Framework for doctoral one-to-one tutorial service at INTO University of Exeter (Insessional).

A small scale investigation following previous article-length studies especially those of Turner (2004 and 2010). The research of Kandiko and Kinchin (2010) and Kumar and Stracke (2011) is also noted.
59 tutorials over two terms 2010-2011: tutorial length 50 minutes is often exceeded.
1.0

Academic programme (PhD).	Number of appointments.
Drama	13
Business	14
Sciences & Engineering	9
Social Sciences & Geography	2
Law	4
Politics	6
Education (incl. EdD candidates)	1 (many more given at MEd level, however).
Psychology	2
Humanities	8

Table 1 indicating subject range.

1.1
Students' discourse covers topics such as The Influence of Darwin & Huxley on Chinese thought and literary criticism; Experimental Work on Light Absorption in Various Digital Interfaces; The Hotel Provisioning and Supply Chain in South West England; Feminist Perspectives on Philosopy of Law as it deals with legal status of women; Effect of Differing Levels of salinity and of dissolved substances on various micro-organisms; The role of Government in the Work of Non-governmental agencies in Libya; and various drama, literary, classical and translation topics.
1.2
The subject range reflects Exeter's strengths in Theatre Studies; Arabic & Islamic Studies; Modern Languages; Law; the Biosciences; Engineering; Business; Politics; and others.

1.3 The Parameters of the tutorial service:
a) the supervisor view

Student's drafts are sometimes presented with supervisor comment and annotations. When the supervisor comment goes beyond the area of structure,

evidence, and order of ideas, and moves into language and grammar, this is sometimes a sign that the student will have an uphill task in progressing the writing. In one case a supervisor annotates with "this is ideological" to suggest the student is challenged to find appropriate tone and nuance in a literary topic, (in spite of working hard and putting great energy into their work).

1.3
b) the insessional tutor view: In response to the question,

> How do the students refer to or seem to regard the one-to-one tutorial: as a re-writing session done mutually, as a re-writing session with the bulk of the effort falling on the tutor; as a formative consultation, in which they themselves will identify the majority of their weaknesses in sentences and expressions, whether prompted or unprompted?

Tutor A: Regrettably, I think it's often the second. I find myself doing a lot of work. With some students a lot of time is spent just negotiating the meaning, so that gets them working too.

Tutor B: Formative consultation – Some students come with the hope of gaining a very general understanding of writing. Others bring in drafts of writing to look over together to identity issues and to discuss ways of improvement.

Tutor C: Often the second; although students vary enormously in the extent to which they reflect upon and edit their own writing prior to the tutorial. Some track their own edits and corrections carefully, while others bring draft material that has clearly not been revised. The phenomenon of the doctoral student who requests a 'copy editor' in the first days of their research stay is not unknown.

2.0 The research gaps would seem to indicate avenues for enquiry into such topics such as: challenges to students in arts and humanities and other disciplines in bringing the writing to a point of focus where the originality of the research is foregrounded, and proper claims made for it.
> **2.1 There is often absence of any kind of writing training within the departments such that supervisor expectations can be clarified and guidance given as to the expected overall shape of the dissertation.**
> **2.2 At INTO Exeter we experience strong year-round demand for doctoral writing classes, which are valued by students across the disciplines.**

References.
Kandiko, C. and Kinchin, I. (2010). What is a PhD?: Process versus Product in PhD supervision. Concept Maps: Making Learning Meaningful
Proc. of Fourth Int. Conference on Concept Mapping
J.Sánchez, A.J.Cañas, J.D.Novak, Eds.
Viña del Mar, Chile, 2010.
Kumar and Stracke (2011) Examiners' reports on theses: Feedback or assessment? Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 10, 4: pp. 211-222.
Turner, J. (2004) Language as Academic Purpose. Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 3,2: pp.95-109.
Turner, J.(2010)   Supporting Academic Literacy: Issues of Proofreading and Language Proficiency. In Developing Academic Literacy, ed. Blue, G. Peter Lang AG, Bern.