

## Advice-Giving Roles and Strategies in Selected Faculty Member-Graduate Student Advising

*Mohd Muzhafar Idrus*  
[muzhafaridrus@usim.edu.my](mailto:muzhafaridrus@usim.edu.my)  
*Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia*

*Nor Fariza Mohd Nor*  
[fariza@ukm.edu.my](mailto:fariza@ukm.edu.my)  
*Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia*

*Ruzy Suliza Hashim*  
[ruzy@ukm.edu.my](mailto:ruzy@ukm.edu.my)  
*Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia*

*Raihanah Mohd Mydin*  
[raihanah@ukm.edu.my](mailto:raihanah@ukm.edu.my)  
*Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia*

### ABSTRACT

In mentoring graduate students, it is hard to deny the ubiquity of graduate student advising. Faculty members, who are usually engaged in advising to tease out problems and suggest solutions, could often times be faced with negative attributions concerning faculty members' competence, as well as receive unaligned responses rather than collaborative understanding of issues or recommendations. While previous studies on advising may have focused on specific, intricate, discourse particles and microscopic perspectives on advising, studies on advice giving exchanges that depart from these dimensions are insufficient. To fill in this lacuna, this paper proposes to explore strategies and participation roles in which faculty members assume in selected doctoral dissertation advising. Through discourse analysis, specifically focusing on discourse and situational identities grounded in identities-in-interaction (Zimmerman, 1998), the study illuminates some of the many advising roles and advising strategies that are revealed as legitimate, aligning doctoral student learning experience. In particular, advising roles and advising strategies, as illustrated in this study, link social and institutional context by proposing some of the many trajectories of how both faculty members and graduate students understand the relevance of advising exchanges. By focusing on these exchanges, the paper will also contribute to the growing body of literature on a range of different factors that may constitute advising in terms of content and manner in which advising takes place.

**Keywords:** Advice-giving; discourse analysis; strategies; roles; advising

### INTRODUCTION

As an important part of doctoral studies in Malaysia at least, graduate students often discuss their writing of dissertation with faculty members. The conversations between faculty members and graduate students usually establish a platform where learning takes place. As such, understanding the ways in which advising provides unique insights into doctoral-level competence can be established, reproduced, and negotiated (Sweeney, 1983; Wang, Strong, & Odell, 2004). A key difficulty often confronted by faculty members during advising is the dynamics between providing, receiving, and processing advice, which occasionally can result

in promoting growth as well as frustration (Waring, 2017). Perhaps, such tension is often played out in the phases of advising that may include, but not limited to identifying problems (for instance offering critiques) and presenting solutions (for example providing recommendations) (Waring, 2012). Bearing these in mind, this paper will explore advising roles and strategies embedded during selected doctoral dissertation advising between faculty members and doctoral students. It will draw upon existing literature on diverse advisement by exploring intricate identities (Zimmerman, 1998) that constitute their roles and the manner(s) in which faculty members offer their suggestions. Through discourse analysis, this paper firstly describes some ways faculty members and doctoral students initiate, agree, disagree, reaffirm stance, and close discussions during advising. Secondly, this paper elaborates diverse roles during advising that scaffold and facilitate graduate student understanding. Our central concerns, therefore, are, i) What are the strategies faculty members and students used during advisement? ii) What are advice-giving roles of faculty members and student in such consultations? By exploring these questions, findings of the study will present values to anyone who is keen on or is involved with advice giving, in everyday practice or as institutional talk within the demanding and challenging goals of mentoring.

### ADVISING: BRIEF INSIGHTS

Many works associated with advising could be linked to its understanding as a face-threatening act (FTA) (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Recipient's negative face (such as the need to be independent), predicating "some future act of the latter" (Waring, 2017, p.21) as well as recipient's positive face (the need to be accepted) (p.66) are some of the many aspects in advising that entail extension work of FTA. Among others, the "mitigating or face-redressive features" (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 27) involve overgeneralizing impersonalizing (avoiding using "I" and "you") and most relevant to the study perhaps are the use of in-group identity markers, giving reasons, hedging, demonstrating hints, and showing reluctance. Elsewhere, the use of mitigation (for instance "It may be a good idea to...") has widely been documented to reduce the severity of FTA-related issues of advising act (Hyland & Hyland 2012; Khalid Ahmed & Maros, 2017; Waring, 2017). More broadly, advising, which revolves an individual or a group transmitting what he/she or they believe to be useful to another party concerning some progress or behavior (Waring, 2007), can illustrate the dominance of knowledge and expertise of the advice provider (Park, 2012), depending on rights, gender, statuses, and other constraints. Studying advising across everyday or professional settings, therefore, could shed light on what it means for advising to take place, perhaps, on the ways it contributes to pedagogical principles. Limberg's (2010) study on office hours in Germany, for instance, reveals advising as often being conveyed explicitly. Vine, Holmes, and Marra (2012), in addition, uncover similar points in that advice to help migrants socialize into New Zealand professional workplace are frequently given in covert and explicit fashion. Hepburn and Potter (2011) explore the use of idiomatic forms and question tags by a UK child protection agency call takers as a means to provide response to advice that are rejected or resisted. Pudlinski (2012) has demonstrated a number of interrogating acts, attaching advice with detailed accounts, and supporting advice with warnings that are used by a US peer telephone service staff.

In mentoring, advising between educator(s) and (graduate) students is a beneficial act where students usually discuss with their instructors their (graduate) course work as well as dissertation. Many of these instructors are experts in their own area(s) and such discussions may well take place three or more times per year, depending on the consent, need, and urgency of advising. Literature on advising have advanced integral insights into some aspects, for instance, indirectness (Vasquez, 2004), evaluation (Keogh, 2010), evaluation and

reflective practices (Farrell, 2015), and descriptive feedback that help sustain a reflection (Rogers, 2006). Waring (2017) examines how advice is repackaged using “going general” by mentors in managing critiques and suggestions through conversation analysis. While studies on advising have focused on a number of discourse particles and microscopic perspectives of conversation (see for instance Khalid & Maros, 2017; Pudlinski, 2012; Waring, 2007, 2012, 2017), this project deviates from that focus by paying attention to discourse identities and strategies of advice giving to explore “the connection between the micro- and macro-level of any interaction” (De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2012, p.182).

## PARTICIPATION ROLES AND ADVICE GIVING

Before this paper gets into the discussion of advice giving conversation, it is useful to elaborate on the notions of discourse analysis and participation roles in advice giving. How might participation roles provide the conceptual frame and place of analyses that follow? In what ways can discourse analysis describe participation roles in light of advice-giving exchanges? Participation roles, as explained in this context, are some of the many identities assumed within group and institutional membership. These lines of inquiry pertaining participation roles, discourse analysis, and advice-giving have come a long way in establishing links, that are by no means clear-cut, and are not presented as deterministic of language in narrative; they depart from representational accounts of advice-giving narrative studies in social sciences. The latest and renewed interest in discourse analysis is the notion of participation roles. Two schools of thought exist. On the one hand, within the ambit of co-construction of researcher-researched, which has widely been regarded as imperative in knowledge construction (see De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2012; Phoenix, 2008; Squire, 2008 for instance), exchanges are analyzed in broad and general terms. On the other hand, narrative analysis has shown increasing preoccupation from an interactional point of view and identities (Bell, 2006; Branner, 2005; Goodwin, 1986; Manzoni, 2005; Ochs and Capps, 2001; Schiffrin, 1984). In turn, their discussion invites the need to bring these two scopes together. The premise of identities-in-interaction, as discussed above, consequently paves ways for a scrutiny of participation roles in exchanges. Zimmerman (1998) advances the idea of participation roles assumed by interlocutors. Following this premise, he suggests the following kinds of notions concerning participation roles in social and institutional encounters:

*Discourse (or interactional) identities, such as “questioner,” “answerer,” inviter,” “invitee,” etc., may well shift in the course of an interaction. Discourse identities are tied to the sequentiality of a conversation (e.g. adjacency pairs). As they are formed in and by participants’ actions, they constitute the type of activity underway and provide particular resources and constraints for the participants’ display of values within it. (pp. 90-91)*

*Situational identities such as “teacher,” “student,” “doctor,” “patient,” which come into play in particular kinds of situation. These are brought about by local telling roles and are connected with the topic at hand and the activity underway. In turn, situational identities link with the local with the distal context of social activity by proposing to the interlocutors how they should understand the relevance of an exchange. (p. 89)*

These, among many other interactional styles that guide Zimmerman’s (1998) idea of establishing participation roles in social and institutional activities, are among those that are important, therefore, useful for the present analysis. This framework, as Zimmerman (1998) explains, furnishes interlocutors, in this case, faculty members and graduate students, “a continuously evolving framework within which their actions...assume a particular meaning, import, and interactional consequentiality” (Zimmerman, 1998, p. 88). In other words,

Zimmerman's framework of participation roles may describe how participant roles are "oriented to," entailing some types of reasoning that allow participants, speakers, hearers, interlocutors in a particular context to act, say, write, or perform in a certain manner corresponding to topics, issues, or exchanges in question. Accordingly, how can Zimmerman's (1998) framework be applied in this paper?

This paper argues that, as faculty members and graduate students participate in advisement, their interactional styles during such advice-giving consultations can illuminate participation roles as well as strategies used by faculty members to develop graduate student plans to help, check, follow through, and monitor their dissertation writing. To put it differently, the study contends that by using Zimmerman's (1998) framework of participation roles in analyzing faculty member- student advice-giving exchanges, some strategies and roles in which faculty members and students acknowledge, negotiate, affirm, argue, agree, and accept can surface. It follows then that within the scope of diversity, exchanges of advice-giving can be unraveled through a discourse analysis. Ideally, the advice-giving exchanges are transcribed for analyses. However, one can pinpoint the flaws with doctoral advising derived by these exchanges. Hence, this paper is compelled to surmise that under no illusion that whatever exchanges of doctoral students seeking advice this paper has chosen will not be subjected to critiques and refutations. Instead, the point is not to belabor the validity of these exchanges (Creswell, 2007; Mohd Muzhafar, Ruzy, Raihanah, 2014, 2015a, 2015b, 2016, 2017, 2018a, 2018b ; Piaw, 2012; Stewart, 1998), but to consider them as a rough guide in the selection of exchanges that can best manifest the dynamics of advice giving strategies and identities towards writing dissertation.

## METHOD

This study reports on a qualitative dimension of advisement that focuses on advice-giving strategies and roles. Using discourse analysis techniques, this analysis explores the ways in which faculty members and doctoral students engage in advisement. Instead of investigating types of advice, examining construction of hedging, and conducting conversation analysis, this study analyzes the ways advice are presented and the kind of roles they assume as evidenced in the transcripts (DeFina & Georgakopolou, 2012). As such, it would provide a point of entry into how "their actions...assume a particular meaning" (Zimmerman, 1998, p. 88).

Invitations were sent out to diverse faculties at a large, suburban university in Malaysia between December 2015 and early April, 2016. At the beginning, however, difficulties surfaced over the course of searching for participants who would be completing dissertation. The fact that either some faculty members and doctoral students ignored emails, declined verbal invitations, or simply did not respond to local contact boards posted at the university put this project behind schedule. Nevertheless, subsequent multiple telephone calls, including a number of emails and text messages consenting to the involvement of the project meant that some participants were still interested. Eventually, twelve faculty members with their respective graduate students (ten students) in their final semesters agreed to participate in the current study. The doctoral students who participated in this research were either in their fifth or sixth semester. That means some of them were All-But-Dissertation (ABD)-designated. These ABD students have met the required deadlines, published at least two journal articles, and actively organized graduate seminars. Our initial discussions with their advisors revealed that these doctoral students were teaching assistants and regulars at graduate symposium. These discussions have shed light on good practices of PhD candidates; on the one hand, they described some of the many exemplary doctoral graduate 'traits' and a close-up perspective of diverse ways of advising, on the other hand. These PhD students in

their final semesters were 35 years old and above, with some of these have worked for the government, government-affiliated companies, and industries. The faculty members had a minimum of seven years of advising experience and at least one graduate student under advisement.

Placed at a quiet workplace of the faculty members, advising that took place allowed for clear recording, as the faculty members and graduate students sat face-to-face. After consent was obtained, faculty members and students were briefed on the upcoming research project, their disclosure agreement and discretion on starting, pausing, and stopping advising. No video recording was attempted as it was felt authenticity could be an issue. The following interactions that this article concerns circulates around advising, where the thrust of the exchanges pertain to feedback to dissertation, expectations from educational institutions, and publication requirements. As advisors, the faculty members had the capacity to pass or fail graduate students, therefore, the hierarchical distance between these faculty members was observed; faculty members were not regarded as peers. Most of the twenty sessions involved a single advising session; on average, the meeting lasted thirty minutes; some as long as forty minutes, and some as short as fifteen minutes. To improve dissertation and to fulfill doctoral assignments were the goals of advising. Advice-giving sessions were recorded and transcribed verbatim. To uncover methods of institutional interaction, Hutchby & Wooffitt's (2008) transcription convention was adopted. Appendix A lists the transcription convention. The analysis below involves advice-giving exchanges of three students selected for the purposes of reporting this study.

## DATA ANALYSIS

In the following advising exchanges, pseudo names were used for the purposes of keeping anonymity. Analysis is consistent with Waring's (2017) line-by-line analysis so participation roles and advising strategies "emerged" (Waring, 2017, p. 23). In analyzing the exchanges, it was not the intention to solely describe the exchanges as definite, or representatives of all advising for all PhD students. Rather, we were guided by Bryman's (1988) approach that our issue is gauged "in terms of the generalizability of cases to theoretical propositions rather than to populations" (p.90).

### MONITORING PROGRESS TOWARD DISSERTATION WRITING

The first illustration demonstrates some discursive ways advisement is given in an excerpt taken from advisement to a graduate student, Razif, 35 years old, which focused on re-organization of papers. Razif is in his sixth semester, finishing writing on an issue related to sociology and discourse analysis. Specifically, the advising centered on exchanges about how some parts of the paper were missing, how some components of the paper were not adequate, and some of the many reasons why some contents were disorganized. The advising took place at a language learning resource center in the presence of his advisors, Faridah and Normah. Before the point where the transcript starts, his advisors had been following up with his final dissertation progress. When the excerpt in Table 1 starts, Faridah was asking him about some parts of his dissertation's conceptual understanding that had gone missing.

TABLE 1. Monitoring dissertation progress

1	Faridah:	yeah, you know? You will be, you will be rewarded by, by god. So, that is in the Asian
2		culture. That's why there are a lot of women, the Asian women don't go and complain
3		<i>KE APA KE</i> , because, you know, it's just, you just endure silently. So, so, what is it in
4		this. So, can you find the traits, <i>MACAM</i> , you have done in paper two, when you talk
5		about the various [dimensions] of culture

- 
- 6 {yeah, you know? You will be, you will be rewarded by, by god. So, that is in the  
Asian  
7 culture. That's why there are a lot of women, the Asian women don't go and complain  
8 or do anything else, because, you know, it's just, you just endure silently. So, so, what  
is  
9 it in this. So, can you find the traits, like , you have done in paper two, when you  
10 talk about the various [dimensions] of culture}
- 11  
12 Razif: [uh-huh ]
- 13  
14 Faridah: parameters, and all that, so I think you need to go back to those and say what else that  
15 they have mentioned, that that you, that they have not hurm, explained, or you have  
16 found to be extra in your data and this is your contribution. You have, based on these  
17 three, three interviews, but you also have huge data, about hurm, real experiences of  
18 people, because you went to the ground as well, it's not just your interpretation of these  
19 ah::issues. But also, you talked to people, you got them to write, so, it's, it's authentic  
20 experience and you are able to, you are able to [theorize]
- 21  
22 Razif: [ ah-huh ] about their rhetoric.
- 23  
24 Faridah: So, I think, because *DEKAT* conclusion *TU*, you didn't, you didn't, I think you should  
25 have special subsection on ah:: extending [the, you know ]  
26 {So, I think, at the conclusion, you didn't, you didn't, I think you should have  
27 have special subsection on ah:: extending [the, you know ]}
- 28  
29 Normah: [under implication] TAK BOLEH? Under  
30 implication of study. I think that part can be expanded a bit.  
31 {[under implication,] no? Under  
32 implication of study. I think that part can be expanded a bit.}
- 33  
34 Faridah: Ha:: *TAPI*, but the implications have to do with their rhetoric. I think you should,  
35 because, because it's your title *TAU*.  
36 {Ha:: but, but the implications have to do with their rhetoric. I think you should,  
37 because, because it's your title, you know?}
- 38  
39 Razif: Uh-huh.
- 40  
41 Faridah: I think, I think hu::m. You should say, you should say , you've got, I mean, you have  
42 used the triangulation.
- 43  
44 Razif: Uh-huh.
- 45  
46 Faridah: But I think you should re-,[ re-emphasize]
- 47  
48 Razif: [re-iterate ]
- 49  
50 Faridah: you have also got the responses at ground zero. You went to the ground. And you have  
51 got their responses. Therefore, it is not just some imagined thing that you got in your  
52 head.
- 53  
54 Razif: OK.
- 

As illustrated, Razif did not start answering Faridah's question about his impression on some of the missing components regarding culture right away (lines 1-12). At this point, Faridah asked Razif a narrative-eliciting question; if something specific has happened to women in Razif's work (lines 8-10). Faridah started, in what Labov (2003) would call complicating actions, prior to posing the question to Razif. Instead of answering directly, Razif briefly portrayed a general understanding of his processing what Faridah said using

filler (line 12). However, in line 22, Razif started to elaborate what is generally called a 'shared expectation' by finishing Faridah's sentence. Specifically, in response, Razif produced a typical high-involvement style conversation by finishing Faridah's sentence, inserting "about their rhetoric" (line 22) (Tannen, 1992). As we can see, Razif did not describe what he felt about the advice directly, but simply continued to share "a meta message of rapport" (Tannen, 1992, p. 11), indicating his understanding of his advisors' message. Looking forward, Faridah and Normah provided further evaluation on Razif's dissertation; on the one hand, Faridah tried to revise the structure and comments, "I think you should have special subsection" (lines 24-27). On the other hand, Normah conveyed her point of view about a section called implication (lines 29-32). In Labovian terms, these utterances by Normah and Faridah serve as external evaluation when Faridah stops in order to let Normah interrupt and insert details on what dissertation readers' are going to say. From lines 34-37 and 41-42, Faridah further reinforced her advice and comments on providing subsections by stating the rationale. It is interesting to note that this description, has, again, an evaluative stand signaled by the repetition of Faridah. Faridah started building the relevance of her advice on the importance of inserting additional section when she recounted that the corpus employed by Razif had been conducted at "ground zero," negating "imagined thing" (lines 50-52). Notice the function of "you have also got" (line 50); it is used to signal Faridah's evaluations of triangulation as something that "re-emphasizes" Razif's theory. Although nothing is mentioned here about the links between Faridah's "subsection," and dissertation examiners' review, Faridah is implicitly conveying the idea that the "subsection" and mentioning of "theory" are mandatory. Such an implicit meaning is partly being mentioned through the use of "But I think you should" and "Therefore, it's not just," which implies that missing the subsection will result in negative consequence. In fact, the "subsection," as highlighted by Faridah is presented as having spoken exclusively to show the importance of "ground" work. The selection of "ground zero," and "triangulation" can be seen as creating an image of the subsection as concrete on the basis that it supports a generally shared expectations about Razif's dissertation theory, i.e. that a theory would need to be based on concrete evidence instead of merely surmising findings. That this implication is understood is clear from Razif's reactions. Razif mostly interacted with fillers, "uh-huhs" (lines 12, 39, and 44) and OK (line 54), thus, indexing that he had understood what his advisors, Faridah and Normah tried to say. Such filler, coupled with his finishing Faridah's sentence (as shown earlier; lines 22 and 48) shows such awareness of his interpretation of the advice and an alignment of his understanding with his advisors' comments. At this point, Razif has signaled, and his advisors have accepted, the relevance of additional subsection to support Razif's theory.

On a broader level, comments by Normah and Faridah advice are, to a certain extent, good illustration of the way advisors display their advising roles and strategies. In this case, while Faridah's account on "Asian women" is related to advancing arguments on traditions in Asian cultures, Faridah's rationalization further gives a sense of prediction related to her stance on "you have found to be extra in your data and this is your contribution." By reinforcing "means-orientation," (Van Leeuwen, 2007), Normah signals the importance of writing "implications." In this way, these strategies are used to construct some forms of rationale and legitimacy of advice and are, therefore, important in guiding Razif's dissertation writing. As is seen above, Normah's repetition of her advice not only stresses the importance of "subsection," but also has the effect of underscoring the importance of positing theory for Razif to understand some further effects of the advice. In the light of the above narrative, it can be said that roles of advisement is discursively constructed. A typical role of advisor is to reinforce comments (De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2012), which is inserted within the exchanges, coupled with the implications and negative consequences for not heeding the

advice. These meanings are somewhat conveyed indirectly. Nothing about legitimacy of advice is conveyed directly, but through Faridah's and Normah's indexes, as we have seen, via evaluation, constructive comments, repetitions, and ordering of Razif's dissertation paper help to convey the role of faculty members as members of advising discourse community. Thus, even though this analysis began from a micro environment, it has led to the consideration of roles of faculty members on a macro-level. Being reviewers of papers, reinforcers, and rationale providers of the advice are some of the roles illuminated by the faculty members at this juncture. In brief, the exchanges of advice-giving above rely on local scrutiny of faculty member-graduate student interactions and also heralds wider context of strategies and roles of advisement.

While the previous narrative presents advisement for a graduate student who scrutinizes culture and discourse analysis, the next advice-giving consultation focuses on a doctoral student who, then, is writing on an issue concerning Sri Lankan volunteers studying Arabic. The following narrative will illustrate some multiple, discursive ways of advising that took place for a doctoral student, Zaini, 47 years old. The session emphasized on Zaini's dissertation's progress. The advisement centered on questions about paragraph structure, why Zaini made connections to findings in literature review and how both his advisors, Latiffah and Zainab, differed their opinion on writing styles. Zaini, a doctoral candidate here, had finished all parts of dissertation. Prior to the point where the transcript starts, his advisors had already inquired about Zaini's general progress, specifically, raising questions on Zaini's writing clarity and inquiring how Zaini would resolve those questions. When the excerpt starts, Zaini's advisor, Latiffah, is voicing out her impressions of Zaini's order of dissertation. By recording their advising at a graduate meeting room at a large, public institution, their exchanges are captured in Table 2:

TABLE 2. Monitoring dissertation progress

1	Latiffah:	One more thing, one last thing, please take out all analysis, because your chapter two
2		reads more [like]
3		
4	Zaini:	[what]what page is that?
5		
6	Latiffah:	a lot. I've put everywhere. I said, analysis of the texts should not appear in the literature
7		review. For instance, page 22, you are talking about interview transcript.
8		The transcript is your main corpus, isn't it?
9		
10	Zainab:	But I think, I think, there are times when he must make, [MACAM ]
11		But I think, I think, there are times when he must make, {[for instance]}
12		
13	Zaini:	[connection]
14		
15	Zainab:	a::h, make connection.
16		
17	Latiffah:	Hypothesis, yes.
18		
20	Zainab:	you know [MACAM ]
21		{you know [for instance]}
22		
23	Latiffah:	[not ] at the literature review section to write about the analysis.
24		You know, writing about your interview findings is already [analysis]
25		
26	Zainab:	[yeah, but] no- no quotes, but
27		I think he can, I know some examiners say [what]
28		
29	Zaini:	[what's] the [relationship]



- 
- 30  
31 Latiffah: [this ] ha:: to your [work]. You  
32 can make statements like this study will examine how far the Sri Lankan volunteers,  
33 hu::rm, say something about that. You know that sentence, for example,[(reads aloud  
34 thesis)]  
35  
36 Zaini: [ok, let's say if] I  
37 take that part out, do you think I make connection?  
38  
39 Latiffah: No, then you can say so, in the context in this study, I will examine the urban Sri Lankan  
40 volunteers, choose to socialize with people who are lower than their social  
41 hierarchy. Something like this. So you can pose the questions, the issues that you are  
42 going to take up later. But not the answers here. Because if you do that, what's the point  
43 of the analysis chapter?  
44  
45 Zaini: But this is not thorough, though.  
46  
47 Latiffah: It's not thorough, but it shouldn't be there. Coz I know this is one thing my supervisor  
48 told me as well. Because I tended to do this. Because at that time when I was writing my  
49 literature review, I wanted to make my own self clear. That, the reason I'm saying all  
50 these things is because I see the link to my texts. And I had wanted to put the link there  
51 already. So, every point I was asked to take out, and convert that either to a question, a  
52 hypothesis, or one or the other. You know? Or a combination of the two. So, you do a lot  
53 of your [analyses]  
54  
55 Zainab: [I was told] differently. I was told to make connections whenever you can. TAPI,  
56 not extensive LA. So maybe now at the moment *MACAM YOU CAKAP* you've got quotes  
57 so maybe you remove the quote, but you just can, you can say, this aspect is related to  
58 you know, motivation  
59 {[I was told] differently. I was told to make connections whenever you can. But,  
60 not extensive. So maybe now at the moment, like you said, you've got quotes so maybe  
61 you  
62 remove the quote, but you just can, you can say, this aspect is related to, but you just can,  
you can say, this aspect is related to, you know, motivation}
- 

As displayed in the transcript, Zaini did not indicate what he felt about the advice and respond to Latiffah's advice about removing "analysis" right away (line 4). Latiffah further inserted additional points, reinforcing her previous suggestion on the grounds of dissertation sequence (lines 6-8). In view of this, it is interesting to note that this description serves as repetition of Latiffah's advice, when she recounts how "transcript" is related to "analysis." From the perspectives of Labov (2003), these utterances by Latiffah function as external evaluation in that Latiffah allows disruption and let Zainab conveys details on how readers might perceive the dissertation (lines 6-11). To this, Zaini did not show how he felt about his advisors contradicting each other, but continued to finish Zainab's sentence (line 13). In what Tannen (1992) would call "high-involvement style," Zaini is seen as expanding a generally shared expectation towards what Zainab feels about making connection to findings in literature reviews. That the implication of "connection" was understood is evident from Zainab's reactions, as she indicated with fillers, "a::h" (line 15). From this point on, Zainab commenced on building the relevance of her advice on the importance of making "connection," by recounting how Zaini's work was compatible with "examiners" expectation, signaling, again, evaluative justification (De Fina & Georgakopolou, 2012) (lines 20 -24). Although nothing is clear and explicit about the links between Zainab's stance on "connection" and "examiners," Zainab is covertly conveying the idea that meeting what "examiners" want to see is mandatory. Part of attending to such covert meaning is mentioned through the use of modals of possibility "can," providing indication that Zaini will bear the negative consequence should he misses out on creating "connection." However, while

Latiffah intensified her evaluation (Zimmerman, 1998) (lines 30-31, 39-43), as if adding depth to her advice when she recounted the tradition of “analysis,” Zaini posited a hypothetical question, or in Van Leeuwen’s (2007) terms, prediction, within the aspect of theoretical rationalization (lines 36-37). This link between establishing “connection” and “analysis,” is, however, negated by Latiffah. In particular, Latiffah had been reinforcing her advice, but instead of regurgitating on tradition of chapter sequence (Vaara, 2014), this time (lines 47-53), Latiffah augmented her advice using expert authority (Van Leeuwen, 2007). It was communicated through a selective use of “my supervisor,” “I was asked to take out,” and “convert that either to a question,” which is presented as having uttered exclusively as legitimate. Such selection of particular advice by Latiffah can be seen as creating an image of Zaini’s dissertation as violating a broad expectation about “supervisor’s” understanding, that is, “supervisor” would attempt to seek information on “literature review” instead of providing “analysis.” While Latiffah indexed relevance to her advice, Zainab further strengthened her advice; but at this juncture, she constructed the relevance of her advice in terms of length for the development of “connection” (lines 55-62), when she recounted how the dissertation that Zaini is writing ought to have no “quotes.” In Van Leeuwen’s terms (2007), this form of advice (using justification on tradition) has now been made legitimate. The emphasis is achieved through “I was told to make connections,” “not extensive,” and “you can say.” Although nothing clear is said here about relations between “connections,” “not extensive,” and absence of “quotes,” Zainab is covertly indexing that these were integral from the eyes of “examiners.” The preference to use these external evaluations by Zainab can be presented as presupposing the idea that they are valid on the basis that if advisors insert comments, it must be carried out and followed through by graduate students. The use of these advice not only allows advisors to follow through with Zaini’s stance of writing literature review in dissertation, but also toward advisor-advisee relationships in general.

On broader terms, the multiple dimensions of advice-giving exchanges based on the discussion on dissertation is an excellent illustration of the mechanisms advisors use to convey their stance, details, and reminders. In the light of above, we can deduce that the advice received by Zaini is discursively enacting some roles and strategies. Some of the strategies in which advice is given to Zaini are made legitimate are through tradition, moral evaluation, and expert authority. These strategies, rather than directly conveyed, are implied subtly because nothing clear is said about Zaini’s heeding Latiffah’s or Zainab’s advice, but as demonstrated in the narrative above, through these strategies of attaching legitimation (evaluation, tradition, and expert authority) to advisors’ comments, their advice is, to a certain extent, validly indexed. Together, these phrases and lexical strategies used by advisors help convey their points on the visions of how possessing a certain criteria in dissertation writing in a certain way implies an okay from examiners. However, Zaini is also seen as relying on his advisors’ roles, oscillating between what their advice mean and their position as knowledge constructors (Drew & Heritage, 1992). Latiffah subtly directing a change in literature review to providing rationale on why making connection in literature review is not favored by academic discourse community, and Zainab’s implying consent to Zaini’s writing point to a sense of hope generally shared by academics. Given these expectations, the analysis is compelled to surmise that the roles of advisors as evident in the exchanges above include, but are not limited to, being reviewers and revisers of dissertation chapters, maintainer of advisee’s stance, and informer of weaknesses. Thus, although this analysis begins with identifying advising strategies, it has directed us to the consideration of advisors’ roles. Given the prevalence of these strategies and roles, the idea behind sustaining the research rigor through advising appears to be shared by all three participants in this narrative. That said, the advisor-advisee relations, as described above, can allow graduate students like

Zaini to reach a certain understanding of how people felt, other than himself, reading his dissertation.

### PROVIDING RATIONALE FOR INSTITUTIONAL PROCEDURES AND REQUIREMENTS

Whereas previous exchanges focus on advisors' inserting details and comments on doctoral students' progress in dissertation writing, the following section signifies advice-giving exchanges that help develop awareness on institutional procedures and requirements. Specifically, they tap onto administrative and institutional policies advisees need to understand prior to writing or submitting their dissertation. This section begins with advisors presenting discursive insights for adhering to administrative ambits, in an excerpt taken from an advisement with a doctoral student, Faizul, 43 years old, on writing a joint-authored journal article publication with his advisors, Rosli and Kamsiah. To revisit common higher education graduate program procedures in Malaysia, a joint publication with advisors is one of the many pre-requisites for doctoral graduation (Aminah, 2015). While the nature and scope of journal article vary from one higher educational institution to the other, proofs of journal article are produced side by side with dissertation before commencement.

In the following advising narrative, the advising primarily centered on questions about trajectory of Faizul's journal article draft; why his draft looked similar to his dissertation, what Faizul could do about it, how Faizul arrived at drafting the journal article, and the comments raised by both Rosli and Kamsiah. The advising took place at Rosli's workplace and was conducted in the presence of Kamsiah. Rosli is Faizul's primary advisor, while Kamsiah is the second advisor. Before the point where the excerpt begins, they were talking about Faizul's progress as far as writing preliminary sections of Faizul's dissertation, and the kinds of problems Faizul was going through while writing his work. When the transcript in Table 3 starts, Rosli asked about Kamsiah's impressions of the journal article that Faizul had sent earlier.

TABLE 3. Providing institutional procedures and requirements

1	Rosli:	What about this article? We have to go [through ]
2		
3	Kamsiah:	[I have a bit] of question. I read this first ((points
4		at article)), then I read this and I saw overlapping. So, I'm just wondering if they'd be
5		issues with self-plagiarism later on.
6		
7	Rosli:	No, it's okay.
8		
9	Kamsiah:	No:: [because ]
10		
11	Faizul:	[So, what] do you mean by self [plagiarism?]
12		
13	Kamsiah:	[because ] you are publishing things with our
14		names
15		
16	Rosli:	Yeah, it's okay.
17		
18	Faizul:	TA::K, I don't understand what your definition of self-plagiarism is
19		{But I don't understand what your definition of self-plagiarism is}
20		
21	Kamsiah:	You use chunks of it back in your thesis.
22		
23	Rosli:	[I read, I read]
24		
25	Faizul:	[Oh, I TAK BOLEH E::K]

---

26		[{Oh, I can't?}]
27		
28	Rosli:	All students do that.
29		
30	Kamsiah:	Really? I thought they paraphrased?
31		
32	Rosli:	No:: They will say, part of it has been [ published ]
33		
34	Faizul:	[But I change] a little bit. I didn't take all of them.
35		
36	Rosli:	No:: It's okay.
37		
38	Kamsiah:	Sure [ ya:: ]
39		
40	Rosli:	[yeah, yeah]
41		
42	Kamsiah:	I <i>TAKUT</i> later on they send this to Turnitin and in, in [the coming batches]
43		{I'm afraid later on they send this to Turnitin and in, in [the coming batches]}
44		
45	Rosli:	[No, no::]
46		
47	Kamsiah:	they will put the thesis into [Turnitin ]
48		
49	Rosli:	[But, but ] you can say that this part of this
50		[thesis, this ]
51		
52	Faizul:	[This part of ]
53		
54	Rosli:	has been published.
55		
56	Kamsiah:	So, it has to be declared, [yeah]
57		
58	Rosli:	[yeah]
59		
60	Kamsiah:	Ok. hh

---

As demonstrated in the narrative, Kamsiah did not respond to Rosli's narrative-eliciting question right away (De Fina & Georgakopolou, 2012) (lines 3-5). Instead, she produced a story opening device ("a bit of question," line 3), proceeded with an abstract which she gave the narrative, "I read this first, then I read this and I saw overlapping" (lines 3-4). As can be seen here, Kamsiah simply referred to it as a form of "self-plagiarism," (lines 5). In line 21, Kamsiah provided further details on Faizul's journal article, "You use chunks of it back in your thesis." In view of Labov (2003), this utterance serves as external evaluation in that the narrator, in this case, Kamsiah, stopped the action of advising to insert details and comments of Faizul's work, conveying her point of view on what she thought of Faizul's draft. In this case, Kamsiah seems to assert Faizul's draft's sense of impotence in dealing with ethical issues. Subsequently, Kamsiah further enacted her advice, commenting the danger of sending the article to "Turnitin," attaching "I'm scared" (line 42) to her utterance. This utterance which also emphasized evaluation (Labov, 2003) implies dissertation examiners' doubt with the fact that Faizul's dissertation does not conform to ethical consideration of the university. While Kamsiah seems to provide external evaluation (Vaara, 2014), Rosli stressed his agreement towards Faizul's draft through repetition at different points (lines 7-16). This repetition by Rosli communicated through, "no, it's okay," has the effect of underscoring the importance of scholarly publishing in order for Faizul to understand some further implications of Rosli's advice. In this case, Rosli starts establishing the relevance of his advice, agreeing to Faizul's work in declaration terms for the

development of the journal article when he recounted “part of it has been published” (line 32). While nothing direct is mentioned here about the connections between providing such declaration statements and “article” acceptance, Rosli is implicitly communicating the idea that Faizul’s article can further be turned in. Such implicit meaning is partly being conveyed, again, through the use of the expression, “no, it’s okay” (lines 36 and 49), which as illustrated here, implies Rosli’s intensification of advice, following means-orientation (vis-à-vis declarative statement) within the ambit of instrumental rationalization (Mohd Muzhafar & Nor Fariza, 2016; Van Leeuwen, 2007). The selection of this kind of advice by Rosli can be seen as constructing an image of his advice as legitimate on the basis that it supports a universally accepted expectation in academia, i.e. that graduate students such as Rosli may try to write journal article based on dissertation, instead of writing a new research. That this implication is understood is clear from the reaction of Faizul. Faizul further inserted evaluation to unearth his scholarly comment (line 34). Notice the function of the expression “didn’t take all of them” to signal Faizul’s evaluation of the draft as something which is valid (Frank, 2016). The preceding expression of “ok” (line 60) by Kamsiah indexes that she has understood and accepted what Rosli is trying to prove. Such expression reveals the awareness of Kamsiah about the alignment of Faizul’s draft, institutional policy, and legitimizing Rosli’s advice. This is a reflection of what Zimmerman (1998) argues as delineating roles at institutional level, as such exchange “constitute the type of activity underway and provide particular resources and constraints for the participants’ display of values within it” (p. 90-91). At this point, Kamsiah and Rosli have accepted the relevance of declaration statement as an acceptable method to get the dissertation written for the unfolding of publication. By using these strategies in advising, they allow Faizul to understand a plethora of ways journal article is published and the ways in which procedural requirement in higher education institution is central.

Through reading the above-mentioned narrative, it is worthy to note that faculty members provide advice to communicate stance regarding publishing and adherence to higher education procedural stands. The advising exchanges above forms a platform graduate students can relate to not only with respect to publishing, but also construct identities; since advising has at its core ethics and procedural manner, other aspects of publishing such as originality can also be more benefiting to graduate students.

In the light of the above, it can be noted that as advisors, Rosli and Kamsiah discursively and implicitly construct their advice, making their advice legitimate through some strategies. The strategies involved in this narrative include the use of moral evaluation and instrumental orientation which are mentioned indexically, rather than explicitly or directly. Of course, nothing is said directly about the relevance of their advice to the decision of journal editor, but advisors’ stance is indexed through above-mentioned strategies, repetition, emphasis, and temporal ordering of action and reaction. Combining these strategies help convey the participation roles and the vision in which advising can help raise awareness on publishing and author guidelines. For instance, the roles in which these advisors signify as implied, including being a preparer, reviser and reviewer for journal article draft, reinforcer of advice, and referrer of graduate publishing work, are all shared among participants of this interaction. Therefore, even when this discussion starts at local, familiar interaction, it has brought readers to the consideration of broader roles of advisors (DeFina & Georgakopolou, 2012; Park, 2014).

Given these utterances during advising, one needs to be cognizant that advising exchanges depended on a close analysis of data, leading to a broader context of social and institutional relationships and stance, and in this case, academia, allowing faculty members to share responses among graduate students.

## CONCLUSION

From advising conversations above, we see diverse ways advising encourages a sense of community and shared academic purpose which is not just informed by background knowledge or expertise per say. Graduate students, as illustrated above, feel a sense of discourse community of intellectuals as they (re)search and (re)construct various understanding in completing dissertation using, partly, advice that they receive. When advice-giving conversations are examined, they illuminate diverse strategies and roles. Many of these strategies include positing hypothetical questions or predictions (theoretical rationalization), presenting moral evaluation, using expert authority, tradition, and instrumental rationalization, which are fundamental for advisors to help with advising. Being a helper, developer, planner, reviewer, reviser, monitor, discussant, acceptor, reinforcer, interpreter, rationale provider, approver, maintainer, informer, referrer, contactor, consultant, knowledge giver, engager, clarifier, accessor, reader, and requester are some of the many roles demonstrated by faculty member- graduate student advising at a large, public university in Malaysia.

However, it is not the intention to underscore or to complicate the value of advising. As shown in the analysis, the discourse of advice-giving is worth scrutinizing because if universities evolve so does advising. It is worth noting, however, that advice giving exchanges are not necessarily freed of limitations as advice-giving roles and strategies vary from one institution to the other. But the comfort is that discourses such as what this paper explicates in fact expand studies of advice-giving, fundamental to expanding expertise and mentorship. And as they do so, faculty members continue to inscribe, reinforce, replicate, and reproduce their knowledge. There is nothing to resolve about the interconnectedness of advice-giving; it is merely to reconcile and describe the intricacies of faculty member-graduate student advising strategies and roles, amidst the changing and challenging landscape of higher education. As Roberta Frank in Yale University Online News says, “Advise gently. Soft-falling snow sinks in deeper than sharp ice-cubes. When you see a spark, do not water” (Frank, 2016). It is as though it is within these moments of participation roles in interaction that graduate scholarship becomes enlivened. Paraphrasing De Fina and Georgakopoulou (2012, p.190), it is through these faculty member-student advice giving exchanges that are “bound to shape the direction and synergies” of doctoral student experience.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We would like to thank Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia’s Research Management and Innovation Center (RMIC) for their assistance in realizing this publication, under the Journal Publication Payment Scheme.

## REFERENCES

- Aminah, M. Y. (2015). *Road to PhD GOT*. Retrieved April 25, 2016, from <http://sps.utm.my/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/slides-GOT-PGSSUTM-JAN-20151.pdf>.
- Bell, S. (2006). Becoming a mother after DES: Intensive mothering in spite of it all. In De Fina, A., Schiffirin, D. & Bamberg, M. (Eds.), *Discourse and Identity* (pp. 233-252). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Branner, R. (2005). Humorous disaster and success stories among female adolescents in Germany. In Quasthoff, U. M. & Becker, T. (Eds.), *Narrative interaction* (pp. 113-148). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Brown, P., Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bryman, A. (1988). *Quantity and Quality in Social Research*. London: Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- De Fina, A. & Georgakopoulou, A. (2012). *Analyzing Narrative: Discourse and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Drew, P. & J. Heritage. (Eds.). (1992). *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Farrell, T. S. C. (2015). *Promoting Teacher Reflection in Second Language Education: A Framework for Tesol Professionals*. New York: Routledge.
- Frank, R. (2016). *Honoring outstanding mentors: Frank, Dovidio, and Osuji*. Retrieved June 2, 2016, from <http://gsas.yale.edu/news/honoring-outstanding-mentors-frank-dovidio-osuji>
- Goodwin, C. (1986). Audience Diversity, Participation and Interpretation. *Text. Vol. 6*(3), 283-316.
- Hepburn, A. & Potter, J. (2011). Designing the Recipient. *Social Psychology Quarterly. Vol. 74*(2), 216-241.
- Hutchby, I. & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation Analysis*. Manchester: Polity Press.
- Hyland, K. & Hyland, F. (2012). 'You could make this clearer': Teachers' advice on ESL academic writing. In H. Limberg & M. A. Locher (Eds.), *Advice in Discourse* (pp. 53-72). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Keogh, J. (2010). (In)forming Formal Evaluation: Analysis of a Practicum Mentoring Conversation. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Professional Practice. Vol. 7*(1), 51-73.
- Khalid Ahmed, W. & Maros, M. (2017). Using hedges as relational work by Arab EFL students in student-supervisor consultations. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies. Vol. 17*(1), 89-105.
- Labov, W. (2003). Uncovering the event structure of narrative. In Tannen, D., & Alatis, J. (Eds.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 2001* (pp. 63-83). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Limberg, H. (2010). *The Interactional Organization of Academic Talk*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Manzoni, C. (2005). The use of interjections in Italian conversation. In Quasthoff, U. M., & Becker, T. (Eds.), *Narrative Interaction* (pp. 197-220). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Mohd Muzhafar, I. & Nor Fariza, M. N. (2016). Legitimation Analysis: Exploring Decision-making and Power in Hot Bench. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies. Vol. 16*(2), 33-52.
- Mohd Muzhafar, I., Ruzy S. H. & Raihanah, M. M. (2014). Imagining alternative modernity: Negotiating Islamicness and Malay-ness on Popular TV Fiction. *Asian Economic and Financial Review. Vol. 4*(12), 1798-1811.
- Mohd Muzhafar, I., Ruzy S. H. & Raihanah, M. M. (2015a). Malay Cultural Identities: a Review. *Humanities and Social Sciences Letters. Vol. 3*(1), 1-9. doi: 10.18488/journal.73/2015.3.1/73.1.1.9
- Mohd Muzhafar, I., Ruzy S. H. & Raihanah, M. M. (2015b). Followership: Boosting Power and Position in Popular Tv Fiction. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies. Vol. 15*(1), 207-224. doi: 10.17576/GEMA-2015-1501-12
- Mohd Muzhafar, I., Ruzy S. H. & Raihanah, M. M. (2016). Globalization, Re-discovery of the Malay 'local,' and Popular Tv Fiction Through Audience Narratives. *3L: The*

- Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*. Vol. 22(2), 31-48. doi: 10.17576/3L-2016-2202-03
- Mohd Muzhafar, I., Ruzy S. H. & Raihanah, M. M. (2017). Rediscovery of the Malay 'local:' youth and TV fiction in Malaysia. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*. Vol. 22(2), 210-225. doi: 10.1080/02673843.2016.1154876
- Mohd Muzhafar, I., Ruzy S. H. & Raihanah, M. M. (2018a). Female youth responding to popular TV fiction: Unconscious Malay psyche and resistance. *Advanced Science Letters*. Vol. 24(4), 2913-2917. doi: 10.1166/asl.2018.11093.
- Mohd Muzhafar, I., Ruzy S. H. & Raihanah, M. M. (2018b). Audience Narratives, Popular Tv Fiction, and the Unconscious Malay Psyche. *Journal of Language and Communication*. Vol. 5(1), 124-135. [http://www.fbmk.upm.edu.my/upload/dokumen/20180418140720JLC\\_5-1\\_MARCH\\_2018.pdf](http://www.fbmk.upm.edu.my/upload/dokumen/20180418140720JLC_5-1_MARCH_2018.pdf)
- Ochs, E. & Capps, L. (2001). *Living Narrative*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Park, I. (2012). Seeking Advice: Epistemic Asymmetry and Learner Autonomy in Writing Conferences. *Journal of Pragmatics*. Vol. 44(14), 2004-2021.
- Park, I. (2014). Stepwise Advice Negotiation in Writing Center Peer Tutoring. *Language and Education*, 28(4), 362-382.
- Phoenix, A. (2008). Analysing narrative contexts. In Andrews, M., Squire, C., & Tamboukou, M. (Eds.), *Doing Narrative Research* (pp. 64-77). London: SAGE Publications.
- Piaw, C. W. (2012). *Mastering Research Methods*. Kuala Lumpur: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Pudlinski, C. (2012). The pursuit of advice on US peer telephone helplines: Sequential and functional aspects. In H. Limberg & M. A. Locher (Eds.), *Advice in Discourse* (pp. 233-252). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Rogers, C. (2006). Attending to Student Voice: the Impact of Descriptive Feedback on Learning and Teaching. *Curriculum Inquiry*. Vol. 36(2), 209-237.
- Schiffrin, D. (1984). *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Squire, C. (2008). Experience-centred and culturally-oriented approaches to narrative. In Andrews, M., Squire, C. & Tamboukou, M. (Eds.), *Doing Narrative Research* (pp. 41-63). London: SAGE Publications.
- Stewart, A. (1998). *The Ethnographer's Method*. California: Sage.
- Sweeney, J. (1983). The Post-observation Conference: Key to Teacher Improvement. *High School Journal*. Vol. 66(2), 135-140.
- Tannen, D. (1992). *On Language*. Retrieved May 31, 2016, from <http://www.nytimes.com/1992/04/05/magazine/on-language-me-don-t-finish-my-you-sentence.html>.
- Vaara, E. (2014). Struggles Over Legitimacy in the Eurozone Crisis: Discursive Legitimation Strategies and Their Ideological Underpinnings. *Discourse and Society*. Vol. 25(4), 500-518.
- Van Leeuwen, T. (2007). Legitimation in Discourse and Communication. *Discourse and Communication*. Vol. 1(1), 91-112.
- Vásquez, C. (2004). Very Carefully Managed: Advice and Suggestions in Post-observation Meetings. *Linguistics and Education*. Vol. 15(1-2), 33-58.
- Vine, B., Holmes, J. & Marra, M. (2012). Mentoring migrants: Facilitating the transition to the New Zealand workplace. In H. Limberg & M. A. Locher (Eds.), *Advice in Discourse* (pp. 145-166). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.



- Wang, J., Strong, M. & Odell, S. J. (2004). Mentor-Novice Conversations About Teaching: A Comparison of Two U.S. and Two Chinese Cases. *Teachers College Record*. Vol. 106(4), 775-813.
- Waring, H. Z. (2007). The Multi-functionality of Accounts in Advice Giving. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*. Vol. 11(3), 367–391.
- Waring, H. Z. (2012). The advising sequence and its preference structures in graduate peer tutoring at an American university. In H. Limberg & M. A. Locher (Eds.), *Advice in Discourse* (pp. 97-118). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Waring, H. Z. (2017). Going General as a Resource for Doing Advising in Post-observation Conferences in Teacher Training. *Journal of Pragmatics*. Vol. 110, 20-33.
- Zimmerman, D. (1998). Identity, context and interaction. In Antaki, C. & Widdicombe, S. (Ed.), *Identities in Talk* (pp. 87-106). London: SAGE Publications.

## APPENDIX A

### Transcription Convention

::	(colon(s)) Prolonging of sound.
w <sup>o</sup> :rd	(colon after underlined letter) Falling intonation on word.
w <sub>o</sub> :rd	(underlined colon) Rising intonation on word.
<u>word</u>	(underlining).
<u>word</u>	The more underlying, the greater the stress.
WORD	(all caps) Loud speech.
<i>CAP ITALLICS</i>	Utterance in subject's L1.
Hh	(series of h's) Aspiration or laughter.
.hh	(h's preceded by dot) Inhalation.
[ ]	(brackets) simultaneous or overlapping speech.
{ }	(curved brackets) translation of L1 utterance.
=	(equal sign) Latch or contiguous utterances of the same.
(2.4)	(number in parentheses) Length of a silence in 10ths of a second.
( )	(empty parentheses) Non-transcribable segment of talk.
((writing))	(double parentheses) Description of non-speech activity.

### ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Mohd Muzhafar Idrus (PhD) teaches at Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia. His research interests include discourse analysis, urbanism, and literature. He is a reviewer for a number of journals including 3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies (UKM Journal) and Cogent Arts and Humanities (Taylor and Francis Journal).

Nor Fariza Mohd Nor (Ph.D) is Associate Professor at the School of Language Studies and Linguistics, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia. Her research interests include discourse analysis, e-learning and entrepreneurship. She is involved in research in political discourse, e-learning, online reading and entrepreneurship.

Ruzy Suliza Hashim (PhD) is Professor of Literature at the Sustainability of Language Sciences Research Centre. Her research interests include gender issues in literature and psychogeography and literature. She is on editorial board member for 3 L (UKM journal) and Cogent Arts and Humanities Journal (Taylor and Francis journal).

Raihanah M. M. (PhD) is an Associate Professor of literary studies at the Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia. Her research interests include Literary Studies, Minority Fiction, and Muslim Diaspora.