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WRITING CENTRES AND THE TURN TOWARD MULTILINGUAL AND MULTILITERACY WRITING TUTORING

Magnus Gustafsson and Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams

Introduction

Writing centres are student-centred and learning-oriented spaces, which, compared to many other aspects of higher education, offer very good conditions for facilitating learning, peer learning, and life-long learning. Historically, writing centres have been structured around the tutorial, and staff have offered advice mainly to undergraduate students on the writing they do at university – advice ranging from argumentation and paragraphing to the mechanics of writing (e.g. spelling, punctuation, and grammar). Pedagogically, tutorial work in writing centres has embraced rhetorical approaches to written communication (North 1984) and emphasised the triad of genre, audience, and purpose. Consequently, the ethos of the traditional writing centre model is that students mature in their knowledge and independence as academic writers through collaborative discussion with a writing tutor, and through opportunities to work in guided ways on writing processes and strategies (Lunsford 1991). The collaborative discussion is crucial to the beneficial learning environment, and the possibility of conducting one-to-one sessions focused on an individual student’s writing development is central to the writing centre approach.

But what goes into the concept of a “writing centre”? As this chapter addresses audiences far and wide, nomenclature surfaces as a critical component. The writing centre (or “center”) model described above has typically been a US higher education institution, and has largely been concerned with English as a first language or a higher education context where English is the first language.¹ For the purposes of this chapter, however, it is equally important to remember that the writing center in US Higher Education (HE) is not the only institution involved in English for academic purposes (EAP) learning activities. The responsibility for writing development, including EAP writing development, in US HE is shared in a complex and unclear manner between institutions such as “the writing center”,

¹ For the purposes of this chapter, however, it is equally important to remember that the writing center in US Higher Education (HE) is not the only institution involved in English for academic purposes (EAP) learning activities.
“first year composition” (FYC), “writing across the curriculum” (WAC), and “writing in the disciplines” (WID).

These four ways of organising writing development for students are quite different. FYC is a very large institution across US HE, and often consists of one or two composition courses in the first general education year for undergraduates. It is delivered mainly by English departments and involves a large number of staff and contingent faculty on short-term contracts delivering variations on a set curriculum. These variations emerge as the many course sections are taught by different staff even if there is a coordinator in charge. Unlike FYC, WAC and WID approaches tend to be organised as faculty development through workshops and consultancies, and focus on developing pedagogies for faculty to teach writing in their courses across the curriculum. The difference between WAC and WID can be said to lie in the degree of disciplinary depth and specificity. Where WAC emphasises continued development and training in general writing strategies, WID deals with the development and teaching of discipline-specific genres, and tends to focus on upper level, discipline-specific writing-intensive courses. The writing center, finally, will typically welcome students from across these different types of writing activities.

While there are obvious advantages of having several branches involved in a university’s writing development and EAP delivery, there is, at the same time, a risk that EAP becomes nobody’s responsibility. In an ideal organisation, there is a well-resourced programme that contains and coordinates these branches; but it seems, equally often, that there are organisational obstacles to such coordination. Consequently, US writing centers have responded to different institutional aims and educational agendas throughout the decades (Boquet 1999).

Even if the organisational sense of responsibility for writing or EAP might be vague in US HE, the writing center is part of this multi-component structure, and will have a mission statement that is recognisable as that of a writing center (International Writing Centers Association 2015). Today, however, writing centres are making their way into other higher education systems where this multi-branch context for writing development might not exist. In Europe, for instance, there are writing centres in the UK, Ireland, the Nordic countries, and Eastern Europe, but it is perhaps in the German-speaking sector of European HE that the largest number of writing centres is to be found. In this European setting, there is no FYC and little if any WAC or WID, and the writing centre might take on parts of any of these aspects of writing development. We must emphasise, though, with Donahue (2009), that the absence of these particular forms of writing instruction does not in any way mean that there is no writing instruction in European HE (Donahue 2009). Another obvious and crucial aspect of writing centres in Europe, barring the UK possibly, is that they cater for other languages of course. It is no longer EAP only, but also Norwegian, German, Swedish, etc. for academic purposes.

To the extent, then, that there is a fairly homogeneous HE scene in the US, colleagues might be able to distinguish between “writing centers”, “FYC programs”, “WAC/WID programs”, and so on. However, Europe has a more diverse HE environment and a shorter history in terms of “writing centres”, “writing programmes”, and rarely anything like first year composition. Hence, our terminology across Europe as well as compared to the US gets more confused (Bekar et al. 2015). We discuss “writing centres” and read each other’s scholarship and believe we know the meaning of familiar words, but that might not be the case. So, in this chapter, we will talk about writing centres, writing centre approaches, and writing centre methodology, and because some of those statements will refer to European activities, they might refer to groups of people in units called divisions or language centres;
they might also refer to activities that some readers would associate with integrating content and language in higher education (ICLHE; cf. Airey, this volume), or with WAC or WID programmes or the activities in such programmes. In fact, maybe for the purposes describing activities outside the US, distinguishing between writing centres and writing programmes might cost more than it yields (Thaiss et al. 2012).

The writing center in US higher education

In the United States, writing centers have been established in many colleges and universities since the 1970s and 1980s, when open admissions, increasing numbers of students, and widespread concern about a “literacy crisis” in students’ abilities to read and write (Sheils 1975) prompted institutions to set up writing tutoring centers (Harris 1982). However, widening participation is not a phenomenon exclusive to the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Historians of the writing center movement argue that individualised support for students’ writing development in American HE can be traced back much further: to the discussion and debate about students’ reasoning and writing that is described as having taken place within eighteenth-century college and university literary societies (Waller 2002; Lerner 2009); to a 1904 classroom-based “laboratory method” of peer and teacher attention to students’ writing (Carino 1995: 105; Lerner 2009); to the creation of writing labs separate from the classroom by the 1930s (Carino 1995: 106; Lerner 2009); and to writing or composition clinics in the 1940s and 1950s (Boquet 1999: 469; Moore 1950; Carino 1992: 38–39).

A hallmark of US writing center pedagogy is the positioning of the writing tutor as different from a classroom teacher. The role of the writing tutor is to elicit student-writers’ ideas and help them to scaffold their writing as a mentor, rather than as someone who will ultimately be grading their assignment. As a “radical” alternative to classroom pedagogy that would help address the needs of individual student-writers (Bruffee 1984: 87), as well as for reasons of scalability, US writing centers began using students as peer writing tutors during the late 1960s and 1970s (Boquet 1999: 474; Devet et al. 2006: 197–198; Waller 2002), and today the “use of students as peer tutors in US writing centers is almost universal” (Devet et al. 2006: 205). Training and professional development for writing center tutors take place through a variety of means in different institutions, and can include credit-bearing classes focusing on theories and pedagogies of writing tutoring, training sessions, and staff meetings.3

Given a long history focusing on individual students and their writing development through working with peer tutors, writing centers have often positioned themselves as alternative spaces or safe havens for students (Gardner and Ramsey 2005; Geller et al. 2007). Increasingly, however, this self-image has become insufficient and writing centers have also articulated their functions in university policies and their function in university research agendas. Gillespie et al. (2002) promoted the writing center as a research site, and Gardner and Ramsey (2005), in their discussion of the changing mission and the rhetorics of writing center missions, also called for a change of emphasis in the self-definition at work.

Perhaps as a result of appeals like these, the character of research on writing center work has been changing and more often meets Haswell’s (2005) call for replicable, aggregable and data-supported research (RAD). In 2012, Driscoll and Perdue (2012) reviewed 30 years of articles in The Writing Center Journal, the main peer-reviewed journal for writing center work. They found that RAD work has been increasing in writing center communities, particularly in the past ten years of the study, but that a lot of work fails to meet the “RAD
rubric”. They claim that “we must not only revisit our discussion of research diversity; we must embrace RAD research as a language for future of [sic] writing center publications” (2012: 36).

So, while “research diversity” is called for, Driscoll and Perdue (2012) note that RAD work has the potential to problematise the received wisdom or anecdotes of writing center work, known to academic writing scholars as “lore”. Such questioning of writing center lore is another comparatively recent change of direction envisioned for studies by Thompson et al. (2009), who find that writing center lore is rarely supported by actual research findings. An important contribution to the collective testing of writing center lore is Peripheral Visions for Writing Centers (Grutsch McKinney 2013). Grutsch McKinney is hard on lore and likens it, like Gardner and Ramsey (2005), to a grand narrative. She suggests that lore “persists because narratives and the rhetorical and visual habits they spawn are all difficult to change” (2013: 85). Instead of, or in addition to, the grand narrative of the writing center as a welcoming and freethinking space where individualised writing tutorials are conducted, she promotes a more peripheral and localised view of the many writing development activities in which writing centers can be involved.

Questioning a potentially outdated grand narrative is a daunting task of course, but one that writing centre communities elsewhere in the world benefit from and can actually contribute to. In other words, the site- and region-specific adaptations in writing centres outside the US offer important indirect commentary on the givens of US writing center lore. For instance, European writing centres may share a core belief in tutoring student writing but in some cases the similarities end there.

The writing centre makes its way to Europe

Given its success in US HE, it comes as no surprise that the writing centre idea made its way to Europe, too, and has been adopted and contextualised in a number of institutions since the early 2000s (e.g. Bräuer and Girgensohn 2012; Deane and Ganobcsik-Williams 2012; Doleschal 2012; O’Sullivan and Cleary 2012; Stassen and Jansen 2012; Tokay 2012; Worley 2012). Many of the reasons for looking towards writing centres are similar since HE institutions in Europe have also faced the massification of HE, widening participation, and changing educational policies.

What might be more specific to the European setting, at least from a short-term historical perspective, is the Bologna Declaration and the attempt to establish a European HE area (EHEA) for greater student and workforce mobility. The outcomes-oriented educational policy promoted through the Bologna Declaration is one that has a significantly stronger emphasis on writing than various educational curricula in the numerous member states of EHEA. While these many national curricula have various ways of addressing writing development, there is no shared point of reference for writing development and the educational cultures vary significantly (Kruse 2013). Yet, the writing centre approach has offered a way to promote writing development that has been feasible across many of the different educational traditions and cultures in Europe.

On mentioning the Bologna Agreement, another distinctive dimension of writing centre development in Europe comes into focus – the more extensive language variation along with the diverse educational cultures. So, while the Bologna Agreement has generated a greater emphasis on writing and even English for academic purposes, a significant number, if not all, writing centres in Europe also tutor L1 writing in addition to EAP. Since such L1 tutoring often happens prior to EAP tutoring, which typically happens largely at
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the level of master’s degrees, the L1 tutoring also serves to provide ways for students to encounter writing instruction to begin with and prepares them to make better use of the EAP activities.

Where the multiple educational traditions and the greater language variation might offer challenges to European writing centres, there is also the advantage of having US writing center development to learn from. Mullin (2006), for example, argues in relation to writing centre development in a UK context that because such development is less hampered by US traditions and beliefs regarding writing support, there is greater potential to set up more purposeful and context-sensitive writing initiatives.

This opportunity of observing writing center development in the US and the fact that the educational arena is so different has enriched the conversation among European scholars about adaptation and strategy for European centres. Hence, discussions or accounts of US writing center pedagogy have had the explicit function of avoiding transfer and templates and instead have widened the debate (cf. Davidson and Tomic 1999). Such widening concerns issues of curricular design, choice of textbooks, and tutoring philosophies (cf. Santa 2009), but it also goes further and points at how simple import of concepts across languages and educational cultures is ill-advised, and that what is called for is a mutual exchange (Donahue 2009).

It may also be the case that the relative novelty of the writing centre idea offers an appealing site for development for many colleagues in view of the paucity of other shared and recognisable forms of interventions for writing development, and the inherent focus on learning. European writing centres can more quickly and with less resistance take on the functions also of US writing programs. In contrast to the “traditional model of a writing center”, many European centres, therefore, cater also for faculty training, and adopt a more adjustable set of contextualised strategies to increase the writing performance of university students in Europe.4

The centre approach – what’s in it for EAP?

So, from the US horizon as well from a European perspective, the writing centre offers great potential for writing development work. What, then, are the advantages of the writing centre approach for EAP? English for academic purposes, after all, goes well beyond first-year composition and pre-sessional introductions to writing at university. In US HE, writing centers and interventions like WAC/WID originally may have been seen as complementary, whereas there has been increasingly more collaboration and coordination between these activities and agents in the past 15 years or so (Mullin 2001; Anson 2006; Elon University 2015; Flash 2015; Minnesota University WEC-program 2015). This conflation reflects the development horizon in Europe as well, where writing centres tend to take on multiple functions/roles in their respective universities.

This is the point where we believe the many diverse educational contexts in Europe are the most radically accentuated, since the local conditions vary so vastly, and yet the writing centres appear to accommodate this variation and still cater for EAP development. The diversity we see is not only in L1 backgrounds but also in what English as a second language (ESL)/English as a foreign language (EFL) training there is in the various educational traditions. In terms of conflating writing centres and WAC/WID activities, the past 15 years or more have offered a rich body of scholarship on WAC and WID that underlines the strong connection between WAC/WID pedagogy, and that of writing centres with their original one-to-one tutorial mode of operating.
As we access this literature on the connections between writing centre work and WAC/WID, we need to remember that while WAC and WID are distinct and have different objectives and approaches, there is also a tendency among scholars who explore the overlap between WAC/WID and writing centres to “employ the umbrella term WAC” (Corbett and LaFrance 2009: 3). However, to be brief and risking over-simplification, WAC and writing centre approaches align well in so far as having a place in “liberal arts” or “general studies” curricula of US higher education. That these approaches cater for EAP seems an uncontroversial assumption. With increasing conflation of activities, writing centres see more WAC and WID writing.

More importantly, the writing centre–WID connection has additional dimensions beyond the mere fact of students bringing disciplinary writing into the centre. Barnett and Rosen (1999) go as far as to suggest that the writing centre–WAC/WID link has the potential to create a university-wide writing culture. A link between writing centres and WAC/WID offers an environment for writing development that can potentially make “writing visible, understood, and accepted as a valuable tool for teaching and learning across the disciplines. A campus-wide writing environment implies ongoing dialogue about writing and its relationship to thinking and learning among faculty as well as students” (Barnett and Rosen 1999: 1).

Predictably, the crucial connection between writing centres and WAC/WID hinges on precisely this shared responsibility. US scholars like Waldo, McLeod, Maimon, and Childers support Barnett and Rosen in the idea that the writing centre approach should be a part of the hub of writing development at university level. Waldo (1993: 16) sees in the writing centre that caters for WID an environment that “provides students with a comprehensive tutoring program”. Similarly, McLeod and Maimon focus their view of the writing centre–WID connection on the immediate and hands-on WID work that takes place inside writing centres:

> Although it is possible to run a WAC /[WID]/ program without such an entity, our experience is that to sustain a WAC /[WID]/ program, a writing center is crucial. …The most successful writing centers work with faculty in the disciplines, asking for copies of assignments and helping faculty refine them.  

(McLeod and Maimon 2000: 581, italics added)

On the one hand, this claim tells us something about the versatility expected of writing centre tutors as they are addressing writing assignments from all over the university. On the other hand, the claim also points to the work writing centres do with disciplinary faculty in terms of collecting student reactions to assignments, and having a wealth of writing development advice to draw on as they offer to help colleagues revise assignments and assignment briefs. Perhaps it is also this particular aspect of writing centre work that Childers has in mind when she suggests that writing centre colleagues, “rather than mostly working with students, [can] become more of a resource, guide, and facilitator for faculty research, discovery, and risk taking with writing, thinking, and learning across the disciplines” (Barnett and Blumner 1999: xii; Childers 1999).

The somewhat broader definition of writing centre work that includes more direct work with teachers and researchers in other disciplines has been an integral part of many European writing centres from the very beginning. Perhaps it is even the case that writing centre work in Europe to a larger extent than in the US has to cater to a broader set of disciplines and in ways that go beyond tutoring students from these disciplines.
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(Brinkschulte, Stoian, and Borges 2015). For the UK scene, similarly, WID has become the more prominent concept in writing development. The early subject specialisation of UK universities, and what appears to be a degree of preparedness among academics teaching in this system to take responsibility for teaching and responding to disciplinary writing, offer good openings for a WID approach in writing centre work (Ganobcsik-Williams 2006: 52; O’Neill 2010).

So, as writing centres have grown in numbers and the European writing centre community has grown larger, it seems the approach chosen has been one of working across many levels, ranging from the one-to-one with students, to the workshop with teachers, to working with all the teachers in a programme or department in order to develop and sustain a dynamic writing culture. To offer two examples of this kind of work in Europe, we will account for the activities and set up of the writing centre at Coventry University in England, and refer to the corresponding activities at Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden. With very different backgrounds and organisational conditions, the two “centres” nevertheless find themselves with activities that are similar and missions or responsibilities that are almost interchangeable. One of the units is a writing centre and the other is a division in a department.

In 2004, the first centrally funded UK university writing centre, the Centre for Academic Writing (CAW) at Coventry University, opened for students seeking guidance on writing essays and other types of academic prose. CAW has developed steadily in the years since its founding, offering students face-to-face, individualised and small-group writing tutorials, synchronous and asynchronous online writing tutorials, academic writing workshops, credit-bearing undergraduate writing modules, and a credit-bearing master’s module on writing for publication. CAW also cascades support for student writers through WID consultations with teaching staff, and supports postgraduates, academics, and other researchers in writing for publication.

The Division for Language and Communication (DLC) at Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden, is a unit whose current activities can be traced back to the 1980s. Its organisational trajectory has involved four institutions, organisational status ranging from work unit to department, and remits as varied as “providing language service” to providing researched-based engineering communication education to all university students. It offers courses in engineering programmes, electives across programmes and educational levels, thesis tutorials for writing groups, and writing tutorials for individual students as well as groups of students.

Unlike “traditional writing centres”, therefore, CAW’s and DLC’s missions go beyond tutoring “to enable students to become independent writers”, and include phrases like “to equip academic staff in all disciplines to achieve their full potential as authors and teachers of scholarly writing” (CAW 2014). This type of staff development remit authorises academic writing lecturers at CAW and lecturers and staff at DLC to work with academics and support staff on their own scholarly writing; for example, through individualised consultations, scholarly writing retreats, and dedicated writing events or staff development courses for the development of their writing or their use of writing in courses.

The CAW and Chalmers models demonstrate how useful, reciprocal connections can be forged between writing centres, WID, and WAC. This integrated provision for writing development means that the writing centre can be involved in writing development for academic and professional staff as well as for students at all levels, and that writing specialists can work with students and colleagues to create a culture of writing that permeates the institution at all levels (Ganobcsik-Williams 2011: 259). Not surprisingly, both models...
also exemplify the fundamental issue of nomenclature, organisational contexts, and higher education traditions in Europe.

CAW’s remit has included WID since its founding. In the same manner, DLC provides multiple WID programmes. Both CAW’s academic writing lecturers and DLC’s lecturers work with academics in the faculties on creating strategies for teaching writing more explicitly in students’ degree courses. Consultations between a CAW or a DLC lecturer and one or more department-based academics involve discussing the aims of a particular module or degree course, and how to design assignments to meet those aims. Lecturers and writing developers then work together to plan teaching and to draft/revise assignment briefs. In this way, CAW’s and DLC’s writing lecturers provide staff development and support for colleagues in the teaching of writing. Because WID can entail a considerable commitment from both staff developers and lecturers based in other disciplinary fields, CAW and DLC both offer WAC-inspired staff development workshops that promote more general “writing to learn” concepts and techniques (Bazerman and Russell 1994: xiv) to support students’ writing development.

The future is already here: EMI and multiliteracy

Writing centre development is dynamic and responsive, and with increasing globalisation, writing centres have had to respond to greater language variation among the students and faculty who turn to them. In relation to EAP in US higher education, there has historically been a division of labour between WAC initiatives on the one hand, and ESL programs or initiatives on the other. Matsuda observed this unproductive separation already in the 1990s and argued that it is problematic (Matsuda 1999). Writing centres, however, find themselves in the middle, and since writing centre methodology allows higher resolution in terms of the individual writer’s development, US writing centers have had to design material and collect experience, and also gradually develop a degree of ESL delivery (Zawacki and Cox 2011). In fact, as recent WAC and writing centre publications suggest, writing instruction informed by WAC and writing centre approaches is becoming increasingly multilingual both in English-speaking countries and elsewhere (Thaiss et al. 2012; Zawacki and Cox 2014). In terms of specific tutoring practices, the Institute for Writing and Rhetoric at Dartmouth College, for instance, provides guidelines for tutoring multilingual writers in English (Dartmouth College Institute for Writing and Rhetoric 2014), while the Multilingual Writing Center at Dickinson College, “staffed by Overseas Assistants and by Dickinson students who have experienced study abroad and are recommended by foreign language faculty for their writing ability” (Dickinson College Multilingual Writing Center 2014), offers tutoring for multilingual student-writers in languages other than English (Arabic, Chinese, French, German, Hebrew, Italian, Japanese, Russian, Spanish).

In Europe, writing centres were always already multilingual even if they have been informed by an L1 language profile. The Bologna Agreement charges universities and students alike to rise to an increasingly English-mediated higher education. The second cycle (master’s level) is often delivered in English, and writing centres in Europe therefore support EAP development for a large number of different ESL/EFL backgrounds.

The influence of globalisation or policies like the Bologna Agreement, however, is only one of the “new” dimensions of writing centre work. The multilingual is not enough. There has been a marked tendency in writing centre literature and development in the past five years, at least, towards the multiliteracy centre rather than the writing centre. Directors and tutors alike have pointed out how writing centre activity has had to incorporate, as
rule rather than an exception, more than one-channel, one-dimensional writing pieces. So, modern technology and the increasing importance of interactive and social media call for more than just multilingual writing centres (cf. Sheridan and Inman 2010; Cope and Kalantzis 2000).

For many professional or graduate careers, academic writing literacy is insufficient and universities, like Elon University for instance (Elon University, 2015), include in their teaching and learning aims the need to prepare students for the communication they will need to do after graduation. With such objectives for writing, writing centres increasingly need to handle more multiliteracy-oriented and collaborative writing tasks. This new day-to-day experience has “expanded our understandings of the situated and pluralized nature of literacy” (Grimm 2012 in Balester et al. 2012; our emphasis). From a writing centre perspective, then, “academic purposes” now not only entails but begins to emphasise the multiliteracy character that informs writing.

Concluding remarks

This chapter has offered a sketch of the potential of writing centres for EAP. The largely US-oriented background of the writing centre approach has been influential also in other educational systems, and we have offered some examples of its adaptation in European HE and how it helps promote English for academic purposes and beyond. Given the organic development of writing centers in US universities, colleagues in other educational systems who look to the US for writing center development face the challenge of engaging with that perspective in an informed manner in order to develop writing centre activities in their own local contexts.

Such strategic development in some European contexts has meant that writing centres have started out already with a combined mission of working also with WID and WAC approaches, and with local strategies informed by the language contexts of their universities. For us, writing centres may well be ideal hubs from which to design and deliver systematic EAP/WID interventions. It might even be the case that writing centres as such hubs might generate change on a larger scale. A UK writing centre successfully trialled a writing fellows programme, where tutors moved out of the centre and worked with faculty in assigned courses, for instance, and saw its potential for further change:

Indeed, they [writing fellows or mentors] offer so many benefits to students that it becomes tempting to see the “problem” of student writing as an opportunity to make improvements in an educational system that has resisted real pedagogical change for too long.

(O’Neill 2008)

We have tried to outline how writing centres have responded to changes in the HE contexts where they are situated; but as O’Neill suggests, writing centre activities also have the potential of indicating changes that are called for in our respective educational systems (cf. also Bräuer and Girgenson 2012).

The writing centre idea has great appeal and potential. A step that lies in the future but is congruent, we believe, with the multiliteracy centre idea is to see how “writing centres” adapt to and influence massive open online course (MOOC) design and delivery while also promoting EAP. The useful discussion of the future missions of “writing centres” that Gardner and Ramsey initiated in 2005 seems to have found solid support and has
spread the conversation outside the US in a movement that holds great potential for the development of writing and multiliteracy centres.

Still, while we are predictably hesitant to talk of the “core” of something like a “writing centre approach”, the tutorial still holds great appeal. Maybe the bulk of writing centre work might still be one-on-one tutorials, and while we need to make sure that writing centres evolve in response to students’ learning environments, we may have to find ways to safeguard aspects that we deem effective in our everyday activities in learning environments sometimes called writing centres. We hope that our chapter offers an inclusive contribution to an ongoing conversation with an aim to make the most of “writing centres”. It might also serve as an invitation for continued scholarship examining the many ways “writing centres” and higher education systems can interact and mutually evolve.
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Notes

1 Needless to say, this is hardly the case any longer, and the ESL and ELF dimensions are becoming increasingly important also in US HE, as witnessed, for instance, by recent publications by Zawacki and Cox (2011; 2014).
2 In 2013, “Writing centres and writing consultants in Germany […] founded the ‘Gesellschaft für Schreibdidaktik und Schreibforschung’, an association for professionals dedicated to writing centre work and writing consulting. Ten scholars who work in writing centres – either as writing researchers or as freelancing writing consultants – established the association in Göttingen aiming at assisting researchers and practitioners who support, teach, and counsel writing at schools, universities, or job-related writing. After the first writing centre in Germany, the Writing Lab in Bielefeld, inaugurated in 1993, approx. 30 other writing centres have spread all over Germany” (Brinkschulte 2013).
3 The US-based International Writing Centers Association (IWCA 2015) website provides sample syllabi for peer tutoring courses, as well as a link to the “PeerCentered blog” for “peer writing tutors/consultants or anyone interested in writing centers to blog with their colleagues from around the world” (PeerCentered 2014).
4 Cf. Santa 2009: 3, where he claims that in Europe “the writing centre is the writing program”.
5 Also see Manuel Herrero-Puertas’ reflection on the “fertile multilingual scene” and the place of the (multilingual) writing center at the University of Wisconsin-Madison (Herrero-Puertas, 2011).
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