

Editorial

Sharing Pedagogic Practice for Motivating and Developing Student Writing

The Summer 2017 issue of the *Journal of Academic Writing* gathers a snapshot of research into academic writing from various angles. Drawing upon a range of approaches and contexts, both geographically and within university settings, the articles address topics including reassessment practices, peer reviewing, and inter-language revision processes and focal points. The underlying theme for the issue connects pedagogic practice to student writing development, focusing on how best to make students stronger – or, as Lynn Nygaard might put it in *Writing Your Master's Thesis: From A to Zen* more 'experienced' (2017: 64) – writers.

The first article, by Mark Carver, examines differences in feedback and feedforward practices in the context of assignment resubmissions. Carver raises an important question about student motivation in relation to a common practice in universities of grade-capping marks for such assessments. Carver argues that in cases where students' writing of first submissions has been poor, grade-capping suggests a particularly negative incentive for students to make the effort to engage with writing pedagogies to improve their academic writing practices. The localised study discussed in this article deftly builds out to discuss the wider implications of this issue for higher education assessment practices, and academic writing.

To follow, Sophia Zevgoli and Evi Dilaveri evaluate a case study of a Writing Partners project conducted at the American College of Greece, rationalising the peer review training provided to participants in context of the effectiveness of broad peer reviewing cultures. The resulting analysis elaborates on the impact of both solicited and unsolicited feedback, but, more importantly, extracts insights not just from the feedback that participants integrated into their revisions, but also the feedback participants ignored. The article thereby arrives at some engaging implications for motivating students to become more experienced writers.

Esther Breuer's article then examines how foreign language students apply revision techniques in their native (German) and foreign (English) languages. The study attempts to localise and respond to challenges specific to German and English, such as the former's ability to construct compound words which might be overlooked by studies attending to word count rather than character count. Breuer then stretches the scope of revision processes across languages to reflect on the broader implications for academic writing developers. Breuer concludes by outlining a tentative framework for how best to support students working in native or foreign languages, focusing attention on the specific challenges arising from the study.

In contrast to the foregoing articles, the final paper in this issue by Andrea Scott proposes a new genre of book reviews: the *translingual review*. Scott takes up the challenge of expanding the scope of a recent German text on academic writing, *Schreiben: Grundlagentexte zur Theorie, Didaktik und Beratung (Writing: Foundational Texts on Theory, Pedagogy, and Consultations)* in a broader Anglo-American context. The resulting analysis carries implications for how Academic Writing pedagogy often remains localised to national contexts. Non-Anglo-American texts, such as *Schreiben* provide valuable insight into localised practices

which might well inform a global community of Academic Writing researchers and developers. In the context of Lillis and Curry's *Academic Writing in a Global Context: The Politics and Practices of Publishing in English* (2010), Scott presents an inspiring challenge to consider how best to mature our practices as academic writers and pedagogues across boundaries of language and region, as well as those related to capitalism's structural influence on academia.

To close the issue, Kristin Solli provides a book review of Lynn Nygaard's *Writing Your Master's Thesis: from A to Zen*, which begins with a skilful sweep through the genre of thesis-writing handbooks in the context of the inconsistencies of supervision standards – inconsistencies, Solli notes, which Nigel Harwood and Bojana Petrić describe as 'disturbing' (2017: 195). Once again, the question of structural issues within universities emerges; Solli points to arguments locating these inconsistencies as symptomatic of the increasing time pressures academic systems place upon Masters students' advisors. Nygaard's project thereby emerges in refreshing contrast to approaches which appeal all too readily to students' need for support with overly-prescriptive approaches.

Taken together, the papers in this issue of the *Journal of Academic Writing* provide a helpful complement to the discussion in Volume 5 (1), which focused on ways to further students' potential for developing as academic writers. The perspectives in this issue make connections between pedagogy and the structural challenges faced by Academic Writing as a field.

George Ttoouli
Coventry University, UK

Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams
Coventry University, UK

References

- Dreyfürst, S. and Sennewald, N. (2014) *Schreiben: Grundlagentexte zur Theorie, Didaktik und Beratung* [Writing: Foundational Texts on Theory, Pedagogy, and Consultations]. Opladen: UTB
- Harwood, N., and Petrić, B. (2017) *Experiencing Master's Supervision: Perspectives of International Students and Their Supervisors*. London: Routledge
- Lillis, T. and Curry, M. (2010) *Academic Writing in a Global Context: The Politics and Practices of Publishing in English*. Abingdon: Routledge
- Nygaard, L. (2017) *Writing Your Master's Thesis: From A to Zen*. London: Sage