conversational, which can be seen in the interruptions the writer and I both used. "Conversational contributions often overlap... Interruption is defined as the initiation of a contribution by a second party before the first has finished" (Gilewicz and Thonus 35). The writer and I are both interested in theatre, so we are both excited to have a conversation about the topic. She interrupts me in lines 13, 16, and 20, eager to express her opinion on the matter. I interrupt her in line 17, also passionate about the subject. These interruptions can be seen as cooperative overlaps, which "indicate shared knowledge" (Black 67). The shared knowledge the writer and I discussed allowed us to get acquainted quickly; we related to each other because of our common interest. "According to several studies, engaging in small talk can lead to greater satisfaction for tutors and writers, and not doing so can lead to unfulfilled expectations for both" (Fitzgerald and Ianetta 57). This conversational talk with cooperative overlaps helped the writer and I "build a working relationship" (57). Establishing good rapport can aid a tutoring session of any style, whether Storehouse, Garret, or Burkean Parlor. In my case, these patterns of speech throughout my paper where I converse casually with the writer about topics other than her writing aided my role as a Garret Center tutor. By establishing a good working relationship

with the writer, she trusted me to encourage her throughout the session to unlock the knowledge she needed for her writing.

I encouraged the writer's control of the session by frequently backchanneling. Backchanneling consists of "contributions made by other participants while the first speaker holds the floor" (Gilewicz and Thonus 29). These contributions provide "agreement or support" (Black 49) for the speaker, encouraging them to continue with their thoughts. Backchanneling is also a way of demonstrating active listening. "Most people want to be heard... by listening, a tutor creates another opportunity for the writer to engage in the session because it can demonstrate to the writer that she can have a say in the direction of the conversation" (Fitzgerald and Ianetta 63). In this less than twenty-minute session, I used backchanneling a total of seventeen times.

67 T: "mainly consisted of casual and business clothes" (2s) Does that still convey your same

68 T: meaning? Yeah, okay

69 W: Yeah (2s) Ah (.) Just like the whole thing I'm having trouble cause it's

70 W: like a new subject for me I guess, so it's weird to talk about, I'm also repeating a lot of the

71 T: mhm

72 W: same words (.) I don't like (.) So (2s) I honestly wrote this a while ago um (4s)

73 T: okay Like what words

In line 71, I backchannel "mhm" as the writer hedges—a way of indicating uncertainty (Black 67)—with "I guess." I encourage her to keep talking despite her hesitancy, and by demonstrating active listening, I engage the writer and let her keep control of the conversation. I also backchannel in line 73, acknowledging the writer's hesitancy again with "okay." This pattern of backchanneling when the writer is hesitant furthered my role as a Garret Center tutor. Garret Center tutoring is acted out when "the tutor or teacher listens, voices encouragement, and essentially serves as a validation of the students' 'I-search'" (Lunsford 5). By encouraging the writer when her speech is unsure, I am validating her and encouraging her to stay in control.

Once we began actually discussing the paper itself, the writer was in control of what we focused on in her text. While I may initiate a topic twelve times in the transcript compared to her eight, four of my initiations occur prior to looking at the paper itself, such as determining what assignment she came in to work on as well as further context. Additionally, three of the topics I initiate in the session are conversational and not related to the writing itself. In comparison, all of the topics the writer initiated related directly to her writing, such as asking about grammar, word choice, sentence structure, and reader understanding. We never set a formal agenda, instead meandering through the paper as the writer found concerns she wanted to address.

21 T: Uh yeah (.) Okay so what is the like purpose of this assignment like

what does your

22 T: professor want you to get out of this?

23 W: Basically I guess to make sure that we're like able to analyze a play in the way that he

24 T: mhm

25 W: taught us too, so like notice the different elements that you probably wouldn't have noticed

26 W: if you hadn't been in the class, I guess like set design and like (.) scenic design and like

27 W: makeup design specifically I noticed, and like sound and lighting (2s) Those were kind of the

28 W: main stuff he want us to hit on and directing (2s) So he just kind of told us like I want you

29 T: mhm

30 W: guys to just hit those points and like use what I've taught you to expand on it using like your

31 W: own opinion as well

32 T: Okay (.) Okay yeah so what did you specifically want to look at today?

33 W: Ummm I'm just having trouble like structuring this cause I like writing and usually I'm like

34 T: mhm

35 W: fine, but I'm just having some trouble with like the sentence structure, this one in particular

36 W: I just like I was just reading through it and it just didn't click it didn't sound right

T: Okay sentence structure or like the

37 T: structure of the piece as a whole?

38 W: Sentence structure

39 T: Sentence structure okay (4s)

40 W: Yeah I think I'm okay with the actual structure of the thing

41 T: Mhm

42 W: But like for example just this sentence I couldn't figure out how to say it more eloquently

I take the time to get to know the context of the paper, as seen in line 21 where I ask her what her professor wants her to get out of this assignment. Then, instead of reviewing her writing in relation to this context and taking the time to identify any global-level concerns, I immediately put the pressure on the writer to be in control of the situation by asking her what she specifically wanted to look at in line 32. The writer then brings up the topic of sentence structure, a sentence-level concern. She focuses on sentence-level concerns throughout the paper, understanding "the revision process as requiring lexical changes but not semantic changes" (Sommers 382). This is common among student writers. "Because they are still seeing the text as a product, even when they are told they are dealing only

with first drafts, as readers students focus their attention on surface-level, local, lower-concern types of problems. Their impulse is to ‘fix’ what they read” (Gilewicz 67-68). We spent the entire session fixing the paper instead of truly revising it because I was acting as a Garret Center tutor. I did not want to push the writer to do something she did not want to, or make her feel I was wasting her time by harping on context if she did not think she needed to. Black writes about how typically, “the teacher controls the topic and access to the floor” (81), and being a teacher was exactly what I was trying to avoid. I let the writer be in control, so she revised in the way she knew how.

The writer and I both asked questions throughout the session, however, my questions clearly dominated, as I asked twenty-two questions to her ten. According to Thompson and Mackiewicz, “Questions in writing center conferences serve a number of instructional and conversational functions” (37). One of the most common types of questions they identified was leading and scaffolding questions. I asked the writer many scaffolding questions, “questions pushing [the student] forward in revising or brainstorming” (Thompson and Mackiewicz 43). However, the questions I asked did not evoke my desired response from the writer; rather than brainstorming and coming to her own conclusions about how to revise, she would respond to me with descriptions of uncertainty. She would ask me knowledge deficit questions, “questions obtaining information that [the tutor] or [the student] genuinely does not know” (Thompson and Mackiewicz 42). In response, I would hedge my answers to those questions, not wanting to take a learning opportunity from her but misunderstanding what the writer needed from me.

46 T: Mhm well what’s another way you could say that?

47 W: (2s) I don’t know (2s)

48 T: Okay so you have “the costumes for the play were mainly casual clothes and the

49 T: occasional business clothes” (.)

50 W: Like that just sounds not right to me (2s)

51 T: Mmm (5s)

52 W: Could say I think maybe that’s like what’s bothering me the consisted of (.)

53 T: “They mainly consisted of” (.) I would say that that (.) makes sense, I do think that a little

54 W: Is that better?

55 T: flows better (6s)

56 W: And then this like with grammar “and the occasional business clothes” like that’s not

57 W: right, right?

58 T: Mhm yeah um I mean I don’t wanna definitively say it’s grammatically wrong but it does

59 W: yeah ((laughs))

60 T: also read a little weird (2s) um (2s) I dunno how do you think you



could change that?

61 W: I don't know, it just sounds so wrong to me it was bothering me

62 T: "The costumes for the play mainly consisted of casual clothes and occasional business

63 T: clothes" (2s) Uh (8s) I don't know (.) Do you think you maybe want to use a different word?

64 W: Like what word like instead of Oh yeah it might be ((laughs))

65 T:uh Occasional if that's the word that's bothering you

In line 47, the writer responds to my scaffolding question of "well what's another way you could say that?" with "I don't know," a description of uncertainty that Black sees as "defeat, frustration, avoidance, and resistance" (62). This is an indication that the question I asked isn't effective; the writer is not learning anything from this line of questioning. Despite this, I asked essentially the same question in line 60, saying "how do you think you could change that?" Because I was unaware of the effect my questions were having within the session, I continue to do what I know and question the writer, prompting her to come up with her own solution. The writer continues to indicate her uncertainty to me by asking the knowledge deficit question "is that better?" in line 54 and "like that's not right, right?" in lines 56-57. I responded to her questions with hedging and lots of wait time. In line 53, I hedge with "a little," afraid of giving the writer faulty information. In line 58 I hedge again, saying "I don't wanna definitively say." These hedges serve to soften my language, keeping me from sounding confident and absolute. The hedging serves as a safeguard, so that if the writer later finds out that something I told her is wrong, she will remember that I was not entirely sure in the first place. In line 63, I use eleven seconds of wait time, interspersed between "I dunno" and "uh." I am uncertain and resistant, not knowing what to say without either possibly giving out false information or, if the information happens to be correct, giving away information that I should be helping the writer to learn for herself. Rather than giving the writer a straight answer, I ask her another question, a leading question: "do you think you maybe want to use a different word?" My questions are not facilitating learning for the writer. Instead, I am again acting as a Garret Center tutor, trying to draw the solution out of the writer instead of working with her to figure out the answer together.

Throughout the entire transcript, my patterns of speech are indicative of Garret Center tutoring. By establishing rapport and backchanneling with the writer, I set myself up to have the writer's trust so as to help her access her own knowledge most effectively. However, Garret Center tutoring was not effective in this session; my speech was not aligning with my goal. The writer would ask me knowledge-deficit questions and I would become flustered and uncertain, hedging and thinking wildly of other questions I could ask to lead her to the answer herself. Instead of focusing so much on leading the writer, I should have been working to collaborate with her. Had I achieved Burkean Parlor tutoring and worked together with the writer, I could have brought my knowledge of expert revision to the session and kept us from focusing only on sentence-level errors.

Then, the writer might have learned something.

In the future, I will continue to work to establish good rapport and backchannel with my tutees. Establishing a good working relationship is beneficial in any tutoring session, regardless of style. However, in order to work toward Burkean Parlor tutoring, I will be less hesitant to initiate topics related to the writing of the paper. By collaborating with the writer to set a formal agenda at the beginning of the session, I will be able to bring up concerns based on my background knowledge of how professional writers revise as well as addressing any concerns the writer may have with their writing. This will not only make the session more collaborative but also more effective, as global-level concerns are more likely to be addressed. In my future sessions, I will also be more direct with writers, using imperatives instead of asking questions. "Using imperative sentences often invites longer, more reflective responses" (Johnson 34). Rather than receiving a frustrated "I don't know" from a writer, I will be more likely to get thoughtful responses by using imperatives and being direct.

While this seems somewhat contrary to Burkean Parlor tutoring, collaboration means both people bring different strengths to the table. As the one with more revision experience, I need to be confident enough to direct the writer on how we should approach their paper. The writer needs to trust in what I direct them to do, just as I have to trust in their knowledge of the class and the parameters of their assignment. Had I collaborated with this writer to set a clear agenda based on both our concerns, and had I been more direct with my language, the session would have gone differently and been much more effective. However, I do plan to still try and incorporate scaffolding questions into my tutoring. Each session is unique, and just because scaffolding questions did not work for this writer does not mean they will be ineffective for another writer. What is most important is that I pay attention to how my speech affects the session and affects the writer, so I can prevent the disconnect between my goals and my speech.



Wright  
Works Cited

- Black, Laurel Johnson. *Between Talk and Teaching: Reconsidering the Writing Conference*. Utah StateUP, 1998.
- Fitzgerald, Lauren, and Melissa Ianetta. "Chapter 3: Tutoring Practices." *The Oxford Guide for Writing Tutors*, OxfordUP, 2015, pp. 47-82.
- Gilewicz, Magdalena. "Sponsoring Student Response Groups in Writing Center Group Tutorials." *Writing Groups Inside and Outside the Classroom*, edited by Beverly J. Moss, Nels P. Highberg, and Melissa Nicolas, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2004, pp. 63-78.
- Gilewicz, Magdalena, and Terese Thonus. "Close Vertical Transcription." *The Writing Center Journal*, vol. 24, no. 1, 2003, pp. 25-49.
- Johnson, JoAnn B. "Reevaluation of the Question as a Teaching Tool." *Dynamics of the Writing Conference: Social and Cognitive Interaction*, edited by Thomas Flynn and Mary King, NCTE, 1993, pp. 34-40.
- Lunsford, Andrea. "Collaboration, Control, and the Idea of a Writing Center." *The Writing Center Journal*, vol. 12, no. 1, 1991, pp. 3-10.
- Sommers, Nancy. "Revision Strategies of Student Writers and Experienced Adult Writers." *Composition and Communication*, vol. 31, no. 4, 1993, pp. 378-388.
- Thompson, Isabelle, and Jo Mackiewicz. "Questioning in Writing Center Conferences." *The Writing Center Journal*, vol. 33, no. 2, 2014, pp. 37-71.

**L**indsey Wright is a third-year undergraduate student at UCF majoring in Writing & Rhetoric, with minors in Linguistics and Political Science. She is a tutor at the University Writing Center and an assistant editor for *Stylus*. Lindsey's professional interests include freelance editing and writing. She also loves to sing, and when she's not at home with her dog (and when there's not a pandemic) she can be found practicing and performing with the UCF's Women's Chorus.

### Complete Transcript:

32

- 7 W: (2s) I don't know (2s)  
 8 T: Okay so you have "the costumes for the play were mainly casual clothes and the  
 9 T: occasional business clothes" (.)  
 0 W: Like that just sounds not right to me (2s)  
 1 T: Mmm (5s)  
 2 W: Could say I think maybe that's like what's bothering me the consisted of (.)  
 3 T: "They mainly consisted of" (. ) I would say that that (. ) makes sense, I do think that a little  
 4 W: Is that better?  
 5 T: flows better (6s)  
 6 W: And then this like with grammar "and the occasional business clothes" like that's not  
 7 W: right, right?  
 8 T: Mhm yeah um I mean I don't wanna definitively say it's grammatically wrong but it does  
 9 W: yeah ((laughs))  
 0 T: also read a little weird (2s) um (2s) I dunno how do you think you could change that?  
 1 W: I don't know, it just sounds so wrong to me it was bothering me  
 2 T: "The costumes for the play mainly consisted of casual clothes and occasional business  
 3 T: clothes" (2s) Uh (8s) I don't know (. ) Do you think you maybe want to use a different word?  
 4 W: Like what word like instead of Oh yeah it might be ((laughs))  
 5 T: uh Occasional if that's the word that's bothering you  
 6 W: (12s) If I just like  
 7 T: "mainly consisted of casual and business clothes" (2s) Does that still convey your same  
 8 T: meaning? Yeah, okay  
 9 W: Yeah (2s) Ah (. ) Just like the whole thing I'm having trouble cause it's  
 0 W: like a new subject for me I guess, so it's weird to talk about, I'm also repeating a lot of the  
 1 T: mhm  
 2 W: same words (. ) I don't like (. ) So (2s) I honestly wrote this a while ago um (4s)  
 3 T: okay Like what words  
 4 T: Cause you know some words are unavoidable but what you can do is control f and see how  
 5 W: yeah  
 6 T: you can change them if you really think it's bothering you  
 7 W: Yeah (2s) Um can you just read like like this paragraph and tell me if it's (. )  
 8 T: yeah so "two actors that stood out to me were Will Sippel and Christy Clark. Will was an  
 9 T: understudy and he played as Jason. Jason immediately caught my attention being one of the  
 0 T: first characters to appear. The acting for Jason's angry, traumatized character was spot-on. I  
 1 T: could feel the tension between him and the parole officer in the first scene where Jason is  
 2 T: clearly being provoked by Evan. This continues through the play until the end where Jason's  
 3 T: guilt after seeing what he had done to Stan filled the room. Christy Clark also did an amazing  
 4 T: job at evoking Cynthia's character. She made the audience laugh more than the other  
 5 T: characters and you could feel her every emotion just like Will. Christy put the characters look  
 6 T: and persona perfectly. They were both completely comfortable in front of an audience. They  
 7 T: were well-rehearsed and helped with the immersion into the story." (4s) Okay (. ) So what's  
 8 T: bothering you about that paragraph?  
 9 W: It just feels like um you know when someone's like not good at writing ((laughs)) and they  
 0 W: just kind of have the same like flow over and over and over again in a sentence that's kind of  
 1 T: mhm  
 2 W: what it seems like to me

- 93 T: (.) Okay so what about your sentences (.) is (.) similar each time?  
 94 W: I think I overuse commas (.) Like  
 95 T: um  
 96 W: I just add a buffer to everything  
 97 T: Mhm  
 98 W: I don't know I like to but I also try to avoid it because I end up overdoing it  
 99 T: Uh (.) I can agree that (2s) I mean it's kind of a personal choice as to whether or not you think  
 100 W: yeah  
 101 T: You're overusing them but they are very (.) prevalent and if that's something that's bothering  
 102 W: yeah  
 103 T: you that's a change you can make  
 104 W: Yeah (20)  
 105 T: Is that all that's bothering you you think?  
 106 W: Yeah ,yeah I just remembered this particular paragraph I wanted to ask about because I think  
 107 T: mhm  
 108 W: I did that a lot just cause I was talking about two people and I was like comparing them (6s)  
 109 W: Okay I'm gonna bold that so I can fix it later (.) I think I can split that up into like two  
 110 W: sentences  
 111 ENDING AT 7:16 / RESTARTING AT 9:39  
 112 W: Um can we look at the conclusion? I'm not sure if I brought in too many small details that  
 113 W: I didn't bring before  
 114 T: Mhm so "I was left with an overall positive impression of this performance of Sweat. I was  
 115 T: able to fully immerse myself into the story and understand it from all angles. Staying for the  
 116 T: talk-backs also helped me to gain insight into the story and how the actors prepared for such a  
 117 T: political play. Hearing the cast speak on different issues such as the fight scene and Hurricane  
 118 T: Dorian gave me more respect for their dedication. The dramaturg Christy was able to give  
 119 T: us more insight into Lynn Nottage and her inspiration. Sweat, despite being heavily  
 120 T: political and in your face, was delivered very well and opened my eyes about what could be  
 121 T: going on in the rest of the country." (2s) Uh should it be talk-backs or just the one talk-back?  
 122 W: Yeah it's underlined so I guess it's like (2s) Is it like a word? (2s) I think it's a word  
 123 T: No it's definitely, um I know they talk about them I've never actually been to one but I'm just  
 124 T: wondering if it was highlighting it because I think it maybe should be singular  
 125 W: (.) Oh talk-back oh I see what you're saying  
 126 T: Yeah (.) I mean unless you went to more than one  
 127 W: (2s) I think it's fine  
 128 T: (2s) Um so why did you want me to look over that paragraph?  
 129 W: Um (.) Like maybe I kind of brought that up and then I didn't mention it at all earlier so is  
 130 W: okay that I just kind of like mentioned it and threw it in or should I bring it up somewhere  
 131 W: else and expand on it? (.) I'm not sure  
 132 T: Um well did your professor give you any guide about how you should conclude or was it like  
 133 T: you said just like the points to hit? Okay (.) and (2s) mmm (5s) I don't (.) know (10s) I think  
 134 W: yeah  
 135 T: that you can cause it's a conclusion (3s) it makes sense to bring up things (.) like details you  
 136 T: haven't before (2s) it's really up to you whether or not you think it's just (.) kind of thrown in  
 137 T: there you think it's gonna make sense  
 138 W: yeah Okay (.) mhm I'm gonna look at the beginning (13s)



- 9 T: it's so wild how you have to get the tickets like way in advance I don't understand that  
 0 W: Yeah I got it like a month and  
 1 W: a half in advance I was like I hope nothing like comes up that day yeah (3s)  
 2 T: right  
 3 T: I know I think I'm gonna go see a show at Rollins and I looked I haven't even gotten the  
 4 T: tickets yet but I looked online there were like so many seats open I'm like this is different  
 5 W: Yeah it must be nice (8s) Um does this like do you understand what I'm saying ?  
 6 W: Like could you understand what the show's kind of about from reading that like  
 7 W: first line?  
 8 T: Um "This show is about three women who  
 9 T: work at the town's steel tubing factory Olstead's." Um (2s) Not gonna lie I don't know what a  
 0 T: steel tubing factory is but I kind of get at least like (2s) three women they work in a factory  
 1 W: yeah  
 2 T: I'm sure more is to come about the more specifics but  
 3 W: mhm Yeah because I didn't know what that was  
 4 W: either then I was like it's fine cause that's not like a main component in the story that like it's  
 5 T: mhm  
 6 W: steel or whatever but then like (2s) does that make sense? Like "They were all able to find  
 7 T: yeah  
 8 W: work through their fathers."  
 9 T: "through their fathers who worked there before them" (2s) Um (2s) Is  
 0 T: that like an important point the fathers?  
 1 W: Yeah  
 2 T: (2s) "They were able to find this work through their fathers who worked there before them."  
 3 T: (2s) Yeah that makes sense they got the jobs because their dads used to work there  
 4 W: Mhm (20s) I swear I always think there's supposed to be a comma  
 5 T: (2s) Yeah that's a common thing for people to want to just throw in commas, I do it too and  
 6 T: then you go back and you're like oh I only need like three of these  
 7 W: Yeah and it drives me crazy when  
 8 T: mhm  
 9 W: people don't use commas too (6s) I think I'm good I think those were like the main things I  
 0 W: was having problems with, like I don't know if that (.) like (.) portrayed what the play was  
 1 W: about  
 2 T: You wanna look it over?  
 3 W: Yeah  
 4 T: Okay so I already did the first two sentences, "The overall tone of the show was fairly serious.  
 5 T: They are going through a major turning point in their life. Although the three women have fun  
 6 T: laughter-filled nights as friends it doesn't emit much of a comedic tone because of the  
 7 T: underlying ideas being made about their lives. The director Cynthia White did a great job in  
 8 T: matching the era the play took place in. When the play jumped around the timeline there  
 9 T: was the audio of the radio station stating the date and recent major events. This  
 0 T: is a great way to set the scene, especially with the show being nonlinear. The set and costumes  
 1 T: matched very well to the theme of the play and worked smoothly with the actors." Uh (5s) It  
 2 T: all reads (2s) well to me just reading it having not seen it sadly  
 3 W: mhm  
 4 W: (4s) Do you like does everything (.) like you understand everything I'm saying?

185 T: Mhm  
 186 W: Okay that's what I was worried about  
 187 T: (5s) Yeah so (2s) you talk about jumping around the timeline and then the radio like kind of  
 188 T: indicating that, and then you discuss like how that was a good way to set the scene and then  
 189 W: mhm  
 190 T: the costumes and the set (2s) To me it all makes sense  
 191 W: Okay cool I think I'm good, I think that was like everything I had problems with  
 192 T: (2s) Um are you sure? If you want we can go back to that sentence you bolded to fix later  
 193 W: Oh yeah true  
 194 W: I can like split it into two  
 195 T: Yeah (3s) so "She seemed to make the audience laugh more than  
 196 T: other characters and you could feel her every emotion." So how could you split that up?  
 197 W: (17s) Now I want to add another comma to this sentence cause it just feels too short, but like  
 198 T: ((laughs))  
 199 W: I wanna say that because it like he wanted us to mention the acting and like zero in on two  
 200 W: particular actors and like talk about them so I wanna explain that that was like a big part of  
 201 T: mhm  
 202 W: it but that sentence just feels too short  
 203 T: I mean I don't know you were getting annoyed with all the commas you were using before  
 204 W: Yeah ((laughs)) Is  
 205 W: that like a preference thing, like is that fine?  
 206 T: Yeah that's fine  
 207 W: (2s) I think it's just me then yeah I think it's fine  
 208 T: I mean you can always change it to make it sound more like you but grammatically that's fine,  
 209 W: yeah  
 210 T: splitting it up like that  
 211 W: (.) Yeah that is fine I just (.) feel the need to add more (2s) Okay yeah I think I'm good  
 212 T: mhm  
 213 T: (5s) Are you a theatre major or is this just like a GEP  
 214 W: No it's a GEP  
 215 T: (3s) I was mostly done with all my like gen eds and I'm sad like this seems like an interesting  
 216 T: one you know  
 217 W: Yeah I like it I'll be done with all my gen eds after this semester  
 218 T: Ooh exciting  
 219 W: Yeah I just will miss taking like classes like this that are like random but they're interesting  
 220 T: yeah  
 221 T: Yeah what is your major  
 222 W: Ad PR  
 223 T: Oh  
 224 W: Yeah  
 225 T: (2s) See I have like a major and two minors so I'm at least like all over the place but I came in  
 226 W: yeah  
 227 T: with a lot of my gen eds but I still wanted to do four years so I was like might as well (2s) So  
 228 T: you're sure you don't want to look over anything more? we have like twenty-five minutes  
 229 W: No I'm good honestly  
 230 T: Okay

1 W: It was just like specific things that were bothering me  
2 T: Mhm (2s) So now we have to go over your  
3 T: next steps, so what are you going to do with that now that we're done here?  
4 W: Probably just submit it from here. I'll like read it over to check  
5 T: yeah Not much else to write, read it over (3s)  
6 T: Okay I mean if you're submitting there's not really much else you can do  
7 W: yeah  
8 T: Well it was nice to meet you  
9 W: You too  
0 ENDING AT 18:57



