'We would be well advised to agree on our own basic principles': *Schreiben* as an Agent of Discipline-Building in Writing Studies in Germany, Switzerland, Austria, and Liechtenstein

Andrea Scott
Pitzer College, USA

Abstract

Although writing centers in Germany are among the oldest and fastest growing outside of North America, scholarship produced within them remains largely unknown outside national borders due to challenges inherent in translingual research. This article helps remedy this gap by rendering accessible debates in 'writing studies' ('*Schreibwissenschaft*') in German-speaking countries, where a number of projects are underway to define the field at this moment of its maturation. By focusing on one such initiative in Germany, Stephanie Dreyfürst and Nadja Sennewald's edited collection *Schreiben: Grundlagentexte zur Theorie, Didaktik und Beratung* (*Writing: Foundational Texts on Theory, Pedagogy, and Consultations*) (2014), I use the monograph as a case study for investigating larger scholarly conversations about the state of writing studies in the region. In doing so, I propose a new genre for transnational research— the *translingual review*. More thickly descriptive than the book review, the translingual review situates the edited or authored monograph within local disciplinary and institutional contexts. This particular translingual review adopts a comparative framework, examining how German-language scholarship extends Anglo-American research in innovative ways, particularly in its uses of writing process research.

Introduction

Even before the current political climate, Americans have been known—not only abroad—for their cultural isolationism. A recent *New York Times* op-ed bemoans the parochialism of the U.S. book market, where only 3% of new titles are translations, compared with 75% in the Netherlands (Moser). This cultural myopia extends to scholarship in academic writing as well. Bruce Horner, Samantha NeCamp, and Christiane Donahue recently characterized writing studies in their home country as a 'U.S.-centric, English monolingual enterprise' (Horner, NeCamp and Donahue 2011: 291*).* Based on their study of citation practices in major journals published in the U.S., they concluded that non-English citations are rare (2011: 275), translations of scholarship are neither published nor valued (2011: 278), and compositionists often lack training to cross linguistic and disciplinary boundaries in their research (2011: 285). This insularity is all the more striking considering that writing studies in the U.S. is in the midst of an international turn. Renewed attention is being directed to both multilingual writers in the U.S. (e.g., Canagarajah 2013, Horner and Kopelson 2014, Kei Matsuda and Silva 2010) and writing centers and programs across the globe (e.g., Bazerman et al. 2012, Canagarajah 2013, Martins 2014, Thaiss, Bräuer, Carlino, Ganobcsik-Williams and Sinha 2012). Yet scholarship that makes its way to North American is, as Donahue puts it, 'highly partial,' portraying developments elsewhere as largely 'export-based' at the expense of listening closely to what's happening on the ground (Donahue 2009: 214).

By contrast, writing studies scholarship in Europe is marked by greater cultural pluralism, evident in the prevalence of cooperative research, attention to cultural diversity, and the multilingual citation practices of research presented at the European Association of Teaching Academic Writing (EATAW) conferences during its first decade (Kearns and Turner 2015). In fact, Katrin Girgensohn and Nora Peters' recent 'plea for a European writing center scholarship' is based on their desire to harness what the region does best (Girgensohn and Peters 2012: 1): preserving 'methodological plurality' and an 'open engagement with theoretical concepts' developed by the field's multidisciplinary practitioners (2012: 8).[1] U.S.-based scholars have much to learn from this inclusive approach. Yet there is room—even within EATAW—to extend this plurality further. Many articles have been published on pedagogical initiatives, program geneses, and academic genres across borders, but there has been less sustained engagement with scholarly monographs published in languages other than English. By this I do not simply mean traditional book reviews (which are largely absent, too, from the *Journal of Academic Writing*). I refer instead to article-length reviews that situate new scholarly works within larger disciplinary developments in a given region. Horner, NeCamp, and Donahue argue that translingual research demands 'changes in the conduct of current scholarship, the venues for scholarly distribution, and the preparation of scholars' (2011: 288). Building on their call for more book reviews (2011: 290) and new research methods, I propose with this article a new genre within transnational research—the *translingual review*. More comprehensive than the traditional book review, the translingual review uses the edited or authored monograph as a primary source for theorizing the distinctness of disciplinary cultures and their socio-institutional contexts. It requires us to translate excerpts from important works of scholarship and position them within local and transnational frameworks to make their significance legible to others. The translingual review—as a textual ethnography—invites us to privilege thickly descriptive analysis in order to grapple with diverse writing cultures. The traditional book review as a genre is simply too short to facilitate this kind of cultural work.

In this article I focus on Stephanie Dreyfürst and Nadja Sennewald's edited volume *Schreiben: Grundlagentexte zur Theorie, Didaktik und Beratung* (*Writing: Foundational Texts on Theory, Pedagogy, and Consultations*) (2014) as a case study of contemporary debates about the state of writing research in Germany, Switzerland, Austria, and Liechtenstein at this pivotal moment of its development. After establishing the historical context that gave rise to the collection, I synthesize the individual chapters, paying particularly close attention to the early sections of the book that theorize the practices, institutional contexts, and disciplinary debates important to writing center work in the region. Later chapters are summarized more succinctly because they extend this knowledge to point to new directions in the field. Throughout the translingual review, I adopt a comparative approach, attending to how German-language scholarship advances and differentiates itself from North American research, particularly in its uses of writing process theories. The conclusion highlights the new questions that such transnational research enables us to ask.

From the Early Idea of a Writing Center to Its Maturation: The Recent Development of Writing Centers in Germany, Switzerland, Austria, and Liechtenstein

Writing centers are experiencing tremendous growth in German-speaking countries. Since the founding in Bielefeld of the first writing center outside North America in 1993 (Frank, Haacke and Tente 2003), the number of centers in Germany has increased exponentially, from a few dozen active centers several years ago (Grieshammer, Liebetanz, Peters and Zegenhagen 2013: 276) to over sixty writing centers by 2012 (Lahm 2014). Neighboring Switzerland, also an early adopter, is now home to at least six writing centers (The Writing Center Directory 2014) and Austria to ten (GeWissS n.d.). While Liechtenstein currently has no registered writing center, Roman Banzer of the University of Liechtenstein has served on the boards of EATAW and the European Writing Centers Association (EWCA) and been active in developing writing pedagogies in the region.

---

[1] All translations from German into English are my own.

This institutional growth has been accompanied by a steady rise in professionalization. The Swiss *Forum wissenschaftliches Schreiben* [Forum for Academic Writing] was founded in 2005 to address 'writing at the university' and the Austrian organization *GewissS: Gesellschaft für wissenschaftliches Schreiben* [Society for Academic Writing] followed in 2009 to foster research, teaching, and professional development around writing pedagogies and writing competences in higher education (Forum n.d.). *In 2013, an interdisciplinary group of writing professionals (*WPs)[2] founded the *Gesellschaft für Schreibdidaktik und Schreibforschung* (the Society for Writing Pedagogy and Research) in Göttingen, Germany 'to promote writing pedagogy in higher education, in research, in practice, [and] in professional development through networks and exchange' (Gesellschaft 2016). The Society settled on a common term— writing studies (*Schreibwissenschaft*)—to characterize the research conducted by its diverse practitioners. Writing studies, according to the organization's website, encompasses the study of 'writing processes (writing research) and the facilitation and support of writing processes (writing didactics research, applied writing studies)' (Gesellschaft 2016). With this definition the organization brings under one umbrella those scholars whose disciplinary identities are more grounded in applied linguistics and didactics and those who are more closely affiliated with Anglo-American traditions in writing research. The definition is likewise broad enough to account for the diverse institutional positions of its members. Nearly half the Society's constituents are freelance writing consultants who work outside universities or who work at universities as outsiders. Others inhabit professional staff, peer tutor, or faculty roles at postsecondary institutions often (but not always) within writing centers.

Each of these organizations asserts a regional disciplinary identity and is the outgrowth of years of member involvement in transnational organizations like the EWCA and EATAW, which began publishing the *Journal of Academic Writing* in 2011.[3] Writing center directors have played leadership roles in these organizations, giving them an opportunity to place writing center practice and research at the center of professional conversations about writing (see Scott 2016).

In the early stages of writing centers' development in the region, professional activity focused mostly on practice. Handbooks on process-oriented writing pedagogies dominated the market as writing centers adapted theory to local contexts (e.g., Bräuer 1996, Bräuer 1998, Kruse 1993). Since 2001, when Gerd Bräuer established the region's first writing center based on a peer tutoring model, attention has shifted to developing and professionalizing peer tutor training. Bräuer developed a certificate program for writing coaches in 2003, where Girgensohn was a participant before founding her own influential center staffed by peer tutors in Frankfurt Oder in 2007 (Bräuer and Girgensohn 2012). To prepare professionals for the challenges of institutionalizing writing pedagogies at their universities, Girgensohn and Franziska Liebetanz developed a certificate program in 2011 in partnership with an international consortium on 'Writing Center Work and Literacy Management', which is now facilitated by a team of established writing professionals (Girgensohn and Liebetanz 2012). Another important milestone was the publication of the first German tutor handbook in 2012 to critical acclaim (Beyer 2014, Grieshammer et al. 2013). As peer tutoring has spread, writing center directors

---

[2] I am using the term "writing professionals" (WPs) to designate those engaged in writing research and pedagogies informed by writing center research but not limited to it. Anne Ellen Geller and Harry Denny use the term writing center professionals to 'be inclusive of all individuals working in a professional capacity directing and acting as leadership in writing centers' who occupy a range of "both/and" position configurations—administrative and faculty (Geller and Denny 2013: 98-99). While writing professionals in the region may occupy "both/and" positions, they are unique in that many of them conduct writing consultations outside the institutional context of the writing center, working as freelancers and professionals. It is also worth noting that in Germany, for example, some writing centers are affiliated with departments or centers outside literary studies (e.g., second language acquisition, political science, centers dedicated to teaching and learning, and so on). This is a notable departure from the norm in the U.S.

[3] *Forum wissenschaftliches Schreiben* envisions itself as an independent affiliate of EATAW and *GewissS* as a partner of *Forum* and the *Gesellschaft*.

are now turning their attention to quality control, including generating standards for effective tutor education (Bausch et al. 2016) and establishing a common certificate program (Gesellschaft 2016).

Meanwhile, peer tutors—and recent peer tutor alumni—have played active roles at nearly every level of the field. The rapid institutionalization of peer tutoring has led to the increased involvement of students in professional activities across Europe. In partnership with academic staff, in 2010 peer tutors founded the first peer-reviewed journal on writing center theory and practice, *JoSch: Journal der Schreibberatung (JoWri: Journal of Writing Consultations)*. Since 2016, it is published by the well-established press W. Bertelsmann and is now the official journal of the Society for Writing Pedagogy and Research. *JoSch* is designed to encourage mentoring and intellectual exchange around writing center work. Peer tutors are involved in other ways as well. Not only do they now facilitate consultations, writing groups, and writing workshops in centers across the region, they have organized their own annual conferences in Germany since 2008, have participated regularly in peer tutor days in Europe, and have served as representatives on the boards of the Society and EWCA.

This enthusiasm for writing centers and peer tutoring has been accompanied by a surge in scholarship. *Zeitschrift Schreiben* (Journal of Writing) was founded in Switzerland in 2006 and remains a major vehicle for publishing German-language research on writing center work and writing pedagogies. The past ten years have also seen the arrival of the first dissertations in writing studies (e.g., Breuer 2015, Girgensohn 2007, Karsten 2014)—thanks in part to the active and growing presence of mentors in the field. Forthcoming and recent publications speak to the vitality of the discipline, covering a wide range of issues from establishing writing fellows programs at German universities (Kirschbaum 2015, Kirschbaum and Liebetanz 2016, Liebetanz et al. forthcoming) to multimodality in academic writing (Archer and Breuer 2015) to multilingual academic writing (Brinkschulte et al. 2015). It is perhaps an understatement to describe the field as vibrant, interdisciplinary, and well-networked within and beyond Europe.

Stephanie Dreyfürst and Nadja Sennewald's edited collection *Schreiben: Grundlagentexte zur Theorie, Didaktik und Beratung* (*Writing: Foundational Texts on Theory, Pedagogy, and Consultations;* hereafter referred to as *Schreiben*) was published in Germany in fall 2014 amidst this flurry of professional activity. The 455-page volume plays an important role in forging a disciplinary identity around writing studies in the region by gathering its foundational texts into one volume. The editors include German-language research that has helped define writing center practice, as well as Anglo-American theory widely cited and applied in centers during the last twenty-five years. When the editors began querying colleagues on listservs, they realized another gap in the literature: research had not always kept up with practice, so they commissioned established scholars Gerd Bräuer, Otto Kruse, and Gabriela Ruhmann to write articles synthesizing influential practices and theories (2014: 9). The volume makes this research—both German and Anglo-American—more accessible to tutors and academic staff by gathering it into one place and presenting it in their L1 (2014: 9). It also fills a need for a German-language textbook that allows participants in tutor education programs to encounter writing research first-hand (as opposed to relying on guidebooks to synthesize sources for students). The co-editors do not claim to have compiled anything as settled as a "canon" of texts, leaving out completely, for example, the rich scholarly debate on multilingual writing, but they do argue explicitly for the didactic potential of such anthologies to define and articulate disciplinary terrain. 'As a relatively new discipline,' they claim, 'we would be well advised in applied writing studies and writing pedagogy to agree on our own basic principles, on our own terminology, and on possible (both shared and individual) goals' (2014: 9). Even their choice of publishers facilitates this goal of discipline-building: UTB Press specializes in affordable disciplinary primers in a variety of fields.

If Dreyfürst and Sennewald translate their understanding of the field for their readers, this translingual review performs an act of reverse translation, recounting what Dreyfürst and Sennewald—with input from their colleagues—have chosen to include and what these choices reveal about key debates in writing research in the region. Their focus on applied writing studies and writing pedagogy positions the book in a transnational tradition of writing center scholarship influenced by Anglo-American traditions and research conducted in Germany, Switzerland, Austria, and Liechtenstein.

Schreiben: The Anthology as Agent of Discipline-Building

Schreiben presents itself to readers as a disciplinary primer—a move that situates the monograph in writing research that reflects on what the field knows collectively and how this accumulated knowledge can be communicated to others (e.g., Adler-Kassner and Wardle 2015, Malenczyk 2013). Structured around six core questions, the volume orients newcomers to key concepts in the field, while giving insiders opportunities to take stock of shared understandings:

> [1.] *What models exist to describe the writing process?* [.... 2.] *What does writing competence encompass and how can it be facilitated?* [.... 3.] *How do writing blocks develop and how can they be resolved?* [.... 4.] *What are the various approaches to writing consultations and what is their theoretical foundation?* [.... 5.] *What are the responsibilities of writing centers and what conceptual models underpin them?* [.... And 6.] *What is the influence of collaborative learning on the development of competencies in tutees and tutors?* (*Schreiben* 2014: 10, emphasis in original).

These questions point to distinct features of writing center scholarship in the region: the importance of process-oriented research to everyday practice and the impact of the recent reorganization of European universities around accountability and transferrable credits and degrees. Writing competence, as I will explain later, is identified as a key competency at many universities, meaning there are new incentives to teach it explicitly. And teaching writing competence, the book suggests, begins with teaching the writing process.

Schreiben's sustained focus on writing process knowledge can be traced back to distinct institutional contexts. This context needs to be understood before the book's individual chapters can be appreciated. Process-oriented pedagogies were newer and particularly relevant to the German educational system because of its traditional emphasis on independent research and lack—until recently—of a culture of teaching those genres in the classroom. Andrea Frank, Stefanie Haacke, and Christina Tente of the Bielefeld Writing Lab, the first writing center established outside North America, identify their center's early mission as twofold: training faculty to make the teaching of writing in the disciplines an explicit part of department curricula and providing writing consultations and workshops for students to equip them with knowledge of the writing process (Frank, Haacke and Tente 2003: 167). They agree with WPs Kruse and Jakobs (1999) and Ruhmann (1996) that, in addition to an insufficient understanding of the genres of academic writing, 'inadequate knowledge about the writing process' was at the core of students' struggles with writing at German universities because students 'fail to distinguish between the different stages of text production, trying to work concurrently on steps belonging to different stages of the writing process, […] thereby overtaxing themselves' (Frank, Haacke and Tente 2003: 170). Focusing on consultations on writing process knowledge was also a way that writing centers could avoid turf wars with faculty. Consultations focused largely on the writing process with professional tutors trained to 'draw the line very precisely between advice regarding the subject or content and advice pertaining to the writing process' (2003: 171). Frank, Haacke, and Lahm's writing pedagogy guidebook *Writing Competences: Academic and Professional Writing* (2013)—based on the Bielefeld model—defines its objective as helping students 'reflect on their past approaches to writing and expand their repertoire' of strategies for 'organizing the complex process of writing and composing texts with intentionality' (Frank, Haacke and Lahm 2013: 1). The first over one hundred pages may be characterized as applied writing process research (2013: 8-110).

This early history helps explain why writing centers in the region traditionally define their expertise as writing process expertise as opposed to peer tutoring expertise, as is the case in the U.S. (e.g., Brooks 1991, Harris 1995, Trimbur 1987). Muriel Harris, the most frequently cited author in the *Writing Center Journal* (*WCJ*) from 1980 until 2009 (Lerner 2014: 86), and the most ardent defender of peer tutoring, is never mentioned in the German contributions in *Schreiben,* despite the book's transatlantic approach. By contrast, writing process scholars like Linda Flower, John R. Hayes, and Mike Rose make frequent appearances. With the exception of Flower between 1985 and 1989, none of these scholars has ever risen to the top five most

frequently cited authors of *WCJ* (Lerner 2014: 85). And while research on the writing process is still summarized in its own chapter in some tutor handbooks in the U.S. (e.g., Fitzgerald and Ianetta 2015, Gillespie and Lerner 2008), it has fallen out of fashion on this side of the Atlantic (Scott 2014). In *Schreiben* the writing process gets at least 150 pages of attention and is part of a transatlantic research tradition that remains vibrant in German-speaking countries (e.g., Heine 2014, Keseling 2004, Knorr 2014, Ortner 2000, Ruhmann 2014).

Schreiben, as a collection, reflects this trend. The goal of part one is to orient readers to foundational research on the writing process. It begins with a survey essay by Ruhmann and Kruse. In 'Process-Oriented Writing Pedagogy: Principles, Practical Approaches, Perspectives,' Ruhmann and Kruse build on their co-authored 2006 article to survey the history of North American cognitive approaches to the writing process, while contextualizing the further development of this research in German-language scholarship and pedagogies. Whereas in the U.S. process-oriented research is perceived to be at odds with genre-based approaches to writing instruction, they remind readers this hasn't been the case in Germany, where writing centers like the one co-founded by Ruhmann and Frank in Bielefeld have always used a wide variety of process-based strategies for teaching writing in the disciplines (2014: 23). The essay helps disciplinary newcomers understand the history of writing process research, from cognitive approaches in the 1980s to the "social turn" of the 1990s, giving them a lens for understanding the value and limitations of the canonical research included in this section: Linda Flower and John Hayes' 'A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing' (1981), John Haye's 'A New Framework for Understanding Cognition and Affect in Writing' (1996), an excerpt from Carl Bereiter and Marlene Scardamalia's *The Psychology of Written Composition* (1987), and Carl Bereiter's 'Development in Writing' (1980). All but the latter appear here in German translation for the first time—though they have widely informed writing center practice in the region.

If Ruhmann and Kruse emphasize the usefulness of both cognitive and social approaches to teaching the writing process, they also recount the influence of the German educational system—and recent European reforms—on local writing pedagogies. Teaching writing, they argue, was initially viewed with skepticism by German universities, dismissed as too expensive and complex to implement (2014: 29). However, the poor results of the 2000 PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment) study on literacy in German schools shifted this thinking, triggering the perception of what Bräuer calls elsewhere a 'Why-Hans-can't read' literacy crisis that renewed interest in the process-oriented pedagogies of writing centers (Bräuer 2002: 68). Furthermore, the Bologna Reforms transformed the traditional research missions of German universities into a model emphasizing student-centered teaching. Universities across Europe were suddenly mandated to create learning outcomes in order to make credits transferrable between institutions and ensure that degrees would be recognized as equal across borders (Ruhmann and Kruse 2014: 15). Since the early 1990s, German universities were encouraged to teach writing as a core competence. The implementation of the Bologna Reforms in the 2000s helped mainstream the creation of courses, writing consultations, and writing groups (2014: 16-17). The controversial 'excellence initiatives' ('*Exzellenzinitiative*') in Germany, which resulted in the first ranking system whereby research universities could compete for classification as 'excellent' if they met specific criteria, bolstered initiatives to support writing pedagogies in doctoral programs. Facilitating competency in writing was perceived as a means of preparing doctoral students for productive careers as scholars (2014: 30).

These moves have positioned writing centers as important institutional partners in both the research and new teaching and learning missions of the university. The creation of government funding like the *Qualitätspakt Lehre* (Quality Pact for Teaching), funded by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF), has provided seed funding that is partially responsible for almost doubling the number of writing centers in Germany since 2012 ('Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung' n.d., Lahm 2014). Writing process pedagogies are poised, Ruhmann and Kruse argue, to deepen learning in the disciplines because they prepare students not to simply 'accept and imitate field-specific modes of research and communication as disciplinary conventions, but rather to engage reflectively with their actualization while writing and thus to gain greater autonomy over the composition of discipline-specific texts' (Ruhmann and Kruse 2014: 30).

Throughout the article, Ruhmann and Kruse emphasize that local and European higher education cultures influence the delivery of writing. If composition began to replace rhetoric in nineteenth-century American classrooms (creating first-year composition with all its attendant problems), writing pedagogy in Germany was hindered by a different set of circumstances. Humboldt's early nineteenth-century school reforms were based on an arhetorical pedagogy that emphasized content over form (2014: 16). Ideas were believed to be more important than their representation in language. This perspective was coupled with an approach to university writing that revolved around the *Seminararbeit* as the primary means of socializing students into their disciplines. As Macgilchrist and Girgensohn argue elsewhere, the 6,000-12,000-word genre poses challenges to writers entering a new discourse community: 'where in North America or the UK it is common for Bachelor students to revel in writing an essay "overnight," in Germany, it was common for Diplom or Magister students to discuss the "months" they had spent on a *Hausarbeit*' during the long semester breaks when such papers typically are written, they argue (Macgilchrist and Girgensohn 2011: 6). Students' inability to navigate the demands of these assignments was presumed to be a cause for their high attrition rates.

If part one of *Schreiben* establishes writing process research as central to the field, part two focuses on how to help students develop writing competencies within the region's university systems. In their opening article 'Writing Competency in Degree Programs: Components, Models, and Assessment' Kruse and Madalina Chitez offer a definition of writing competency and theorize models for its instruction. Since the *Seminararbeit* is a Germanic genre privileging the 'reproduction of texts and the integration of summaries into the writer's own representation structure,' writing competencies can be defined, they argue, as strategies in reading, synthesizing, organizing, and citing sources (Kruse and Chitez 2014: 109). The two remaining articles conceptualize how this disciplinary expertise can be developed and include Ronald T. Kellogg's (2008) 'Training Writing Skills: A Cognitive Development Perspective,' originally published in the *Journal of Writing Research* and translated here into German for the first time, and Anne Beaufort's 'Adapting to New Writing Situations: How Writers Gain New Skills' (2005), in a reprinted translation. Kellogg argues that the cultivation of writing competency is a long-term process, taking about twenty years before the writer transitions from a 'knowledge-telling' to a 'knowledge-transforming' to a 'knowledge-crafting' stage. Beaufort takes a similarly long view, presenting her widely cited model of expertise based on five knowledge domains. The article debunks the popular myth that university writing courses can single-handedly prepare students for professional writing after graduation, a presumption that the Bologna Accords—with their emphasis on career-readiness—make deceptively attractive.

Sennewald's contribution, 'Writing Strategies: An Overview,' is likely to be of particular interest to readers outside the region because it presents research largely unknown elsewhere. She synthesizes the findings of Hanspeter Ortner, an Austrian linguist whose 644-page study of the writing processes of almost 6,000 writers of literature and philosophy has been cited and adapted in nearly every influential handbook on writing pedagogy in the region (e.g., Frank, Haacke and Lahm 2013: 9-11, Girgensohn 2007: 68-70, Girgensohn and Sennewald 2012: 116-118, Grieshammer et al. 2013: 29-43, Keseling 2004: 160-172, Kruse 1993, 2007: 41-45, Scheuermann 2011: 9-30, 2013: 51-60). Despite its widespread influence, no article-length representation of the research has existed until now. By analyzing self-reports, Ortner arrives at a typology of ten 'types of writers' ('*Schreibtypen*'), which represent exaggerated versions of 'writing strategies' (*'Schreibstrategien'*), defined as routines writers engage during the composing process (Sennewald 2014: 169). Sennewald asserts these strategies help writers learn how to adapt their writing to specific rhetorical situations and genres, while giving them alternative tools to test if they find their usual strategies unsuccessful (2014: 188). Ortner's typology, she concludes, 'renders intelligible the individuality and diversity of possible modes of working,' empowering students to understand that 'there is no "one right way" of working as a writer' (2014: 187) despite what an advisor or teacher might say. The self-reflective tool is practical, empirically based, and individualized in its approach—which likely accounts for its widespread use.

Writing consultations are envisioned as a means of facilitating writing process knowledge in the next two parts of *Schreiben*: part three on writing problems and part four on writing consultations. The former opens with an excerpt from Mike Rose's (1984) famous study of writing blocks and a commissioned essay by Keith Hjortshoj, author of *Understanding Writing*

Blocks (2001) and a writing program administrator at the John S. Knight Institute for Writing in the Disciplines, which provided an early model for the Writing Lab in Bielefeld. It concludes with Gisbert Keseling's (2004) widely cited essay 'Overcoming Writer's Block,' which extends Ortner's typology to describe five 'types of writer's block' ('*Schreibstörungstypen'*) among scholarly writers. Based on his analysis of protocols of the practices of fifteen academics working in the Marburg Writing Lab, Keseling develops a system for diagnosing and treating writer's block. In his article, he presents a series of self-assessment tools that allow writers to become more aware of their writing processes and discover strategies for addressing the particular and often concurrent reasons for their blocks.

After showcasing in part three how writing process research informs consultation practices, part four of *Schreiben* turns to the range of approaches to tutoring developed in the region. By focusing exclusively on German-language scholarship to conceptualize the very cornerstone of writing center practice, Dreyfürst and Sennewald highlight the field's arrival as a discipline. The first article is penned by Bräuer, a prolific and respected writing center director who left his position as a professor of German at Emory University to help develop the field in Germany and Switzerland. In 'Foundational Principles of Writing Consultations: A Pragmatic Perspective on Writing Process Theory,' he draws on systematic practitioner knowledge to theorize six key terms important to writing center work (2014: 257): 1.) 'writing development,' conceptualized according to Kellogg's notion of writing expertise, 2.) 'writing ability,' which he defines as the 'current competence of a person to compose a text that is more or less effective for readers' (2014: 260) 3.) knowledge of 'writer type' ('*Schreibertyp*'), which (echoing Ortner) involves an awareness of individual writing processes and how to facilitate them with effective strategies (2014: 262-263); 4.) 'text production,' defined as an understanding of the factors influencing text production, including the writing assignment, writing strategies, writing to learn techniques, genre knowledge, and source use (2014: 263-266), 5.) knowledge of how to navigate challenges in the writing process, including inhibitions and blocks (2014: 267-268), and finally 6.) 'writing as reflective practice,' which involves consultants motivating writers to document and reflect on their writing processes in the interest of producing texts (2014: 268-269). Bräuer then clarifies definitions of the writing consultation, distinguishing between 'writing consultations' ('*Schreibberatung*'), 'writing coaching' ('*Schreib-Coaching'*) and 'text feedback between peers' ('*Textfeedback zwischen Peers*') (2014: 269-270).

Ulrike Lange and Maike Wiethoff pick up where Bräuer leaves off, theorizing a tension between the practices of writing coaches and writing consultants. In 'Systemic Writing Consultations,' Lange and Wiethoff highlight a divide between those who conceptualize conferences in Rogerian terms (as person-centered and non-directive) and those who focus on more systemic, solution-oriented approaches to writing consultations (2014: 283). Lange and Wiethoff aim to bridge this divide, arguing for a 'close connection between systems theory and writing consultation practices' (2014: 283). By theorizing a systems approach to consultations, they argue for the affinities between the 'institutional conditions of university writing consultations and contemporary concepts in educational psychology in the scholarship of teaching and learning' (2014: 283).

In 'Intercultural Competence in Writing Consultations' Nadine Stahlberg, too, invites readers to take a broader view of writing center work. Scholarship on intercultural competence highlights the effects of cultural contexts on writing consultations. The internationalization of German universities, Stahlberg claims, prompts the need for tutor training in intercultural competence because both tutor and tutee 'act out of their own cultural understanding and out of different culturally specific expectations' yet each is likely to assume the other is coming from the same place, which can lead to miscommunications (2014: 303). Stahlberg's article conceptualizes intercultural competence in the writing consultation and proposes materials for use in tutor training programs. These materials include case studies of intercultural miscommunications likely to occur in sessions, self-evaluation tools for tutors to reflect on how their cultural backgrounds may inform their understandings of teaching and learning, particularly as they relate to writing, and questions that can be added to client report forms to invite L2 tutors to self-assess how effectively they have navigated intercultural contexts (2014: 315-17).

In 'Online Writing Consultations: A New Field for (Peer) Tutoring,' Dreyfürst, Sascha Dieter, and Dennis Fassing (2014) offer a different approach to globalizing the writing center. Their article

reviews North American scholarship on synchronous writing consultations to make a case for the potential of digital tutoring, which currently exists at only a handful of German centers using mostly video conference calls during normal hours of operation (2014: 324). While they acknowledge that many new writing centers won't prioritize such initiatives given their more pressing concerns (2014: 323), they advocate for the potential of online synchronous consultations to familiarize students with diverse methods of feedback, support 'autonomous writing groups' (Girgensohn 2007) in new ways and offer online forms of blended learning to complement in-class lectures (Dreyfürst, Dieter and Fassing 2014: 334). Online synchronous consultations may help increase the accessibility of writing centers in German-speaking countries because they tend to be open only on weekdays from mornings until late afternoons (2014: 324).

Part five extends this German-language scholarship on writing center consultations by theorizing and defining the responsibilities of writing centers. The section opens with influential North American scholarship only to complicate it in later contributions. It begins with Stephen M. North's 'The Idea of a Writing Center' (1984), which makes palpable, as Ella Grieshammer and Nora Peters put it in their contribution, that writing centers are '*indeed* an innovative concept that departs from much that's anchored firmly in German university culture' (Grieshammer and Peter 2014: 443). It is followed by an excerpt from North's 'Revisiting the Idea of a Writing Center,' and Clark's 'Addressing Genre in the Writing Center' (1999), before Girgensohn takes over the reins.

In 'Collaboration and Autonomy: How Peer Tutors Advance Writing Center Work,' Girgensohn recounts findings from a year-long study conducted in the U.S. on leadership models in successful writing centers.[4] Drawing on their more established histories, she sought to gather information on how WPs could avoid common 'mistakes' and 'detours' during the still early stage of the development of writing centers in Germany (Girgensohn 2014: 383). From her extended stays and transcribed interviews at sixteen writing centers, she uses a grounded theory approach to conceptualize successful leadership styles, manifested in directors who are 'attentive, astute observers,' who 'create opportunities for interaction,' who 'encourage a playful, humorous atmosphere,' who 'value the contributions of others,' who 'develop individual talent,' who 'provide professional development opportunities,' who 'exercise forethought without following rigid plans,' and who 'share responsibilities and authority' (2014: 383). Her study establishes how collaborative learning and respect for the autonomy of the writer can be expanded outward into a collaborative leadership style that encourages the cultivation of student agency through autonomous writing groups that strengthen tutors' self-efficacy as writers, portfolios that allow them to determine their own learning goals for their training, and opportunities for tutors to become involved in leading the center (2014: 382). This very emphasis on autonomy—and Girgensohn's tremendous respect for the creativity and resourcefulness of tutors—has helped distinguish the writing center at the European University Viadrina as one of the most innovative in the region since its founding in 2007. Girgensohn has also been a longtime vocal advocate for redefining writing centers as locations of inquiry (Girgensohn and Peters 2012), arguing that 'research is the best way to establish oneself as a scholarly institution' (Girgensohn 2014: 386). She practices what she preaches by cultivating a research profile that has helped put her center on the map and secure permanent funding for its operations.

Schreiben brings its discipline-building agenda full circle with its final section, which explores the impact of tutoring on student learning. It opens with influential North American research on the issue: Kenneth A. Bruffee's 'Peer Tutoring and the "Conversation of Mankind"' (1995) and Bradley Hughes, Paula Gillespie, and Harvey Kail's 'What They Take with Them: Findings from the Peer Writing Tutor Alumni Research Project' (2010). These contributions are directly followed by 'Peer Tutoring as a Learning Experience: A Report,' an article by former peer tutors Simone Tschirpke and Lisa Breford that offers anecdotal evidence that the study's findings are also applicable in Europe. Tschirpke and Breford report gaining transferable skills as peer tutors, including 'the ability to give constructive feedback, to negotiate between different

---

[4] An earlier version of the article was published in volume two of *Journal of Academic Writing* (Girgensohn 2012).

positions, to adapt quickly to new (conversation) situations, and to work effectively in a team' (2014: 430). In 'Peer Tutoring: Answers for Skeptics,' Grieshammer and Peters build on earlier research published in the first issue of the *Journal of Academic Writing* to provide WPs with a template for responding to the most common forms of skepticism about writing centers from stakeholders (Grieshammer and Peters 2011). While much of this criticism (alas) will be familiar to WPs everywhere, their responses point to some particularities of tutoring in the region. For example, in response to faculty concerns about tutor expertise and turf, Grieshammer and Peters emphasize that writing tutors are experts on the *writing process* not content (2014: 439)—as opposed to U.S.-based theories that see tutors as experts in *tutoring*. This point is interesting because it shows how North American research on the writing process has been appropriated and extended in local research traditions to contribute to the creation of alternative disciplinary identities.

Conclusion

In the diversity of its contributions, Dreyfürst and Sennewald's *Schreiben* encapsulates the vitality of the discipline in the region. Its ultimate legacy will depend on how readers—many of whom are likely to be peer tutors and new directors—choose to advance this conversation in their centers. But the volume also raises questions fruitful to transnational research conducted anywhere. What might a systematic investigation of citation practices reveal about the genealogy of writing center research in distinct regions around the world? How might such studies offer insight into how writing studies scholarship is appropriated, extended, or ignored as it migrates across national borders through presentations and publications? If strands of U.S.-based research continue to exercise influence in some regions, to what extent might the reception of these theories, which some U.S.-based scholars view skeptically as 'lore' (e.g., Driscoll and Wynn Perdue 2012), enhance or block the development of new directions in the field?

Research needs to cross linguistic borders to remain attuned to our networked, global field. This is something U.S.-based writing research is slow in understanding. In a recent issue of *WCJ*, Neal Lerner laments the 'small town' feel of research published in the field's flagship journal during the past thirty years. Scholars rely, he claims, on a small set of 'insider' readings that 'affirm established beliefs and run the risk of casting the field as largely talking to itself' (Lerner 2014: 68). International research can directly challenge this 'unpromising present' (2014: 69) of writing center research by directing our attention to a plurality of presences. European scholars have long since recognized the value of this approach, which is exemplified in Dreyfürst and Sennewald's *Schreiben*. The collection includes thirteen translations of Anglo-American articles and twelve German-language contributions, many of which explore the limitations and uses of U.S.-based research. In doing so, the editors have actualized what remains a utopian call on the other side of the Atlantic: they have used international research to 'adapt, resituate, [and] perhaps decenter our contexts' in the field (Donahue 2009: 215).

References

Adler-Kassner, L. and Wardle, E. (eds.) (2015) *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts and Composition Studies*. Logan: Utah State University Press

Archer, A. and Breuer, E.O. (eds.) (2015) *Multimodality in Writing: The State of the Art in Theory, Methodology and Pedagogy*. Leiden: Brill

Bausch, A., Breuer, E., Grieshammer, E., Henkel, C., Lange, U., Limburg, A., Wiethoff, M., Schäfer, S., Schneider-Ludorff, A., Sennewald, N., and Zegenhagen, J. (2016) *Rahmenkonzept für Ausbildungen von Peer-Schreibtutor*innen*. [online] available from <http://www.schreibdidaktik.de/images/Downloads/RahmenkonzepPeerSchreibtutor_innenausbildg.pdf> [1 February 2017]

Bazerman, C., Dean, C., Early, J., Lunsford, K., Null, S., Rogers, P. and Stansell, A. (eds.) (2012) *International Advances in Writing Research: Cultures, Places, Measures*. Fort Collins: The WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press

Beaufort, A. (2005) 'Adapting to New Writing Situations: How Writers Gain New Skills'. in *Schreiben am Arbeitsplatz.* ed. by. Jakobs, E. M, Lehnen, K. and Schindler, K. Frankfurt am Main: Springer, 201-216

Bereiter, C. (1980) 'Development in Writing'. in *Cognitive Processes in Writing.* ed. by Lee, G. W. and Steinberg, E. R. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 73-93

Bereiter, C. and Scardamalia, M. (1987) *The Psychology of Written Composition*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Beyer, A. (2014) 'Grieshammer Et Al.: Zukunftsmodell Schreibberatung'. Review of Grieshammer, Ella, et al. *Zukunftsmodell Schreibberatung: Eine Anleitung zur Begleitung von Schreibenden im Studium. Zeitschrift Schreiben: Schreiben in Schule, Hochschule und Beruf* [online] 1-3. available from <https://zeitschrift-schreiben.eu/globalassets/zeitschrift-schreiben.eu/rezensionen/abe_rez_grieshammer2013.pdf> [2 June 2017]

Bräuer, G. (1996) *Warum Schreiben? Schreiben in den USA*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang

Bräuer, G. (1998) *Schreibend lernen: Grundlagen einer theoretischen und praktischen Schreibpädagogik*. Innsbruck: Studienverlag

Bräuer, G. (2002) 'Drawing Connections across Education: The Freiburg Writing Center Model'. *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines* 5 (3), 61-80

Bräuer, G. (2014) 'Grundprinzipien der Schreibberatung: Eine pragmatische Sicht auf die Schreibprozesstheorie'. in *Schreiben: Grundlagentexte zur Theorie, Didaktik und Beratung.* ed. by Dreyfürst, S. and Sennewald. N. Opladen: UTB, 257-282

Bräuer, G. and Girgensohn, K. (2012) 'Literacy Development Projects Initiating Institutional Change'. in *Writing Programs Worldwide: Profiles of Academic Writing in Many Places.* ed. by Thaiss, C., Bräuer, G., Carlino, P., Ganobcsik-Williams, L. and Sinha. A. Fort Collins: The WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press, 225-238

Breuer, E. (2015) *First Language versus Foreign Language: Fluency, Errors and Revision Processes in First Language and Foreign Language Writing*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang

Brinkschulte, M., Stoian, M-E. and Borges, E. (2015) 'Resource-focused Research for Multilingual Competence in Scientific Writing'. *Journal of Academic Writing* [online] 5 (1), 17-28. available from <http://e-learning.coventry.ac.uk/ojs/index.php/joaw/article/view/159/174> [18 March 2016]

Brooks, J. (1991) 'Minimalist Tutoring: Making the Student Do All the Work'. *Writing Lab Newsletter* 15 (6), 1-4

Bruffee, K. A. (1995) 'Peer Tutoring and the "Conversation of Mankind"'. in *Landmark Essays on Writing Centers.* ed. by Murphy, C. and Law, J. London: Routledge, 87-98

Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung. (n.d.) *Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung.* [online] available from <http://www.qualitaetspakt-lehre.de/en/index.php> [25 January 2015]

Canagarajah, S. (ed.) (2013) *Literacy as Translingual Practice: Between Communities and Classrooms*. New York: Routledge

Clark, I. L. (1999) 'Addressing Genre in the Writing Center'. *The Writing Center Journal* 20 (1), 7-32

Donahue, C. (2009) '"Internationalization" and Composition Studies: Reorienting the Discourse'. *College Composition and Communication* 61 (2), 212-243

Dreyfürst, S., Dieter, S. and Fassing, D. (2014) 'Online Schreibberatung: Ein neues Feld für das (Peer) Tutoring'. in *Schreiben: Grundlagentexte zur Theorie, Didaktik und Beratung.* ed. by Dreyfürst. S. and Sennewald, N. Opladen: UTB, 321-335

Dreyfürst, S. and Sennewald, N. (2014) *Schreiben: Grundlagentexte zur Theorie, Didaktik und Beratung* [*Writing: Foundational Texts on Theory, Pedagogy, and Consultations*]. Opladen: UTB

Driscoll, D. and Wynn Perdue, S. (2012) 'Theory, Lore, and More: An Analysis of Rad Research in *the Writing Center Journal,* 1980–2009'. *The Writing Center Journal* 32 (1), 11-39

Fitzgerald, L. and Ianetta, M. (2015) *Oxford Guide for Writing Tutors: Practice and Research*. New York: Oxford University Press

Flower, L. and Hayes, J. R. (1981) 'A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing'. *College Composition and Communication* 32 (4), 365-387

Frank, A., Haacke, S. and Lahm, S. (2013) *Schlüsselkompetenzen: Schreiben in Studium und Beruf.* 2nd edn. Weimar: Verlag J. B. Metzler

Frank, A., Haacke, S. and Tente, C. (2003) 'Contact, Conflicts, Cooperation: A Report from the Writing Lab of Bielefeld'. in *Teaching Academic Writing in European Higher Education.* ed. by Björk, L., Bräuer, G., Rienecker, L. and Stray Jörgensen, P. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 165-174

Forum wissenschaftliches Schreiben, e.V. (n.d.). *Forum wissenschaftliches Schreiben* [online] available from <http://www.forumschreiben.ch/ > [1 March 2016]

Geller, A. E. and Denny, H. (2013) 'Of Ladybugs, Low Status, and Loving the Job: Writing Center Professionals Navigating Their Careers'. *The Writing Center Journal* 33 (1), 96-129

Gesellschaft für Schreibdidaktik und Schreibforschung, e.V. (2016) *Gesellschaft für Schreibdidaktik und Schreibforschung.* [online] available from < http://www.schreibdidaktik.de/> [1 March 2016]

Gesellschaft für wissenschaftliches Schreiben, e.V. (2015). *GewissS.* [online] available from <http://www.gewisss.at/karte.html> [1 March 2016]

Gillespie, P. and Lerner, N. (2008) *The Longman Guide to Peer Tutoring.* 2nd edn. New York: Pearson Longman

Girgensohn, K. (2007) *Neue Wege zur Schlüsselqualifikation Schreiben: Autonome Schreibgruppen an der Hochschule.* Wiesbaden: Deutscher Universitäts-Verlag and VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften

Girgensohn, K. (2012) 'Mutual Growing: How Student Experience Can Shape Writing Centers'. *Journal of Academic Writing* [online] 2 (1), 127-137. available from <http://e-learning.coventry.ac.uk/ojs/index.php/joaw/article/view/68> [5 April 2015]

Girgensohn, K. (2014) 'Kollaboration und Autonomie: wie Peer Tutor*Innen die Schreibzentrumsarbeit fördern'. in *Schreiben: Grundlagentexte zur Theorie, Didaktik und Beratung.* ed. by Dreyfürst, S. and Sennewald, N. Opladen: UTB, 377-391

Girgensohn, K. and Liebetanz, F. (2012) 'Literacy Management: Zertifikatsverleihung des Schreibzentrums Frankfurt (Oder) im Schreibzentrum Frankfurt am Main'. in *Schreiben im Zentrum Europa Universität Viadrina Blog* [online] 21 September 2012. available from < https://schreibzentrum.wordpress.com/2012/09/24/literacy-management-zertifikatsverleihung-des-schreibzentrums-frankfurt-oder-im-schreibzentrum-frankfurt-am-main/> [15 March 2016]

Girgensohn, K. and Peters, N. (2012) '"At University Nothing Speaks Louder Than Research": Plädoyer für Schreibzentrumsforschung'. in *Zeitschrift Schreiben: Schreiben in Schule, Hochschule und Beruf* [online] 1-11. available from <http://www.zeitschrift-schreiben.eu/Beitraege/girgensohn_Schreibzentrumsforschung.pdf> [5 March 2015]

Girgensohn, K. and Sennewald, N. (2012) *Schreiben Lehren, Schreiben Lernen.* Darmstadt: WBG

Grieshammer, E., Liebetanz, F., Peters, N. and Zegenhagen, J. (2013) *Zukunftsmodell Schreibberatung: eine Anleitung zur Begleitung von Schreibenden im Studium.* Baltmannsweiler: Schneider Verlag Hohengehren

Grieshammer, E. and Peters, N. (2011) 'Fighting for Peer Tutoring in Writing: Learning How to Respond to Scepticism'. *Journal of Academic Writing* [online] 1 (1), 120-125. available from <http://e-learning.coventry.ac.uk/ojs/index.php/joaw/article/view/9/0> [15 December 2014]

Grieshammer, E. and Peters, N. (2014) 'Peer Tutoring: Antworten für Skeptiker'. *Schreiben: Grundlagentexte zur Theorie, Didaktik und Beratung.* ed. by Dreyfürst, S. and Sennewald, N. Opladen: UTB, 437-444

Harris, M. (1995) 'Talking in the Middle: Why Writers Need Writing Tutors'. *College English* 57 (1), 27-42

Hayes, J. R. (1996) 'A New Framework for Understanding Cognition and Affect in Writing'. in *The Science of Writing: Theories, Methods, Individual Differences, and Applications.* ed. by Levy, M. C. and Ransdell, S. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1-27

Heine, C., Engberg, J., Knorr, D. and Spielmann, D. (2014) 'New Methods of Text Production Process Research Combined'. in *Methods in Writing Process Research.* ed. by Knorr, D., Heine, C., and Engberg, J. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 123-146

Hjortshoj, K. (2001) *Understanding Writing Blocks*. New York: Oxford University Press

Horner, B. and Kopelson, K. (eds.) (2014) *Reworking English in Rhetoric and Composition: Global Interrogations, Local Interventions*. Logan: Utah State University Press

Horner, B., NeCamp, S. and Donahue, C. (2011) 'Toward a Multilingual Composition Scholarship: From English Only to a Translingual Norm'. *College Composition and Communication* 63 (2), 269-300

Hughes, B., Gillespie, P. and Kail, H. (2010) 'What They Take with Them: Findings from the Peer Writing Tutor Alumni Research Project'. *Writing Center Journal,* 30 (2) 12-46

Karsten, A. (2014) *Schreiben im Blick: Schriftliche Formen der sprachlichen Tätigkeit aus dialogischer Perspektive.* Berlin: Lehmanns Media

Kearns, J. and Turner, B. (2015) 'An International Discourse Community, an Internationalist Perspective: Reading EATAW Conference Programs, 2001-2011'. *Journal of Academic Writing* [online] 5 (1), 1-16. available from <http://e-learning.coventry.ac.uk/ojs/index.php/joaw/article/view/137> [5 July 2015]

Kei Matsuda, P. and Silva, T. (eds.) (2010) *Practicing Theory in Second Language Writing*. Anderson: Parlor Press

Kellogg, R. T. (2008) 'Training Writing Skills: A Cognitive Development Perspective'. *Journal of Writing Research* 1 (1), 1-26

Keseling, G. (2004) *Die Einsamkeit des Schreibers: Wie Schreibblockaden entstehen und erfolgreich bearbeitet werden können.* Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften

Kirschbaum, A. (2015) 'Drei Semester als Writing Fellow: Ein Erfahrungsbericht'. *JoSch: Journal der Schreibberatung* [online] 1, 71-77. available from <https://www.wbv.de/journals/zeitschriften/josch > [18 March 2016]

Kirschbaum, A. and Liebetanz, F. (2016) **'**Schreiben fördern—aber wie? Writing Fellows in der Fachlehre'. *Interkulturalität und Wissensvermittlung an Hochschulen: Didaktischer Umgang mit Differenzen.* ed. by Balfanz, A. And Choluj, B. Frankfurt an der Oder and Slubice: Lehrstuhl für deutsch-polnische Literaturbeziehungen und Gender Studies, 119-128

Knorr, D., Heine, C., and Engberg, J. (eds.) (2014) *Methods in Writing Process Research*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang

Kruse, O. (1993) *Keine Angst vor dem leeren Blatt: ohne Schreibblockaden durchs Studium.* Frankfurt am Main: Campus

Kruse, O. and Jakobs, E.-M. (1999) 'Schreiben lehren an der Hochschule: ein Überblick'. in *Schlüsselkompetenz Schreiben: Konzepte, Methoden, Projekte für Schreibberatung und Schreibdidaktik an der Hochschule.* ed. by Kruse, O., Jakobs, E.-M. and Ruhmann, G. Neuwied: Luchterhand, 19-34

Kruse, O. and Ruhmann, G. (2006) 'Prozessorientierte Schreididaktik: Eine Einführung'. *Prozessorientierte Schreibdidaktik: Schreibtraining für Schule, Studium und Beruf.* ed. by Kruse, O., Berger, K., and Ulmi, M. Bern: Haupt, 13-35

Lahm, S. (2014) 'Stories We Live By: A Review of 20 Years Writing Center Work at German Universities'. *Conference of the European Writing Centers Association.* held 19-22 July 2014 at the European University Viadrina, Frankfurt Oder, Germany

Lange, U. and Wiethoff, M. (2014) 'Systemische Schreibberatung'. in *Schreiben: Grundlagentexte zur Theorie, Didaktik und Beratung.* ed. by Dreyfürst, S. and Sennewald, N. Opladen: UTB, 283-299

Lerner, N. (2014) 'The Unpromising Present of Writing Center Studies: Author and Citation Patterns in *the Writing Center Journal*, 1980 to 2009'. *The Writing Center Journal* 34 (1), 67-97

Liebetanz, F., Voigt, A., and Dreyfürst, S. (forthcoming) *Das Writing Fellow-Programm: Ein Praxishandbuch zum Schreiben im Fach*. Bielefeld: WBV Verlag.

Macgilchrist, F. and Girgensohn, K. (2011) 'Humboldt Meets Bologna: Developments and Debates in Institutional Writing Support in Germany'. *Canadian Journal for Studies in Discourse and Writing* 23 (1), 1-19

Malenczyk, R. (2013) 'Introduction, with Some Rhetorical Terms'. in *A Rhetoric for Writing Program Administrators.* ed. by Malenczyk, R. Anderson: Parlor Press, 3-8

Martins, D. S. (ed.) (2014) *Transnational Writing Program Administration*. Logan: Utah State University Press

Moser, B. (2015). 'Found in Translation'. *The New York Times* [online] 7 July 2015. available from <http://www.nytimes.com/2015/07/08/opinion/found-in-translation.html?_r=0> [2 June 2017]

North, S. M. (1984) 'The Idea of a Writing Center'. *College English* 46 (5), 433-446

Ortner, H. (2000) *Schreiben und Denken*. Tübingen: de Gruyter

Rose, M. (1984) *Writer's Block: The Cognitive Dimension*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press

Ruhmann, G. (1996) 'Schreibblockaden und wie man sie überwindet'. *Schreiben Im Studium. Ein Trainingsprogram.* ed. by Bünting, K.-D., Bitterlich, A. and Pospiech, U. Berlin: Cornelsen Scriptor, 108-119

Ruhmann, G. (2014) 'Between Experience and Empirical Research: Writing Process Counseling as a Natural Setting for Writing Process Research'. in *Methods in Writing Process Research.* ed. by Knorr, D., Heine, C., and Engberg, J. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 59-80

Ruhmann, G. and Kruse, O. (2014) 'Prozessorientierte Schreibdidaktik: Grundlagen, Arbeitsformen, Perspektiven'. in *Schreiben: Grundlagentexte zur Theorie, Didaktik, und Beratung.* ed. by Dreyfürst, S. and Sennewald, N. Opladen: UTB, 15-34

Scheuermann, U. (2011) *Die Schreibfitness-Mappe: 60 Checklisten, Beispiele und Übungen für alle, die beruflich schreiben*. Vienna: Linde

Scheuermann, U. (2013) *Schreibdenken: Schreiben als Denk- und Lernwerkzeug nutzen und vermitteln.* Opladen and Toronto: Verlag Barbara Budrich

Scott, A. (2014) 'Writer's Block: A Study of Disciplinary Negotiations in the Faculty Office and Classroom'. *CEA Forum* [online] 43 (1), 61-81. available from <https://journals.tdl.org/ceaforum/index.php/ceaforum/article/view/7066> [3 March 2015]

Scott, A. (2016) 'Re-Centering Writing Center Studies: What U.S.-Based Scholars Can Learn from Their Colleagues in Germany, Switzerland, and Austria'. *Zeitschrift Schreiben: Schreiben in Schule, Hochschule und Beruf* [online] 1-10 available from <http://zeitschrift-schreiben.eu/globalassets/zeitschrift-schreiben.eu/2016/scott_writingcenterstudies.pdf> [1 February 2017]

Thaiss, C., Thaiss, C., Bräuer, G., Carlino, P., Ganobcsik-Williams and Sinha. A. (eds.) (2012) *Writing Programs Worldwide: Profiles of Academic Writing in Many Places* Fort Collins: The WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press

Trimbur, J. (1987) 'Peer Tutoring: A Contradiction in Terms?'. *Writing Center Journal* 7 (2), 21-28

The Writing Center Directory (2014) [online] available from <http://web.stcloudstate.edu/writeplace/wcd/Switzerland.html> [1 March 2016]