

Proof

PART I

**Local and National
Policy Contexts**

Taylor & Francis
Not for distribution

Proof

Proof

Taylor & Francis
Not for distribution

Proof

2

**WORLDS APART, BUT IN THE
SAME BOAT****How Macro-Level Policy Influences
EFL Writing Pedagogy in China, Mexico,
and Poland**

Estela Ene and Katarzyna Hryniuk

Introduction

English as a foreign language (EFL) classrooms, as arenas in which the global and the local co-exist, reflect the complex status of English in the world. They empower by propagating English as the main means of global communication (or *lingua franca*) and access to global resources and opportunities. However, they contribute to the creation of a homogenized, “single global market which is supplanting the nation-state as the primary economic and political unit” (Fairclough, 2006, p. 15).

Despite the pull towards global homogeneity, distinctions among EFL contexts persist, due in part to the fact that global and national policies are conceptualized and enacted differently. Some have contended that “the principal locus of policy making remains the nation-state” (Haskell, 2002, p. 5), and that language policies, as a subcategory of national policy, reflect different national sociopolitical and economic goals. Most states promote English as the most important foreign language. However, they may also promote other foreign and local languages (Lo Bianco, 2002). For example, former Soviet republics or Québec, the Basque region, Catalonia, and other areas interested in preserving minority rights may prioritize local or minority languages over English. In multilingual states like Switzerland, the official languages of the country may be expected to be developed first (Haskell, 2002; Lo Bianco, 2002). Such circumstances lead to variation, across and even within nation-states, in when students begin and end studying English, for what purposes, and how achievement is assessed.

Assessment is particularly influential in English Language Teaching (ELT) because standardized examinations are often mandated through national policy. Large-scale, centrally administered achievement tests allow for comparability of students’ performance in schools across a country or internationally. A positive

washback effect is that certain writing—genres, for example, and their formal features—gets taught when it is required in high-stakes examinations (Crusan, 2010). A negative effect is that only the forms and task types tested are practiced. Such tests assess only subskills, as writing under time pressure does not reflect writing ability realistically, reliably, or fairly. Also, standardization hinders creativity, “ignoring the richness of culturally diverse backgrounds and neglecting the unique problems of students” (Crusan, 2010, p. 256). Yet, such tests determine students’ further education and the focus of the EFL class.

The need to account for variability in teaching EFL/ESL writing across institutional and sociopolitical contexts has been emphasized by many (Crusan, 2010; Crusan, Plakans, & Gebril, 2016; Cumming, 2001; Ruecker, Shapiro, Johnson, & Tardy, 2014; Spalding, Wang, & Lin, 2010). The value of research on variability across EFL contexts lies in that it promotes the critical evaluation of the mainstream, English-centered ideas that underpin the teaching and assessing of EFL writing (Donahue, 2009; Min, 2011). Additionally, such research fills in a long-standing gap in the scholarship on EFL writing that, if left unfilled, may “perpetuate stereotypes about practice and could limit valuable cross-context dialogue” (Ruecker et al., 2014, p. 402; also Cumming, 2003; Ene & Mitrea, 2013; Ortega, 2009; Silva, Leki, & Carson, 1997).

Philosophically, the concept that English is plurilithic (Pennycook, 2007) and its teaching should be, too (Hall, 2013), has emphasized the need to pay attention to local factors, because EFL contexts are different enough from one another to warrant dramatically different approaches to EFL teacher preparation and classroom teaching. Until now, researchers have investigated many EFL writing contexts one by one (see edited volumes by Cimasko & Reichelt, 2011; Manchón, 2009). Recently, large multinational surveys have been used to achieve a more inclusive representation of ESL and EFL writing contexts. Ruecker et al. (2014) explored the linguistic and institutional contexts of writing instruction in TESOL through a survey completed by 290 ESL and 111 EFL participants from Japan, Canada, China, Mexico, South Korea, and Thailand. Crusan et al. (2016) investigated the writing assessment literacy of 702 second language instructors from tertiary institutions in 41 countries. Still, there is a scarcity of research that directly compares different EFL contexts based on a common research question and methodology in order to understand how EFL writing practices differ (or not) across the world, due to a variety of factors, including assessment policies.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this chapter is to explore the tenets of both homogeneity and variability in EFL contexts, particularly as related to macro-policy and its influence on EFL writing pedagogy and assessment. Our goal is to address the current need in L2 writing for a clearer understanding of EFL contexts, representations of approaches to L2 writing, and implications for teacher development. The chapter

offers insights from comparative research conducted in China, Mexico, and Poland, and focuses on the question:

What is the impact of assessment, national, and global policy on EFL writing teachers' beliefs and practices?

In the sections below, we describe each context with respect to the status of English and assessment policies. Then, we present the results of our survey, interviews, and focus groups, and we discuss the results focusing on similarities and differences in teaching and assessing EFL writing in relation to national and global policy.

ELT in China

China has the largest English-learning population in the world. English is the most important foreign language for finance, business, travel, and academic success. In the 1990s, English began being taught in schools in third grade “wherever conditions permit[ted]” (Qixin, 2002, p. 228). The study continues through high school, and then for at least two years in college for English non-majors. Qixin (2002) has noted:

there is no single document [mandating English competence] from the Ministry of Education . . . Still, the Chinese government's strategy for foreign language education permeates the national curricula . . . at all levels. Approved and issued by the Ministry of Education, it is reflected in . . . required levels of proficiency in English, length of study and required courses.

(p. 228)

English, alongside Chinese and mathematics, is tested when entering high school and college. In 1989, a writing task was added to the national college admission exam. At the tertiary level, there are three semesters of mandatory EFL, after which students take the College English Test (CET) Band 4. For this, students should be able to communicate easily in English, especially orally, and write short essays with personal opinion in at least 160 words, summarize literature, and write abstracts. The belief that admission into university guarantees upward mobility and personal honor has created a culture of testing, building up from the lower grades to the beginning of college (Cheng, 2008).

ELT in Mexico

In Mexico, “the mission of the National English Programme in Basic Education is framed by the needs of ‘contemporary society . . . that demands citizens with the necessary competencies to face and incorporate into a globalised constantly

changing world” (British Council, 2015, p. 7). National standards of proficiency have been designed with attention to the European Union’s *Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR)* (Council of Europe, 2001). Basic education is divided into primary school (grades 1–6), junior high school (grades 7–9), and high school (grades 10–12). The Secretariat of Public Education (SPE) sets standards for English education, but the federal educational system is decentralized. Officially, since 2012, English instruction begins in pre-K (in year 3 of 3) and continues until twelfth grade; however, in practice many schools do not implement the programs due to funding shortages (Jimenez, 2008). Admission to the university does not take foreign language proficiency into account. There is great variation across the 31 Mexican states, caused by the fact that there is no real national policy for English, and the expansion of English education has been slow and uneven (Ramírez-Romero & Sayer, 2016).

ELT in Poland

Foreign language teaching in Poland is regulated by the Ministry for National Education, and it adheres to the *CEFR* (Council of Europe, 2001). Since Poland’s admission to the European Union in 2004, the largest of many changes was the 2008 educational reform, which introduced a compulsory foreign language from the first grade. Most students (95%) choose to study English (Salski, 2016).

The Central Examination Commission oversees the design and administration of national, standardized English tests. At the end of primary school, a test checks learners’ foreign language knowledge. Lower secondary school (grades 7–9) ends with a written exam for which the students can choose the A1 or A2 level of the *CEFR*. This assesses listening and reading comprehension, grammar and lexis, and language functions. In the A2 exam, learners write texts of 50–100 words (a letter, a news item, an email). High school (grades 10–12) also ends with a foreign language exam (part of the *Matura* exam). On the high school exit examination, all levels must complete a writing task. The high school exit exam substituted for university entrance exams in 2005. Its high-stakes nature motivates students to prepare for it meticulously. Learners can choose among written tests B1 (less advanced), B2 (advanced), or C1 level (for bilingual schools). At the lower level, learners write texts of 80–130 words (a letter, an email, blog news, etc.); at the more advanced level, texts of 200–250 words (a formal letter, an argumentative essay, an article, etc.). For bilingual schools, the examinees must write 300–350 words. At universities, students are required to pass an exam in a foreign language, which is usually English, at the B2 level, in order to graduate.

In sum, China, Mexico, and Poland share a similar view of the importance of English language skills in the globalized world. All have expectations of early and long exposure to the language, but in Mexico national policy and testing are less strict. ELT begins in kindergarten in Mexico, first grade in Poland, and

third grade in China. Chinese and Polish high schoolers take an exit exam in English, while Mexican students do not. Chinese students take a national college admission test in English, while Mexican and Polish students do not. Finally, college English is mandated in China and Poland (where a foreign language is required and English is usually chosen), but not in Mexico.

Study Design

Instruments and Procedures

To determine the similarities and differences among different EFL contexts, as well as the influence of macro-level policy on EFL writing, we investigated comparatively the beliefs and practices of EFL writing teachers in China, Mexico, and Poland. Using instruments implemented in a similar study in Romania (Ene & Mitrea, 2013), the researchers conducted teacher surveys with 71 in-service teachers—15 from China, 14 from Mexico, and 42 from Poland. The survey consisted of close- and open-ended questions, including Likert-type scale items. The survey for the Polish group was administered a year after collecting data in China and Mexico. In China and Mexico, focus groups and follow-up interviews with willing participants were audio-recorded and transcribed before being analyzed. All of the participants were in the focus groups and seven from each group were interviewed. Interviews and focus groups were not conducted in Poland; instead, questions about national policy and globalization—topics that emerged in interviews and focus groups in China and Mexico, as well as the Romanian study—were added to the survey. For the Polish data, we also benefited from one of the researchers' emic perspective.

Analysis

The open-ended answers from the survey and the focus group and interview transcripts were analyzed qualitatively. The researchers read the responses and grouped them into themes, which were rank-ordered based on their frequency. For the Likert-type scale items, we counted the responses. For both the open-ended answers and the Likert-type items, we will report the number and percentage of respondents out of the total number of participants in each context who elected a certain theme or option.

Participants

The participants were in-service K–12 teachers of English enrolled in English departments at universities in China and Mexico, where one of the authors was on research and teaching visits, and in Poland, where the other researcher works. All were MA students except for eight (11%) Polish participants who were BA

students. Ninety-three percent (or 14 and 13, respectively) of the participants in China and Mexico, and 86% (36) in Poland, were female. On average, the Chinese teachers had 12 years of English teaching experience, the Mexican teachers 9 years, and the Polish teachers 6.

Results

Classroom Practices

General Approach to Teaching EFL Writing

What is taught in English classes and how it is taught speaks to the status of English and EFL writing in the overall system. In terms of *what*, 46% (7) of the Chinese teachers reported teaching academic, persuasive essay writing, and professional letters and reports, respectively. Half of the teachers from Mexico also placed the academic essay at the top of frequently taught types of writing, and 28% (4) marked professional and business writing. In Poland, informal letter and email writing emerged as the genres most frequently taught (by 38% (16) of the participants), while academic writing—persuasive essays, research papers, summaries, and literary analyses—was marked by only 5% (2) of the teachers. The Polish teachers reported using no professional writing assignments, and no creative writing (narratives, poems, anecdotes, etc.), which the Mexican and Chinese teachers reported engaging with occasionally, to lighten up the load of academic assignments and allow the students to explore their creative side. An explanation for this is the fact that, although Poland has national assessments for English, the exams at the lower levels of education require informal personal writing, and only in the higher secondary and tertiary levels do academic essays become important. Thus, we note a clear alignment between the text types taught and the national curriculum/language policy of each country, as noted by Crusan (2010). In Mexico, where national exams are not mandated but English and academic writing have become more valued, the same alignment existed.

Teachers from all three groups engaged in effective instructional practices such as providing feedback, utilizing multiple drafts, and peer reviews. Sixty-four percent (9) of the Mexican teachers, 90% (38) of the Polish teachers, and 93% (14) of the Chinese teachers reported providing feedback on writing. Fifty-seven percent (8) of the Mexican teachers, 46% (7) of the Chinese teachers, and 40% (17) of the Polish teachers used peer reviews. Only 20% (3) of the Chinese teachers and 29% (12) of the Polish teachers required multiple drafts, compared to 57% (8) of the Mexican teachers. The use of multiple drafts was the least frequent practice, especially for the Polish and Chinese teachers. Overall, the Mexican teachers' approach came across as more methodologically balanced and diversified, while the Chinese and the Polish groups seemed more

product-oriented and teacher-centered. In the focus group, the Chinese teachers were unanimous about what one of them expressed in her interview: “Correcting and telling the students what is right or wrong is a teacher’s duty . . . Our students do not trust other students to find their mistakes and show them the right way.” Similar feelings were expressed in the Mexican focus group, one teacher eloquently noting: “We must write feedback on essays. The students depend on us.”

In addition to the cultural belief that being a writing teacher equals providing feedback and that peers have limited ability to support others, all three groups named class size and workload as limiting factors. In all three contexts, a full-time teacher’s load could amount to 40 hours of classroom teaching per week. The Chinese teachers, who could have multiple classes with as many as 40 students in each, stressed that it is “absolutely impossible” to implement process-oriented techniques with large groups, especially when buy-in from the students is low. The Mexican teachers felt similarly, but an interviewee (who had studied in the U.S.) pointed out: “It is important to try new techniques. Everything takes a lot of time, but we want the students to learn on their own, and I see sometimes that peer reviews and self-assessment can reduce the time I spend correcting.” Large classes, workload, low pay, and limited professional development are known systemic problems that negatively impact teaching in China (Lee, 2010), Mexico (Ramírez-Romero & Sayer, 2016), and Poland (Reichelt, 2005).

Assessment

The assessment practices used by our participants reflected the prioritization of formal accuracy. When asked *What do you most focus on when evaluating student writing?*—Polish teachers answered grammar (50% or 21), vocabulary (36% or 15), and content (31% or 13). The Chinese teachers assigned more weight to correct grammar (70% or 10) and vocabulary (65% or 10). In the focus group, the Chinese teachers explained that they valued content and text organization, but that these could not be achieved without solid grammar and vocabulary. The Chinese teachers felt that their students did not lack ideas for their essays, but rather the grammatical and lexical issues stemming from the linguistic distance between Chinese and English made it difficult to express those ideas. The teachers from Mexico indicated concerns for grammar (49% or 6) and vocabulary (37% or 5) less than the Chinese group, and their interest in content and organization (67% or 9) was higher. The importance of grammar and lexis was similar in Mexico and Poland, despite their different national assessment policies, indicating the strong influence of linguistic factors on EFL teaching and assessment. Other aspects of writing, including style, register, and punctuation, were marked as important to assess by less than 20% of the teachers in all three contexts, so they will not be discussed.

We also asked the teachers what most influences the way they teach and assess EFL writing. In Poland, 31% (13) of the participants identified the national curriculum and, separately, the textbooks available, which in fact overlap, as textbook choices are pre-approved nationally. A teacher explained: “Teachers tend to focus on grammar, reading and listening skills rather than writing. There is no time to teach English-language writing during the class, as you have to follow the national curriculum.” Indeed, other literature on ELT in Poland has acknowledged that oral skills receive the most attention throughout school (Salski, 2012), primarily due to the national curriculum. The next most frequent factor—for 29% (12) of the teachers—was students’ needs and interests. Nineteen percent (8) of the respondents identified the Matura exam evaluation criteria as a determining factor. The Chinese and Mexican focus groups also claimed that student needs shaped their practices (76% (11) and 59% (8)). The Chinese group explained that their “students have to be ready for the [national] college English test,” which they framed as a learner need. It is notable that this “need” is predefined by national policy and curriculum (as found in Romania by Ene and Mitrea (2013)), not personal goals, yet the two overlapped in the teachers’ view. In contrast, for the Mexican teachers, the notion of student need was a more diffuse sense that the students should have, generally speaking, good English (writing) skills in today’s world. This view reflects the influence of the global view that English is important. Finally, the teachers’ familiarity with topics and genres mattered only for 24% (10) of the respondents in Poland, 19% (3) in China, and 22% (3) in Mexico. Cumulatively, our findings show that policy and curriculum are more powerful influences than individual factors such as teacher preparedness or student-voiced preferences.

Perceptions of the Value of EFL Writing

When asked to rank order the importance of the four skills, all of the participants placed speaking first, followed by listening, reading, and, lastly, writing. Large surveys of learners (British Council, 2015; European Commission, 2006) have indeed shown that they value more the ability to speak English, for both personal and professional purposes, while writing academically in English is only important for the professional and academic elites (Haskell, 2002). In Mexico, an interviewee shared that “students don’t really care about English, and especially about writing, until they are older and start thinking about going to study in the U.S. or getting a good job.” A Chinese teacher stated: “We don’t really emphasize writing a lot. Our students don’t really need it. Speaking is more important for communication. The curriculum starts to introduce writing to prepare for the [national] exam, and it’s important to follow that.” In Poland, as pointed out in the section above, the national curriculum and target exams set the pace of the classroom and shape most perceptions about the value of EFL writing skills. The influence of the national requirements is evident once more. Naturally, the

perceived low value of EFL writing and the over-valuing of the types of writing included in national exams is bound to affect teaching practices—including the methods, content, and assessment, as shown above.

Perceptions of National Policy and Globalization

In China and Mexico, the interviewees spoke about the challenges of keeping up with the frequent education reforms, and a general sense of instability and disempowerment. One of the Chinese teachers observed: “Our country is trying to change, to advance, all the time. We have new rules, new textbooks, reform all the time. One must keep up.” A Mexican teacher characterized educational reforms as frequently changing as “the flavor of the day. It can make you dizzy, but we do what we do—teach.” Some noted that the importance of mastering English seemed overblown in the official discourse (“Not *everybody* wants to or needs to know English in reality,” a Mexican teacher stated), and that it was important to equip the students with the skills needed in the global economy without “turning” them into native English speakers. A Polish teacher commented: “There is no point in speaking and writing fluently, but just so-so, just a communicative language.” In the Chinese and Mexican groups, the participants wished for more stability in the educational system, smaller classes, and more professional development focused on EFL writing. They acknowledged that access to materials in English is easier than ever. Primed by their comments, we added related questions to the Poland survey. When asked what they wished their institution would offer them, the most frequent answer (from 38% (16) participants) indicated professional development in L2 writing and pedagogy. When asked what they wished their Ministry of Education would offer them, they made the same request, and a few respondents also marked better pay and smaller classes. We also asked how globalization affected the teaching of EFL writing. Except for one person, the Polish teachers had a positive perception of how it affected their work. They pointed out that the level of English is increasing as a consequence of access to more authentic, relevant materials; ease of communication outside one’s local context, including through technology and the Internet; increased cross-cultural awareness; and improved teaching due to easier access to materials. The same desires and attitude towards the effects of globalization were documented in a similarly designed study in Romania (Ene & Mitrea, 2013), further attesting to the commonalities among EFL contexts.

Discussion and Conclusions

The goal of the study was to explore the similarities and differences in the beliefs and practices of EFL writing teachers in three different EFL contexts, to understand the extent to which they are unitary or diverse and how policy impacts ELT practice, especially in EFL writing. The three contexts explored were distinct

geographically, linguistically, and culturally, as well as by orientation towards English language assessment policy. China and Poland implement national standardized assessments in English at crucial transition points in students' education, while Mexico does not. In all three settings, we found important similarities, including related to the influence of global linguistic priorities and national curricula for ELT. All three countries officially acknowledge the importance of English, first for spoken communication, and to a lesser degree for academic and professional writing. The English language curriculum balanced attention to these skills in the order in which they were prioritized above the classroom level. The teachers' view of the reduced importance of EFL writing correlated with this hierarchy. Where a national-level English exam is not (yet) required—meaning, in Mexico—academic and professional writing were prioritized by the K–12 teachers included in the study, in line with the national and global rhetoric that advocates the need for multilingual professionals in the global economy. Thus, in broad terms, we see EFL classrooms and the teaching of EFL writing as reflecting the global zeitgeist in general and national policy in particular. In this respect, the EFL world appears as unitary, despite contextual differences, in its response to the English-dominated, single global market (Fairclough, 2006).

In all three contexts, the long, firm reach of national policy was felt in specific terms. The evidence presented in this study supports the argument that “the principal locus of policy making remains the nation-state” (Haskell, 2002, p. 5; Lo Bianco, 2002). In Poland, where the national tests do not emphasize academic writing in the earlier years, the teachers reported not focusing on essays in their classes. In China, too, the types of writing tasks to be mastered for college admission were included in classroom practice. “Teaching to the test” and even to the eventuality of a test (in Mexico's case) occurred in all three contexts. The existence and effects of cultures of testing on classroom teaching have been noted before (Crusan, 2010; Cumming, 2001; You, 2010). Crusan (2010) in particular noted that while such cultures ensure that certain genres are taught, they also enhance the disconnect from learners' true needs, as these are shaped and defined from above, by the national curriculum. In her view, standardized tests should not be used exclusively. More locally developed assessment of writing and more teacher training in this area is needed. Our study seconds Crusan (2010), but it should also be noted that

in some cases, it is very hard to identify any specific current or future needs a student might have for writing in English, beyond perhaps passing required exams. This might be especially true for secondary students [in Poland], whose future is unclear.

(Reichelt, 2013, p. 33)

Especially in the lower levels of K–12, learners often feel no real need for EFL writing skills. Consequently, it is understandable that teachers rely primarily on national guidelines, as they provide—for what it's worth—a structure.

The specter of future tests influenced the teaching of EFL writing at classroom level. In China and Poland, the teachers' pedagogical choices were connected to what the students needed to be prepared for in national exams. This factor interacted with other linguistic and cultural factors in each country. To a significant degree, the teachers felt obligated to develop their learners' grammatical and lexical accuracy as a way to provide the means to express ideas. The linguistic distance between the L1s of the students and English in the contexts we explored correlated with the sense the teachers felt to focus on the formal aspects of EFL writing. In addition, commonly shared beliefs about teacher roles, where teachers are viewed as the source of all answers and are expected to perform the duty of providing corrections, enforced the tendency to focus on grammar and vocabulary when evaluating writing. Such interactions between the culture of testing and linguistic and cultural context are known to lead to more form-focused, teacher-centered practices in EFL (Ene & Mitrea, 2013; Lee, 2010; You, 2010). Ultimately, this is also indicative of another significant feature of EFL contexts, especially at K–12 levels, where learners learn how to write in English in order to learn the English language first, and only then in order to learn how to write (Manchón, 2009).

At a large, systemic level, the teaching of EFL writing in the three contexts explored here was also affected by the conditions for language teacher education and development as well as labor conditions. These limited the variety of pedagogical approaches the teachers used. In Mexico, teachers frequently rally in order to draw the governments' attention to the instability of their jobs, inhumane workloads with low pay, and scarcity of training and resources (Ramírez-Romero & Sayer, 2016). Arguably, and in concordance with the reported wishes of the teachers, Ministries of Education and other supervising bodies in each respective country should design curricula and policies that make it possible for teachers and students to perform at the desired levels. It is important to understand that, without decent working conditions, teachers' ability to give even more of their time or engage in continued professional development will remain limited (also see Lee (2010) and You (2010)).

An additional similarity between the contexts investigated here is that the relative value of EFL writing skills is low compared to other skills, in a similar way that it is relatively less important compared to ESL and university-level studies (Ruecker et al., 2014). Research from Romania (Ene & Mitrea, 2013) and Poland (Majchrzak & Salski, 2016; Reichelt, 2005; Salski, 2016) previously pointed out that an additional reason for deprioritizing the development of writing skills in EFL is that in these countries there is no strong tradition of teaching writing in the native tongue, except at the primary school level. Despite the fact that Poland has undergone many educational reforms over the last decades, the 2005 format of the Matura examinations caused a significant drop in writing practice even in Polish (Majchrzak & Salski, 2016), and there is a known negative attitude of learners and teachers towards the activity of writing itself (Salski, 2012).

With regard to globalization, it is notable that positive feelings about it were prevalent, and focusing on the opportunities afforded by this process to both teachers and learners of English. The teachers credited globalization for making it easier to find authentic language samples, native speakers to practice with, and many online materials in the target language. One may argue, like Pennycook (2007), that a more critical attitude towards globalization is desirable. It is possible that the participating teachers found it difficult to express criticism. However, it appears that, while in the “trenches,” teachers prioritize teaching over fighting problems that are out of their immediate reach, such as linguistic imperialism (Ene & Mitrea, 2013). Further research is needed to explore this issue, as our study was limited in size and cannot claim to represent all EFL contexts.

Our study reinforces the realization that there exists a certain unity in the EFL world that co-exists with a high degree of diversity induced by localized policies, needs, and linguistic, cultural, and institutional factors. The most important ramification is for teacher training and development. The fields of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) and second language writing would benefit from the development of not only research but also theoretical frameworks from EFL contexts. For a while now, we have been looking at ELT and EFL writing using ESL as a point of reference. It is realistic to expect that, from the existing populations of applied linguists from EFL contexts, a certain number should specialize in EFL writing in order to represent the field in the international arena, formulate theories, and provide the much-needed training for teachers in those contexts. Dissatisfaction with the importation of U.S.- and UK-based approaches and materials and the preferential consultation of experts from those countries has been expressed quite vocally in Mexico (Ramírez-Romero & Sayer, 2016). For Poland, too, researchers have noted the need for local expertise to develop (Reichelt, 2013; Salski, 2012). Ultimately, L2 writing research can only benefit from contributions from EFL contexts that more clearly define the theoretical propensities of different contexts. In the meantime, it appears necessary to provide training, in TESOL programs, focused on the specific needs and expectations teachers should be prepared for in EFL contexts.

References

- British Council. (2015). *English in Mexico: An examination of policy, perceptions, and influencing factors*. Retrieved from <https://ei.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/latin-america-research/English%20in%20Mexico.pdf>
- Cheng, L. (2008). The key to success: English language testing in China. *Language Testing*, 25(1), 15–37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532207083743>
- Cimasko, T., & Reichelt, M. (Eds.). (2011). *Foreign language writing instruction: Principles and practices*. Anderson, SC: Parlor Press.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages*. Retrieved July 15, 2015 from www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/Framework_EN.pdf

- Crusan, D. (2010). Assess thyself lest others assess thee. In T. Silva & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *Practicing theory in second language writing* (pp. 245–262). West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press.
- Crusan, D., Plakans, L., & Gebril, A. (2016). Writing assessment literacy: Surveying second language teachers' knowledge, beliefs, and practices. *Assessing Writing*, 28, 43–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2016.03.001>
- Cumming, A. (2001). The difficulty of standards, for example in L2 writing. In T. Silva & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *On second language writing* (pp. 209–229). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cumming, A. (2003). Experienced ESL/EFL writing instructors' conceptualizations of their teaching: Curriculum options and implications. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 71–92). New York: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524810>
- Donahue, C. (2009). “Internationalization” and composition studies: Reorienting the discourse. *College Composition and Communication*, 61(2), 212–243.
- Ene, E., & Mitrea, A. (2013). EFL writing teacher training, beliefs, and practices in Romania: A tale of adaptation. *The European Journal of Applied Linguistics and TEFL*, 2(2), 117–138.
- European Commission. (2006). *Special Eurobarometer 243: Europeans and their languages*. Retrieved May 17, 2010 from http://ec.europa.eu/education/languages/pdf/doc631_en.pdf
- Fairclough, N. (2006). *Language and globalization*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hall, C. J. (2013). Cognitive contributions to plurilithic views of English and other languages. *Applied Linguistics*, 34(2), 211–231. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ams042>
- Haskell, C. C. (2002). Language and globalization: Why national policies matter. In S. J. Baker (Ed.), *Language policy: Lessons from global models* (pp. 2–7). Monterey, CA: Monterey Institute of International Studies.
- Jimenez, E. (2008, April). *Six Latin American countries: Creativity and innovation. The teaching of English in Mexico*. Paper presented at the 42nd Annual TESOL Convention and Exhibit, New York.
- Lee, I. (2010). Writing teacher education and teacher learning: Testimonies of four EFL teachers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19, 143–157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2010.05.001>
- Lo Bianco, J. (2002). Real world language politics and policy. In S. J. Baker (Ed.), *Language policy: Lessons from global models* (pp. 8–28). Monterey, CA: Monterey Institute of International Studies.
- Majchrzak, O., & Salski, Ł (2016). Poland. In O. Kruse, M. Chitez, B. Rodriguez, & M. Castelló (Eds.), *Exploring European writing cultures: Country reports on genres, writing practices and languages used in European higher education* (pp. 151–164). Winterthur, SZ: ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences (Working Papers in Applied Linguistics 10). <https://doi.org/10.21256/zhaw-1056>
- Manchón, R. (Ed.). (2009). *Writing in foreign language contexts: Learning, teaching, and research*. Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Min, H.-T. (2011). Foreign language writing instruction: A principled eclectic approach in Taiwan. In T. Cimasko & M. Reichelt (Eds.), *Foreign language writing instruction: Principles and practices* (pp. 159–182). Anderson, SC: Parlor Press. <https://doi.org/10.1558/wap.v5i1.151>
- Ortega, L. (2009). Studying writing across EFL contexts: Looking back and moving forward. In R. Manchón (Ed.), *Writing in foreign language contexts: Learning, teaching, and research* (pp. 232–255). Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.

- Pennycook, A. (2007). The myth of English as an international language. In S. Makoni & A. Pennycook (Eds.), *Disinventing and reconstituting languages* (pp. 90–115). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Qixin, H. (2002). English language education in China. In S. J. Baker (Ed.), *Language policy: Lessons from global models* (pp. 225–231). Monterey, CA: Monterey Institute of International Studies.
- Ramírez-Romero, J. L., & Sayer, P. (2016). The teaching of English in public primary schools in Mexico: More heat than light? *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 24(84). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.24.2502>
- Reichelt, M. (2005). English-language instruction in Poland. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14, 215–232. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.10.005>
- Reichelt, M. (2013). English-language writing instruction in Poland: Adapting to the local EFL context. In O. Majchrzak (Ed.), *PLEJ_2 czyli Psycholingwistyczne Eksploracje Językowe* (pp. 25–42). **Łódź, PL: Łódź** University Press.
- Ruecker, T., Shapiro, S., Johnson, E. N., & Tardy, C. M. (2014). Exploring the linguistic and institutional contexts of writing instruction in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(2), 401–412. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.165>
- Salski, Ł (2012). *Contrastive rhetoric and teaching English composition skills*. **Łódź, PL: Łódź** University Press.
- Salski, Ł (2016). EFL writing in Poland, where traditional does not mean current, but current means traditional. In T. Silva, J. Wang, J. Paiz, & C. Zhang (Eds.), *Second language writing in the global context: Represented, underrepresented, and unrepresented voices* (pp. 207–226). Beijing, CH: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Silva, T., Leki, I., & Carson, J. (1997). Broadening the perspective of mainstream composition studies. *Written Communication*, 14(3), 398–428. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0741088397014003004>
- Spalding, E., Wang, J., & Lin, E. (2010). The impact of a writing workshop approach on Chinese English teachers' beliefs about effective writing instruction. *Asian Journal of English Writing Teaching*, 20, 135–160.
- You, X. (2010). *Writing in the devil's tongue: A history of English composition in China*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.