

## Research Article

# A Comparative Study of the Effectiveness of Integrated Reading–Writing Instruction and Explicit Writing Instruction in Chinese as a Second Language Classroom

Chunyu Wang\*

MA. (Education), Assistant Professor

Pridi Banomyong International College (PBIC), Thammasat University

Jumphol Thawornchob

MA. (Teaching Chinese to Speakers of Other Language), Lecturer

School of Chinese International Business, Faculty of International Business, Rattana Bundit University

\*Corresponding author: E-mailwang.c@pbic.tu.ac.th

Received: November 20, 2025/ Revised: March 6, 2026/ Accepted: March 16, 2026

## Abstract

In the field of second language teaching, there has been an increasing interest in adopting reading as an instructional strategy to improve writing skills. However, most studies focus on intermediate or advanced learners and scarce research has been conducted on writing development for beginners in higher education in Chinese as a Second or Foreign Language (CSL/CFL) classroom. This study aims to examine the effectiveness of Integrated Reading and Writing (IRW) compared with Explicit Writing Instruction (EWI) in two groups: the experimental group (EG) and the control group (CG), each consisting of 40 participants from the same academic year enrolled in a CSL/CFL class. The participants (HSK Level 3 or lower) were taking the same major at a Thai university. The data were generated by assessing their writing tasks in 4 categories: Content (Cont), Phrases & Vocabulary (Phr&V), Grammar (Gram) and Organization (Org). The scores were subjected to an independent sample t-test. The results showed that the EWI method was better suited for the students. This study provides CSL/CFL with insights on how to promote the development of writing for beginners and improve the curriculum design.

**Keywords:** Integrated reading and writing, Explicit writing instruction, Low-level writing, Chinese as a second/Foreign language

## Introduction

Writing plays a crucial role in developing language skills and is considered a main assessment measure for second language (L2) proficiency (Mgijima, 2021). Writing embodies every author's creativity and thought, making it a medium for self-expression. Additionally, by using the written word we can demonstrate how advanced our language skills are. Despite extensive research on L2 writing, limited studies have been conducted on the effectiveness of the strategies used in teaching writing skills to second language learners (Lee & Yuan, 2021) prompting a need for further exploration of the topic.

The rapid growth of China's economy, coupled with the rising prominence of Mandarin in international business communication, has significantly increased the global demand for this language acquisition. In the last couple of decades, as can be seen on CNKI (China National Knowledge Infrastructure), Chinese researchers have conducted a significant volume of research on various aspects in the field of CSL/CFL (Chinese as a Second or Foreign Language). However, it has been pointed out that these studies hold a rather "limited and peripheral" influence on international language education research and on developing new methodologies and approaches. Unfortunately, they lack an empirical and quantitative design and have a "disparate and narrow" focus (Yang et al., 2020).

Linguistically speaking, since Thai and Mandarin writing systems vary substantially, Thai students need to overcome major barriers when acquiring reading and writing skills and teaching them entails more effort. Thai learners majoring in Mandarin often require further studying to improve their proficiency even after graduation (Wasinanon, 2016).

Sun and Wang (2020) are of the opinion that "writing embodies language learners' overall linguistic competence and is a challenge for learners in any language" (p. 1). Some scholars have pointed out that incorporating a reading component into L2 writing classes can be beneficial, as texts can be used as a leading medium. On the other hand, Choi et al. (2018) concluded that vocabulary acquired through integrating reading into writing courses did not exhibit a notable direct impact on writing proficiency. To further complicate matters, whether positive, neutral or negative, the impact is dependent on the writing level of the L1 (first language) for each particular student (Cho et al., 2021).

Overall, in both L1 and L2, vocabulary plays a crucial role as familiarity with a variety of words allows for more precise self-expression, although it is also vital for them to be able to select appropriate and accurate words to convey their ideas. This issue is particularly evident in beginners, who often use vocabulary from texts without fully understanding its meaning or context. As a result, even though new words may be stored in their long-term memory, correct usage is not guaranteed. Such difficulties can hinder self-expression and erode confidence (Joyce, 2018). Moreover, external input is needed to stimulate students' initiative and improve the quality of their work. Consequently, educators have adopted various strategies (e.g. blogging, listening comprehension) to support writing development.

Reading is implemented consistently during all levels of education, since the majority of tasks students engage in at school are text-based. It has traditionally been considered a basic skill for language acquisition, because through reading students can deepen their knowledge of any topic.

Continuous reading practice leads to higher literacy levels in L1 and comprehension tasks can promote the development of multiple skills. Since it exposes students to a wide variety of vocabulary and grammatical structures in multiple contexts, it promotes proficient and precise writing. It is considered an additional resource and helps develop the cognitive processes required to create coherent written work (Allan, 2015, pp. 311-328). Reading and writing in L1 are skills that interact with each other, therefore reading is regarded as the foundation of writing, and writing performance boosts both reading comprehension and memory.

When it comes to second language (L2) acquisition, Pae (2019) noted the interdependence of reading skills between L1 and L2. Reading skills in L1 set the ground and ease the learning of reading in L2. Some research has shown that since reading comprehension levels vary between L1 and L2 learners, reading activities can impact L2 acquisition in a different manner (Kuehner & Hurley, 2019). At the initial stage of L2 learning, students with lower proficiency can encounter challenges in understanding reading materials due to their limited vocabulary and lack of familiarity with the topic. Past studies identified that feelings of anxiety and stress could also hinder students' reading progress (Chow et al., 2021).

This is the main reason why it is vital to continuously investigate and improve both new and existing teaching methods that would guide the students through the difficult process of learning a foreign language. It also needs emphasizing that intermediate or advanced learners can employ and benefit from different methods than beginners, as their basic skills are already developed. While there is some research on writing skills in a CSL/CFL classroom done by Chen & Gong (2025) and Zhao et al. (2025), they focus on learning methods and performance of intermediate and advanced language learners. There is a distinct lack of research on the effectiveness of teaching methods suitable for low-level learners and that was the original idea behind the study.

## Research Objective

This study aims to investigate the effectiveness of using IRW (Integrated Reading and Writing) and EWI (Explicit Writing Instruction) to promote better teaching outcomes with long-term implications in curriculum design.

## Research Hypothesis

Traditionally, writing and reading courses have been taught separately. In this study, we set out to examine if teaching writing through reading can improve the skills of low-level students in higher education and we hypothesize a positive outcome. This was the motivation behind the present study. The key research question for this study was: Does incorporating a reading component into a low-level CSL/CFL writing course have a positive impact on the acquisition of writing skills?

## Research Framework

This study employed a conceptual framework that assumes a direct relationship between the teaching method and writing performance, with no mediating or moderating variables, in order to determine whether Integrated Reading and Writing (IRW) or Explicit Writing Instruction (EWI) was more effective in enhancing writing skills for low-level students.

The IRW is theoretically grounded in the role of reading as a basis for writing, as reading provides input, supports vocabulary acquisition, and facilitates transfer of language skills to other contexts. EWI centers exclusively on writing and emphasizes small and clear writing steps and templates. The lessons are instructor-led and feature step-by-step, scaffolded teaching and vocabulary extension exercises (Oshima, 2020). The teaching approaches were tested in 2 separate groups: the Experimental Group (EG) adopted IRW and the Control Group (CG) employed EWI.

The dependent variable was students' writing performance assessed in four dimensions: Content, Grammar, Organization and Phrases & Vocabulary. They provided measurable criteria for evaluating the impact of each instructional approach on the assigned writing tasks.

## Methodology

### Study Design

We followed the university syllabus, which was spread over 15 weeks with 3 hours of classes per week. The school year consisted of two semesters, during which students were randomly assigned by the university to either EG or CG. The classes were conducted in different semesters with no interaction between the groups. The curriculum was aligned with the course objectives of developing writing knowledge and skills in CSL/CFL. Both groups used the same material to ensure consistent input. The scores were analyzed by the independent sample *t*-test.

### Participants

The participants of this study were first-language Thai students, aged 18 to 20, all from the same university in Thailand and enrolled in the compulsory course in their major. They had a weak foundation in Chinese, corresponding to HSK (Hanyu Shuiping Kaoshi) Level 3 or lower. A total of 80 students participated in the study: 40 were placed in the EG and the other 40 in the CG. Gender was not considered a variable in this study.

### Teaching Materials

The textbook '*Boya Chinese Reading and Writing: Elementary*' (Li & Xu, 2019) was preselected and assigned by the university. It contains 10 structured units, each divided into three parts: introduction of vocabulary words, two reading tasks and three follow-up writing tasks. Due to limited time, not all tasks could be completed within the duration of the course. For EG, each lesson included: introduction of vocabulary, one reading task and one writing task, and for CG, the vocabulary introduction and one writing task. Both groups received the same writing tasks with the same vocabulary. The teaching materials were created on PowerPoint slides. Learning materials were copied, distributed weekly and collected after each lesson. Devices and dictionaries were not permitted throughout the lessons. Specialized knowledge from any particular field of study was not required.

### Procedure

To ensure full understanding, at the start of every unit all students received an explanation of the target vocabulary and completed a fill-in-the-blank exercise. The EG was given a few options to choose from, whereas the CG was only provided with information about the parts of speech of the target words and required to refer to the complete vocabulary list for that lesson. Extra time was allocated for students to practice writing the strokes of the new characters. After that, EG moved to

Q1-Q3 Reading Tasks and their comprehension was assessed through completion of Q3 for which they had 15 min. Table 1 illustrates the types of reading tasks included in the course (translated from Chinese).

**Table 1**

*Reading Comprehension for EG*

| Question Type      | Instructions                                                                     |
|--------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Multiple choice | Select the correct answer from the choices provided.                             |
| 2. True or False   | Determine whether the statements given are true or false.                        |
| 3. Writing task    | Reread the passage and respond to comprehension questions in complete sentences. |

Note: The data for the reading was collected from comprehension Q3 only

While EG were completing the reading, CG worked on creating sentences within different contexts and using conjunctions and cohesive devices to expand their ideas and link them into paragraphs. The instructor used a sample paragraph to scaffold the process for the students (Tsiriotakis et al., 2020). The last part of the lesson for both EG and CG was the individual writing task, during which the students were encouraged to use the given patterns and vocabulary learnt to create a personal answer. Scaffolding questions were provided to guide them. Table 2 presents examples of questions for the topic ‘My trip’.

**Table 2**

*Writing Tasks*

| Paragraph | Scaffolding questions                                                    | Suggested patterns                           |
|-----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| 1.        | After arriving in China, what did you like or dislike about the country? | I remember (that) ----- To my surprise ----- |
| 2.        | How do you feel about this experience?                                   | At that moment ----- Not sure -----          |
| 3.        | Do you understand Chinese Culture better now?                            | Until ----- In the end -----                 |

Students were required to write at least a 100-120 word-long article consisting of three paragraphs (Williams, 2018). Both groups received remedial feedback after each writing task. Table 3 shows the time allocation for all the instructional activities for the groups.

**Table 3**

*Time Allocation for CG & EG Activities*

| Section                     | CG                                                                                                                          | EG                                                                                               |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Pre-writing (120 min)       | Vocabulary (40 min)<br>Language points & Paragraph structure (40 min)<br>Use of conjunctions for complex sentences (40 min) | Vocabulary (40 min)<br>Reading comprehension & Q1-Q2 (40 min)<br>Intensive reading & Q3 (40 min) |
| Individual Writing (45 min) | Write a 100-120-word article on the given topic                                                                             |                                                                                                  |

Note. a: Both groups were given a 15-minute break before the individual writing.

b: See Q1 – Q3 in Table 1

## Data collection

For this study, the data were collected from EG and CG weekly over the course of the academic term. Firstly, we gathered data from intensive reading (Q3, see Table 1) to assess reading scores for EG students on a scale of 0-10 (Wang, 2022). They had to answer 5 questions and every answer

demonstrating full comprehension was awarded 2 points. Grammatical structure, vocabulary usage and length of the answer did not factor in the score.

The second set of scores came from the writing tasks that both EG and CG completed. Their writing was assessed in four core areas: structuring, clear statements, sentence formation and grammar (Cheung, 2016). To eliminate the subjectivity in grading written work, a score for each task was awarded based on the criteria for HSK level 5 proficiency in Chinese writing (Zhang & Lin, 2017). The overall rating scale and task standards, along with their scores, were the primary sources of writing data in this study. Table 4 below shows the categories and the score allocation. The IOC (Index of Item-Objective Congruence) of the tasks signifies content with a reliability value of 1.0 ( $\geq 0.67$ ). The average scores of all writing tasks were used as the study results.

**Table 4**

*Categories and Mark Allocation for Writing*

| Category             | Abbrev. | Score Range | Description                                |
|----------------------|---------|-------------|--------------------------------------------|
| Content              | Cont    | 6           | Understanding and consistency of the topic |
| Phrases & Vocabulary | Phr&V   | 5           | Correct and consistent in usage            |
| Grammar              | Gram    | 6           | Appropriate word order                     |
| Organization         | Org     | 5           | Appropriate and logical structure          |
| Punctuation          | Punct   | 3           | Correct use of punctuation symbols         |
| Word Count           | WC      | 5           | Length of the article                      |

Note: Punct and WC were not considered for data collection in this study

## Data Analysis

The data collected from EG and CG were analyzed utilizing an independent sample *t*-test. The score of each participant was recorded and analyzed with SPSS (Version 26). The data were divided into four criteria: Cont, Phr&V, Gram and Org for descriptive statistical analysis of writing tasks.

## Results

In our study, the EG students received intensive reading (see Table 1). The average score of that section collection was not optimistic as it showed only 4.87 out of 10. The second set of scores was for writing performance for each group, and they are compared in Table 5 and 6 below.

**Table 5**

*Descriptive Statistics for CG and EG*

| Group    | N  | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|----------|----|------|----------------|-----------------|
| Cont CG  | 40 | 5.50 | .751           | .119            |
| EG       | 40 | 4.95 | .932           | .147            |
| Gram CG  | 40 | 4.55 | 1.011          | .160            |
| EG       | 40 | 4.10 | .841           | .133            |
| Org CG   | 40 | 4.45 | .783           | .124            |
| EG       | 40 | 3.93 | .730           | .115            |
| Phr&V CG | 40 | 4.05 | .639           | .101            |
| EG       | 40 | 3.58 | .747           | .118            |

Table 5 presents the descriptive statistics for the CG and EG with a total of 80 participants, indicating that IRW had no positive effects on developing writing skills in CSL/CFL. The mean scores of the CG were significantly higher than those of the EG in all four categories.

**Table 6**

*Results of independent sample t-test (Cont, Org, Gram, and Phr&V) in CG & EG*

| Levene's Test for Equality of Variances |    |       |      | t-test for Equality of Means |        |                 |
|-----------------------------------------|----|-------|------|------------------------------|--------|-----------------|
| Group                                   |    | F     | Sig. | t                            | df     | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| Cont                                    | CG | .721  | .399 | 2.905                        | 78     | .005            |
|                                         | EG |       |      | 2.905                        | 74.618 | .005            |
| Gram                                    | CG | 3.058 | .084 | 3.102                        | 78     | .003            |
|                                         | EG |       |      | 3.102                        | 77.620 | .003            |
| Org                                     | CG | 2.903 | .092 | 2.163                        | 78     | .034            |
|                                         | EG |       |      | 2.163                        | 75.493 | .034            |
| Phr&V                                   | CG | 7.279 | .009 | 3.057                        | 78     | .003            |
|                                         | EG |       |      | 3.057                        | 76.148 | .003            |

Table 6 depicts that EG participants received a non-significant effect for the group compared to CG. The outcome shows that the EWI in CG was statistically more effective than the IRW method in EG, as the difference between groups was  $p < 0.05$ . Furthermore, the result of the effect size shows that Cohen's  $d$  of each criterion specifies a strong effect on CG. This study found that the development of writing skills using an integrated reading-to-writing approach is more challenging for low-level students of CSL/ CFL. Based on the results, a difficulty analysis is indicated with Difficulty Index CG = 0.84 and EG = 0.75. The scores of both also suggest that the difficulty level was consistent with the results above. Cronbach's Alpha was also used to further verify the entire teaching objectives ( $\alpha = .820$ ). To gain more insight, the IRW was surveyed by the EG students. Table 7 presents their opinions.

**Table 7**

Questionnaire survey on EG's satisfaction upon completing the course

| Evaluation Aspect                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | SD    | Mean | Full Mark |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------|-----------|
| 1. The instructor is open to questions and discussion.                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 0.640 | 4.53 | 5         |
| 2. The instructor is able to stimulate students' critical thinking.                                                                                                                                                                                       | 0.458 | 4.73 | 5         |
| 3. Satisfaction with the materials and readings in the course.                                                                                                                                                                                            | 1.125 | 3.87 | 5         |
| 4. Effectiveness of assessment methods (exercises, assignments)                                                                                                                                                                                           | 1.060 | 4.13 | 5         |
| Additional comments from students: 1. The units contain too much knowledge to learn in a very short time. I think 1- 2 units would be enough, because the vocabulary is very, very hard to understand for Thai students. 2. There is too much vocabulary. |       |      |           |

As can be concluded from the survey, some students felt pressure because of the amount of vocabulary covered and the fast pace of the course. The findings of this study could help with further research into how to design a more effective and less stressful curriculum for writing for low-level students of CSL/CFL.

## Discussion

For the study, we collected data and examined the effects using a statistical comparison of scores from the EWI in CG and the IRW in EG. The EWI approach helped students' writing improve noticeably: 18.55 out of 22 for the four assessment areas, compared to 16.56 for IRW. CG outperformed EG students in all 4 categories (Table 5 and 6,  $p < 0.05$ ).

For the EWI, the average score for the Phr & V was 0.47 points higher than for the IRW. One reason could be that CG focused more on the target vocabulary, while EG emphasized reading tasks.

Lack of vocabulary and weak recollection of new words are related to students' dependence on source texts and proficiency. To get the maximum score (5 points) the students' writing had to be mistake-free and only 4 students received a full mark. Most of EG students repeatedly used simple vocabulary and the maximum application rate of new vocabulary usage in each lesson did not exceed 5 words.

After repetition, the second most popular error was calque which is translating native language words into another language instead of using the correct word or collocation. Additionally, they often used the Thai word order, such as putting the name of the place at the end of the sentence instead of at the beginning ('I bought it in China.' while the correct word order in Chinese is 'I in China bought it.'). Also, time expressions were placed at the end of sentences yet, in Chinese, all time expressions must begin the sentence (incorrect: 'I travelled to China last year ', correct: 'Last year I travelled to China.').

Moreover, Thai is not as rich as Chinese vocabulary-wise. For example, in Chinese, there are 2 different words for love: romantic love for a couple or spouses (爱情) and regular love for anything or anybody (爱). Also, the word 'non-particular' can be expressed in two ways: 平常 or 寻常 and the choice depends on whether an adjective (寻常) or an adverb (平常) is needed. On the surface, these words are similar, but they can only be used in a specific context. Thai students struggled with understanding when to apply each and often confused the contexts as the exact translation of those words in Thai do not exist or both words are translated identically.

Another issue was incorrect collocation use. Students tried translating the words from Thai instead of using learnt Chinese expressions. For instance, a collocation 'pass an exam' in Chinese is "我通过了考试" but Thai learners kept using '考过了大学' which in Chinese means 'experience an exam' and does not signify whether the exam was completed successfully or not.

As can be seen from the above-mentioned examples, even though the students were familiar with some words, their vocabulary acquisition range still confused them, and it interfered with context transfer (Magnusson et al., 2019). Students relied on the source text, thus missing out on the actual application of language in context (Ye & Ren, 2019). Since CG focused more on practicing vocabulary, the students from that group had a higher awareness of how to apply the words in their writing correctly based on the context and so, they made fewer mistakes (Seyapalan et al., 2023).

As for grammatical performance, when using the IRW strategy, students were encouraged to apply vocabulary and language points learned from reading to improve their written work. The Gram test results showed that the EG scored 0.45 points lower than the CG, and this difference was statistically significant ( $p=0.00$ ,  $p<0.05$ ,  $d=0.484$ ).

Most students found it difficult to write new and original sentences in L2 based on the existing grammar structure and their sentences and grammatical structures were almost identical to the reading materials. The most popular mistakes include incomplete sentence structure, lack of coherence, insufficient conjunctions and continuous transfer of native language calque and structures. For example, Thai students often forget to use verb 'to be' and conjunctions: 'You same me' instead of 'You and I are the same' or 'The story I moved.' instead of 'I by the story am moved.'). Also, the majority of students opted for simple sentences and, due to insufficient vocabulary, struggled to identify and learn how to use more complex grammatical structures (Singh

et al., 2017). In contrast, the method of teaching grammar in CG was focused on combining language points with target vocabulary and encouraging creativity and persistence in use. Since students had no original text to copy from, they had to construct sentences independently by directly applying what they had learned.

The research findings in ORG indicate that CG scores were again higher than those of EG (4.45 out of 5, compared to 3.93 out of 5). This significant difference is likely linked to the EG students' low proficiency in reading. As mentioned earlier, the average reading score was just 4.87 out of 10, indicating that typically students understood less than half of the text. The research therefore shows that the IRW was less effective at promoting low-level students' skills in properly structuring writing than the EWI. They had insufficient time to familiarize themselves with the reading and failed to use it as a model. The reappearance of content and information in different paragraphs made the overall structure of the article unclear. Also, many students didn't know how to divide their ideas into separate paragraphs and, even if they managed, the parts of their writing did not seem logically connected and confused the reader. The CG was not influenced by reading pressure; thus, learners were able to engage in more framework-guided exercises (Jouhar & Rupley, 2021).

The content category showed similar differences with CG scoring 5.50 and EG 4.95. Due to the relatively high error rate while using new words and grammatical structures, students seldom chose being innovative. They would rather repeat words and sentences to avoid making mistakes which in turn made their writing seem basic and information they presented incoherent. Generally, reading may give more content prompts, but it also requires students to spend additional time on understanding and analyzing texts. EG students may have felt under pressure due to time constraints or a lack of knowledge and did not utilize the original text skillfully to enhance the content of their work (Hastuti, 2015). Mikami (2017) pointed out that completing reading comprehension tasks and analyzing texts required a significant amount of practice. The statistical difference could be attributed to the fact that both groups consisted of students who were relative beginners in CSL/CFL. Although the difference might seem small, it remains statistically significant.

Previous studies conducted on Integrated Reading and Writing in L2 show that reading can help students and orient the structure of writing (Nguyen, 2023). Findings of our study unequivocally show that teaching writing through reading was less successful than using the EWI in improving writing in a group of low-level learners of CSL/CFL. As EWI provides students with more scaffolded instruction and teacher guidance, it is more suited for beginner learners who do not have a fully developed language foundation. This method focuses more on repetition and recollection of previously studied vocabulary and structure and accuracy of its usage. Beginner learners might find IRW daunting as it gives them more freedom and independence in use that they might not be ready for while EWI lets them comfortably learn prechosen structures in a limited environment. Moreover, IRW centers around 2 separate skills: reading and writing and EWI offers practice of only writing. Therefore, students can fully focus on the writing skills alone without being distracted by reading passages.

Similarly, Jang and Lee (2019) found that participants with low language skills in L2 did not demonstrate improvement in their overall writing quality. Miralpeix and Muñoz (2018) examined a strong correlation between language level and writing ability. Our result reflects those findings. Low-

level students seemed to make slower progress in learning with the IRW and we deem the lack of vocabulary as the main obstacle for EG to have completed the reading comprehension and writing tasks efficiently.

## Conclusion

This study compared IRW with EWI in CSL/CFL and findings show that students learning with IRW progress more slowly, as it requires strong reading skills and greater learner's autonomy. With a limited vocabulary, beginners often struggle to extract and transfer information from texts into writing. While previous research focused on advanced learners who did not need extra support, lower-level students require scaffolded teaching and additional time to complete tasks effectively.

Therefore, EWI yields better results for beginners. Without the burden of complex texts, students receive more language support through targeted vocabulary and scaffolding. This allows them to focus on applying grammar and language chunks in writing creatively, thereby strengthening cognitive processes and promoting skills development.

## Limitations of the study

The study was aligned with the university's course syllabus. Although the drawbacks of using Integrated Reading and Writing in low-level classes are evident, several factors fall outside the scope of this study. For example, we did not examine whether writing anxiety arises, nor could we conduct a more in-depth analysis of students' mistakes.

## Recommendations

This study put forward new aims for further instruction in writing classes for low-level students in the CSL/CFL. Further study into developing a more suitable and effective method for teaching writing skills may provide valuable insights into curriculum creation.

### 1. An effective curriculum design could prove beneficial for skills development

It is recommended to allocate time reasonably in accordance with the students' writing level in future integrated writing instruction. In low-level classes, reading and writing skills should be taught separately. Further consideration should be given as to which class should take priority. We need to ensure compatibility in teaching both skills and help students successfully transfer reading skills into writing tasks in CSL/CFL.

### 2. Learning support

Online learning platforms or other digital tools could provide students with more individually tailored practice and ultimately lead to integrating reading into writing outside the classroom. For instance, creating a group on Microsoft Teams (or similar easily accessible platforms), where members can post stories or share experiences, could be an engaging opportunity for practice. They could use both reading and writing skills more naturally and boost each other's motivation to write. The group could be beginner-focused to provide a safe space for low-level learners.

## Recommendations for Future Research

The findings of this study put forth some ideas that are deserving of additional research. In the future teaching of writing, we should stimulate students' curiosity and incorporate other innovative

teaching methods, such as audio-visual involvement to pique their interest in writing. There is more that can be done to make teaching writing more favorable to low-level CSL/CFL students in the future. Further research on how to improve writing skills may yield better results.

## References

- Allan, K. (Ed.). (2015). *The Routledge handbook of linguistics* (1st ed.) [eBook]. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315718453>
- Chen, C., & Gong, Y. (2025). The role of AI-assisted learning in academic writing: A mixed-methods study on Chinese as a second language students. *Education Sciences*, 15(2), 141. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15020141>
- Cheung, Y. L. (2016). *Teaching writing in English language teaching today: Linking theory and practice* (pp.179-194). Springer International Publishing. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-38834-2
- Cho, Y., Kim, D., & Jeong, S. (2021). Evidence-based reading interventions for English language learners: A multilevel meta-analysis. *Heliyon*, 7(9). doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07985
- Choi, J., Moon, Y., Paek, J. K., & Kang, Y. (2018). Examining the relationship between reading and writing of advanced Korean EFL learners. *응용언어학*, 34(1), 91-116. DOI:10.17154/kjal.2018.3.34.1.91
- Chow, B. W. Y., Mo, J., & Dong, Y. (2021). Roles of reading anxiety and working memory in reading comprehension in English as a second language. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 92, 102092. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2021.102092>
- Hastuti, S. D. S. (2015). The influence of vocabulary and grammar mastery on the students' writing skill at yogyakarta state university. *Media Wisata*, 13(1). doi.org/10.36276/mws.v13i1.213
- Jang, Y., & Lee, J. (2019). The effects of ideal and ought-to L2 selves on Korean EFL learners' writing strategy use and writing quality. *Reading and Writing*, 32, 1129-1148. DOI:10.1007/s11145-018-9903-0
- Jouhar, M. R., & Rupley, W. H. (2021). The reading-writing connection based on independent reading and writing: A systematic review. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 37(2), 136-156. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2020.1740632>
- Joyce, P. (2018). L2 vocabulary learning and testing: The use of L1 translation versus L2 definition. *The Language Learning Journal*, 46(3), 217-227. doi:10.1080/09571736.2015.1028088
- Kuehner, A. V., & Hurley, J. (2019). How integrating reading and writing supports student success. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 42(2), 20-26. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/45221759>
- Lee, I., & Yuan, R. E. (2021). Understanding L2 writing teacher expertise. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 52, 100755. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100755>
- Li, X., & Xu, J. (2019). *Boya Chinese: Reading and writing (Elementary) (Vol. 1)*. Peking University Press.
- Magnusson, C. G., Roe, A., & Blikstad-Balas, M. (2019). To what extent and how are reading comprehension strategies part of language arts instruction? A study of lower secondary classrooms. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 54(2), 187-212. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.231>
- Mgijima, V. D. (2021). Advancing text prediction skills through translanguaging. *Reading & Writing*, 12(1), 1-10. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/rw.v12i1.284>

- Mikami, A. (2017). Students' attitudes toward extensive reading in the Japanese EFL context. *Tesol Journal*, 8(2), 471-488. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.283>
- Miralpeix, I., & Muñoz, C. (2018). Receptive vocabulary size and its relationship to EFL language skills. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 56(1), 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral-2017-0016>
- Nguyen, C. T. (2023). EFL students' challenges in the integration of reading and writing in their writing classes. *European Journal of English Language Studies*, 3(1), 13-22. [doi.org/10.12973/ejels.3.1.13](https://doi.org/10.12973/ejels.3.1.13)
- Oshima, S. (2020). Effects of explicit instruction on text structure in process writing. *Teacher efficacy, learner agency*, 433-442. DOI:10.37546/JALTPCP2019-50
- Pae, T. I. (2019). A simultaneous analysis of relations between L1 and L2 skills in reading and writing. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 54(1), 109-124. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.216>
- Seyapalan, E. D., Bakar, A., Razali, M., Ismail, L., & Noordin, N. (2023). A review of studies on the potential of specific word instruction (SWI) to improve vocabulary knowledge among Malaysian ESL learners. DOI:10.6007/IJARBS/v13-i9/18414
- Singh, C. K. S., Singh, A. K. J., Razak, N. Q. A., & Ravinthar, T. (2017). Grammar errors made by ESL tertiary students in writing. *English Language Teaching*, 10(5), 16-27. [10.5539/elt.v10n5p16](https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n5p16)
- Sun, T., & Wang, C. (2020). College students' writing self-efficacy and writing self-regulated learning strategies in learning English as a foreign language. *System*, 90, 102221. DOI:10.1016/j.system.2020.102221
- Tsiriou, I. K., Grünke, M., Spantidakis, I., Vassilaki, E., & Stavrou, N. A. (2020, October). The impact of an explicit writing intervention on EFL students' short story writing. In *Frontiers in Education* (Vol. 5, p. 565213). Frontiers Media SA. [doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2020.565213](https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2020.565213)
- Wang, C. (2022). The Comparison between the use of audio-visual methods and audio-only methods in Improving learners' listening proficiency in Chinese as a second language classrooms. *Journal of Liberal Arts Prince of Songkla University*, 14(2), 181-205. [doi.org/10.14456/jlpsu](https://doi.org/10.14456/jlpsu)
- Wasinanon, N. (2016). The study of Thailand's systematic Chinese teaching management if higher education. *Chinese Studies Journal Kasetsart University*, 9(2), 263-287. <https://so01.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/CSJ/article/view/98162/76449>
- Williams, C. (2018). Learning to write with interactive writing instruction. *The Reading Teacher*, 71(5), 523-532. <https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1643>
- Yang, G., Xuesong, G., & Boning, L. (2020). Teaching Chinese as a second or foreign language to non-Chinese learners in mainland China (2014–2018). *Language Teaching*, 53(1), 44-62. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444819000387>
- Ye, W., & Ren, W. (2019). Source use in the story continuation writing task. *Assessing Writing*, 39, 39–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2018.12.001>
- Zhang, D., & Lin, C. H. (Eds.). (2017). *Chinese as a second language assessment*. Routledge.
- Zhao, Y., Chew, F. P., & Yap, T. T. (2025). Effects of English-Chinese code-switching on writing anxiety in Chinese as a second language learners. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 7(6), 554–567. <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i6.9511>