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Abstract

This project examines perceptions and practices of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) K-12 teachers in Montenegro regarding their teaching of writing. To collect data the researcher utilized a researcher-created online questionnaire. Participants’ responses were analyzed and compared in order to examine their perceptions of importance of EFL writing instruction for their students, the extent and quality of professional training on teaching EFL writing they receive, the approaches to teaching EFL writing they practice, and perception of their competence in teaching EFL writing. Findings showed that the 27 participants would feel more confident teaching EFL writing if they had more training, time and practice using different approaches. It is hoped that the findings of this study will inspire future research, inform EFL teacher education authorities in Montenegro of the needs of K-12 EFL teachers and encourage taking actions directed to the advancement of the EFL writing instruction.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Most English as a Second Language (ESL) or English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers would probably agree that it is important to teach students to write effectively in English, as English has become important in examinations in Europe and globally (Ene, 2013, p. 120). Moreover, as English is a Lingua franca, teachers want to prepare students to communicate globally in their future careers. The need for the written dissemination of information in today’s world of information-technology-mediated work and communication means that students should be taught to write in various genres. Academic writing in particular is considered a complex skill to teach and attain because it involves cognitive, metacognitive, and affective processes. Typically, it requires high levels of self-regulation, such as composition strategies, planning and revision (Zimmerman & Risemberg, 1997; Hidi & Boscolo, 2006; Harris, Graham, MacArthur, Reid, & Mason, 2011). Being complex and building on previous knowledge and competence, writing represents a significant motivational challenge (Rogers & Graham, 2008; Graham, McKeown, Kiuhara, & Harris, 2012; Smedt and Keer, 2014). According to research findings, the quality of writing instruction may have a major impact on students’ motivation and success in writing (Dornyei, 2007; Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 2007; Moskovsky et al., 2013).

By the end of 1970s and at the beginning of 1980s, the recognition of the need for English learners (ELs) to write in target language increased, but although the EFL/ESL learners were required to practice some “free writing”, the writing was dominantly product-centered and learners did not participate in creating meaning or developing writing competence more independently. The second half of 1980s saw a shift from a product-based to a process-based approach, purpose, audience, and the process of composing are taken into consideration. (Murray 1980, p. 4 - 5), as all those stages contribute to discovering meaning. Rather than being the
development of some well-formed idea, according to the process-centered approach, writing is “the record of an idea developing” (Zamel, 1982, p. 197). However, while the Second language Acquisition (SLA) field has recognized the importance of those methods, the product-based approach still hasn’t lost its influence. The shifts in various approaches to writing in second language (L2) may be described not as a movement from one focus to another but the sequential emergence of competing foci: “focus on form, focus on the writer, focus on content, and focus on the reader” (Raimes, 1991, p. 408-413, as cited in Matsuda, 2003, p. 78).

Despite the rich corpus of existing research on writing instruction in a first language (L1) and ESL contexts, there is a recognized need for more intensive research in EFL contexts (Manchón & Haan, 2008; Ortega, 2009; Reichelt, 2009; Casanave, 2009; Lee, 2010; Ene, 2013) because English is the most taught and studied language (97%) across all age ranges in Europe (Eurostat, 2016). Ene (2013) gives a short overview of studies on ESL/EFL writing in the last two decades, concluding that little attention has been paid to L2 writing in EFL contexts. However, Ene (2013) says that during this period, the percentage of research articles about EFL contexts has grown to 45% (or 30 of 67) of the articles published in the *Journal of Second Language Writing* and 40% (or 46 of 114) in *TESOL Quarterly*. That said, Asian contexts continue to be represented in the literature more strongly than others. As a result Ene (2013) concludes that views and theories of EFL writing are limited (in context), preventing us of having a wider understanding on what informs teachers’ work in the area of EFL writing.

Teaching EFL writing at elementary and secondary levels is even more underrepresented in the research, especially in the European context. Mohite (2014) claims that his study is the first one treating writing strategies used by EFL secondary school students in Poland. The most cited studies and publications exploring EFL writing in Europe and globally focus on university
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EFL students’ writing (Leki, 2001; You, 2004a; Miao, Badger & Zhen, 2006; Bitchener, 2008; Manchon, 2009; Reichelt et al., 2012; Ene, 2013).

As an EFL teacher with a decade of experience in teaching in my country of origin, Montenegro, I often found myself facing certain doubts and challenges in planning and carrying out lessons on EFL writing. Although I have had years of instruction in writing and received positive feedback from various authorities, and I dare to consider myself a good writer, I realized that knowing a skill doesn’t necessarily mean having skills to teach it. However, searching for help and support with this, I also found that, due to rarely offered professional development (PD) sessions on teaching EFL writing, I would have to rely on sharing the experience with and hopefully getting some help from other English teachers, or go online to research necessary information in order to narrow my instructional gap.

I acknowledge that the internet may have untrustworthy information because it is fed by human knowledge and experience, which can be limited. Looking for best practices in teaching EFL writing, I learned that research data in this area is also limited. This was especially evident in the context of Europe and, specifically, my country, Montenegro. Due to the identified research gap in teaching EFL writing in Montenegro, I concluded that Montenegrin teachers would benefit from research, which would explore more comprehensively their practices, professional training and perceptions of their competence in teaching of EFL writing and examine the ways in which their instruction was related to and determined by situation-specific factors.

Having recognized the context-specific research gap identified above and wishing to narrow this gap, this research project is focused on exploring the perceptions and approaches of Montenegrin EFL teachers in teaching writing to elementary and high school students in
Montenegro. Besides giving them voice to express their perceptions and needs regarding their professional training and experience in teaching EFL writing, an implicit aim of this study is to raise teachers’ awareness of the variety and importance of methods for enhancing the writing motivation and written output of their students. Results of this study could inform educational and professional development (PD) authorities in Montenegro on the practices and needs of EFL teachers in teaching writing. Furthermore, taking into consideration that education and professional development in writing instruction for EFL teachers in Montenegro seems to be limited, this study and its results could contribute to some future research in this area.

Before getting immersed in the research design and the analysis of its results, I will provide some theoretical and empirical background on this issue. The literature review will highlight the limited existing research exploring second/foreign language learners and their experience with EFL writing in the European context, the instruction those students receive, and the way their behavior and motivation are determined by those factors. Then the focus will narrow to English as a foreign language in primary and secondary schools in Montenegro, and the factors that influence students’ attitude to writing and their performance in the European EFL context. I will also provide insight into the status of English as a foreign language and its instruction in Montenegro, with a special focus on teaching EFL writing, as well as a short overview on the university programs for English teacher education and training in Montenegro.

Following the literature review, the research design will be presented with a focus on the following research questions:

1) How important is writing instruction in K-12 EFL contexts in Montenegro and how important is it for K-12 EFL teachers to receive training in teaching writing?
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2) What are the approaches to and practices of Montenegrin K-12 EFL teachers for teaching writing?

3) What are their perceptions of their competence in teaching writing and is there a link between these perceptions and their approach?

The research findings, results of the analysis, and discussion in relation to these research questions will be presented prior to the conclusions and implications.
Chapter 2: Review of Literature

The theoretical discussion in this chapter starts by providing some background on EFL teaching and learning in Europe and Montenegro in particular, and narrows to discussing factors that influence EFL teaching, with a special focus on the professional training, classroom practice, and the link between the two. It is evident that there is a lack of research on EFL writing in K-12 contexts. However, some valuable research from other EFL contexts may have implications for the K-12 settings; hence, they are included in this review.

Classroom Context Shaping EFL Writing Instruction

Factors affecting teachers’ perceptions of their teaching start with the importance of context. Perceptions are formed by the context in which they occur. According to Palardy (2015), classroom context refers to composition of the student body, classroom structures, and resources excluding the teachers or their teaching. Thus classroom context is something that is there before a teacher steps in. Turner and Meyer (2000), after observing teachers’ impact in a classroom, define another aspect of classroom context, the instructional context of classrooms, writing that it “is a distinct but overlapping aspect of the classroom context and includes the influences of the teacher, students, content area, and instructional activities on learning, teaching, and motivation” (p. 70). Palardy (2015) and Turner and Meyer (2000) agree that classroom context can significantly influence classroom instruction and its results.

EFL writing in the European context. In an attempt to contribute to an expanded, more global understanding of second language writing instruction, Reichelt (2005, 2009), Reichelt et al. (2012) and Ene (2013) investigated foreign language (FL) and EFL writing pedagogy at various educational levels in Europe and the USA. Here, I will provide a short review of their findings in Europe, more precisely, Germany, Poland, Spain, and Romania.
Based on the various pedagogical materials, published research, interviews and meetings with EFL teachers, students and curriculum developers, both Reichelt (2005, 2009) and Ene (2013) found that English is by far the most commonly learned foreign language in Germany, Poland, Spain, and Romania. Instruction in EFL writing for elementary and high school students in Germany, Poland, Spain, and Romania is focused on enabling students to compose short narratives and texts about themselves; write text summaries; answer comprehension or opinion-related questions after reading; listen to or watch something; compose texts with clearly instrumental functions, such as letters; and write in response to a text, usually with a specific context and audience in mind (Reichelt, 2009, p. 185). Teachers, participants of the two research studies, employed a traditional product-centered approach to writing, including insistence on grammatical accuracy and scored writing exams according to content, style, and grammatical accuracy. According to the curriculum reforms for English instruction in secondary schools, writing tasks needed to be integrated into larger projects with communicative purposes, with a context-embedded purposes (Reichelt, 2009, p. 186; Reichelt et al., 2012).

However, EFL writing has traditionally received little emphasis compared to other skills in the EFL classes. It was generally used to support overall English learning, especially grammar and vocabulary, and help students better compete for higher education opportunities on international level (Reichelt, 2005, 2009; Reichelt et al., 2012). Furthermore, writing instruction was inferior to other EFL skills not only in instruction but also in assessment due to, on one hand, heavy workload of teachers and, on the other hand, grading written works being usually time-consuming (Reichelt, 2005).
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Similar results were obtained by Ene (2013) in Romania, where most of the teachers (66%) said that EFL writing is not the most important language skill for their students and rated speaking as the most important skill. Writing was rated as the most important skill by only 27% (11) of the participants (p. 124). Furthermore, 22% of the respondents claimed that their own teaching experience and the requirements of the national curriculum influenced their pedagogical choices, which shows how important the national policy is in shaping the teachers’ perception of the learners’ needs. Despite such perceptions of the importance of EFL writing skills, teachers targeted writing as one of the skills necessary for their students to master in order to pass national and international assessments and eventually accomplish their professional goals. Also in Poland, perceptions on the importance of good EFL writing skills are changing (Reichelt, 2005). The need for written English skills of Polish students is especially recognized when it comes to final examinations (Matura exam), applying and participating in exchange programs outside Poland, applying for employment, conducting professional correspondence, publishing in academic journals, etc. (Reichelt, 2005).

In terms of pre-service training in EFL writing pedagogy, in Europe, Reichelt (2009) writes that most secondary EFL teachers are natives of the countries covered by her research, with little or no training in teaching writing (pp. 183-203). Ene (2013) reports on a similar situation in Romania where “despite the developments in FL pedagogy, both L1 and L2 writing pedagogy are just beginning to individualize as subjects” (p. 120). Reichelt (2005) finds a similar situation in Poland, where EFL writing is not emphasized because there has not been “a strong tradition of L1 writing pedagogy on which to draw” (p. 219). But, interestingly enough, 66% of teachers, respondents of the Ene’s (2013) study reported that, as far as university coursework is concerned, their courses on L2 writing had been useful for their development as EFL writing
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teachers, even though they had to find out themselves how to apply theoretical information about
L2 writing to teaching situations on their own (p. 122). Furthermore, when it comes to the
perception of their competence in teaching EFL writing, 71% of teachers in Ene’s (2013)
research thought that they were well prepared for teaching EFL writing, and another 17%
indicated feeling very well prepared, although most of the participating teachers (85%) indicated
that they taught themselves about L2 writing pedagogy or attended professional development
sessions (conferences and workshops) on theory and pedagogy of EFL writing. However, Ene
(2013) adds that at the university level, there is a recognized need for more experts in L2 writing
who can educate more English writing teachers (p. 121). The same issue seems to be in Poland,
where EFL writing is taught mostly by native English speaking teachers from the UK, US,
Canada. This, according to Reichelt (2005), is due to the fact that Polish teachers rather teach
other courses, but also because they lack training in teaching writing.

When it comes to adopting or adapting the theory discussed above, most of the teachers
in those two studies recognized the need to change the treatment of FL writing prescribed by the
national curricula (and previously practiced their classrooms) in order to better prepare students
for university. At the same time, and disagreeing with the Ene’s (2013) research results from
Romania, the teachers in Reichelt’s (2009) research (2009) reported that the lack of teacher
education for EFL writing represented a significant challenge for them in this effort to reconcile
curriculum with actual needs of their students (p. 201).

Another interesting finding was that “the training that teachers have received in FL
writing instruction also impacts how FL writing is taught” (Reichelt, 2009, p. 202). Thus, those
with less preparation in writing focused less on writing instruction and instead prioritized the
correctness of grammatical forms, while teachers with more insight in teaching writing in
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English-dominant countries attempted to implement this knowledge in their teaching although with a certain concern about whether doing so is realistic or desirable in their context.

Concluding her research insights in teaching EFL writing in European contexts and calling attention to the ways in which local factors shape EFL writing instruction, Reichelt (2009) invites EFL education decision-makers to reflect upon the appropriate purposes for classroom-based EFL writing given the particular context; consider what students’ own purpose for EFL writing might be and should FL writing instruction draw on the practices of local L1 writing pedagogies, L2 writing pedagogies, or both, and in what proportion; and finally, how should L2 teacher education programs more adequately prepare their students for grappling with the local factors that shape EFL writing instruction around the world. Ene (2013) on the other side, calls for more comprehensive research in teaching EFL writing which would include other less commonly researched EFL contexts in order to achieve a more objective and complete understanding of EFL writing instruction around the world and then integrate it into a context-specific pedagogy (p. 131).

EFL in Montenegro. English as a foreign language is a compulsory course in the nine-year elementary education in Montenegro. It is taught from grade 1 to grade 9 of the primary education and throughout high school (Bureau of Education Montenegro, 2017a). Government-prepared curriculum documents and booklets intended for primary school English teachers include recommended teaching approaches and very detailed specifications of content with lists of language items and target skills, as well as specification of the level(s) of achievement to be reached by the learners. The use of textbooks is compulsory, and the textbooks for use in primary and secondary schools must be approved by the Ministry of Education and the Bureau of Education. However, English teachers are allowed to make their own materials in addition to any
published materials/textbooks that they use (Rixon, 2013, p. 31). The required level of English by the end of the primary schooling, according to those set by the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) of Council of Europe, is A2+, and by the end of high school education, B1-B2 (Bureau of Education Montenegro, 2017).

Accepted qualifications for teachers of English in state primary schools are: teachers who followed a specialist pre-service training course in teaching primary school English at the college or university, qualified secondary school teachers of English willing to work in primary schools, and a university graduate in English language and/or literature. Most of the teachers (96%) are university graduates in English language and literature education who had courses in education and methodology at university (Bureau of Education Montenegro, 2017; Rixon, 2013, p. 24). Children from Montenegro enter school when they are 6 years old. This is an early age for learning and pedagogical and methodological approaches vary immensely along the 9-year-long primary school (Rixon, 2013).

**Writing in EFL classes in Montenegro.** Writing and written expression in EFL primary school in Montenegro is gradually introduced in the third grade after students have mastered the Roman alphabet in grades 1 and 2. From third grade on to the final ninth grade, EFL teachers can use the so-called controlled writing (sentence transformation, writing by model, image, diagram) or writing on a free subject: writing letters, songs, stories, dialogs, advertisements, reports, text/book/film comments (Bureau of Education Montenegro, 2017a, p. 34). Some of the guidelines given for teachers in the curriculum booklet (2017) are to pay attention to the writing process and not just the writing product, encourage students to adhere to the methodical approach to writing (thinking about the topic, writing ideas, grouping, and organizing ideas in paragraphs); focus less on linguistic precision; check written works for an appropriate form,
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lexical, and grammatical adequacy; check spelling and punctuation only after the final version of the text is received by the teacher; and assign written tasks individually, in pairs and groups. The guidelines given for EFL secondary school teachers in the curriculum booklet (Bureau of Education Montenegro, 2017b, pp. 17-18) are to develop writing skills using controlled writing or writing on a free topic (writing letters, songs, stories, dialogs, ads, reports, comments on text/book/film); to pay attention to students on the importance of the writing process itself, not just the product of writing; encourage students to adhere to the methodical approach to writing (thinking about the topic, writing ideas, grouping and organizing ideas into paragraphs) and to check the final draft regarding its form for the adequacy of lexical, grammatical correctness, spelling, and punctuation.

To an extent, this effort achieves a more comprehensive approach to teaching EFL writing which includes product, process, and genre. This contradicts the findings of Harbord (2010), who, in his research on approaches to EFL writing in Central and Eastern Europe, says that teaching EFL writing is still governed by the belief that issues with writing origin from the inadequate mastery of vocabulary and grammar. He goes on saying that it “promotes a product-oriented model of teaching writing which ignores most recent scholarship on process and genre, and confines the teaching of writing largely to the selection of the right words and phrases to plug in” (p. 9). Harbord’s (2010) research findings match the ones on the same topic obtained by Reichelt (2005, 2009) and Ene (2013) discussed in paragraphs above.

The final external examination at the end of primary and secondary school (Matura exam) is compulsory for all students. English is offered as one of the exams of choice. The English examination consists of reading comprehension, grammar and writing tasks. The goal of testing English writing skills is to test the ability of students to communicate and express their thoughts
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in a written form, in a logical, coherent, and comprehensible way (Examination Center Montenegro, 2012). In line with the curriculum, students are expected to write functional texts, a letter, diary, an interview, a survey and draw short or guided texts based on what they read, saw, heard or experienced. When evaluating written assignments, they are scored based on integrity of the text and connection of its parts, the use of lexicon, respect for grammatical and syntax rules, spelling and punctuation. Reports on the implementation of final examination, analysis of the results and suggestions are forwarded to the Ministry of Education and to the Bureau of Education by the end of the calendar year in which the assessment of the knowledge was carried out (Examination Center Montenegro, 2012). However, the results are not available to teachers or published online. Results of the examination in English at the end of primary and secondary school have an impact on secondary school and university registration since they carry a certain number of points, depending on the examination grade (Examination Center Montenegro, 2012).

The Bureau of Education in Montenegro is one of the leading institutions in Montenegro concerned with meeting professional development needs of teachers, working proactively through advocacy and outreach, promoting research that impacts the development of professional programs, and enhancing the quality of language teaching and learning. Catalogues of professional development activities and events approved and hosted in the last five years (2014 to June 2018) by this institution reveal that there have been only two seminars accredited by this institution on teaching productive skills in foreign language classrooms. This means that for five years there have been no more than two PD events focused exclusively on teaching writing in an EFL context.

One of the reasons for the lack of PD in EFL writing pedagogy in Montenegro may be that teaching writing skills in EFL classes is not considered crucial and necessary is grounded on
assumption that students, during their education, acquire basic writing skills in the mother tongue literacy classes; hence, they have no need to develop these skills in English. Harbord (2010) refers to this notion, calling it “transferring skills or transplanting culture,” saying that “if writing is a transferable skill, it would be best taught in a language one masters, then transferred to a language one masters less well. But is writing in fact a transferable skill?” (p. 11). Significant research corpora in contrastive rhetoric and the differences of academic writing in different cultures (Monroe, 2002; Connor, 1997) argue that such approach to writing might cause severe problems in transfer across languages and cultures.

This lack of PD focus on teaching EFL writing at elementary and high school level in Montenegro may affect the practice of many EFL teachers in Montenegro since many of them lack university training in teaching EFL writing as well. Students attending university English teacher education programs (bachelor’s and higher academic degrees) acquire only general training in teaching specific language skills (speaking, listening, reading and writing) as part of a few methodology courses, which are offered in some of the specialist’s and master’s degree programs of the University of Montenegro (University of Montenegro, 2018a, 2018b, 2018c). Future EFL teachers are expected to develop their own (academic) writing skills but receive very limited university preparation in how to teach writing. Composition and academic writing courses tend to draw on theoretical approaches associated with applied linguistics, such as genre analysis, rather than writing pedagogy. Courses on academic writing in English are initially introduced into the graduate programs of English (translation studies and graduate programs for teachers of English), where students are also required to write a final research paper in English.

Another problematic fact is that there is no analysis or research published on the scores of Montenegrin students’ English test results since the final examination has been introduced in
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2012. Furthermore, according to the “E-theses” online system of the University of Montenegro, there is no research thesis on writing, let alone teaching writing in the Montenegrin EFL context. Published research is limited to (mostly) non-pedagogical language topics, such as theory of translation, comparative phonetics and phonology, morphology, literature in English, speech acts, etc. Pedagogical research topics mostly deal with teaching EFL vocabulary and grammar.

An absence of analysis implies an absence of certain professional activities focused on training teachers and improving the quality of students’ knowledge and skills in this area. To help fill the gap in research on writing pedagogy in Montenegro, a research study aiming at exploring EFL teachers’ perceptions and confidence in teaching EFL writing in Montenegro is necessary. Studying teachers’ perceptions rather than actual practices will enable me as a researcher to obtain data on common tendencies related to the way Montenegrin EFL teachers feel about their competence in teaching EFL writing and what influenced it. Such data obtained by those “on the spot” will show what actually happens in classrooms; how the university courses and PD sessions on (teaching) EFL writing, or the lack of them, impact the teachers’ practice, and finally, their students’ knowledge in this area. Although some might argue that research based on classroom observations would be more credible, in my opinion, the data obtained by those having to “grapple” with teaching EFL writing on daily basis and within the given context would more authentic, extensive, and reliable than that based on researcher’s “snapshot” observations as a visitor.

Insights gained from teachers’ perceptions could have implications for pre- and in-service English teacher education in Montenegro. A study on this topic would inform teachers on the variety and importance of methods for enhancing the writing motivation and written output of their students as well as encouraging them to include such approach to writing in their planning.
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and classroom practice. It could also inform educational authorities and potentially influence changes in educational policy that leads to the improvement of writing skills of EFL learners in Montenegro.

Despite the rich corpus of existing research on writing instruction in general, there is a recognized need for more intensive study of this area which would explore more comprehensively the experiences of L2 writers within specific classroom settings and examine the ways in which the behaviors, strategies, and difficulties of writers are related to and determined by situation-specific factors.

Factors that Influence Teaching EFL Writing

The factors that influence teaching EFL writing fall under two categories: external or macro and internal or micro factors. External include the influences coming from policy-makers and other contexts, while internal are those created in the classroom. In order to make more clear the character and origin of those two types of influences, in the text that follows I will provide a short overview of the global circumstances of the importance of English language learning, more precisely learning to write in English, and the forces that shape the way it’s taught around the world.

Influence from other contexts. In the era of globalization, when the idea of English as an international language (EIL) and English as lingua franca (ELF) has gained importance, ideas, successful approaches and methods of teaching EFL are being spread. Education policy makers around the world, as well as in Montenegro, are receptive of those influences. You (2004), in her article on “Globalization and the Politics of Teaching EFL Writing” examines how the rhetoric of globalization re-conceptualize English writing instruction, English literacy, their meaning in non-English dominant countries, ways they are and should be taught within the limits of local
PERCEPTIONS AND APPROACHES TO TEACHING EFL WRITING

conditions. Kachru (1995, cited in You, 2004) argued that the institutional varieties of English used in the Outer Circle countries have developed their own grammatical and textual forms to express their contexts of culture. Therefore the norms of writing grown out of inner-circle countries are no longer the standard for English writing practices in outer-circle contexts.

Exploring the results of adapting Anglo-American norms of writing and writing pedagogies in non-English dominant countries, You (2004) argues that English writing skills in such contexts are increasingly being considered a practical tool, like a driver’s license or a personal computer. However, discussing ethical and ideological challenges in teaching EFL writing, research findings express concern that majority of English learners world-wide may not fully realize the purpose of learning to write in English (Leki, 2001; Lefkowitz & Hadgcock, 2009; Reichelt et al. 2012). If writing is seen as peripheral or irrelevant to students’ educations, careers, or lives, this creates somewhat specific challenges. In such cases, educational systems or individual writing teachers must decide exactly what the purpose for teaching EFL writing is. No matter how persuasive recommendations for writing instruction methods and materials (often coming from the center) may be, they must be adapted to local circumstances. In line with this, part of the existing research corpora (Reichelt, 2009; Ortega, 2009; Lee, 2010; Reichelt et al. 2012) points out that the teaching of EFL writing in non-English dominant countries is shaped by various influences: the background of English language teaching, local and western approaches to teaching English and (English) writing, strong presence of English-language-oriented composition pedagogies and teaching materials, and an increasing need for the development of English writing skills.

As an initial step in dealing with the dilemma of adopting or adapting the English dominant pedagogy of teaching English writing, and how to do it, research findings (Leki, 2001;
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Lefkowitz, 2009; Reichelt et al. 2012) suggest learning more about the context in which this teaching takes place, including students’ previous experiences with both L1 and L2 writing instruction; how good they themselves want to become at writing in English; what a good writing means to the teachers and administrators; and according to that how good the students will be required to become, whether EFL writing courses will be general or specific; will EFL writing primarily be a way of learning and developing fluency in language or used for professional purposes; and which of these goals are reasonable for a specific student or group of students.

Atkinson (2018) presented the concept of “small-t theories” in which language teaching “theory and practice are complexly and indivisibly united” (p. 4) because language writing teachers root their teaching in local reality and practices by adopting a top-down approach to theory-practice dichotomy. Furthermore, suggesting that the best approach to second language writing theories may be the “thinking/acting tool” approach, where access to various theories on second language teaching is viewed as tool in increasing the teachers awareness but not as a recipe for acting, Atkinson (2018) concludes that by trying out various theories on writing instruction coming from all over the world various contexts and bringing informed decisions on what works in their situated realities, ESL writing teachers empower their instruction with a powerful toolkit to be used in mediating theory and practice in their writing classrooms.

Aware of the potential of globalization in spreading intellectual ideas, trends, and products it supports, while taking in consideration the research results presented above, it seems a rational decision for an EFL teacher to act cautiously when trying to apply various approaches to teaching English writing coming from English dominant countries.
Although seemingly inevitable, research and classroom practice has shown that it is up to teachers and higher educational contexts to examine and determine how such “universal” approaches fit into a context-specific EFL writing needs, goals, and possibilities. Tudor (2003), as cited in Casanave (2009), suggests avoiding blanket imposition of both traditional and nontraditional methods to EFL writing instruction and finding a common ground by thoughtfully and critically examining their appropriateness by the teachers who would be skillful enough to listen, learn, and adapt within the contexts and dynamics of their local teaching-learning situations (p. 260). Casanave herself (2009) points out that the so-called “Western” methods of English language teaching (communicative, task-based, student-centered, process-oriented) cannot be applied wholesale to EFL contexts, where traditions of large, teacher-fronted, exam-oriented classes persist in Asia and in many European countries (p. 262). Leki (2001) concludes that if teachers and administrators can address the question of why L2 writing is being taught and learned, take students where they are in their writing expertise and move them forward, and help learners create texts that match their expanding intellectual abilities, L2 writing instruction can become a valuable way to advancing learners interests and academic skills (p. 206).

Besides all those challenges that globalization and various external influences may cause, there are some, I will call them here “internal”, domestic constraints to successful EFL writing instruction. For instance, Casanave (2009) cites one Japanese high school teacher saying that the Ministry approved textbook had the word “writing” in the title but was hardly focused on writing, while another teacher mentioned being constrained by the curriculum and under pressure, especially in terms of time, to cover the required material and prepare students for tests and examinations (p. 267). More on some other types of internal, or more precisely, classroom factors which impact and shape teaching EFL writing, will be discussed in the text that follows.
Influences within the classroom. Within the EFL writing classroom there are many factors that influence EFL writing. One of them is students’ attitude towards writing, which further influences their motivation and performance. In order for teachers to motivate students to succeed in writing it can help to give them a clear purpose for writing (Hedge, 2005; Richards & Renandya, 2002).

Writing in a second or foreign language is a complex skill to master. Besides following the expected form to arrange their ideas, which in EFL context can often significantly differ from the one they were taught and used to follow in their L1 writing culture, students should also be able to organize their ideas in paragraphs, arrange the paragraphs in logical sequences, and make the right choice of vocabulary and grammar. Typically, if they fail to do so, what they can expect is to get back their paper covered in red ink. All this cognitive and metacognitive effort, not mentioning the red pen effect, may have a negative impact on students’ attitude as well as their confidence and performance in writing in a second language (Lee, 2010).

Writing attitude, motivation and writing performance are highly related (Krawczyk, 2005; Hidi & Boscolo, 2006; Hii, 2011), motivation being not only important when it comes to developing writing skills, but in language learning in general (Dörnyei, 2001; Gardner et al. 2004; Okuniewski, 2014; Dörnyei, MacIntyre & Henry, 2015). Exploring the motivation factors in learning EFL in Croatia, Penjak and Karninčić (2015) found that “having a positive attitude towards second language leads to a desire to learn foreign language that, in the end, results in motivation intensity that in case of a higher intensity leads to success in learning a foreign language”, (p. 18). However, motivation and attitude to writing in a second language are not only contextually bound (when knowledge is constructed being influenced by learner’s immediate surroundings and instruction), but also determined by domain-specific factors, where language is
used to talk about more specific topics or tasks (Hyland, 2003; Zhang and Guo, 2012; Boo, Dornyei & Ryan, 2015). Thus, within the classroom teachers are the ones who have the major influence on making writing meaningful, enjoyable and involving metacognitive skills. As a result they contribute to building a positive attitude to writing which then increases students’ readiness to improve their writing skills and do that more often (Graham, Berninger & Fan, 2007; Hidi & Boscolo, 2006; Fidalgo, Torrance & Garcia, 2008).

Besides being related to their classroom writing experience, research shows that students’ motivation for writing in another language depends on their motivation to learn another (foreign/second) language because a motivated student writes more independently and creatively (Tran, 2007, p. 161). Casanave (2009), writing about her experience with Japanese EFL students, says that what motivated those students to learn to write in English are their beliefs that EFL writing was important for their personal development, future work and possible future study, recognizing writing as a tool for thought development and self-expression beyond Japan’s borders, which would help to build their fluency and confidence in (international) communication, contribute to language learning in general, and broaden their visions of the world (p. 264). All the respondents agreed that grammar-translation exercises were useless, except as exam preparation.

Although not based on EFL context, research based on foreign language (FL) is interesting and may relate to the way influences in the classroom impact students writing. Exploring various approaches to teaching writing in FL (and a few ESL) classrooms in the US and their impact on students’ motivation, Lefkowitz (2009) found out that FL instructors dominantly used form-focused, product-oriented approaches assigning artificial writing topics in the absence of a previous writing instruction, with the final goal to emphasize grammatical
correctness at the expense of communicative content. Such instruction is usually referred to as a writing-to-learn. This type of instruction views writing as a vehicle for language practice, focuses more on accuracy, and writing content is seen as subordinate to the ultimate goal of language practice. Opposed to writing-to-learn instruction is learning-to-write instruction. This approach emphasizes content over linguistic precision, is focused on the entire writing process and leads the entire writing process to contribute developing writing skills (Hedgecock & Lefkowitz, 2011). The observed ESL and FL teachers who used learning-to-write approach practiced the following activities: free writing, group discussions linking oral and written registers, paraphrasing, summarizing, sentence combining, and synthesizing. Such activities also enhance students’ skills that may serve them outside the classroom such as rhetorical skills, discourse knowledge and genre awareness (Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 2011, as cited in Reichelt et al., 2012, p. 8).

Some techniques which may enhance writing motivation include blogs, journal writing, self-assessment and peer assessment tools, interesting and relevant writing topics, and focusing less on errors and more on the ideas (Lo & Hyland, 2007; Zhang & Guo, 2012; Reichelt et al. 2012). Furthermore, taking in consideration goal-oriented classroom writing activities, instruction based on providing encouragement and support in learning could play a significant role in boosting students’ positive attitude to second language writing. Teachers are, therefore, advised to provide a positive writing environment for students by adopting relevant teaching materials to support writing, contextualizing writing tasks and matching activities with students’ needs in order to make writing tasks more purposeful and relevant (Gray, 2004; Lo & Hyland, 2007; Peterson, 2010).
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However, to be able to provide optimal writing instruction and enhance their students’ writing motivation and performance, teachers should have necessary skills, which can be augmented by attending various professional development sessions. Unfortunately, in both FL and EFL settings, it is possible that language teachers are forced into teaching writing without being fully aware of what teaching writing entails and how to implement it because they don’t have much experiential resources to draw on except those that focused dominantly on neatness, spelling and grammar correctness (Leki, 2001; Lefkowitz, 2009; Reichelt et al., 2012).

Becoming an EFL Writing Teacher

In becoming an EFL writing teacher, besides the initial teachers’ preparation program, professional training and experience gained from classroom teaching are important in preparing teachers to be knowledgeable in their field. Although most of the literature on EFL writing preparation and professional development refers to Asian contexts, it is included here to stress its importance.

Teacher training. Reiterating the importance of context, Casanave (2009) warns that without asking the hard why questions and attending to the local realities of our writing instruction, we risk stirring ideological clashes on what is being imposed from outside and what actually fits in the context, and neglecting to meet our students’ needs (p. 256). She points out that the main challenge of the future EFL writing teachers is developing sufficient understanding of local conditions of learning and teaching and responding appropriately (Casanave, 2009, p. 257). However, according to her views of this issue, teachers and educators should not be left alone to deal with it, but they should be equipped with sufficient information and skills starting from their pre-service teachers education programs.
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Drawing from her concrete experiences and the experiences of students in Japanese L2 teacher education programs, Casanave (2009) shows that TESOL teacher education programs in Japan do not pay nearly enough attention to the needs of students to know how to adapt to local teaching conditions in diverse EFL settings. Instead, they conform to nontraditional methods, deeming traditional ways of teaching ineffective and not valid. But when asked about the positive changes they would like to see happen in the future in such programs, respondents said that a program focusing more on their teaching realities (differences between teaching primary, secondary and tertiary levels, little time devoted to writing, test-oriented curriculum) would be more purposeful. Casanave (2009) points out that besides gaining the knowledge on how to teach writing, EFL teachers must learn also how to negotiate the circumstances and the curriculum, even the local institutional culture, to be able to make changes of any kind without risking losing their jobs (p. 270).

At the end of her research article, Casanave (2009) directs some open questions to education policy makers regarding EFL and TESOL teacher education programs. She also calls for research and innovation in the area of teaching EFL and L2 writing (p. 272-273).

Professional development and classroom practice. Once teachers are in service, continuing their professional development is important to keep them informed of best practices and assure innovative and high-quality teaching. Strong examples of professional development in EFL writing are occurring in Asia, specifically Hong Kong and Japan.

Lee (2010) in her study on the effects of a EFL writing course on English teachers in Hong Kong found that the professional training in teaching writing besides enhancing their theoretical knowledge on writing process, also developed their critical thinking on pedagogical principles. Such training also guided them through a context-appropriate approach to teaching
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EFL writing, helping them to balance idealism and realism, in other words, choose the best balance between theoretical foundations and authentic learning needs and circumstances.

This study showed that sociocultural and sociopolitical circumstances can considerably influence EFL teachers, reflected in the way they work and talk about their work, how they negotiate and build their professional identities and in accordance to it, how they interpret their roles within a system. The training in EFL writing helped the teachers, participants in this research, to develop their enthusiasm and commitment to teaching writing, emphasizing more students’ role in the writing process and changing the perspective of their own teacher identity and their role in the classroom— from an EFL teacher to a writing teacher (Lee, 2010, p. 335). According to the teachers’ narratives, this professional development experience helped them to realize the underlying cognitive and metacognitive skills of their own students. The teachers achieved this by teaching their students how to think and organize their ideas; how to creatively present their ideas, allowing more freedom for the students to direct their writing experience; focus less on (grammar and vocabulary) errors; and providing a more constructive feedback to their students (p. 337).

Previous to this PD experience, the participating teachers based their teaching EFL writing on the ways they learned writing, their apprenticeship of observation embedded in specific contexts and beliefs about writing (Lee, 2010, p. 340). The training helped them realize that they don’t have to act like robots trying to entirely comply with school policy and requirements but could instead be agents of change in order to search for and find ways to develop preferred teaching practices, which wouldn’t clash with practical constraints. This finding is in accordance with Casanave’s (2009) research conclusion cited above, who suggests
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negotiating the circumstances and local institutional curriculum in order to be able to balance idealism and reality in teaching EFL writing.

Studies discussed above reveal that becoming a writing teacher “does not occur in a void but is situated within the social, institutional and historical context of teachers’ work” (Lee, 2010, p. 342). Furthermore, the context, reflective practice, and writing teacher education shapes teachers’ perceptions of their role in the classroom and their instructional practice, which can be described as a process of becoming rather than being, from being an EFL teacher to becoming a writing (EFL) teacher (p. 343).

To learn more about EFL teachers’ perceptions in Montenegro, this research investigates K-12 teachers’ perceptions of their training and practice in teaching EFL writing and explores links between their training, practice and reported levels of confidence. The following chapter shows how the research was designed.
Chapter 3: Research Design and Methods

Purpose

The purpose of this research project was to study elementary and high school EFL teachers’ perceptions and beliefs about teaching writing in Montenegro. In so doing, this research project aimed at identifying teachers' current practices in teaching writing.

The specific questions that guided the study were as follows:

1) How important is writing instruction in K-12 EFL context in Montenegro and how important is it for K-12 EFL teachers to receive training in teaching writing?
2) What are the approaches to and practices of Montenegrin K-12 EFL teachers for teaching writing?
3) What are their perceptions of their competence in teaching writing and is there a link between these perceptions and their approach?

The study aimed at examining Montenegrin K-12 EFL teachers’ perceptions on importance of EFL writing instruction for their students, the extent and quality of professional training on teaching EFL writing they receive, the approaches to teaching EFL writing they practice, and perception of their competence in teaching EFL writing.

This is one of the very few studies treating the topic of approaches to teaching EFL writing in elementary and high schools in Montenegro, and its results could be significant in encouraging some future research in this area. This study also has the potential to inform teachers about the variety and importance of instructional practices for enhancing the writing motivation and written output of their students, and possibly encourage them to include such practices to writing in their planning and classroom practice.
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Ultimately, it is hoped that the results will inform educational leaders about the strengths of EFL writing practices and areas where professional development (PD) and initial training opportunities could be implemented to improve EFL writing instruction in Montenegro.

Methodology

In order to answer research questions, this study employed an online survey. Using a survey had multiple benefits. It allowed the researcher to reach more participants, to avoid logistical constraints and lack of practicality of observations, to target specific research questions, and to investigate participants’ beliefs and perceptions on their teaching writing.

Before discussing the methods of data collection and analysis, the profile of participants will be described.

Participants

Participants in this study were elementary and high school (K-12) EFL teachers in Montenegro. The participants were recruited from the membership database of the English Language Teachers Association of Montenegro (ELTAM). After gaining department’s approval (see Appendix C) and institutional approval to conduct research on human subjects (Appendix D) and then seeking support from the ELTAM executive board (Appendix E), an email invitation to participate in the study was sent to all ELTAM members (Appendix F). In total 27 teachers responded and were enrolled in the study as volunteer participants. Participation in this study was anonymous and besides the information on their professional experience and education, no personal data were collected from participants. However, the same fact that the survey was anonymous may have contributed to reliability of such self-reported data because it may have led to more honest responses.
Table 3.1 shows that the highest percentage of the respondents, 59.2%, or 16 respondents had bachelor’s degree in teaching English as a foreign language. The percentage of those with master’s degree in ELT was 33.3% or nine respondents, while the other 7.5%, or two respondents, held a specialist degree.

Table 3.1

*Highest Education of Study Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>No. of teachers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree in English Language and literature</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree in English Language and literature</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist’s Degree in English Arts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the participants (13) were elementary school EFL teachers. Only two of them taught only high school EFL classes, while the other 12 teachers taught elementary and high school classes (see Table 3.2).

Table 3.2

*Levels taught by the study participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>No. of teachers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school only (age 6-15)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school only (age 15-19)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach both levels</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest percentage of respondents (51.9%) taught EFL between 11 and 20 years, approximately one third taught EFL for 6 to 10 years (29.5%), while the rest of them have the EFL teaching experience of more than 20 years (18.5%). All participants have more than 5 years of teaching experience (see Table 3.3.).
Table 3.3

Participants’ years of teaching experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of teaching experience</th>
<th>No. of teachers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection

The researcher first sought approval from the Eastern Michigan University Human Subjects Review Committee. Subsequently, she prepared a pilot survey to check the research instrument. The draft survey was piloted and reviewed by five of the researcher’s EFL teacher colleagues in Montenegro—both elementary and high-school level teachers. This enabled the researcher to identify ambiguous or irrelevant items, determine the duration of time needed to complete the survey, decide whether there was a need for both the informed consent form and survey to be translated into Montenegrin, and resolve any issues related to the survey’s content and layout. After being piloted and revised, the final survey version contained 20 items, 12 of them using a Likert rating scale (see Appendix A for the complete survey). Likert scale questions are generally deemed to be more reliable than open-ended questions due to the fact that they narrow the respondent’s focus on the topics relevant to the research. Feedback from the pilot phase indicated that it would be unnecessary to translate the consent form and survey into Montenegrin. It was concluded that translating the survey into Montenegrin could cause certain miscommunication related to the difficulty translating academic terms. In addition, the EFL teachers in Montenegro would already be familiar with the terms. Thus both texts, the informed consent and the research survey, were distributed in English.
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The survey was online and anonymous. No identifiable data was collected from the participants. The survey questions consisted of closed and Likert scales questions, plus a few open-ended questions in order to give the participants a chance to express their opinions and explain responses, which might have not been covered by the closed and Likert scale questions. Besides being used to obtain richer information, responses to open-ended questions were also used to triangulate the data from the closed and Likert scale questions, more precisely to provide an extended insight into teachers’ instructional practices in teaching EFL writing. As a result, the survey collected both qualitative and quantitative data on the perceptions and attitudes of elementary and high school EFL teachers in Montenegro on their writing instruction.

The survey questions were divided into three thematic parts: (a) background information, (b) experience and confidence in teaching EFL writing, and (c) practice of teaching EFL writing. The first part was intended to collect general information on research participants: their academic degree (bachelor’s, master’s, other), what classes they teach (elementary, high school classes or both), and their years of teaching experience. This set of questions aimed at answering the second part of the first research question on the importance of the acquired training in teaching EFL writing. The second part aimed at exploring further and in more detail the respondents’ professional training in teaching EFL writing and the perception of their competence in teaching writing as a result of their professional training and experience, which also contributed to answering the first but also the third research question on teachers’ perceptions of their competence in teaching EFL writing. The third part was focused on obtaining data on the respondents’ instructional and assessment practices in teaching EFL writing which helped to answer the second and part of the third research question.
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Data Analysis

This study used survey to collect qualitative and some quantitative data. Most of the data came from Likert scale questions, multiple choice and some limited descriptive data from an open-ended questions. The study aimed at drawing conclusions based on calculations of percentages of the collected data on teachers’ confidence and approach to teaching EFL writing to determine particular type of study results.

Simple descriptive statistics were used to analyze the quantitative data. The qualitative data were analyzed by identifying, examining, and interpreting the patterns and themes in textual data. The researcher compared similar questions and responses in order to determine how these patterns and themes help answer the research questions and form the final conclusions on the teachers’ perceptions, confidence, and approach to teaching EFL writing as well as on the link between the teachers’ perceptions and practice. When analyzing qualitative data, the researcher also looked for any deviations from the identified patterns and if those patterns support the findings.

Research Question 1 was answered using the results of survey questions Q10, Q14, and Q16. Research Question 2 was answered using data obtained by questions Q13, Q18, and Q19. Research Question 3 was answered using the results of survey questions Q12 and Q13. In order to answer Research Question 3, to determine if the teachers’ perception of their competence and identified approaches in teaching EFL writing correlated in any significant way, SPSS software was used.

The software was used for question Q13 in order to compute the frequencies for all variables of Q13 with a particular variable of Q12. Correlations between Q12 and Q13 could not be computed using SPSS due to the fact that the question Q12 is multiple choice and the question
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Q13 is multiple answer type. Thus the inferences on the existence of any patterns between those two questions were based on observing and analyzing the SPSS computed results in the following way. Every variable of both questions Q12 and Q13 were first coded in Excel in a way that each option was given a numerical code. The coded variables of question Q13 were run through the SPSS software in order to determine possible patterns between each of them and the one of the three possible choices in Q12. In this way the percentage of choice of each of the (12) options in Q13 and its share in the total number of options was determined. The percentages and frequencies obtained in this way enabled the researcher to notice and determine patterns and draw inferences on the causality between the teachers’ perception of their competence (Q12) and the approaches used by those teachers (Q13) in teaching EFL writing.

Other data obtained from the other survey questions were visually presented using Excel charts and tables, which allowed them to be converted into a numerical format and facilitate capturing the trends. This data helped to form general conclusions on Montenegrin teachers’ perceptions and practices of teaching EFL writing as well as supporting answers on the main research questions.
Chapter 4: Presentation and Analysis of Data

Data about participants from Part 1 of the survey were discussed in Chapter 3. In this chapter, data obtained from the Parts 2 and 3 of the survey are presented and research questions are addressed. Parts 2 and 3 of the survey aimed at collecting the information on respondents’ training, teaching experience, confidence and practice in teaching EFL writing. What follows is a review of the questions and answers from these two parts.

In this chapter I will also offer my observations because the findings and discussion are inextricably linked. Questions and results are presented as they occur in the survey. Although some of them may not directly answer the research questions, they contribute to more in-depth analysis of research results. Connections between questions are presented and explained, where relevant.

Review of Survey Responses

Q4: Did you have a university course/subject on teaching writing at the university you graduated from, besides the general teaching methodology class?

![Figure 4.1 Responses to question 4](image)
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As the Figure 4. 2 shows, more than a half of respondents (51.9%) answered that they had course on teaching writing at the university they graduated from. Such results are to an extent surprising, considering the fact that the EFL teacher education programs in Montenegro do not offer courses on teaching writing. More specifically, there are courses teaching future EFL teachers how to write (as a part of the modern English language courses and academic writing courses), but not how to teach writing. It is likely that the teachers who responded “yes” graduated from a university outside Montenegro which might have offered courses on teaching EFL writing.

Q5: How much do you think your teaching certification courses at the university were successful in providing you with necessary skills in teaching writing?

There was almost an even split between those who thought that their teaching certification courses at the university were successful in providing them with necessary skills in teaching writing, and those who thought that they were not (see Figure 4. 4). There were 3.7% of respondents who thought that the teaching certification courses at the university they took were “extensively” successful in providing them with necessary skills in teaching writing. If assumed that the 51.9% of those who answered negatively here are those 51.9% who did not have a
Q6: How much field experience (observation and teaching) did you get during your university formal preparation for teaching writing?

As shown in Figure 4. 5 Responses to question 6

As shown in Figure 4. 6 relatively high percentage (almost a quarter) of all responses had no field experience for teaching writing. If we add to this the 29.6% of those reporting to have had one to two field experience lessons on teaching writing, it’s clear that half of the respondents got minimum to no experience teaching writing in a (EFL) classroom during their university formal teacher training.
Q7: Do you feel that you should have received more field experience?

A high percentage of teachers (37% + 40.7% = 77.7%) thought that they should have received more field experience during their teacher preparation courses (see Figure 4, 8).

Possibly, this percentage includes the almost 52% of teachers who declared the lack of courses and field experience in teaching writing (see Q4 and Q5) and an additional 25.7% of those who declared (see Q4 and Q5) having had an adequate university education in teaching writing. The other 22.2% thought that they had sufficient field experience in teaching EFL writing.

When compared with the answers on Q5, this set of answers sheds light on another finding: the respondents, despite thinking that they got sufficient (theoretical) knowledge on teaching writing at the university they graduated from (see Q5), wished they had more practical insight into how teaching EFL writing “works” in the classroom. Observing the results in Q6, another conclusion may be that although 48.1% of respondents got more than two lessons per week of field experience, this experience was not sufficient. Interestingly, such results disagree with the research conducted by Ene (2013) discussed in Chapter 2, where EFL teachers from
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Romania declared that their university courses on teaching writing were useful enough to support their classroom practice.

Q8: How often do you have an opportunity to attend professional development activities on teaching writing (e.g. workshops, conferences, webinars)?

![Figure 4. 9 Responses to question 8](image)

Almost 30% of teachers responded that they had had an opportunity to attend a PD event on teaching writing less than once a year to almost never and in total, 88.9% respond no more than once a year (see Figure 4. 10). More specifically, 9 out of 10 EFL teachers attend a PD session on teaching writing at most once a year.
Q9: How often do you have an opportunity to discuss and learn more on teaching writing from another English teacher?

Figure 4. 11 Responses to question 9

Figure 4. 12 shows that almost 26% of respondents claimed they had almost no opportunity to discuss and learn more on teaching writing from another English teacher. If this score is compared with the one from the previous question, it could be concluded that more than a quarter of the respondents have almost no opportunities to attend any kind of PD event or meeting on teaching writing, while in total 77.8% have this opportunity at the most once per semester.
Q10: How much impact do the professional development activities on teaching writing have on influencing your practice?

A total of 70.4% of respondents declared that their practice of teaching writing is moderately influenced by PD sessions (see Figure 4. 14). This set of answers show that they have certain reservations about applying in their EFL classrooms the new knowledge gained at PD events. On the other hand, 18.5% of respondents claim that such PD events are welcomed and have a high impact on teaching EFL writing.

There are two possible explanations to such situation. Possibly most of those 70.4% are the teachers who rarely (no more than once a year) have an opportunity to attend PD sessions on writing, and thus, those sessions being rare do not influence their teaching. Alternatively, most of the respondents tend to first reflect on their context before eventually deciding to implement any new practices in their classroom context, and based on how applicable they find them to their context, they eventually decide if they would incorporate the new practices in their instruction or not.
Q11: Do you feel you got sufficient competence in teaching writing solely through your experience in teaching writing?

As shown in Figure 4. 16 responses indicate that 51.9% of respondents have 11 to 20 years of teaching EFL experience, which is the same percentage (51.9%) of those having had no university course on teaching writing (Q4) at the university they graduated from. This is also similar to the percentage (51.9-59.3%) of those having less than one opportunity a year to attend PD events or consult another English teacher about teaching writing (Q8 and Q9). This suggests that a significant number of teachers (more than a half of the total number of respondents) were left to rely on their experience of teaching writing as a model and benchmark of success.

On the other hand, this result may, to an extent, confirm the answers obtained in the Q10, showing that, for some reason (may it be the lack of PD sessions?), the respondents rely more on their classroom experience than on their colleagues to test and build their competence in teaching EFL writing.
Q12: How confident do you feel when instructing your students in writing?

![Figure 4. 17 Responses to question 12](image)

Again, as shown in Figure 4. 17 the percentage of those lamenting not having sufficient training in teaching writing (48.1%) is very close to the percentage of those declaring rare or almost no opportunity to learn more about teaching writing in Q8 (59.3%). This shows that those teachers, in the first line their confidence and practice in teaching EFL writing, would greatly benefit from having more of such opportunities.

This set of answers also to an extent clarifies the uncertainty created by answers on the question Q10, leading to the assumption that most of the teachers do not (cannot) rely much on the PD sessions due to their unavailability, and thus instead rely more on their own classroom experience in teaching EFL writing. However, this seemingly does not contribute sufficiently to building their confidence in teaching EFL writing due to the lack of information, which leaves them in doubt about the quality of their practice.
Q13: What is your approach to teaching writing in English?

Table 4.

Approaches Used by Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#Q</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Results (in percentages)</th>
<th>Results (in the # of teachers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>That of teaching writing in their L1 (traditional approaches in teaching writing in L1)</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Process approach (prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing)</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Product approach (focusing on grammatical and syntactical structures and imitating models)</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Genre approach (focus on specific audience and purpose)</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Grammar-translation approach (writing as a product of a translation task)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Integrated skills approach (integration of all skills: reading, listening, speaking and writing)</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Task-based approach (the task creates a need to use language and write)</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Project-based approach (writing as a product of an authentic class research experience)</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Problem-based approach (writing as a part of problem solving activity)</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Communicative language approaches (realistic and relevant writing to communicate a message)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Discovery approaches (invite learners to find the writing rules themselves)</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I mostly teach from the textbook</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. 2 shows that the most common approaches to teaching writing among Montenegrin EFL teachers are process, genre, task-based, and project-based approaches, while the least used approaches are discovery and grammar-translation. However, an integrated skills approach is also used relatively rarely to teach writing. This situation confirms research findings in some other European countries (citation) where writing is seen as just another way of supporting language learning and not much attention is paid on integrating other skills in order to develop writing skills per se (Reichelt et al. 2012).
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In order to examine the possibility of existence of links between question 12 and 13 and thus answer the Research Question 3, SPSS software was used (results in Table 4. 3; original SPSS table in Appendix B). The results show that teachers who feel confident seem to rely significantly less on the traditional approaches in teaching writing in L1 (1 participant, or 2.8%) and the use of the textbook (1 participant, or 2.8%) than the other two groups of participants. On the other hand confident teachers use more than the other participants (5 participants, or 13.9%) problem based approach. A certain pattern was also noticed between the confident and other teachers in the variety of approaches they use. Thus, the participants who said to need more training seem to use and explore a wider variety of approaches (55) that those who said to need more class time (32) or feel confident in teaching EFL writing (36).

Table 4. 4

Results of SPSS Data Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approaches listed in Q13</th>
<th>Number of teachers who use the approach</th>
<th>Percentage of teachers who use the approach (in Q12)</th>
<th>Number of teachers who use the approach (in Q13)</th>
<th>Percentage of teachers who use the approach (in Q13)</th>
<th>Number of teachers who use the approach (in Q14)</th>
<th>Percentage of teachers who use the approach (in Q14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching L1 writing approach</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process approach</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product approach</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genre approach</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated skills approach</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-based approach</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-based approach</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-based approach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q14: In your opinion, how important is it for your students to have good writing skills in English?

The results above in Figure 4.20 show that 92.6% of respondents thought that good writing skills in English are important to very important for their students. Taking into consideration such high value placed on writing in English, it would be reasonable to conclude that Montenegrin teachers often focus on teaching writing skills and thus recognize the need to improve and test their teaching skills in this aspect.
Q15: How do you motivate your students in writing in your class?

Table 4. 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent’s code</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>I give them authentic and age-proper <strong>topics</strong>, I let them choose a topic, or I choose from the topics that may be interesting for their age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>I let them choose <strong>a topic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>By providing <strong>resources</strong> they need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Connect it with <strong>real life tasks</strong>, for what they will need it in life. Giving reasons, justifying, negotiating, convincing... They need to be able to express those in written form as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>By making them aware how much they will need this skill in the <strong>future</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>I try to make all <strong>topics</strong> more familiar with students, encourage them to write, use linkers, express opinions, help them use <strong>structures</strong> they can apply in different types of texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>I <strong>publish</strong> their works on my blog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>I encourage the Ss in writing by using writing <strong>prompts</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>That everything is possible and that they only have to try.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10</td>
<td>I explain why it is important to write for their <strong>future</strong> since they will need it for work someday, also after a certain writing tasks especially more demanding I &quot;reward&quot; them with a set of engaging games and energizers. I sometimes play <strong>games</strong> which include writing theme before the task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T11</td>
<td>I tell them to think of their <strong>future professional image</strong>, good writing opens doors, opportunities in the job market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T12</td>
<td>I give my students interesting <strong>themes</strong> to write about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T13</td>
<td>Using <strong>games</strong> and fun <strong>themes</strong> and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T14</td>
<td>By emphasizing <strong>importance of writing</strong> for crossing the message in the right way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T15</td>
<td>I give them a project work about <strong>what they like</strong> (fashion, love, problems)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T16</td>
<td>Unfortunately, <strong>grades</strong> are the most effective type of motivation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T17</td>
<td>I give them <strong>examples</strong> of correct writing, then they write the similar using the clues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T18</td>
<td>By telling them about the practical use of writing, for example <strong>applying for a University</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T19</td>
<td>I choose age appropriate and <strong>topics</strong> interesting for that age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T20</td>
<td>I help them accumulate ideas and <strong>how to arrange</strong> them in their writing. I assign familiar and modern <strong>topics</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T21</td>
<td>By telling them how important it is for them to have good writing skills in their <strong>future</strong>, as students, or in a business correspondence (formal register), and for their final examination. I give them basic <strong>guidelines</strong> on composition and <strong>topics</strong> relevant to their future needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Not being too critical when it comes to **correcting their errors**, valuing their effort and ideas, discussing the writing topic before the writing task and **brainstorming ideas**, assigning **topics** they are interested in.

I find it difficult.

They do not have much time to do it during the lesson, but they have their **portfolios** where they put their essays, projects, short stories...I am interested in process writing rather than in product. One of the reasons is that in that way I am sure that Ss did not use copy-paste technique.

Answers on the Q15 presented in Table 4. 6 were varied, and some of the instructional practices that teachers mentioned included:

**Table 4. 7**

*Instructional Practices Used by Teachers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional practice</th>
<th>Number of teachers who mentioned it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authentic, age appropriate topics, matching their interests, freedom of topic choice</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising awareness of the importance of good writing skills for their future</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing guidelines how to brainstorm, organize and write their ideas</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support writing by giving prompts, discourse markers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples, modeling good writing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not insisting much on accuracy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign writing tasks for homework due to the lack of class time</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The answers in Table 4. 8 above show that Montenegrin teachers try to motivate their students mostly by attractive, relevant topics aligned to their students’ ages and everyday interests, and some occasionally give students freedom to choose their own topics. Teachers also try to raise students’ awareness of the importance of the good (EFL) writing skills for their future education and career, by helping them with choosing, organizing, and writing down their ideas and by showing that they value their effort etc. One teacher mentioned process writing explicitly while a few other responses show that they focus on process writing more than product writing.
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This dominantly process writing approach contradicts with the research findings based on some other parts of Europe by Reichelt (2009) and Ene (2013). The reason for this may be that the things are changing in different parts of Europe. Another reason may be the tendency by Montenegrin teachers to treat both approaches as effective in various contexts to improve students’ English knowledge skills.

Q16: How important are good writing skills in English for Montenegrin EFL students?

Questions 14 and 16 may be asking for the same information but the offered answers provided different results (see Figure 4. 22). In Q14, 92.6% of respondents agree that good writing skills in English are important to very important for Montenegrin EFL students. The answers to Q16 complement the question Q14 specifying that 22.7% of respondents thought that the importance of good EFL writing skills depend on the specific context and may be less important than other skills, like speaking or reading. This moment in the research was somewhat similar to the findings described in studies on EFL writing in Europe done by Reichelt (2009) and Ene (2013) discussed in Chapter 2 of this paper, saying that writing is not the most important language skill for students; teachers rated speaking as the most important.
Q17: How do you assess students’ written products?

Table 4. 9

Responses to Question 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Results (percentages)</th>
<th>Results (# of teachers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I assess a construct per assignment (fluency, meaning, accuracy)</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I assess holistically (focus on the whole, rather than specific</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elements)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubrics/written criteria</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My professional judgment</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By comparing to other students' works</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By comparing to the best work</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (according to the curriculum goals)</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking into consideration that respondents could choose all the answers that corresponded to their practice of assessing students’ written products, it is obvious that most of the respondents use various approaches (see Table 4. 10), probably depending on the focus of their assessment. In fact, one respondent explicitly stated that (s)he assesses according to the curriculum goals.

Q18: How often do you:

Table 4. 11

Responses to Question 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Always and often</th>
<th>Sometimes and never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Re-teach writing skills or strategies that were previously taught</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>give student an alternate writing assignment</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teach sentence construction skills.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teach students about ways of organizing a text</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teach punctuation skills.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. 12 list the statements that correspond to Q18 and the responses chosen by participants. According to the respondents’ answers to support and enhance their students’ writing, Montenegrin EFL teachers mostly teach them how to organize their text, re-teach writing skills or strategies that were previously taught, teach sentence construction skills, and monitor the writing progress of their students.

When it came to three practices, namely giving students “alternate writing assignment” for choice or differentiation, “providing mini-lessons on writing”, and teaching process writing, there was almost an equal distribution of those respondents who answered that they practice this always or often and those who only sometimes or never provide this opportunity for their students.

The least practiced are teaching punctuation and capitalization skills, modeling writing strategies and modeling the enjoyment or love of writing for students. Although these were the least selected practices, the numbers are not significant due to the small sample size.
Q19: How often do your students:

Table 4. 13

Responses to question 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Always and often</th>
<th>Sometimes and never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>engage in planning before writing.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>select their own writing topics.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revise their writing products.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>share their writing with their peers.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publish their writing. (Publish means to print or write it so that it can be shared with others and/or be displayed)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help their classmates with their writing.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are allowed to complete writing assignments at their own pace.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generate and organize ideas on information before writing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work together to plan, edit, or revise their work</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use a graphic organizer (e.g., story map) when writing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluate their writing.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use writing portfolios (add material to a portfolio, look at material already in it, and so forth).</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use Google doc or some other software for collaborative writing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use writing to support reading (e.g., write about something they read).</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use reading to support writing (e.g., read to inform their writing).</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This set of questions was aimed at exploring the approaches and techniques the responding teachers use to motivate their students to write in English and improve their writing skills.

According to the respondents’ answers on this question (see Table 4. 14), Montenegrin students are less engaged (70%) in working together to plan, edit, or revise their work; using a
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graphic organizer (e.g., story map) when writing (70.3%); publishing their writing (70.3%); helping their classmates (70.3%) with their writing; selecting their own writing topics (66.6%); evaluating their writing and using writing portfolios (66.6%). They are the least engaged (85%) in using Google doc or some other software for collaborative writing.

When it comes to opportunities for Montenegrin EFL students to individually generate and organize their ideas before writing, individually revise their writing products, or share their writing with their peers, there is almost an equal distribution of those respondents who claimed that they practice this *always* and *often* and those who only *sometimes* or *never* provide this opportunity for their students (48.15%--51.8%).

Based on these answers, it seems that students’ writing is seen as an individual effort, a usual language development task, to be done individually, within certain constraints (class time, topic, resources) and “trapped” within the notebook covers or classroom walls. Writing is not generally seen as a way to develop students’ critical thinking and development of general cognitive and metacognitive skills. It is mostly seen as a tool to develop and get evidence (assessment) of students’ English language proficiency (Reichelt et al., 2012).

Questions 13, 15, 18 and 19 show that Montenegrin teachers use wide range of approaches and techniques for teaching and assessing EFL writing. This indicates that they understand that there is no comprehensive approach or theory to language teaching. Such post-method pedagogy approach to language teaching is also suggested by Atkinson (2018). From the point of view of second language teaching, he writes that “eclecticism is heart and soul of second language writing, so no single theoretical umbrella can suffice”. Atkinson (2018) defines traditional pedagogical theories from two perspectives, viewing them as a thinking tool, which includes the ability to understand and speculate about various theoretical phenomena, and the acting tool, the skill of putting that knowledge into action, by adjusting it to the local realities.
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Similar point of view on teaching second language writing are also shared by some other scholars (Silva, 2016; Cumming, 2016).

The final question in the questionnaire aimed at identifying the professional development needs of the respondents. Besides the topics identified by the researcher as relevant to development of the 21st century skills, including those focused on teaching writing, there was also an open-ended question where teachers could add the PD topics which, according to their opinion, would meet their PD needs and interests.

Q20: Which topic would you like to learn more about in some of the professional development events in the future?

Table 4. 15

Responses to Question 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Results (in percentages)</th>
<th>Results (in the # of teachers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching productive skills (speaking, writing)</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching receptive skills (listening, reading)</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation and use of authentic language materials</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of social media in teaching English</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimodal approach to teaching (combination of text, audio and image)</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self and peer assessment</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-based teaching/learning</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-based teaching/learning</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of L1 in the classroom</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative work</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Assessment, assessment of writing (2))</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the Table 4. 16 given above, it is obvious that the professional development needs recognized by the research respondents were more PD sessions on teaching productive skills (speaking, writing) and creation and use of authentic language materials. Somewhat less but still significantly high demand exists for PD sessions which would provide the Montenegrin teachers
This final set of answers seems to offer a better understanding of the previous two questions (Q18 and Q19) and their results. These answers show that the reason why Montenegrin EFL teachers use more certain methods than others to encourage and enhance students’ writing (motivation) is that they do feel more confident and competent using those methods due to the lack of professional development and experience in using the other ones.
Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion

In this chapter I will refer to the findings and explain how they contribute to answering the research questions. This study highlighted several perceptions and identified a few needs which impact the teaching of EFL writing in Montenegrin EFL classrooms. As in many other parts of Europe and the world, this research also showed that testing old and trying out new ways of teaching writing plays an important role in forming perceptions on teachers’ beliefs and confidence in teaching writing (Reichelt, 2009; Manchón, 2009; Casanave, 2009; You 2010). These beliefs are influenced by teacher education, PD sessions, and reflecting on practice. These processes can lead to teachers’ decisions whether or not certain approaches and methods work in certain contexts.

In response to the Research Question 1, How important is writing instruction in EFL context in Montenegro and how important is it for EFL teachers to receive training in teaching writing?, the results show that good writing skills in English for Montenegrin EFL students are perceived as important to very important by almost all EFL teachers (92.2%). Because of this importance, professional development opportunities are seen as a useful way to inform their practice and improve teachers’ skills in teaching writing. Results also show that insight into theoretical foundations developed from their teachers’ education is helpful, but only after testing them in their context.

More than a half of the respondents did not have any course on teaching writing during their teacher education program. The same teachers feel that their program was not successful with providing them with necessary skills in teaching writing, because besides not having a course on theoretical foundations on teaching (EFL) writing, they also had no field experience to get an insight how it works in a classroom. However, when it comes to field experience, a high
percentage of those (more than 50% of them) who said to have had university courses on
teaching writing which incorporated field experience as well responded that the offered amount
of such experience was not enough to support their teaching writing. Based on teachers’ answers
related to their university training programs, it seems that (future) Montenegrin EFL teachers
would benefit from EFL teacher education coursework which would focus purposefully on EFL
writing pedagogy. Improved preparation in EFL writing would empower EFL writing teachers in
Montenegro as well as in other EFL contexts to approach their work with a better informed,
critical eye and to become genuinely learner-centered (Casanave, 2009; Ene, 2013). In addition,
introduction of coursework on teaching EFL writing, and more frequent PD sessions on teaching
EFL writing are also recognized as necessary by the most in-service EFL teachers in this
research.

Discussion on the need for more (extensive) preservice training in EFL writing leads to
the question on where and how to incorporate such courses in already packed university EFL
programs’ curricula? Drawing from my personal experience as a student of one of those
programs in Montenegro and also on the content of the present curricula (available also online)
of most of EFL teachers’ university programs in Montenegro, it seems that courses on English
and American literature take a significant share in the total number of courses, especially in the
bachelor’s degree EFL teaching programs. The question is as follows: How important is the
knowledge on English literature for an EFL teacher in Montenegro and how much it is used and
incorporated into elementary and secondary school EFL curricula and teaching? Moreover,
would it be more useful and purposeful for pre-service EFL teachers to be offered more TESOL
courses? This doesn’t have to be quite at the cost of the courses in English literature either. A
suggestion that seems rational to me is to provide EFL pre-service teachers with instruction on
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how to effectively write their papers on literature and to train them on how to teach their elementary and secondary school students to support writing by reading and vice versa.

When it comes to PD opportunities after the graduation, dedicated and accessible mostly to EFL in-service teachers, most of the respondents (88.9%) said that they have such opportunities at most once a year. Besides organized PD events, Montenegrin teachers lack opportunity to discuss their EFL teaching with other colleagues, EFL teachers. Thus, 77.8% have such opportunities less than once per semester. However, if offered more frequently, such opportunities would have a moderate to high impact on their teaching EFL writing for 88.9% of them, or for 9 out of 10 teachers. But, on the other hand, Montenegrin EFL teachers seem to find a way to grapple with the issue of insufficient offer of PD sessions on teaching EFL writing. The majority of them (51.95) feel that they have sufficient competence in teaching EFL writing solely through their experience in teaching it, but then again they would feel much more confident if they had a chance to receive more professional training (48.1%) and more class time to explore and test the theory (25.9%).

Besides professional training, teachers’ experience in teaching EFL writing seems to be a significant factor in influencing Montenegrin EFL writing teachers’ practice whether it originates from their classroom experience, their experience with learning to write in English or as the result of university coursework and education polices. This parallels Ene (2013) and others (Casanave, 2009; Ortega, 2009; Lee, 2010; Atkinson, 2018) who noticed in various other language learning contexts that teaching EFL/ESL writing is a balancing act between idealism and realism. In other words, teachers express the desire and readiness to test in practice new theories learned from their teacher education and PD sessions, but they may be constrained by their specific micro contexts. This said, teachers’ perceptions about the importance of writing are
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highly context specific and influenced by: available class time, perceptions on the importance of good EFL writing skills, impact of standardized testing, and curriculum priorities.

The second Research Question asked: *What are the approaches to and practices of Montenegrin K-12 EFL teachers for teaching writing?* Despite the lack of more regular PD sessions on teaching EFL writing, study participants seem to be well informed of the variety of instructional practices and (latest) trends in teaching EFL/ESL writing. This may suggest that they quench the thirst for knowledge by participating in PD events or looking for the information online. Also the variety of the approaches used may imply that this is the way teachers try to meet various needs of their students when it comes to developing their EFL writing skills.

In response to the third question, *What are their perceptions of their competence in teaching writing and is there a link between these perceptions and their approach?*, findings show that there is a certain link between teachers’ perceptions of their competence in teaching writing and a particular approach used to teach writing. The most striking was that confident teachers relied less on traditional L1 teaching approaches and the use of the textbook, while the teachers who said that they needed more professional training in teaching EFL writing employed a wider range of approaches in their teaching of EFL writing. The reason for this may be the perceived lack of training and the need to rely on their classroom experience and their own effort in order to explore and get insight into those approaches. This again is in accordance with the answer to the first research question on the importance of their own experience when applying the theoretical knowledge or trying to compensate the lack of PD in teaching EFL writing. The analysis of the obtained data showed that teachers who answered that they need more training also experiment more with various approaches. This could be understood in terms of the lack of
effectiveness of one single approach to all learning contexts and the attempt by the teachers to use various approaches to adjust to various classroom and learning contexts.

The results discussed above to an extent clarified what EFL teachers who feel more or less confident do. But the question on what influences teachers’ perception of their competence in teaching writing remains half answered. It is clear that teachers who don’t feel confident feel this way due to their lack of training or class time to explore various approaches, but what influences the feeling of confidence with the confident teachers remains partially unanswered. It may be assumed that perception of their confidence on teaching EFL writing is rather formed and influenced by the amount of professional development they got on teaching EFL writing, the macro and micro circumstances influencing their opportunities to apply theoretical foundations on teaching writing in their classrooms and draw conclusions on their success, and possibly their students’ success in and motivation for writing.

Besides the evident need for more research on teaching EFL writing in Montenegrin context, local EFL teachers would also benefit from more extensive research based on classroom observations or interviews with teachers on their needs and experiences with teaching this skill. More extensive research on EFL writing textbooks and practices, education policies, EFL teacher preparation courses and professional development opportunities would also contribute to better support for teachers. When it comes to meeting students’ needs and creating more student-focused instruction, research data based on the EFL students’ performance in EFL writing would be valuable in order to guide future teachers’ practice and contextual educational policies.

Limitations

The small sample size is a limitation of this research. Furthermore, as the survey was anonymous, there is no personal data about participants, such as from which region of
Montenegro they come. Another limitation is that self-reported data can be unreliable. Perceptions are respondents’ beliefs and feelings they have about the reality surrounding them, and since they often determine the way people behave, examining them provides the researcher with valuable information on the reasons respondents act in a certain way. In this research, exploring teachers’ perception of their competence and confidence in teaching EFL writing help find out how such views influence their practice. However, perceptions can vary from person to person. Thus, conclusions drawn from this research cannot be generalized to represent the perceptions and practices of all K-12 EFL teachers in Montenegro. That said, this study does help build up the literature in this area. In order to ensure the reliability of the survey data, the researcher formulated the survey questions to aim directly at obtaining the information crucial for answering the research questions while at the same time making sure that they are clear and explicit enough so that they don’t create confusion for the study participants. Finally, data were verified only by the researcher and this may be another limitation to this study.

It is hoped that this study will make the perceptions, challenges, and practices of Montenegrin EFL writing teachers more visible and inspire future research into EFL writing in Montenegro so that education authorities will take action directed to the advancement of EFL writing instruction in Montenegro.
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Appendix A: Survey

Survey on beliefs and practices of Montenegrin K-12 EFL teachers in teaching writing

**Part one: background information.**

1. I have completed the following degrees:
   - Bachelor’s Degree
   - Master's Degree
   - Other: _______________

2. I currently teach (check all that apply) *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Elementary school

   Secondary school
   (choose 1-4 grade)

3. I have ______ years of teaching experience
   - 0-5
   - 6-10
   - 11-20
   - More than 20

**Part Two: Experience and confidence in teaching writing.**

4. Did you have a university course/subject on teaching writing at the university you graduated from, besides the general teaching methodology class? *
   - Yes
   - No

5. How much do you think your teaching certification courses at the university were successful in providing you with necessary skills in teaching writing?
   - Extensively
   - Adequately
   - Inadequately
   - Not at all
6. How much field experience (observation and teaching) did you get during your university formal preparation for teaching writing?

- Several weeks of lessons
- Several lessons
- One to two lessons
- None

7. Do you feel that you should have received more field experience?

- Definitely yes
- Yes
- No
- Definitely no

8. How often do you have an opportunity to attend professional development activities on teaching writing (e.g. workshops, conferences, webinars)?

- Every month
- Once per semester
- Once a year
- Almost never

9. How often do you have an opportunity to discuss and learn more on teaching writing from another English teacher?

- Every week
- Every month
- Once per semester
- Almost never

10. How much impact do the professional development activities on teaching writing have on influencing your practice?

- High
- Moderate
- Low
- None

11. Do you feel you got sufficient competence in teaching writing solely through your experience in teaching writing?

- Definitely yes
- Yes
- No
- Definitely no
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12. How confident do you feel when instructing your students in writing?
   - I am confident in teaching writing
   - I would feel more confident if I had more training/knowledge in teaching writing
   - I would feel more confident if I had more class time
   - I am not confident in teaching writing

13. What is your approach to teaching writing in English (check all that apply)?
   - That of teaching writing in their L1 (traditional approaches in teaching writing in L1)
   - Process approach (prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing)
   - Product approach (focusing on grammatical and syntactical structures and imitating models)
   - Genre approach (focus on specific audience and purpose)
   - Grammar-translation approach (writing as a product of a translation task)
   - Integrated skills approach (integration of all skills: reading, listening, speaking and writing)
   - Task-based approach (the task creates a need to use language and write)
   - Project-based approach (writing as a product of an authentic class research experience)
   - Problem-based approach (writing as a part of problem solving activity)
   - Communicative language approaches (realistic and relevant writing to communicate a message)
   - Discovery approaches (invite learners to find the writing rules themselves)
   - I mostly teach from the textbook
   - Other: __________________________________________

Part Three: Practice of teaching writing.

14. In your opinion, how important is for your students to have good writing skills in English?
   - Very important
   - Important
   - Somewhat important
   - Not important

15. How do you motivate your students in writing in your class?

16. How important are good writing skills in English for Montenegrin EFL students? *
   - Very important
   - Somewhat important
   - Less important than other skills, like speaking or reading
   - Important mostly when it comes to testing
17. How do you assess students’ written products? (choose all that apply)

- I assess one construct per assignment (fluency, meaning, accuracy)
- I assess holistically (focus on the whole, rather than specific elements)
- Rubrics/written criteria
- My professional judgment
- By comparing to other students' works
- By comparing to the best work
- Other: ______________________________

18. How often do you:

**Always** | **Often** | **Sometimes** | **Never**
---|---|---|---
Re-teach writing skills or strategies that were previously taught
Give student an alternate writing assignment
teach sentence construction skills.
teach students about ways of organizing a text
teach punctuation skills.
teach capitalization skills.
provide mini-lessons on writing skills or processes students need to know at this moment----skills, vocabulary, concepts, strategies etc.
model writing strategies.
teach specific strategies for planning, drafting, revising, and organizing written work
provide examples of good writing
model the enjoyment or love of writing for students.
assign writing homework to students in your class.
use a writing prompt (e.g., story starter, picture, physical object, etc.) to encourage writing
monitor the writing progress of your students.

19. How often do your students: 

**Always** | **Often** | **Sometimes** | **Never**
---|---|---|---
engage in “planning” before writing.
select their own writing topics.
“revise” their writing products.
share their writing with their peers.
“publish” their writing. (Publish means to print or write it so that it can be shared with others and/or be displayed)
help their classmates with their writing.
are allowed to complete writing assignments at their own pace.
generate and organize ideas on information before writing
work together to plan, edit, or revise their work
use a graphic organizer (e.g., story map) when writing.
evaluate their writing.
use writing portfolios (add material to a portfolio, look at material already in it, and so forth).
use Google doc or some other software for collaborative writing
use writing to support reading (e.g., write about something they read).
use reading to support writing (e.g., read to inform their writing).

20. Which topic would you like to learn more about in some of the professional development events in the future (check all that apply)?

- teaching productive skills (speaking, writing)
- Teaching receptive skills (listening, reading)
- Creation and use of authentic language materials
- Use of social media in teaching English
- Multimodal approach to teaching (combination of text, audio and image)
- Self and peer assessment
- Task-based teaching/learning
- Project-based teaching/learning
- Use of L1 in the classroom
- Collaborative work
- Other: ______________________________________
Appendix B: Table of Q12 and Q13 SPSS calculation results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>qx13 Frequencies a</th>
<th>q12: More training</th>
<th>q12: More class time</th>
<th>q12: Confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responses N</td>
<td>Percent of Cases</td>
<td>Responses N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q13a1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.1% 41.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q13b2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.3% 33.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q13c3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.3% 33.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q13d4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.7% 58.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q13f6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.1% 41.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q13g7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.7% 58.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q13h8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.9% 50.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q13i9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6% 16.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q13j10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.7% 58.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q13k11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6% 16.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q13l12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.9% 50.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100.0% 458.3%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of chosen answers: 55
Percent between all questions: 100.0%
Percent within each question: 458.3%

Total number of chosen answers: 32
Percent between all questions: 100.0%
Percent within each question: 428.5%

Total number of chosen answers: 36
Percent between all questions: 100.0%
Percent within each question: 514.3%
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Appendix D: The EMU Human Subjects Review Committee Approval
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Dear Silvija Marnikovic:

The Eastern Michigan University Human Subjects Review Committee has rendered the decision below for PERCEPTIONS AND APPROACHES TO TEACHING WRITING OF ELEMENTARY AND HIGH SCHOOL EFL TEACHERS IN MONTENEGRO. You may begin your research.

Decision: Exempt
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Appendix F: Email to Montenegrin English teachers/survey participants

Dear English teacher,

Via this email ELTAM is reaching out to you and asking for your voluntary contribution in helping one of our Board members with her research. Her name is Silvija Marnikovic and she is doing her MA thesis at Eastern Michigan University in the USA. She is interested in exploring the ways teaching EFL writing can be improved. Therefore she is conducting a study that will explore Montenegrin EFL teachers’ approaches to and perceptions of teaching EFL writing. Ultimately the results of this study may help students improve the quality and increase their motivation for writing in English classes.

As an English teacher in Montenegro you have some valuable contribution to make. Silvija would be grateful if you can help with her research and would like to request your permission to conduct the survey. Your participation would involve filling in an online survey about your experience and practice in teaching writing which should take about 15 minutes of your time. No personal information will be requested. Furthermore, all the data collected will be kept confidential and your answers will only be reported in an aggregate form.

If you know someone who would also like to add their thoughts to the survey, please feel free to share the survey link.

Any questions can be directed to the researcher, Silvija Marnikovic, at smarniko@emich.edu, and/or to her faculty advisor: Dr. Macknish at cmacknish@emich.edu.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to contribute to this valuable area of research.

Sincerely,

ELTAM
Appendix G: Informed Consent

**Project Title:** Perceptions and approaches to teaching writing of elementary and highschool EFL teachers in Montenegro

**Principal Investigator:** Silvija Marnikovic, smarniko@emich.edu, Eastern Michigan University

**Faculty Advisor:** Dr. Cynthia Macknish, cmacknish@emich.edu, Eastern Michigan University

**Invitation to participate in research:** You are invited to participate in a research study. In order to participate, you must complete an online survey. Participation in research is voluntary. Please ask any questions you may have about participation in this study.

**Purpose of the study:** the purpose of this study is to identify perceptions, approaches and confidence of EFL teachers in Montenegro in teaching EFL writing and raise awarenes of different ways of teaching writing.

**Funding:** This research is unfunded.

**Procedure:** You will be asked to take a 10-15minute online survey with a Likert scale response option and open response option.

**Confidentiality:** The results of this research may be published or used for teaching. However, identifiable information will not be used for these purposes and no personal information will be requested. Furthermore, all the data collected will be kept confidential and your answers will only be reported in the aggregate. All answers will be kept in the researcher’s locked office, and will be stored in a password-protected file on a password-protected computer and deleted after the study is published, no more than five years after the study is finished.

Other groups may have access to your research information for quality control or safety purposes. These groups include the University Human Subjects Review Committee, the Office of Research Development. The University Human Subjects Review Committee reviews research for the safety and protection of people who participate in research studies. I may share the research information with other researchers outside of Eastern Michigan University. If I share the research information, there will not be any identifiable information so that you cannot reasonably be identified.

**Expected Risks:** There are no expected physical or psychological risks to you as a participant. You can take as many breaks as you need during the questionnaire. Confidentiality will be maintained to the degree permitted by the technology used. Your participation in this online survey involves risks similar to a person’s everyday use of the Internet.

**Expected Benefits:** You will not directly benefit from participating in this research, although you may find useful and informative the set of questions related to variety and importance of methods for enhancing the writing motivation and written output of your students. However, by participating in this study you may help inform education leaders and teachers’ associations on the professional development needs of the EFL teachers in Montenegro when it comes to writing instruction. This study is hoping to help teachers (and students) to make their teaching writing (and students’ motivation for writing) more meaningful in EFL classes.
Voluntary Participation: You can choose whether or not you want to take the survey. You may drop out of the study at any time even after signing this form, without repercussion. Participation will not cost you anything. You will not be paid to participate in this research study.

Study Contact Information: If you have any questions about the research, you can contact the Principal Investigator, Silvija Marnikovic, at smarniko@emich.edu, and/or her faculty advisor, Dr. Cynthia Macknish, at cmacknish@emich.edu

For information about your rights as a participant in research, you can contact the Eastern Michigan University Office of Research Compliance at 734-487-3090 or human.subjects@emich.edu

Statement of Consent

By completing and returning this questionnaire I agree with the terms of this Informed Consent. I am saying that I have read this form. I have had an opportunity to ask questions and am satisfied with the answers I received. I click “continue” below to indicate my consent to participate in this research study.