

A Study on the Influence of Language Environment on English Writing Ability in Universities

—Based on the Theory of Second Language Acquisition

Zi Jin^{1,a,*}

¹*School of Foreign Studies, Harbin Engineering University, Harbin, China*

a. jinzi731@hrbeu.edu.cn

**corresponding author*

Abstract: Based on the theory of second language acquisition, this study employs a mixed-method approach to investigate the impact of language environment on English writing proficiency in higher education institutions. In the quantitative study, data were collected from 184 students with diverse English language learning backgrounds via the online questionnaire platform "Wenjuanxing" at several universities in China and in-depth interviews were conducted to gain qualitative insights. The findings indicate that the frequency and depth of writing practice, parents' education level, and early exposure to English have a notable impact on English writing ability. Students in the advanced training group demonstrated superior performance due to their increased exposure and practice opportunities, whereas students in the standard study group necessitated more structured instruction and writing practice to enhance their proficiency. The study offers a theoretical foundation and practical guidance for teaching English writing, such as the creation of a rich language environment to facilitate students' English writing abilities.

Keywords: language environment, English writing ability, second language acquisition theory.

1. Introduction

As a result of the growing closeness of international exchanges and cooperation, ties between countries continue to intensify. As an international language, the importance of English has been rising in areas such as politics, economics, and trade. English language education is crucial to the development of internationally minded people, not only providing individuals with broader development prospects and rich learning resources, but also providing them with opportunities to be exposed to multiculturalism. For the country, a high-quality English education environment can help cultivate an open and inclusive social atmosphere, promote stable and positive development trends, and expand a broad international perspective. The ability to write in English is at the heart of general English language proficiency and plays a key role in the academic and professional worlds. In academia, English has become the dominant language of scientific communication, and the increase in multinational research teams has made English the lingua franca of communication. Academic journals, research reports, and speeches at international conferences are commonly written in English,

which places implicit demands on researchers' English writing skills. Therefore, the widespread use of English writing ability not only highlights its research value in teaching English writing at home and abroad, but also emphasizes the importance of improving this ability.

It is worth noting that English writing teaching is influenced by different language environments. In Chinese higher education, English writing is more emotional, focusing on the transmission of aesthetic experience and humanistic sensibility, such as the use of gorgeous rhetoric and famous quotes, and the requirements for logical rigor are more lenient, while in the West, rational and logical thinking is more favored. This difference is likely to lead to the retention of the writing habits of the early stage of learning in the transition period of English writing, and it is difficult to get through the bottleneck of writing improvement.

A comparative analysis of English writing ability in universities, coupled with the identification of exemplary models, can provide a theoretical framework for the teaching of English writing in Chinese universities. This, in turn, can contribute to the enhancement of the quality of English writing teaching, which is of paramount importance in facilitating the integration of internationalization and localization in the teaching of English writing. Furthermore, it can foster learners' awareness of cultural differences.

The theory of second language acquisition provides new insights into the pedagogy of college-level English writing. The theory places an emphasis on the regular acquisition of language, proposing that this process occurs in a spiral manner. The comprehensible input hypothesis also provides a theoretical basis for the necessity of more sophisticated language materials and more authentic writing contexts for English writing teaching. This enables English writing learners to enhance the quality of their English writing and their language application skills through a substantial number of writing practices, utilizing feedback and corrections.

This study aims to investigate the impact of diverse language environments on English writing proficiency in higher education and to examine the potential applications of bilingual acquisition theory in pedagogical practice. The objective is to identify effective strategies for enhancing English writing proficiency and to enhance the efficacy of English writing instruction in China.

2. Literature review

The theory of second language acquisition elucidates the rules and principles that learners adhere to when acquiring a second language, and facilitates comprehension of the impact of disparate language environments on English writing proficiency.

From the perspective of the language environment, the differences in grammar, vocabulary, pragmatics, as well as culture and thinking styles in different language environments have an impact on learners' expressions, logical thinking, and cultural awareness in the process of English writing. The term "language environment" is used to describe the context in which language is used by learners, including the circumstances surrounding the input and output of language. Individuals who are native English speakers are exposed to a considerable amount of English input on a daily basis. In contrast, learners from non-native English-speaking countries have a less robust English language environment, which can result in the influence of their native language on various linguistic aspects, including grammatical structure, vocabulary usage, and expression habits. Furthermore, cultural dissimilarities also serve to delineate the discrepancies in the linguistic milieu of English writing. Western culture places significant emphasis on individuality, logical rigor, and direct expression. However, Chinese students tend to be influenced by Chinese expression habits when writing in English. This manifests as a preference for idioms and a tendency to borrow Chinese customary expressions. The differential language environment exerts a profound effect on students' English writing ability and strategy choices.

In conjunction with the theory of second language acquisition, it examines the impact of diverse language environments on learners' English writing proficiency. By employing the tenets of second language acquisition theory, this study will elucidate the impact of environmental factors, including language input, output, and interaction, on the development of writing ability. Krashen's input hypothesis is a significant contributor to the comprehension of the language learning process and the function of the language environment. The argument is that language learning is dependent on the input being comprehensible. This theory places significant emphasis on the importance of linguistic input, proposing that learners acquire a second language through the linguistic input to which they are exposed. It can thus be concluded that in order to enhance learners' writing ability, they require exposure to a substantial amount of comprehensible English input within an appropriate language environment. The theory of second language acquisition provides an important theoretical framework for the study. By understanding the importance of language input and interactivity in language learning, pedagogues can better design teaching environments and activities to promote students' English writing ability. The findings of this study can facilitate a more comprehensive understanding of the factors influencing English writing ability in higher education, and provide a basis for further research and the development of effective pedagogical strategies. Furthermore, it assists in the advancement and optimization of the English teaching environment, thereby facilitating more efficacious support for students' English writing abilities.

In domestic research, several papers have provided insights into the influence of language environment on English writing in universities. Chen Mal and Lv Mingchen [1] point out that some generative AI can reduce teachers' knowledge output and repetitive tasks while increasing the need for critical thinking and emotional guidance. Liang Haiying [2] argues that the application of digital humanities tools has a positive effect on students' writing skills, promoting critical thinking, collaboration, and innovation. Yang Yang and Feng Zhiwei [3] showed that students' language complexity was significantly improved in SPOC-based blended learning. Li Zhang [4] proposed the design and evaluation of blended academic English writing instruction integrated with curriculum ideology, emphasizing the importance of academic English proficiency development. Yang Xiaorong [5] 's findings show that students' difficulties in college English writing with confused thinking, similar expressions, and common sense problems need to be paid attention to and solutions sought. Sun Youzhong [6] believes that language teaching should focus on developing students' critical thinking skills. In addition, Wen Qiufang [7] puts forward the "output-oriented approach", which emphasizes the importance of teachers guiding students to adapt to the new teaching methods in teaching.

In conclusion, the language environment exerts a significant impact on English writing in Chinese and Western universities. It is imperative for educators to prioritize the nurturing of students' critical thinking abilities in the classroom, while also acknowledging the multifaceted challenges and obstacles encountered by students in the writing process. This approach aims to enhance the efficacy and outcomes of English writing instruction. It would be beneficial for future research to focus on English writing in cross-cultural language environments. This should include an exploration of the influence of different language environments on learners' writing ability and the mechanism of cross-cultural communication on writing acquisition. Furthermore, the research should be expanded to encompass different age groups and educational levels. Additionally, quantitative research should be augmented to provide a more objective and comprehensive understanding of the impact of language environments.

There are differences in the English writing skills of learners in different language environments. Western learners tend to be more fluent in grammar, vocabulary, and expression because they have more opportunities to communicate and practice English due to easier access to the native English environment. Non-native English learners, on the other hand, are more influenced by their mother

tongue, lag behind in their English writing ability, and have certain traces of grammatical structure, vocabulary use and expression. Differences in thinking patterns between Chinese and Western learners also affect the way of expression in English writing. Western learners are more logical and organized, good at deductive and inductive thinking, and therefore tend to be more rigorous and clear in their arguments and organizational structure. On the other hand, Chinese learners emphasize emotion and rhetoric and are good at using metaphors and symbols, so they are more imaginative and poetic in their expressions. In addition, both Chinese and Western learners need to accumulate and expand their vocabularies and pay attention to cultural integration and cross-cultural communication in order to better adapt to the needs of writing in different language environments.

The impact of the language environment on the proficiency of English writing in higher education exhibits both distinctive and shared characteristics. It is imperative that this is fully recognized in daily teaching practice and that the specific influence of the language environment on English writing is explored in accordance with the particular circumstances of the learners, in order to provide a more scientific theoretical basis for teaching practice.

3. Research methodology

3.1. Research design

This study employs a mixed-methods research design to comprehensively investigate the impact of diverse language environments on university English writing proficiency. Data are collected through quantitative surveys and qualitative interviews. The quantitative component was conducted through the administration of questionnaires, the objective of which was to ascertain learners' English writing ability and learning strategies in different language environments. The qualitative component provided further elucidation of the quantitative findings through in-depth interviews, enabling the acquisition of additional information pertaining to the subjective experiences and perspectives of the learners.

3.2. Objects of study

184 students in different language environments were selected from some domestic universities (Harbin Engineering University, Harbin Institute of Technology, Northwestern University, Xi'an University of Electronic Science and Technology, Xi'an University of Foreign Languages, etc.) as the research subjects and divided into the following two groups. The advanced training group was students who had attended higher-level English training, while the standard study group was students who had only studied in university English programs.

3.3. Data collection methods

3.3.1. Questionnaires

The questionnaire design is based on the LHQ questionnaire, which is structured according to the respondents' English learning background, writing habits, frequency of writing, learning resources used, language environment, and so on. The questionnaire includes multiple-choice questions, Likert scale questions (e.g., "Please rate your interest in English writing" 1-5 points), and short-answer questions (e.g., "What resources are you used to use for English writing practice?"). The questionnaire included basic information (age, gender, and age). The questionnaire includes basic information (age, gender, major, etc.), English learning background (e.g., whether or not you have participated in intensive English classes, or whether or not you have had overseas exchange experiences, etc.), writing habits (e.g., frequency of writing, time spent on writing, resources used for writing, etc.), and

language environment (e.g., frequency of daily use of English, English daily communication environment, etc.), etc. The questionnaire is administered through the online platform "Star". The questionnaire was distributed through the online platform "Wenjuanxing" to ensure that each participant filled out the questionnaire on his/her own.

3.3.2. In-depth interviews

Smaller in-depth interviews were conducted with a randomly selected number of learners in each of the advanced training and standard learning groups as interviewees. The interviews centered on learning experiences, writing habits, language environment, writing challenges, and strategies. The interviews were semi-structured, with pre-set questions and flexible adjustments based on the specific circumstances of the interview process. Each session lasted approximately 30-60 minutes, and the results were audio-recorded and transcribed into text.

3.4. Data analysis methods

The questionnaire data were statistically analyzed using SPSSAU software, and the analyses mainly included: descriptive statistics to describe the basic data, such as mean and standard deviation, etc. T-test and ANOVA to compare the differences between Chinese and Western students in terms of language input, output, and writing habits. Qualitative analyses were conducted using content analysis to code and categorize the interview transcripts, and to extract major themes and patterns to explore the influence of the language environment on students' writing experience and self-evaluation.

4. Findings

4.1. Descriptive statistical results

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of English writing ability and daily writing time of the two groups of students (183 in total)

	min	max	M	SD	Mdn
Self-rating of writing skills of the advanced training group/(score)	1.000	3.000	2.574	0.578	3.000
Self-rating of writing skills in standardized learning groups/(marks)	1.000	3.000	1.951	0.665	2.000
Writing time per day for the advanced training team/(hours)	0.000	12.000	2.389	2.770	1.000
Writing time per day for standard study group/(hours)	0.000	10.000	0.925	1.668	0.000

The mean score for the self-assessment of writing ability in the advanced training group was 2.574, indicating that students in this group considered their English writing ability to be at the upper-middle level. Furthermore, the median of 3.000 indicates that over half of the students self-assessed their

writing ability at the highest level. The mean self-rating of writing ability for the standard learning group was 1.951, indicating that this group exhibited a relatively low level of self-rated writing ability.

The mean value of daily writing time for the advanced training group was 2.389 hours, indicating that students in the advanced training group engaged in writing for an average of more than two hours per day. The mean value of daily writing time for the Standard Learning Group was considerably lower than that of the Advanced Training Group, indicating that students in the Standard Learning Group devoted fewer hours per day to writing. The median of 0.000 hours indicates that more than half of the students engaged in minimal or no writing activities.

4.2. ANOVA results

Table 2: ANOVA table of English writing ability and writing time of students in the advanced training group in the context of different parental education levels

Parents' level of education: (mean ± standard deviation)					
	PhD (n=3)	Masters (n=4)	Bachelor's degree (B.A.) (n=55)	High school (n=71)	
Advanced Training Group Self-scoring of writing skills/(marks)	2.67±0.58	2.25±0.96	1.87±0.64	1.90±0.68	
Daily writing time in English for the advanced training group/(hours)	1.33±1.15	0.75±0.50	2.44±2.65	2.32±2.69	
* p<0.05 ** p<0.01					
Parents' level of education: (mean ± standard deviation)				F	p
	Lower secondary (n=35)	Primary schools (n=7)	Other (n=9)		
Advanced Training Group Self-scoring of writing skills/(marks)	2.20±0.58	1.71±0.49	1.67±0.71	2.244	0.041*
Daily writing time in English for the advanced training group/(hours)	2.86±3.20	1.86±1.77	2.11±3.82	0.535	0.781
* p<0.05 ** p<0.01					

The self-ratings of writing ability in the different education level groups had the highest mean value in the postgraduate (PhD) group and the lowest mean value in the primary education level group. The postgraduate (Master's) group had the highest standard deviation, indicating the highest variability in the self-ratings within that group. The ANOVA test showed an *F* value of 2.244, corresponding to a *p* value of 0.041, which means that the original hypothesis (i.e., that the means of all the groups are equal) was rejected at the 0.05 level of significance, and at least two of the groups was considered to be significantly different in terms of their mean values.

Mean values of daily time spent using English for writing in the different education level groups ranged from 0.75 to 2.86 hours but fluctuated considerably overall. The standard deviations ranged from 0.50 to 3.20, showing greater variability, especially for the undergraduate (bachelor's) and high school groups.

4.3. Results of related analyses

Table 3: Correlation analysis between students' self-scores of English writing ability and writing time in different study groups

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Score (1)	2.571	0.578	0.910**	0.402**	0.182*	0.024	0.742**	0.820**	0.787**	1	
Score (2)	1.951	0.663	0.272**	0.878**	0.055	0.329**	0.199**	0.255**	0.200**	0.344**	0.704**
Time (3)	2.379	2.766	0.100	0.189*	0.641**	0.434**	0.082	0.062	0.093	0.131	0.187*
Time (4)	0.923	1.664	-0.008	0.375**	0.268**	0.937**	0.020	-0.094	0.018	0.024	0.369**
	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Score (1)											
Score (2)	0.723**	0.652**	1								
Time (3)	0.153*	0.180*	0.146*	0.372**	0.472**	1					
Time (4)	0.325**	0.278**	0.348**	0.238**	0.154*	0.466**	0.035	0.880**	0.817**	1	

Score(1) Advanced Training Group Self-scoring of writing skills/(marks)

Score(2) Standards Learning Group Self-scoring of writing skills/(marks)

Time(3) Advanced Training Group daily Time spent in English for writing/(hours)

Time(4) Standardized Learning Group Daily Time spent in English for writing/(hours)

* p<0.05 ** p<0.01

There is a significant positive correlation between the advanced training group's self-ratings of writing ability and several variables, such as with the advanced training group's daily time spent in writing using English (0.910**), and the standard study group's self-ratings of writing ability (0.787**). There is a significant positive correlation between the self-ratings of writing ability in the standard learning group and the self-ratings of writing ability in the advanced training group (0.878**), indicating that there is some similarity between the two groups.

There was a significant positive correlation (0.189*) between the Advanced Training group's daily time spent writing using English and the Advanced Training group's self-ratings of writing proficiency, suggesting that there is some positive correlation between time spent writing and self-assessment of proficiency. There was a significant positive correlation (0.375**) between time spent using English for daily writing in the standard learning group and self-ratings of writing ability in the standard learning group, suggesting that more time spent writing may be associated with higher self-assessed ability.

Table 4: Correlation analysis table of factors related to English writing ability

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
Age/(years)	22.890	4.720	1					
Age(1)	4.821	1.584	-0.192**	-0.085	-0.239**	-0.040	-0.216**	1
Year(2)	22.864	4.701	1.000**	-0.061	0.117	0.036	0.157*	-0.192**
Age(3)	10.652	4.493	0.334**	-0.044	0.078	0.038	0.032	-0.021
Years(4)	13.701	6.693	0.371**	-0.063	0.004	-0.081	0.044	-0.077
	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Age/(years)								
Age(1)								
Year(2)	1							
Age(3)	0.335**	0.032	0.933**	0.959**	0.973**	1		
Years(4)	0.366**	0.044	0.131	0.148*	0.150*	0.164*	-0.030	1

Age(1) Age at which the advanced training group started writing in English/(years)

Years(2) Cumulative number of years of English language use by the Advanced Training Group/(years)

Age(3) Age at which the standardized learning group started writing in English/(years)

Years(4) Cumulative number of years of English language use by the standard training group/(years)

The table demonstrates the correlation between the variables of age, the age at which the advanced training group started to use English for writing, the cumulative number of years of English use in the advanced training group, the age at which the standard study group started to use English for writing, and cumulative number of years of English use in the standard training group. The analyses support the importance of early exposure to English in improving English proficiency, and the positive effect of consistent English use in improving English writing skills, and these indirectly reflect the influence of the language environment, i.e., earlier and more frequent exposure to and use of English may contribute to improving English writing skills.

4.4. Results of in-depth interviews

Students in the advanced training group generally believed that the advanced training they had received had significantly helped them improve their writing skills, and they were more accustomed to regular writing practice and actively sought feedback; students in the standard learning group relied more on classroom learning, and they wrote less frequently and lacked a systematic practice plan; students in the advanced training group had more opportunities to actually use English, and they overcame their confusion about the organization and logical expression of their thoughts by reading and writing more frequently; students in the standard learning group mainly used English in the English classroom, and solved their confusion about vocabulary and grammar mainly by consulting dictionaries and practicing sentence patterns. organization and logical expression; students in the Standard Learning group used English mainly in the English classroom and solved their vocabulary and grammatical confusion mainly by consulting dictionaries and practicing sentence patterns.

5. Discussion

5.1. Discussion of results

5.1.1. Length of writing input

The advanced training group exhibited higher self-scores for writing ability and engaged in more daily writing than the standard study group, indicating that augmented training and practice opportunities can facilitate enhanced English writing proficiency. This is consistent with Krashen's input hypothesis, which posits that learners require exposure to slightly higher levels of input than their current level in order to facilitate the development of language proficiency. [8] Swain's output hypothesis also places considerable emphasis on the importance of output in language learning. It suggests that through writing practice, learners can deepen their understanding of language structure and function. [9] The notable impact of parents' educational attainment on students' self-assessments of their writing proficiency in the advanced training group aligns with Bourdieu's conceptualization of cultural capital. This posits that a family's socio-economic status and cultural resources can be translated into educational advantages. [10]

5.1.2. The relevance of linguistic context to English writing ability

The results of the correlation analyses indicated a positive correlation between the self-assessed proficiency in writing and the amount of time spent writing in English on a daily basis. This finding lends support to the view that writing practice is an important factor in improving writing proficiency. The mean self-rating of writing proficiency for the advanced training group was higher than that of the standard study group and was significantly correlated with several variables, indicating that higher levels of training facilitate improvements in students' writing proficiency. It is similarly hypothesized that a rich language environment facilitates the improvement of English writing ability, particularly in relation to the amount of writing practice undertaken. This is consistent with Ferris's argument that opportunities to utilize the language in question facilitate the development of language proficiency. [11] The consistent use of English has a positive effect on the improvement of English writing ability. Hyland posits that the enhancement of writing proficiency necessitates not only the aggregation of linguistic expertise but also the acquisition of writing techniques and competencies through practice. [12] The Advanced Training Group is afforded greater opportunities to utilize English in authentic communication scenarios, whereas the Standard Learning Group predominantly employs English within the confines of the classroom, thus limiting their exposure to actual communication. It is of the utmost importance to create a favorable language environment in order to facilitate the improvement of writing skills. It is incumbent upon educators to endeavor to create more opportunities for students to utilize the English language. This may be achieved by increasing communication with native English speakers and by organizing English writing competitions and activities, which will facilitate the advancement of students' writing abilities.

5.1.3. Writing Challenges and Coping Strategies

This study elucidates the discrepancies in the English writing challenges and coping strategies observed between students in the advanced training group and those in the standard learning group. The advanced training group encountered challenges in organizing ideas and expressing them logically, whereas the standard learning group demonstrated greater difficulties with vocabulary and grammar. Swain's output hypothesis posits that learners identify and resolve issues in language use through the completion of actual writing tasks. This finding aligns with the results of the present study, which indicate that students in the advanced training group overcame their difficulties by engaging

in more reading and writing activities and actively seeking feedback. While the difficulties faced by the students in the standard learning group can be overcome by consulting dictionaries and practicing sentence patterns, thus gradually improving their vocabulary and grammatical correctness, their overall writing ability improves at a slower rate due to the lack of systematic writing instruction. This is consistent with Ellis's input hypothesis, which posits that an increase in language input can facilitate language learning, but that practical use and output practice are equally important. [13]

Language environment has a significant effect on Chinese college students' English writing. Students who had participated in intensive English training usually showed higher writing scores due to the high frequency of writing practice and abundant writing resources. Both writing habits and language environment have a significant effect on writing, suggesting that regular writing practice and opportunities to actually use English are crucial for improving writing ability. Educators should increase the number of writing tasks and provide more opportunities to use English practically in their teaching in order to promote the development of students' writing skills.

5.2. Integration of theory and practical application

In the context of teaching practice, this can be achieved by integrating writing tasks into lesson plans and facilitating in-class discussions on diverse writing styles and techniques. Furthermore, writing workshops are provided with the objective of encouraging students to assess each other's writing in order to facilitate improvement through the provision of constructive feedback. Furthermore, English discussion sessions can be established to facilitate student engagement in dialogues conducted in the English language. Additionally, native English speakers are encouraged to interact with students through foreign lectures or online interactive platforms, thereby facilitating a language immersion experience. It is the responsibility of the teacher to facilitate group discussion and feedback in a timely manner following the completion of writing exercises. Additionally, the teacher should arrange tutoring sessions on an individual basis for students experiencing difficulties with their writing. It is recommended that teachers provide students with detailed feedback after each writing task, offering suggestions for improvement. Furthermore, writing competitions or presentations are held on a regular basis, providing an opportunity for students to share their work and to enhance their self-confidence in writing.

5.3. Limitations of the study

The present study is subject to certain limitations pertaining to the selection of the sample. The sample is restricted to Chinese college students, and the underrepresentation of the sample may limit the generalizability of the findings. The relatively limited sample size may not fully reflect the diversity of students' writing abilities. In terms of data collection, the questionnaire data was reliant on students' self-assessment, which may have been affected by a number of factors, including students' self-assessment ability, honesty, and comprehension. This could have resulted in information bias and an inaccurate understanding of actual writing abilities and habits. Secondly, the results of the in-depth interviews may be influenced by the subjective judgment of the interviewees. Additionally, the time and content constraints of the interviews may also impact the depth and breadth of the data, potentially limiting the representativeness of the views and experiences of all students.

6. Conclusion

6.1. Writing Skills Gap: Advanced Group Outperforms

The students in the advanced training group exhibited superior performance in vocabulary richness and sentence structure complexity, along with elevated self-efficacy and language fluency. This was

attributed to the regular exposure to language input and writing practice. The opportunity to engage in immersive language learning environments proved advantageous for the students in terms of their ability to communicate across cultures. In contrast, students in the Standard Learning Group demonstrated proficiency in basic grammatical and lexical knowledge, yet exhibited deficiencies in creative expression and intercultural understanding.

6.2. Enhanced Language Proficiency: Advanced Training Environment

The theory of second language acquisition posits that students in the advanced training group benefit from a rich language input and output environment, whereas students in the standard learning group acquire language knowledge through a structured teaching system but lack the flexibility for practical application. Students in the advanced training group typically exhibit higher levels of motivation and receive immediate feedback on their language acquisition due to the incorporation of diverse practice and interaction.

6.3. Integrated Approach for Writing Skill Improvement

It is recommended that educators adopt an integrated teaching approach, combining the strengths of the Advanced Training Group and the solid foundation of the Standard Learning Group, with the objective of designing a comprehensive teaching program to enhance student's overall writing skills. Furthermore, additional components of an augmented language milieu (e.g., cross-cultural communication, and online linguistic praxis) should be incorporated into the pedagogical process to augment students' linguistic dexterity and ingenuity. It is recommended that personalized learning pathways be provided according to students' specific needs and abilities, with the aim of facilitating effective improvement of their writing skills in different language environments.

The impact of the linguistic environment on the English writing proficiency of Chinese and Western university students is evidenced by the distinct characteristics observed in the advanced training group and the standard learning group. The advanced training group demonstrates improvement in writing fluency and creativity through diversified language input and practice; however, it lacks standardized training in formal writing norms. In contrast, the standard learning group exhibits proficiency in writing through systematic teaching and standardized practice; nevertheless, it demonstrates a deficiency in practical application ability. The combination of these two approaches, with the incorporation of effective teaching strategies, has the potential to enhance students' English writing abilities in a comprehensive manner. It would be beneficial for future research to focus on the actual effects of different teaching methods and to explore more effective integrated teaching models.

References

- [1] Chen, Mo & Lv, Mingchen. (2024). *College English Writing Instruction in a ChatGPT Context*. *Contemporary Foreign Language Studies*, 1, 161-168. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1674-8921.2024.01.013
- [2] Liang, Haiying. (2022). *College English Writing Instruction from the Digital Humanities Perspective: Thoughts and Methods*. *Foreign Languages*, 6, 50-57. DOI: 10.20083/j.cnki.fleic.2023.04.003
- [3] Yang, Yang & Feng, Zhiwei. (2022). *The Impact of the SPOC Hybrid Writing Teaching Model on the Development of College Students' English Writing*. *Foreign Language Teaching*, 43(2), 67-73. doi:10.16362/j.cnki.cn61-1023/h.2022.02.009
- [4] Zhang, Li. (2023). *Design and Evaluation of Hybrid Academic English Writing Instruction Integrated with Ideological and Political Courses*. *Contemporary Foreign Language Studies*, 6, 54-65+193. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1674-8921.2023.06.005
- [5] Yang, Xiaorong. (1993). *Teaching from Answer Sheets: Notes from TEM4-93 Composition Marking*. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 4, 70-72.

- [6] Sun, Youzhong. (2019). *Principles of Critical Thinking in English Language Teaching*. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 6, 825-837+959. doi: 10.1007/s11304-019-0006-9
- [7] Wen, Qiufang. (2018). *The "Output-Oriented Approach" and the Teaching of Chinese as a Foreign Language*. *Chinese Language Teaching in the World*, 3, 387-400. doi:10.13724/j.cnki.ctiw.2018.03.008
- [8] Krashen, S. D. (1985). *Invest in Language*. Beijing: Modern Education Press.
- [9] Swain, M. (1995). *Three functions of output in second language learning*. *Cahiers Linguistiques d'Ottawa*, 23(1), 127-139.
- [10] Bourdieu, P. (1986). *The forms of capital*. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241-258). New York: Greenwood Press.
- [11] Ferris, D. R. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(3), 496-509.
- [12] Hyland, K. (2003). *Second Language Writing*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- [13] Ellis, R. (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.