

# English writing complexity, accuracy, and quality among Chinese college students

Sun, Qi ✉

Graduate School, Lyceum of the Philippines University - Batangas, Philippines

Received: 1 April 2024  
Available Online: 15 June 2024

Revised: 15 May 2024  
DOI: 10.5861/ijrsl.2024.012

Accepted: 30 May 2024

ISSN: 2243-7754  
Online ISSN: 2243-7762

OPEN ACCESS



## ***Abstract***

Mastering the English language is essential for staying competitive on a global scale. It is pursued internationally due to its countless advantages. As the most widely spoken language globally, achieving fluency in English can significantly broaden opportunities for both personal and professional advancement. The study assessed the complexity, accuracy, and quality of English writing among Chinese college students, with the aim of proposing supplemental language program to enhance their English writing skills. The study involved 341 freshmen and sophomore Chinese college students from HD Normal University. It used a descriptive quantitative research design, specifically, correlational and comparative approaches, with a survey questionnaire as the primary tool. The study found a balanced representation of genders, with most students being freshmen majoring in Liberal Arts. Respondents acknowledged writing complexity in terms of vocabulary richness, block, syntactical, and morphological complexities. They prioritized accuracy, with morphology being the highest priority. Participants recognized the importance of language writing quality, with content receiving the highest agreement. However, article structure received the lowest agreement. Furthermore, the analysis showed significant differences in writing complexity based on gender, year level except for syntactical complexity and morphological complexity, and major. Similarly, differences in accuracy were observed based on gender, year level except for vocabulary), and major except for syntax. Additionally, variations in quality were found based on gender, year level (except for content), and major. Overall, females, freshmen, and liberal arts students tended to perform better. Positive correlations were also found between writing complexity, accuracy, and fluency levels. Based on the findings, the study proposed supplemental English program to enhance the English writing skills of Chinese college students may be implemented.

***Keywords:*** English writing complexity, accuracy, quality, Chinese college students

## English writing complexity, accuracy, and quality among Chinese college students

### 1. Introduction

Mastering the English language is an indispensable skill for achieving global competitiveness and fostering personal and professional growth. Across the globe, individuals recognize the myriad benefits that come with attaining proficiency in English. As the most widely spoken language worldwide, fluency in English unlocks countless opportunities. It serves as the lingua franca of global commerce and academia, granting access to top-tier universities and a wealth of knowledge not readily available in one's native tongue. Moreover, English dominates the digital sphere, with many of the internet's leading platforms and resources predominantly in English. Consequently, a firm grasp of the language enhances one's online experiences and facilitates meaningful connections in the digital realm. Beyond its practical utility, learning English transcends borders, enabling individuals to broaden their cultural horizons and forge connections with people from diverse backgrounds and nations. The ability to bridge linguistic and cultural divides is invaluable in today's interconnected world, enriching both personal interactions and professional endeavors.

China has long integrated English language instruction into its educational curriculum. Nevertheless, despite this widespread incorporation, achieving fluency in English remains a significant challenge for many Chinese learners. Despite the substantial number of individuals engaged in English language studies in China, it is disheartening to note that only a minute fraction can be considered proficient speakers. Estimates suggest that less than 1 percent of the population in mainland China possesses conversational proficiency in English. The 2022 English Proficiency Index, as highlighted by Salomone, and Salomone, (2022), underscored China's struggle, ranking it at 62, indicative of low proficiency. This ranking marks a notable decline from previous years, with China slipping from a moderate proficiency level of 49 in 2021 and 38 in 2020. As a result, China's proficiency in English is lower than that of countries like Singapore, the Philippines, Malaysia, and Hong Kong, posing challenges in both domestic and international contexts. The research findings from Jin et al. (2022) revealed a continued decline in China's English proficiency ranking over the past year. This deterioration positioned the nation at 62nd among 111 non-English speaking countries and regions. With a score of 498 out of 800 on the company's 2022 English Proficiency Index, China's proficiency level transitioned from moderate to low, according to the organization's assessment.

Zhang et al (2022), an English professor at Universität Würzburg, expressed skepticism about the noted drop in proficiency levels. He did, however, acknowledge that China's level of English ability still falls well below that of other countries. The main causes of this discrepancy are China's widespread exam-based English education system and English teachers' resistance to adopting modern, international teaching approaches. In addition, Jiang (2019) observations highlight the widespread practice of intensive English teaching in Chinese technical institutions. Giving pupils the tools they need to succeed on standardized tests like the College English Test (CET) or the National College Entrance Examination (NCEE), also known as Gaokao, is the main goal of this demanding curriculum. Due to the emphasis on exam preparation, grammar drills have received disproportionate attention at the expense of the development of strong academic writing skills as noted by Hughes & Loader (2023). Consequently, students' learning approaches are molded to prioritize test performance, with their educational experiences heavily influenced by the pervasive influence of exam-centric English training methodologies.

Numerous studies have delved into the underlying factors contributing to the lack of oral proficiency among Chinese students. With China's rapid development and increasing globalization, there has been a growing recognition of the importance of spoken English, resulting in heightened attention to this aspect of language learning. However, it is widely acknowledged that achieving true English language proficiency transcends mere success in tests or addressing oral challenges. True proficiency entails mastery of all four macro skills of communication, with writing often considered the most intricate and demanding. Despite this reality, writing skills

are frequently undervalued in language education. Many learners prioritize speaking and listening skills, often neglecting the importance of writing in comprehensive language acquisition.

Consequently, neglecting to hone and reinforce writing skills in the English language could hinder progress in language acquisition. This issue is particularly pertinent for university students aiming for global career opportunities for advancement, as they are expected to master sophisticated writing abilities. Francis(2019) highlighted in his research that ESL college students must proficiently articulate their personal perspectives on academic topics, substantiate their claims with ample evidence, construct coherent and cohesive written compositions, and demonstrate a robust command of vocabulary, syntax, and discourse conventions. Key components of writing assignments in higher education encompass argumentative essays, laboratory reports, statement of purposes, weekly reflections, revisions, among others. Assessing students' written assignments serves as a crucial criterion to evaluate their academic performance within their respective study programs. As a result, the mastery of writing skills emerges as a pivotal factor in determining the academic achievements of university students. Nonetheless, a plethora of research studies underscores the unfortunate neglect of English writing within the realm of language learning. This neglect stems from the disproportionate distribution of attention and resources towards the instruction and acquisition of English reading skills, as highlighted by various scholars (James, et al., 2018).

Research findings have brought to light a common trend in numerous Chinese universities, where English reading and writing are frequently conflated. Notably, there is a notable absence of dedicated courses tailored specifically for teaching and learning English writing. Instead, English writing instruction is often integrated into English reading classes, particularly for non-native English speakers (Cheng & Zhang, 2021.). This integration is primarily driven by constraints such as limited instructional time and the pressures imposed by curriculum and syllabus requirements. As a result, reading instruction is frequently given priority by English teachers, who spend little time teaching writing techniques. Chinese undergraduate students thus face difficulties in acquiring and practicing English writing due to the scarcity of time and opportunities. As an unintended consequence of this practice, many Chinese undergraduate students tend to underestimate the significance of acquiring and refining their English writing abilities (Zhang, et al. 2021).

Furthermore, the study conducted by Fan (2019) yielded the conclusion that Chinese ESL students encounter significant challenges in achieving success in writing, particularly within the academic context. These obstacles stem from language barriers and the instructional materials utilized in writing lessons. Notably, difficulties arise in the generation and organization of ideas, as well as in mastering various aspects of writing such as syntax, spelling, word choice, punctuation, and more. The inadequacy of writing skills is influenced by a multitude of factors, including curriculum design and syllabus structure, adopted learning strategies, students' individual attitudes and motivation levels, the impact of College English Tests (CETs), and others. Moreover, these contributing factors interact with each other, resulting in the manifestation of problematic writing outcomes. Additionally, contextual factors such as large class sizes, ineffective instructional methodologies, and an environment dominated by the use of the first language (L1-only) further hinder the learning process of English writing (Blatchford & Webster 2018).

To effectively tackle the writing hurdles faced by Chinese students, it becomes imperative to delve into and evaluate their English writing proficiencies. This entails a comprehensive examination and analysis of their Writing Complexity, Accuracy, and Quality. These three aspects serve not only as descriptors of performance but also as indicators of language advancement, proficiency, and overall writing competence. By scrutinizing the intricacies of these components, educators can gain valuable insights into students' language development, gauge their language performance, and assess the level of their writing prowess. The concept of complexity, as explored by Yang (2020), stands as a recurrently examined facet of language progression, relevant to individuals proficient in both their first language (L1) and second language (L2) when it comes to speaking and writing. This relationship between complexity and language development arises from the finding that people with higher degrees of skill in L2, or who are more proficient in L1, tend to use more complex language structures and produce writings that are

more complex. In this context, complexity is typically understood to be the ability to use a wide variety of complex vocabulary and linguistic structures within the context of L2 communication.

Conversely, accuracy, as defined by Stapleton & Kin (2019), is the ability to produce error-free language that is similar to the target language. This includes the accuracy with which students apply the language system to things like vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation. Finally, the notion of "quality" in writing refers to the degree of excellence or superiority demonstrated in a piece of writing. Numerous factors, such as accuracy, coherence, clarity, and effectiveness in communicating the intended message or goal, can be used to evaluate it. While numerous research endeavors have explored the intricacies of each of these dimensions, it becomes evident that these three variables stand out as discrete elements within the realm of second language proficiency and performance. Their manifestation can vary significantly depending on the specific contexts of second language utilization, and they may undergo diverse developmental trajectories among learners exposed to varying learning conditions. Hence, there exists a compelling need for continued exploration and investigation into these aspects to gain a deeper understanding of their nuances and implications in language acquisition and use.

Considering the significance of English writing proficiency for college-level learners and the prevalent challenges encountered in this aspect of language acquisition, it is pertinent to undertake a thorough examination of the strengths and weaknesses exhibited by Chinese college students in their English writing endeavors, focusing on the aforementioned indicators. Therefore, the purpose of this study project is to clarify the degrees of English writing complexity, accuracy, and quality among Chinese university students. Furthermore, in order to address the areas that need improvement, the researcher is working to develop an intervention program that will help Chinese college students enhance their English writing abilities.

**Objectives of the Study** - Generally, the purpose of this study was to determine English writing complexity, accuracy, and quality among Chinese college students in order to propose a program to enhance their English writing. More specifically, this study intended to describe the respondents' English writing complexity in terms of vocabulary richness, block complexity, syntactic complexity, and morphological complexity; assess the respondents' English writing accuracy in terms of vocabulary, syntax, and morphology; evaluate the respondents' English writing quality in terms of content, language use, and article structure; test the relationship between the respondents' English complexity and accuracy of English writing for Chinese college students; test the significant relationships among English writing complexity, accuracy, and quality; and propose a language learning program to enhance Chinese college students' writing skills.

## 2. Methods

**Research Design** - The objective of this study was to ascertain the complexity, accuracy, and quality of English writing among Chinese college students at HD Normal University in China. To achieve these goals, the researcher employed the descriptive quantitative research method, utilizing comparative and correlational approaches. For this research, the data was primarily collected through a questionnaire to substantiate the study's findings. This method was chosen to ensure valid, unbiased, and accurate results. Descriptive correlation and comparative research designs were deemed the most appropriate methods to determine and evaluate the English writing complexity, quality, and accuracy of Chinese college students.

**Participants of the Study** - The researcher used the probability sampling technique to select the subjects for the study. The sample size was determined using the Raosoft Online Sampling Calculator. The respondents for the study were a sample of 341 Chinese college students drawn from a total population of 3000. The 341 samples were assigned in a proportional manner, with 182 from the freshman level and 159 from the sophomore level. As mentioned, this research involved 341 freshmen and sophomore college students from HD Normal University in China as respondents. Moreover, the researcher believed that these respondents were capable enough to answer the questionnaire, which aimed to assess their English writing complexities and determine their English writing quality and accuracy as college students majoring in preschool education.

**Instruments of the Study** - The researcher employed a descriptive quantitative research design in which the survey questionnaire served as the main instrument of the study. Results were substantiated through informal observation and interviews with the respondents, as well as relevant literature. The contents of the questionnaire were derived from multiple sources, and the statements were designed specifically for the study, which aimed to assess the English writing complexities and determine the quality and accuracy of the English writing of the college students majoring in preschool education. The questionnaire was presented according to how the questions in the statement of the problem were posed. Consultations with the research adviser, College dean, and faculty experts were done for the enhancement and refinement of the questions in the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was divided into four parts. The first part identified respondents' profiles, such as sex, year level, parents' occupation, parent's educational attainment, and type of media exposure. The second part consisted of statements describing the respondents' English writing complexity, including vocabulary richness, block complexity, syntactic complexity, and morphological complexity. The third part comprised statements determining the respondents' English writing accuracy in terms of vocabulary, syntax, and morphology. Moreover, the last part contained statements used to measure the respondents' English writing quality in terms of content, language use, and article structure. The survey questionnaire for determining English writing complexity, quality, and accuracy was derived from multiple standardized sources. Hence, it no longer underwent face and content validation as well as reliability testing.

**Data Gathering Procedures** - The questionnaire for measuring the respondents' English writing complexity, accuracy, and quality was derived from multiple standardized sources. It was constructed after the finalization and approval of the topic and the statement of the problem. Additionally, the researcher sought necessary coordination from the concerned research authorities prior to the distribution of the questionnaire, either online or face-to-face. The respondents were properly selected based on the set qualifications. A data gathering permit was also obtained from the management of HD Normal University before the actual survey was conducted with the college students who served as the respondents to the study. The researcher collected the data personally or via an online survey using Google Forms. Then these questionnaires were retrieved, and the data was tabulated. The data that was gathered was subjected to statistical computation with the help of a professional statistician.

**Data Analysis** - The study used descriptive correlational and comparative research methods. The data which were gathered were tabulated and statistically analyzed using SPSS 23. Weighted Mean and Composite Mean were used to assess the English writing complexity, accuracy, and quality of the college student-respondents. Pearson's  $r$  was used to test the relationship between the respondents' English complexity and accuracy of English writing for Chinese college students and the relationship between the respondents' English complexity and quality of English writing for Chinese college students.

**Ethical Considerations** - The research was undertaken with ethical considerations in mind, notably in terms of informing and gaining agreement from the target school's administration. Consent and confidentiality were two of the most crucial ethical issues during the research process. The respondents were provided with all necessary information about the study, and their consent was obtained. Their responses and personal information were kept confidential. Only the information required to answer the study's questions was provided. Furthermore, the authors and researchers whose works were used in this study to assess and interpret its results were appropriately acknowledged and cited.

### 3. Results and discussion

As reflected in Table 1, the highest composite mean of 2.99 was received by block complexity. It is followed by morphological complexity (2.91) and vocabulary richness (2.90). Lastly, syntactical complexity had the lowest composite mean of 2.86. All these English writing complexity indicators were assessed by the respondents as agree with a composite mean of 2.92.

**Table 1**  
*Summary Table on English Writing Complexity*

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
Vocabulary Richness	2.90	Agree	3
Block Complexity	2.99	Agree	1
Syntactical Complexity	2.86	Agree	4
Morphological Complexity	2.91	Agree	2
Composite Mean	2.92	Agree	

*Legend: 3.50 – 4.00 = Strongly Agree; 2.50 – 3.49 = Agree; 1.50 – 2.49 = Disagree; 1.00 - 1.49 = Strongly Disagree*

The highest score of 2.99 for block complexity in the participants' self-assessment suggests a notable level of confidence and proficiency in paragraphing, organizational skills, and the clear presentation of content. This finding implies a strong emphasis on effective communication and structural clarity in their writing. The participants' preference for block complexity over other elements may signify a prioritization of conveying information clearly and logically, showcasing a practical and utilitarian approach to writing. The emphasis on substance over stylistic flourishes suggests a commitment to delivering information in a straightforward and coherent manner, possibly aligned with professional or academic writing expectations. The instructors can build upon this strength by encouraging further refinement of organizational skills and providing opportunities for participants to apply their proficiency in block complexity to different writing contexts. While the emphasis on clarity is commendable, instructors might also explore ways to incorporate stylistic elements that can enhance engagement and expressiveness without compromising the overall structural integrity of their writing.

In addition, morphological complexity scored 2.91 and got second in the rank. It suggests a noteworthy level of proficiency among respondents in areas related to verb usage, grammar, and basic word formations. This indicates a strong command over the fundamental rules governing language construction, highlighting respondents' comfort in navigating these essential linguistic elements. However, the score falling slightly below the highest mean suggests that there is room for further exploration and development. While respondents exhibit confidence in handling basic morphological structures, there is potential for deeper engagement, particularly in areas involving more intricate wordplay and nuanced grammar. This implies that participants might benefit from targeted instruction or activities that encourage the exploration of advanced morphological features and more complex grammatical structures.

The analysis underscores the participants' solid foundation in morphology while also identifying an opportunity for educators to guide them towards a more nuanced and sophisticated command of linguistic elements, ultimately enhancing their overall language proficiency. This was supported by Anderson (2015) that morphological complexity appears in many ways and to varying degrees in different dimensions. Thus, morphological systems can be compared based on the morphotactic complexity, morphosyntactic content, exponence relations, semantic patterns, incidence of autonomous morphological patterns ("morphomic" patterns) expressing neither syntactic nor semantic content, and complexity. Remember that complexity in one dimension does not always correlate with complexity in another. Thus, statements of morphological complexity must always be qualified by stating the dimension, the methods for assessing complexity in that dimension, and the representations to which these criteria are applied.

Third in the rank was vocabulary richness with the composite mean of 2.90 which showed a diverse lexicon and conscious word choice. While respondents seem at ease employing a variety of words, further refinement through exploring sophisticated synonyms and nuanced vocabulary might be beneficial most especially to novice English language learners. Zhang, et. al., (2022) affirmed that the lexical richness of L2 writings produced by novice learners is comparably low, with a limited range of vocabulary consisting mostly of high-frequency terms and function words. The learners' preference for the spoken register is reflected in their written products due to a lack of lexical resources. Furthermore, all four measures produced significant, albeit non-linear and irregularly paced, developmental gains throughout the grade levels. The large lexical expansion shows that in the process of learning English, L2 writing by starting learners tends toward a written-like mode.

Syntactical complexity brings up the rear with the lowest mean score (2.86). This suggests that complex sentence structures and diverse clause usage might be areas where respondents feel less confident. However, it could also reflect a preference for clarity and conciseness, or the influence of the writing context itself. The finding was in consonance with Lee, et. al., (2022) who proposed an approach that introduces complex grammatical features as tools for meaning making rather than focusing solely on their forms. The emphasis is on students understanding these complexities not merely as displays of linguistic prowess but as resources for creating meaning in their writing. The recommendation is to encourage students to view grammatical complexity as a means to achieve concise and effective writing rather than an end in itself. Additionally, the study suggests that students may encounter challenges and make errors while attempting to incorporate syntactically sophisticated features. Rather than focusing on these errors, teachers are encouraged to emphasize the importance of taking linguistic risks as a part of the learning process. Furthermore, the authors also highlighted the need for teachers to help ESL learners master challenging syntactic structures by guiding them on correct usage of prepositions and relative clauses, creating a positive environment for block complexity development.

**Table 2**  
*Summary Table on English Writing Quality*

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
Vocabulary	2.68	Agree	2.5
Syntax	2.68	Agree	2.5
Morphology	2.75	Agree	1
Composite Mean	2.70	Agree	

*Legend: 3.50 – 4.00 = Strongly Agree; 2.50 – 3.49 = Agree; 1.50 – 2.49 = Disagree; 1.00 - 1.49 = Strongly Disagree*

As reflected in Table 2, the highest composite mean of 2.75 was received by morphology. It is followed by vocabulary and syntax with mean score of 2.68. Morphology, with a mean score of 2.75, appears to be the strongest area for the respondents. This suggests they have a good understanding of word parts and how they combine to form new words. This could indicate proficiency in areas like using prefixes, suffixes, and root words effectively. This was supported by Noori (2023) when she stated that developing morphology skills is crucial for students in both reading and spelling. Morphemes, the building blocks of meaning in language, play a significant role in communication, whether spoken or written. Understanding word structure becomes essential for comprehending texts. Knowledge of prefixes, suffixes, and base words empowers students to decipher unfamiliar terms. For instance, recognizing that "re-" signifies repetition or reversal aids in understanding words like 'redo.' Morphological awareness becomes especially vital when students transition to reading for information or engaging with academic language in textbooks. Furthermore, morphology contributes to improved reading comprehension. When students encounter challenging words and can deduce their meanings, they enhance their ability to understand and interpret the overall content they are reading.

Vocabulary and syntax received comparable mean scores of 2.68 each, indicating a tough foundation in both lexical choice and sentence structure among respondents. This suggests that participants possess a commendable breadth of vocabulary and a proficiency in organizing words and phrases to construct clear and grammatically sound sentences. The parallel scores affirm a balanced competence in both aspects, reflecting a well-rounded linguistic skill set among the respondents. Generally, respondents attained 2.70 as the average composite mean which suggests that they are generally aware of these key aspects of language used in writing. This implies they understand basic concepts and rules related to word forms, word meanings, and sentence structure. Accordingly, Shi and Lei (2024) suggested that readers are more engaged with texts that balance moderate complexity with clear and grammatically correct language. Similar scores for vocabulary, syntax, and morphology could indicate that respondents understand the importance of achieving this balance in their writing, even if they have not yet fully mastered all aspects.

**Table 3**  
*Summary Table on Language Writing Quality*

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
Content	2.96	Agree	1
Language Use	2.78	Agree	2
Article Structure	2.77	Agree	3
Composite Mean	2.84	Agree	

*Legend: 3.50 – 4.00 = Strongly Agree; 2.50 – 3.49 = Agree; 1.50 – 2.49 = Disagree; 1.00 - 1.49 = Strongly Disagree*

As reflected in Table 3, the highest composite mean of 2.96 was received by content. It is followed by language use with mean score of 2.78 and article structure with mean score of 2.77. With a mean score of 2.96, content appears to be the strongest area for the respondents. This suggests the writers can come up with interesting, engaging, and original topics or arguments and they excel in supporting them with relevant evidence and ensuring overall coherence and completeness of their writing. They may know how to back up their claims with facts, examples, and other forms of evidence to make their writing credible and persuasive. Further, their writing flows smoothly and logically, with all the necessary information included to convey their message effectively. Language use and article structure follow closely. The scores for language use (2.78) and article structure (2.77) indicate that respondents also have a good understanding of effective word choice, grammar, and sentence construction.

Additionally, they seem proficient in organizing their writing into logical sections and using appropriate formatting. Accordingly, respondents acquired 2.84 as the average composite mean which shows a positive outcome, indicating that the respondents have a solid foundation in the fundamentals of writing. They may have a wide understanding about the key components of writing, including content, language use, and article structure. Particularly, Hyland and Jiang (2023) suggested that a wide understanding of genre conventions, register variations, and different text structures all contribute to overall writing competence, aligning with the idea of respondents having a broad knowledge of key components,

**Table 4**  
*Relationship Between English Writing Complexity and English writing Accuracy*

Vocabulary Richness	r-value	p-value	Interpretation
Vocabulary	.761**	0.000	Highly Significant
Syntax	.823**	0.000	Highly Significant
Morphology	.377**	0.000	Highly Significant
Block Complexity			
Vocabulary	.722**	0.000	Highly Significant
Syntax	.778**	0.000	Highly Significant
Morphology	.306**	0.000	Highly Significant
Syntactical Complexity			
Vocabulary	.849**	0.000	Highly Significant
Syntax	.802**	0.000	Highly Significant
Morphology	.555**	0.000	Highly Significant
Morphological Complexity			
Vocabulary	.567**	0.000	Highly Significant
Syntax	.473**	0.000	Highly Significant
Morphology	.714**	0.000	Highly Significant

*Legend: Significant at p-value < 0.01*

Table 4 shows the association between English writing complexity and English writing accuracy. The computed r-values indicates a strong direct correlation and the resulted p-values were less than the alpha level. Thus, there was significant relationship exists and shows that the better English writing complexity, the more accurate is the English writing.

In terms of Vocabulary Richness, Vocabulary, Syntax, and Morphology were verbally interpreted as highly significant. This suggests that a strong command of vocabulary, syntax, and morphology significantly improves English writing accuracy, implying that focusing on these aspects in writing instruction is crucial for fostering clear, precise, and effective communication. Accordingly, Xu et al (2023) mentioned that vocabulary instruction significantly improves L2 writing accuracy and fluency, particularly when the instruction focuses on word meaning, usage, and collocations. On the other hand, in terms of Block Complexity, all of the indicators were also interpreted



as highly significant. This highlights the importance of not just individual sentence-level skills, but also the ability to structure and connect ideas within paragraphs for accurate and impactful writing. It emphasizes the need for a holistic approach to writing instruction that prioritizes both micro-level (vocabulary, syntax, morphology) and macro-level (paragraph organization, topic development, flow) skills. Hsiang, et al. (2020) highlighted the importance of teaching students how to structure and organize their writing at the paragraph and essay level, as well as how to use complex sentence structures, to improve writing accuracy and impact. Moreover, in terms of Syntactical Complexity, all of the indicators were also interpreted as highly significant. Mastering complex sentence structures, encompassing all aspects of Syntactical Complexity, significantly enhances writing accuracy. This suggests that prioritizing the development of these skills in writing instruction is crucial for fostering clear, precise, and effective communication. Lastly, in terms of Morphological Complexity, all of the indicators were verbally interpreted as highly significant. This means that focusing on morphological awareness alongside vocabulary, syntax, and block complexity is essential for fostering accurate and effective written English.

**Table 5**  
*Relationship Between English Writing Complexity and English Writing Quality*

Vocabulary Richness	r-value	p-value	Interpretation
Content	.413**	0.000	Highly Significant
Language Use	.824**	0.000	Highly Significant
Article Structure	.771**	0.000	Highly Significant
<b>Block Complexity</b>			
Content	.469**	0.000	Highly Significant
Language Use	.847**	0.000	Highly Significant
Article Structure	.815**	0.000	Highly Significant
<b>Syntactical Complexity</b>			
Content	.586**	0.000	Highly Significant
Language Use	.845**	0.000	Highly Significant
Article Structure	.843**	0.000	Highly Significant
<b>Morphological Complexity</b>			
Content	.734**	0.000	Highly Significant
Language Use	.410**	0.000	Highly Significant
Article Structure	.459**	0.000	Highly Significant

*Legend: Significant at p-value < 0.01*

Table 5 displays the association between English writing complexity and English writing quality. The computed r-values indicates a strong direct correlation and the resulted p-values were less than the alpha level. Result means that there was significant relationship exists and shows that the better English writing complexity, the better the is the quality.

In terms of Vocabulary Richness, Content, Language Use, and Article Structure were verbally interpreted as highly significant. This suggests that the key components of writing complexity – significantly enhances English writing quality. This suggests a holistic approach to writing instruction is critical, focusing on both individual language skills and the overall structure and impact of writing. Hou et al. (2022) emphasized his study found that vocabulary depth (understanding word nuances) and flexibility (using words in different contexts) significantly enhance L2 writing quality beyond just vocabulary breadth (number of words). Whereas, in terms of Block Complexity, Content, Language Use, and Article Structure were also verbally interpreted as highly significant. This suggests that mastering paragraph-level organization, content development, and language choices within blocks is just as crucial as sentence-level skills (vocabulary, syntax, morphology) for achieving high-quality writing. This implies that focusing solely on individual sentence construction is insufficient; effective writing instruction must also prioritize the development of cohesive and impactful paragraphs. Xu et al. (2023) pointed out that explicit instruction in text structure and paragraph cohesion (e.g., using transition words, maintaining thematic coherence) improves the quality and clarity of L2 writing. On the other hand, in terms of Syntactical Complexity, Content, Language Use, and Article Structure were also verbally interpreted as highly significant. This means all of these factors are relevant in maintaining the structure of sentences. Lastly, in terms of Morphological Complexity, suggests that mastering diverse sentence structures and effectively integrating them within paragraphs is crucial for enhancing English writing quality. This implies that focusing solely on complex

sentences in isolation is insufficient; effective instruction must emphasize how sentence choices contribute to the overall content, language use, and structure of paragraphs. Balthazar and Scott, (2024) also highlighted that focusing on the functional use of diverse sentence structures within paragraphs is more impactful than simply using complex sentences for their own sake. They found that L2 writers who effectively used sentences to vary emphasis, introduce new information, and connect ideas within paragraphs produced higher-quality writing.

**Table 6**  
*Relationship Between English Writing Accuracy and English Writing Quality*

Vocabulary	r-value	p-value	Interpretation
Content	.584**	0.000	Highly Significant
Language Use	.889**	0.000	Highly Significant
Article Structure	.831**	0.000	Highly Significant
Syntax			
Content	.563**	0.000	Highly Significant
Language Use	.839**	0.000	Highly Significant
Article Structure	.786**	0.000	Highly Significant
Morphology			
Content	.869**	0.000	Highly Significant
Language Use	.574**	0.000	Highly Significant
Article Structure	.454**	0.000	Highly Significant

*Legend: Significant at p-value < 0.01*

Table 6 presents the association between English writing accuracy and English writing quality. The computed r-values indicates a strong direct correlation and the resulted p-values were less than the alpha level. This means that there was significant relationship exists and implies that the more accurate in English writing, the better the is the quality.

In terms of Vocabulary, Content, Language, and Article Structure were verbally interpreted as highly significant. This means that accurate vocabulary usage is not enough for high-quality writing; it must be integrated seamlessly with clear content, effective language, and strong structure. Similarly, Duke et al. (2021) focused on developing students' understanding of text structure and organization. It shows how vocabulary, content, and language choices can be used to effectively support and develop key ideas within paragraphs and across the entire text. Furthermore, in terms of Syntax, all of the indicators were also verbally interpreted as highly significant. It suggests that syntax must be coupled with clear content development, effective language choices, and strong paragraph organization. This implies that syntax instruction should go beyond isolated sentence manipulation and focus on constructing sentences that seamlessly integrate with the overall content, supporting and developing key ideas. Alimohammadi (2023) also emphasized that explicit instruction in text structure and paragraph cohesion (using transition words, maintaining thematic coherence) improves the quality and clarity of L2 writing. This suggests that syntax instruction should be embedded within the context of broader text structures. Lastly, in terms of Morphology, all of the indicators were also verbally interpreted as highly significant. It suggests that understanding word parts and their functions is not just about spelling accuracy; it directly impacts the content, language choices, and overall structure of high-quality writing.

### **Proposed Program**

Based on the results of the study, the researcher puts forward the following program to improve both the teaching and learning of English writing for Chinese college students. The program involved three main areas, namely, English Writing Complexity, Accuracy, and English writing Fluency. Each of the three variables has at least one indicator with the lowest mean score. Specific improvement solutions for these indicators are suggested and included into the overall program. Over this program, Chinese college students' critical thinking disposition will be enhanced, the choice of English writing self-regulation strategy will be optimized, and English writing techniques will be raised, thus both teaching and learning in English writing will be lifted gradually. The researcher hopes this program can provide some clues and guidance for English teaching and reform in English writing in Chinese universities and vocational colleges. The Integrated English Writing Program aims to strengthen the writing skills of Chinese college students through a comprehensive and engaging method. The program seeks

to enhance students' language skills necessary for academic and professional achievement by offering interactive workshops, focused clinics, and diverse writing activities that target writing complexity, accuracy, and quality. Further, the implementation of continuous evaluation, feedback mechanisms, and cultural contextualization should be undertaken to guarantee a thorough and tailored learning experience.

**Table 7**  
*Proposed Supplemental English Program*

Key Result Area	Programs/Activities	Objectives	Success Indicators	Persons Involved
English Writing				
Complexity	Genre-Specific Writing Workshops	To develop students' ability to use a variety of sentence structures and language functions and encourage the use of advanced vocabulary and expressions in writing.	Have at least 90% of participation in weekly interactive workshops focused on specific genres (e.g., argumentative essays, literature reviews, business proposals). Workshops will include: •Guided analysis of model texts within each genre. •Practical exercises on structure, vocabulary, style, and grammar. •Peer review and feedback sessions.	Experienced English instructors specializing in different genres.
Accuracy	Interactive Writing Workshops	To address common grammar, punctuation, and syntax errors through targeted exercises and provide feedback and correction strategies for common language pitfalls.	Have at least 90% participation in the English writing accuracy competitions. Record the number of participants in the competitions compared to the total number of program participants.	Experienced English instructors
Fluency	writing Prompts and Reflections	to foster critical thinking and analytical skills through writing prompts and activities and emphasize organization, coherence, and argumentative techniques in writing.	Achieve an evaluation average level of 80% or higher in English writing fluency. Measurement: Conduct pre- and post-workshop assessments to evaluate learners' knowledge and application of social skills.	Writing Coordinators, Academic Advisors

#### 4. Conclusions and recommendations

The respondents confirmed that they exhibit writing complexity in terms of Vocabulary Richness, Block Complexity, Syntactical Complexity, and Morphological Complexity. Block Complexity was identified as the highest, whilst Syntactical Complexity was revealed as the least. The participants confirmed their commitment to maintaining writing accuracy. Morphology emerged as the highest priorities for writing accuracy among the participants, while vocabulary and syntax were ranked equally. The participants acknowledged their comprehensive understanding of Language Writing Quality with regards to Content, Language Use, and Article Structure. According to these indications, the content was found to be of the highest agreement, while the article structure was deemed to be of the lowest agreement.. The study revealed a substantial correlation between the complexity of writing, the level of accuracy, and the level of fluency. Therefore, the greater the complexity of English writing, the more precise one's English writing becomes. Moreover, as the level of English writing complexity increases, so does the quality. Furthermore, the higher the accuracy in English writing, the greater the quality of the written outputs. A supplemental English language program has been proposed, aiming to improve the English writing complexity, accuracy and, and quality among Chinese college students.

English instructors should give equal instructional emphasis to writing complexity, accuracy, and quality to help Chinese students develop comprehensive language and communication skills they need to succeed in academics and life in general. University administrators are encouraged to consider implementing the proposed supplemental program to aid in the holistic development and improvement of the writing complexity, accuracy, and quality of the learners. Academic support services or writing centers within the institution should spearhead the organization and execution of targeted writing workshops. These workshops should be led by experienced

English professors or teachers who can provide tailored guidance to freshman students, especially those majoring in Liberal Arts. Faculty members and writing instructors may take the lead in establishing enhanced feedback channels for students. They can implement structured feedback mechanisms within their courses or collaborate with writing centers to provide additional support outside the classroom. This collaborative effort ensures that students receive comprehensive guidance on improving their writing skills and addressing specific areas of concern. Future researchers may use this study as basis for related inquiries. They may explore more on the topic by employing a qualitative study that will delve more on the experiences of Chinese students in learning writing to verify and strengthen the findings of the current study.

## 5. References

- Alimohammadi, S. (2023). Coherence and cohesion in an ESL academic writing environment: Rethinking the use of translation and FOMT in language teaching (Doctoral dissertation, Université d'Ottawa/University of Ottawa).
- Anderson, S. R. (2015). Dimensions of morphological complexity. Understanding and measuring morphological complexity, 11-26.
- Balthazar, C. H., & Scott, C. M. (2024). Sentences are key: Helping school-age children and adolescents build sentence skills needed for real language. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 33(2), 564-579.
- Blatchford, P., & Webster, R. (2018). Classroom contexts for learning at primary and secondary school: Class size, groupings, interactions and special educational needs. *British Educational Research Journal*, 44(4), 681-703.
- Cheng, X., & Zhang, L. J. (2021). Teacher written feedback on English as a foreign language learners' writing: Examining native and nonnative English-speaking teachers' practices in feedback provision. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 629921.
- Duke, N. K., Ward, A. E., & Pearson, P. D. (2021). The science of reading comprehension instruction. *The Reading Teacher*, 74(6), 663-672.
- Fan, J. (2019). Chinese ESL Learners' Perceptions of English Language Teaching and Learning in Australia. *English Language Teaching*, 12(7), 139-152.
- Francis, N. J. (2019). ESL College Students' Perspectives on Classroom Content Delivery and Assessments (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University).
- Hou, J., Lee, J. F., & Doherty, S. (2022). A study of the effects of mobile media on L2 text processing: Beyond offline comprehension accuracy measures. *Computers & Education*, 182, 104466.
- Hsiang, T. P., Graham, S., & Yang, Y. M. (2020). Teachers' practices and beliefs about teaching writing: A comprehensive survey of grades 1 to 3 teachers. *Reading and Writing*, 33(10), 2511-2548.
- Hughes, J., & Loader, R. (2023). Is academic selection in Northern Ireland a barrier to social cohesion?. *Research Papers in Education*, 1-19.
- Hyland, K., & Jiang, F. (2023). Interaction in Written Texts: A Bibliometric Study of Published Research. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 13(4), 903-924.
- James, A. J., Schriever, U. G., Jahangiri, S., & Girgin, S. C. (2018). Improving maritime English competence as the cornerstone of safety at sea: a focus on teaching practices to improve maritime communication. *WMU Journal of Maritime Affairs*, 17, 293-310.
- Jiang, L., Zhang, L. J., & May, S. (2019). Implementing English-medium instruction (EMI) in China: Teachers' practices and perceptions, and students' learning motivation and needs. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(2), 107-119.
- Jin, C., Li, B., Jansen, S. J., Boumeester, H. J., & Boelhouwer, P. J. (2022). What attracts young talents? Understanding the migration intention of university students to first-tier cities in China. *Cities*, 128, 103802.
- Lee, J., Wu, K.Y., & Lee, E.P.C. (2022) View of Syntactic Complexity and Writing Quality in Students' Technical Writing. *Tci-Thaijo.org*.

- Noori, Q. (2023). The role of morphological awareness in elementary students early reading skills (Doctoral dissertation, Fordham University).
- Salomone, R., & Salomone, R. C. (2022). *The rise of English: Global politics and the power of language*. Oxford University Press.
- Shi, Y., & Lei, L. (2024). Structural Complexity in Adapted Reading Materials: A Study Based on the Amount of Information. *Reading Research Quarterly*.
- Xu, W., Zhao, P., Yao, Y., Pang, W., & Zhu, X. (2023). Effects of self-efficacy on integrated writing performance: A cross-linguistic perspective. *System*, 115, 103065.
- Yang, Y. (2020). Effects of the Second Language on the First Language: Tracing Possible Backward Transfer in Chinese EFL Learners' Written Texts (Doctoral dissertation, ResearchSpace@ Auckland).
- Zhang, S., Zhang, H., & Zhang, C. (2022). A Dynamic Systems Study on Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency in English Writing Development by Chinese University Students. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.787710>
- Zhang, X. (2021). Effects of using self-assessment on English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) Students' self-efficacy beliefs and writing improvement (Doctoral dissertation, ResearchSpace@ Auckland).

