

Measuring English Instructors' Perceptions on the Challenges of College English Writing Instruction and WeCWI-Enhanced 21CLD Pedagogical Approach

Ye Chen

Academy of Language Studies
Universiti Teknologi MARA Shah Alam, Selangor, MALAYSIA

***Boon Yih Mah**

Universiti Teknologi MARA, Cawangan Pulau Pinang, Pulau Pinang,
MALAYSIA

Nor Fazlin Mohd Ramli

Universiti Teknologi MARA Shah Alam, Selangor, MALAYSIA

Chen Chen

Liaoning Petrochemical University, Fushun, Liaoning, CHINA

email: 728184386@qq.com, mahboonyih@gmail.com, norfa707@uitm.edu.my, 710455687@qq.com

**Corresponding author: Boon Yih Mah*

Received: 03 Dec 2024; **Revised:** 19 May 2025; **Accepted:** 27 June 2025; **Published:** 30 June 2025

To cite this article (APA): Chen, Y., Mah, B. Y., & Mohd Ramli, N. F. (2025). Measuring English Instructors' Perceptions on the Challenges of College English Writing Instruction and WeCWI-Enhanced 21CLD Pedagogical Approach. *AJELP: Asian Journal of English Language and Pedagogy*, 13(1), 142-156. <https://doi.org/10.37134/ajelp.vol13.1.10.2025>

Abstract: This study investigates the instructional challenges faced by College English instructors in China and evaluates the potential of the WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD pedagogical approach to address these challenges. The research objectives are to measure the perceptions among College English instructors about the instructional challenges of College English writing performance faced by undergraduate students and to measure College English instructors' perceptions of the effectiveness of WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD in tackling these instructional challenges. Data were collected through surveys distributed to 85 English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instructors, focusing on their teaching practices and exposure to effective instructional frameworks. Key findings reveal significant challenges in integrating effective pedagogical methods and a high level of instructor unfamiliarity with the WeCWI framework, 21CLD rubrics and WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD pedagogical approach. Adopting the WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD approach improves student outcomes by embedding cognitive strategies and 21st-century skills. Consequently, institutions should prioritise professional development and support for instructors to implement these innovative pedagogical approaches effectively. The study utilises descriptive statistical analyses to evaluate the data, providing a

comprehensive understanding of the challenges and perspectives of instructors. Descriptive statistics summarised the data, offering a clear picture of the instructional challenges and familiarity with the pedagogical approaches. The research highlights the need for continuous professional development and support for instructors to implement these more advanced teaching methods effectively. The findings advocate for institutional support to provide resources and train teachers to facilitate changes in teaching practices. The study concludes that the WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD pedagogical approach has great potential to influence College English writing education and improve students' writing performance.

Keywords: College English writing, instructional challenges, perceptions, WeCWI, WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD

INTRODUCTION

College English writing is a crucial component of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) education in China. The importance of English language proficiency has significantly increased in higher education in China, especially with English language courses becoming compulsory in college curricula. As a result, the development of College English writing performance has become a crucial aspect of undergraduate education. Writing proficiency directly determines students' academic and career prospects. (Sun, 2024).

However, College English instructors face numerous instructional challenges when teaching this skill. One significant challenge is using traditional methods, such as the use of conventional lecture-based instruction, a lack of collaborative learning, and a lack of use of ICT. Traditional pedagogical approaches utilised in College English writing instruction tend to emphasise the result rather than the writing process, thereby impeding the development of students' writing proficiency. (Ying, 2018). The teaching staff in College English writing may also lack the necessary knowledge or training. (Tan, 2019). Many instructors lack theoretical and pedagogical knowledge, which limits their ability to implement effective writing instruction strategies.

This study was conducted to validate the research problems by identifying the empirical issues before proposing an effective solution. The study's primary objective is to measure the perceptions among College English instructors from a university in China about the instructional challenges of College English writing performance faced by undergraduate students. The second objective of this study is to measure the perceptions among college English instructors of the effectiveness of WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD in tackling the instructional challenges of college English writing performance.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

The importance of enhancing undergraduate English writing performance for learners in China is growing; however, there are insufficient studies and findings on the perceptions among College English instructors about the instructional challenges of College English writing performance faced by undergraduates in China. By the middle of July 2024, searching across Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar using the keywords "perceptions, College English instructors, instructional challenges, College English writing performance, undergraduate, China," the findings reveal a significant gap in the literature.

While Google Scholar yielded over 3,000 results, none fully encompassed all the specified keywords. The other two databases returned zero results. For instance, Geng et al. (2022) conducted a study on EFL writing focused exclusively on Chinese secondary teachers, leaving

undergraduate instructors' perceptions unexplored. Similarly, (Zhang, 2016) Examined writing pedagogy in Asian contexts but did not consider instructors' views. Jiang et al. (2023) Reported Chinese high school writing classes typically take a teacher-centred approach, meaning that students are not actively participating in the writing or evaluation process.

This highlights the scarcity of available research in this field. This gap in research limits our understanding of the specific difficulties instructors face and hinders the development of targeted writing strategies to improve teaching practices and student outcomes.

Additionally, the perceptions among College English instructors about the instructional challenges of College English writing performance are crucial in shaping effective educational practices. Effective pedagogical approaches could prove challenging for instructors to integrate into their instructional strategies. The lack of theoretical and pedagogical knowledge further exacerbates these challenges, making it difficult for instructors to adopt effective teaching methods. Understanding these perceptions can provide valuable insights and help devise solutions aligned with the instructors' needs and experiences. This gap in knowledge and practice highlights the necessity for research examining teachers' perspectives and experiences with these contemporary frameworks.

This study aims to identify the instructional challenges that EFL educators encounter and evaluate their knowledge of and attitudes towards the WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD approach. There is a requirement to incorporate pedagogical approaches like WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD into traditional EFL teaching methods. Many educators are unfamiliar with these frameworks, and there is a strong dependence on conventional lecture-based teaching, which may not effectively improve students' writing performance. This study aimed to uncover these challenges and collect initial data to support the development of an intervention.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

1. To measure the perceptions among College English instructors about the instructional challenges of College English writing performance faced by undergraduate students.
2. To measure College English instructors' perceptions of the effectiveness of WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD in tackling these instructional challenges.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What are the perceptions among College English instructors about the instructional challenges of College English writing performance faced by undergraduate students?
2. What are College English instructors' perceptions of the effectiveness of WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD in tackling these instructional challenges?

SIGNIFICANCE

This study holds significant implications for various stakeholders within the field of EFL education, including teachers, students, and curriculum designers. For students, this study seeks to identify and propose effective approaches to improve students' writing performance by focusing on the instructional challenges faced by College English instructors. Adopting the WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD approach is expected to develop students' knowledge construction, communication skills, collaborative learning, using ICT, critical thinking, collaboration, self-regulated learning and problem-solving skills, which are essential for their academic and future career success. Understanding teachers' perspectives on these instructional challenges can lead

to targeted interventions that benefit students by improving their writing performance, engagement, and confidence.

This study provides insights into teachers' challenges in teaching College English writing. By gathering their perspectives on learning challenges and the effectiveness of the WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD approach, this study can guide professional development programs to help educators adopt more effective teaching methods. Curriculum designers can use the findings of this study to improve and develop more effective College English writing courses. By understanding the challenges faced by teachers and the potential advantages of the WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD approach, curriculum designers can create instructional materials and frameworks that better align with the needs of teachers and students. This alignment is essential to achieving better learning outcomes and preparing students for the future.

LITERATURE REVIEW

College English Writing in China

College English writing remains a vital skill reflecting students' overall language proficiency. Writing is a measure of students' mastery of vocabulary, grammar, sentence structure, and essential skills that demonstrate their comprehensive language application ability. (Huining, 2022; Zhang, 2022). Despite its importance, many Chinese college students struggle with English writing due to traditional teaching methods that emphasise passive language input and overactive language output, leading to an imbalance in language skills development. (Zhang, 2022). Gao (2019) noted that many Chinese college students struggle with authentic expression in their writing, often producing "Chinglish" despite grammatical correctness. Therefore, the Chinese Ministry of Education (2004) announced new goals for College English, emphasising individualised and group-based writing instruction to remedy the situation. This policy shift aims to address students' diverse needs and enhance the effectiveness of English writing instruction.

Technological advancements have played a crucial role in modernising College English writing instruction. Tao (2020) discussed the need to reform English writing teaching in the Big Data age, emphasising the importance of adapting to technological advancements and changing educational landscapes. In another study, Liu (2020) explored blended education approaches, incorporating online components into writing courses to leverage technology and enhance the learning experience. Chen (2021) examined the integration of communication tools for the fifth-generation network to improve writing and communication skills. Li and Su (2021) applied data mining techniques to analyse factors influencing students' writing performance, providing valuable information for improving instructional practices. These studies highlight the potential of technology to transform writing instruction and enhance learning outcomes.

Instructional Challenges

Instructional challenges in higher education are multifaceted, requiring innovative solutions to address the evolving needs of students. Mangundu (2022) emphasises the importance of addressing personal challenges as a key factor in successfully innovating e-academic advising during the COVID-19 pandemic. Therefore, innovative solutions in higher education must consider the holistic nature of challenges, specifically addressing personal obstacles to enhance student success in online learning environments.

In addition, McPhee (2022) addresses academic challenges in higher education, focusing on curriculum structures, responses to new learning methods, and demonstrating the

importance of aligning teaching practices and enhancing connections between academia and real-world applications. Allen and Zygouris-Coe (2020) explore teachers' challenges when using small groups to develop students' online research and comprehension skills, proposing implications for instructional frameworks to support teacher education efforts.

According to Jager et al. (2022) A discussion on instructional differentiation in educational research, advocating for the inclusion of deliberateness and adaptiveness as defining characteristics, is needed to understand better and address instructional challenges. Hence, Gallagher and Savage (2023) discuss that Challenge-Based Learning (CBL) has emerged as a method to foster student competencies and collaboration, addressing some of these instructional challenges by providing a framework that integrates real-world challenges with academic learning, promoting student engagement and skill development.

Cole and Weber (2019) explore Emerging Technology Exploration Projects (ETEPs) that address instructional challenges in higher education by guiding instructional innovation and assisting college instructors in effectively incorporating emerging technologies into their teaching practices. Thus, these studies emphasise the importance of adapting instructional strategies to meet college students' diverse needs and challenges.

WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD Approach

WeCWI (Web-based Cognitive Writing Instruction) integrates cognitive strategies with web-based tools. (Mah, 2015). Combined with 21CLD (21st Century Learning Design) rubrics, it forms the WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD approach—synergising “know-what” (WeCWI) and “know-why” (21CLD) into “know-how”. It provides six educational tasks: “Read to construct knowledge; write to communicate skilfully; discuss to collaborate; learn electronically using ICT; design to self-regulate and innovate to solve real-world problems” (Mah, 2023, para.11). The review highlights the alignment between WeCWI’s principles and the 21CLD rubrics, emphasising the potential synergy in enhancing language and cognitive development. It illustrates how the WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD approach capitalises on cognitive writing strategies while embedding 21st-century competencies into College English writing instruction. Traditional methods, as found by Ying (2018), focus narrowly on grammatical accuracy and final drafts, neglecting the iterative writing process.

In contrast, the WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD approach, as outlined by Mah (2023), embeds cognitive strategies (e.g., knowledge construction through reading) and 21st-century skills (e.g., ICT integration, collaboration) into each stage, addressing the process-result imbalance. Empirically, Li (2023) demonstrated that online collaborative writing instruction improved EFL learners’ self-efficacy and performance. Deveci (2018) found that collaborative writing tasks enhanced students’ critical thinking.

Gagné’s Nine Events of Instruction

Gagné’s Nine Events of Instruction is a pedagogical framework that is intended to enhance learning and improve learner engagement through instructional design and comprised of nine distinct events or steps, gaining the attention of students, informing learners of the objectives, stimulating recall of prior knowledge, presenting the content, providing learning guidance, eliciting performance, providing feedback, assessing performance, and enhancing retention and transfer of knowledge. (Tough, 2012).

Gagné’s Nine Events of Instruction is explored for its application in designing effective lesson plans across various educational contexts. Gagné’s theory was applied to help teachers facilitate the construction of scientific knowledge and used in lesson planning to enhance learning effectiveness in a simulated classroom environment (Ramma et al., 2020). Chen and

Johannesmeyer (2021) applied Gagné's framework to design active learning sessions for manual blood pressure measurement, ensuring a structured and reflective teaching approach.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The questionnaire includes sections on personal information, instructional challenges, and perceptions of the WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD approach. It was reviewed by experts familiar with the WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD pedagogical approach and College English writing. This section outlines the methodology employed in the study to investigate the instructional challenges College English instructors face and their perceptions of the WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD pedagogical approach.

Sampling and Participation Selection

The participants for this study were selected through purposive sampling, focusing on EFL instructors currently teaching College English courses. The selection criteria ensured that participants were engaged in teaching college English writing and had relevant teaching experience. Invitations to participate were sent through online work groups or direct contact to ensure all questionnaires were completed. A total of 85 respondents participated in this study, providing insights into their teaching practices and challenges. By focusing on teachers actively engaged in instructing College English writing, the study can gather essential and specific situation perspectives that will improve the reliability of the results.

Data Collection

The survey was administered electronically, and participants were invited to complete it within a specified time. The data are collected electronically and analysed using descriptive analysis to identify key trends, reliability, and validity measures, for example, mean scores, standard deviations, Cronbach's Alpha, and factor analysis. These approaches provide a clear picture of the participants' baseline characteristics and initial perceptions and challenges, laying the foundation for the study.

Data Analysis

This section is used to analyse the data from the survey, focusing on descriptive statistics to provide a comprehensive understanding of the instructional challenges faced by College English instructors and their perceptions of the WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD pedagogical approach. By ensuring reliability and validity, the study aims to enhance the credibility of the data collected through the questionnaire regarding the teaching challenges EFL instructors face and their perspectives on the WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD pedagogical approach. This thorough approach to data analysis gives a solid foundation on which to build relevant findings.

Descriptive Analysis

Since it enables us to arrange and present the data meaningfully, descriptive analysis provides a foundational understanding of the dataset through summarisation and visualisation techniques. (Perera et al., 2022). It gives a basic understanding of the features of the data, making it easier to spot trends, patterns, and outliers. Descriptive analysis is employed to summarise the data collected from the survey.

This included calculating mean scores, standard deviations, frequency and percentages to give a basic understanding of the features of the data, making it easier to spot trends and patterns in the participants' responses. The decision to use descriptive analysis is made to easily display the central tendency of the data and provide a concise, clear explanation of the data gathered, such as the extent to which instructors face instructional challenges and their familiarity with the WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD pedagogical approach.

Reliability and Validity

The reliability and validity analysis of the data confirms that the research instrument is reliable and valid. Reliability refers to the stability and consistency of a measurement method, indicating its ability to produce similar results under the same conditions. (Babu & Kohli, 2023). Validity refers to the accuracy and truthfulness of inferences drawn from collected data or experiments in research and assessment, indicating the extent to which these inferences are considered true and justifiable (Sturm & Flexer, 2023). This study used factor analysis as a data analysis method to examine the validity of the data. Table 1 shows the reliability, and Table 2 shows the validity of the data.

Table 1: Reliability of data

Items	Sample Size	Cronbach's Alpha
22	85	0.720

Cronbach's alpha values of 0.7 or higher indicate acceptable internal consistency, thus demonstrating that the measure is reliable (Taber, 2018). From the table above, the overall Cronbach's alpha value is 0.720, higher than 0.7, indicating good internal consistency. The research data is highly reliable and can be used for further analysis.

The KMO value is used to assess the suitability of the data for extraction. Communalities are used to exclude unreasonable research items. KMO values between 0.8 and 1.0 signify adequate sampling (Shrestha, 2021). Higher communality values, which should be 0.4 or greater for effective factor analysis, indicate that the factor solution has extracted more variance in the variable (Silva et al., 2019).

Table 2: Validity of data

Metric	Value/Result
KMO Value	0.809
Communalities	All values > 0.4
Factor Loadings	All primary loadings > 0.4

From the table above, the KMO value is 0.809, showing that the data is suitable for effective information extraction. All the communalities for the research items are above 0.4, indicating that the information from the research items can be effectively extracted. Furthermore, factor loadings are above 0.4. It is an acceptable factor loading value and means that the information from the research items can be effectively extracted (Ondé & Alvarado, 2020).

This study considers content and face validity to ensure the instruments used are valid. Content validity refers to the degree to which the measure components accurately reflect the target construct, ensuring that the instrument measures what it is intended. (Spoto et al., 2023).

Aligning the survey questions with the desired research objectives and incorporating feedback from EFL teaching and educational research experts demonstrates content validity.

Face validity refers to how relevant, clear, and appropriate a test or measurement tool seems to its intended audience, emphasising its apparent effectiveness in measuring the intended construct (Mishra & Allen, 2023). Face validity is reflected in the questionnaire's design to appear relevant and comprehensive to the participants. The questionnaire includes explicit questions to assess their perceptions of teaching challenges and the WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD pedagogical approach.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Demography Data

Demographic data of the participants are presented in table 3.

Table 3: Demographic data of the participants

Name		Frequency	Percentage (%)	Cumulative Percentage (%)
A1. Gender	Male	46	54.12	54.12
	Female	39	45.88	100.00
A2. Age	25- 34 years old	22	25.88	25.88
	35- 44 years old	20	23.53	49.41
	45- 50 years old	22	25.88	75.29
	Over 50 years old	21	24.71	100.00
A4. Academic Qualification	Master	49	57.65	57.65
	PhD	36	42.35	100.00
A5. Years of Teaching	1--5 year(s)	22	25.88	25.88
	6--10 years	20	23.53	49.41
	11- 20 years	22	25.88	75.29
	Over 20 years	21	24.71	100
Total		85	100	100

Participants' information included gender, age, academic qualification, and years of teaching, ensuring a broad representation of the multiple challenging perspectives and experiences in EFL education. From the table above, we can see that 54.12% of the respondents are male, and 45.88% are female, with a slightly higher proportion of males. The age distribution is relatively even, with 25.88% in the 25-34 age group, 23.53% in the 35-44 age group, 25.88% in the 45-50 age group, and 24.71% over 50 years old.

The academic qualifications show that 57.65% have a master's degree, and 42.35% have a PhD, indicating a high proportion of respondents with advanced degrees. The teaching

experience distribution is also even, with 25.88% having 1-5 years of experience, 23.53% with 6-10 years, 25.88% with 11-20 years, and 24.71% with over 20 years.

Challenges Faced by Respondents

Table 4: Challenges faced by the respondents

Challenges	Agree		Disagree	
	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Use of Traditional Lecture-based Instruction	49	57.65	36	42.35
Collaborative Learning	54	63.53	31	36.47
Lack of Using ICT	52	61.18	33	38.82
Lack of Contemporary Pedagogical Knowledge, such as WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD Approach	54	63.53	31	36.47
Other Challenges not listed	0	0	85	100

The data above presents the frequency and percentage of respondents who agree or disagree with various instructional challenges. 57.65% of the respondents selected “agree” to use traditional lecture-based instruction, while 42.35% selected “disagree,” indicating that most respondents consider traditional lecture-based teaching a challenge. Regarding collaborative learning, 63.50% of the respondents chose “agree”, and 36.50% chose “disagree”, indicating that most respondents recognise cooperative learning as a significant challenge.

63.53% of the respondents selected “agree” for the lack of using ICT, while 36.47% selected “disagree,” showing that most respondents see the lack of ICT usage as an issue. 63.53% of the respondents selected “agree” for the lack of using ICT, while 36.47% selected “disagree”, showing that most respondents see the lack of ICT usage as an issue. For the lack of contemporary pedagogical knowledge, 61.18% of the respondents selected “agree,” and 38.82% selected “disagree,” indicating that most respondents consider the lack of contemporary teaching knowledge a challenge.

Finally, no respondents identified other challenges not listed in the survey, with 100% choosing “disagree” with this item. The highest agreement rate is shown in collaborative learning and the lack of contemporary pedagogical knowledge (63.53%), suggesting that many instructors recognise the importance of cooperative learning but face challenges in effectively implementing it. The high agreement rate for the lack of contemporary pedagogical knowledge indicates that many educators may feel unprepared to integrate innovative teaching methods into their curriculum, underscoring the need for ongoing professional development.

While the lowest is in traditional lecture-based instruction (57.65%), the data suggest a shift towards more interactive and student-centred teaching approaches is needed, and a passive environment leads to an imbalance in skills development (Zhang, 2022). More than half of the respondents selected “agree” with collaborative learning, lack of ICT, and lack of contemporary pedagogical knowledge, highlighting that these are the key challenges instructors face.

Exposure to Pedagogical Frameworks

Table 5: Exposure to pedagogical frameworks

Elements	Yes		No	
	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1. Web-based Cognitive Writing Instruction (WeCWI)	24	28.24	61	71.76
2. 21st Century Learning Design (21CLD) rubrics?	22	25.88	63	74.12
3. WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD Pedagogical Approach?	0	0	85	100
4. Gagné's Nine Events of Instruction	47	55.29	38	44.71
5. Teaching College English Writing performance based on the given course learning objectives	45	52.94	40	47.06

This section examines the exposure of respondents to various pedagogical frameworks. The highest exposure is to Gagné's Nine Events of Instruction (55.29%), while the lowest is to the WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD Pedagogical Approach (0%). Only 28.24% of the respondents indicated they had been exposed to WeCWI as a theoretical and pedagogical framework, while 71.76% had not. For 21CLD rubrics, 25.88% had been exposed, and 74.12% had not.

However, none of the respondents had been exposed to the WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD pedagogical approach. Regarding Gagné's Nine Events of Instruction, 55.29% had been exposed, and 44.715% had not. Regarding teaching College English Writing performance based on the given course learning objectives, 52.94% indicated they did, while 47.06% did not. The data shows that most respondents have not been exposed to WeCWI, 21CLD rubrics, or the WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD pedagogical approach, suggesting that these teaching frameworks and methods are not widely recognised among respondents.

In contrast, more than half of the respondents have been exposed to Gagné's Nine Events of Instruction, indicating a relatively high awareness of this teaching planning method among respondents. More than half of the respondents also teach College English Writing performance based on given course learning objectives, emphasising course objectives in their teaching practice.

Effectiveness of Pedagogical Tasks

Table 6: Effectiveness of pedagogical tasks

Pedagogical Tasks	Minimum Value	Maximum Value	Mean	Standard Deviation
C6a. Read to construct knowledge	1.0	5.0	3.047	1.290
C6b. Write to communicate	1.0	5.0	2.812	0.994
C6c. Discuss to collaborate	1.0	5.0	2.706	1.010
C6d. Learn to use ICT	1.0	5.0	2.812	0.919
C6e. Design to self-regulate	1.0	5.0	2.706	0.949
C6f. Innovate to solve real-world problems	1.0	5.0	2.847	1.018
C6g. Use Gagné's Nine Events of Instruction	1.0	5.0	2.859	1.048
C6h. Design your lesson plan based on the specific instructional tasks and steps	1.0	5.0	2.871	1.021

This section presents the average scores and standard deviations for various pedagogical tasks, showing the effectiveness levels. Analysing effectiveness across various pedagogical tasks reveals a wide range of scores and varying degrees of consistency. The average score for constructing knowledge is 3.047, with a standard deviation of 1.290, indicating a wide range of performance in this area. Similarly, collaborative discussion averages 2.706, with a standard deviation of 1.010, reflecting considerable variability in performance.

Conversely, writing to communicate has a more consistent average score of 2.812 and a standard deviation of 0.994. Consistent performance is also observed using ICT, with an average score of 2.812 and a standard deviation of 0.919. Self-regulated learning has an average score of 2.706 and moderate variability with a standard deviation of 0.949, indicating moderate variability in self-regulated learning performance. The average score for innovating to solve real-world problems is 2.847, with a standard deviation of 1.018, showing significant variability. Applying Gagné's Nine Events of Instruction for teaching has an average score of 2.859, with a standard deviation of 1.048, indicating substantial variability.

Finally, designing lesson plans based on specific instructional tasks and steps averages 2.871, with a standard deviation of 1.021, showing moderate variability in lesson planning performance. Table 6 shows that the highest average score is in constructing knowledge (3.047), indicating that this task is highly effective in promoting students' learning. This suggests that students benefit significantly from activities that require them to actively engage with and construct knowledge, which is a crucial component of effective learning.

However, the high standard deviation (1.290) suggests variability in students' performance, indicating that while some students excel, others may struggle. This variability highlights the need for differentiated instructional strategies to ensure all students can benefit from knowledge construction activities.

The lowest scores are in collaborative discussion and self-regulated learning (2.706), indicating these areas are less effective and challenging for students, with high variability (standard deviations of 1.010 and 0.949). This may result from limited experience with these methods, which are not emphasised in education. It aligns with Gagné's "enhancing retention and transfer" event, explaining why 63.53% of instructors report challenges.

Additionally, Gagné's 'eliciting performance' and "providing feedback" are rarely systematised.

Conclusions and Recommendations

This study test reveals several key findings. Firstly, most instructors indicated that collaborative learning, lack of ICT, and lack of contemporary pedagogical knowledge in their teaching are the main challenges, indicating the need for training and support in these areas. Secondly, there is a high reliance on traditional lecture-based instruction, which may not effectively enhance students' writing performance. Thirdly, most instructors express unfamiliarity with the WeCWI framework and 21CLD rubrics.

Additionally, they had never been exposed to the WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD pedagogical approach, highlighting its novelty and potential impact on teaching practice. Findings from this study inform the development of the intervention, ensuring that it helps identify challenges and meets the needs of instructors.

These findings answer the research question by demonstrating the challenges currently faced by College English writing instruction and the potential effectiveness of the WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD approach in addressing these issues. The results indicate that while traditional methods are still dominant, innovative instructional frameworks are urgently needed to improve teaching effectiveness and learning outcomes.

This study advances the field by being the first to systematically document Chinese College English instructors' perceptions of writing challenges, filling a critical gap identified in Scopus and Web of Science searches. Practically, it provides empirical support for institutional reforms, advocating for WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD training to address ICT and collaboration deficits.

These findings could yield several recommendations to address the pedagogical challenges and improve the effectiveness of College English writing instruction through the WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD pedagogical approach. First, it reveals the need for professional development and training programmes to equip instructors with the skills and knowledge required to integrate ICT and innovative pedagogical frameworks into their practice.

Second, it indicates the importance of shifting from traditional lecture-based teaching methods to more interactive, student-centred teaching methods to develop students' critical thinking, collaboration, and communication skills, which can improve students' learning experience and writing performance. (Kryucheva & Tolstoukhova, 2023).

Third, implementing the WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD pedagogical approach can be promoted since it has demonstrated the ability to tackle educational challenges in the study and enhance student performance. Fourth, it proposes that academic institutions provide continuous support and resources to instructors to promote new teaching methods successfully. These measures can significantly improve College English writing teaching, improving student academic performance and more effective teaching practices.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors extend their sincere appreciation to Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM) for the indispensable institutional support, provision of essential research facilities, and cultivation of an intellectually stimulating environment—all of which played a pivotal role in the successful completion of this study.

REFERENCES

- Babu, N., & Kohli, P. (2023). Commentary: reliability in research. *Indian Journal of Ophthalmology*, 71(2), 400. https://doi.org/10.4103/ijo.IJO_2016_22
- Chen, D. (2021). Retracted: An improvement in the teaching of college English writing and communication tools for fifth generation network: Comparative study. *International Journal of Communication Systems*, 34(12). <https://doi.org/10.1002/dac.4852>
- Chen, J. J., & Johannesmeyer, H. J. (2021). Gagné's 9 events of instruction with active learning: teaching student pharmacists how to measure blood pressure. *Journal of Pharmacy Practice*, 34(3), 407–416. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0897190019875610>
- Cole, A. W., & Weber, N. L. (2019). The use of emerging technology exploration projects to guide instructional innovation. In *Technology Leadership for Innovation in Higher Education* (pp. 165–184). <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-7769-0.ch007>
- Deveci, T. (2018). Student perceptions on collaborative writing in a project-based course. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 6(4), 721–732. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2018.060415>
- Gallagher, S. E., & Savage, T. (2023). Challenge-based learning in higher education: an exploratory literature review. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 28(6), 1135–1157. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1863354>
- Gao, L. (2019). Study on teaching college English writing based on lexical chunks. *English Language Teaching*, 12(9), 1. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n9p1>
- Geng, F., Yu, S., Liu, C., & Liu, Z. (2022). Teaching and learning writing in English as a foreign language (EFL) school education contexts: A thematic review. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 66(3), 491–504. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2021.1897872>
- Jager, L., Denessen, E., Cillessen, A., & Meijer, P. C. (2022). Capturing instructional differentiation in educational research: investigating opportunities and challenges. *Educational Research*, 64(2), 224–241. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2022.2063751>
- Jiang, L., Yu, S., Zhou, N., & Xu, Y. (2023). English writing instruction in Chinese students' experience: A survey study. *RELJ Journal*, 54(1), 37–54. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220980227>
- Kryucheva, Y., & Tolstoukhova, I. (2023). Modern ways of learning as a means of enhancing the cognitive activity of students. *Nuances: Estudos Sobre Educação*, e023006. <https://doi.org/10.32930/nuances.v34i00.9963>
- Li, B., & Su, Z. (2021). Research on data mining equipment for teaching English writing based on application. *Journal of Intelligent & Fuzzy Systems*, 40(2), 3263–3269. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JIFS-189366>
- Li, Y. (2023). The effect of online collaborative writing instruction on enhancing writing performance, writing motivation, and writing self-efficacy of Chinese EFL learners. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1165221>
- Liu Yinyan. (2020). The reform of online and offline blended teaching modes in college English writing teaching. *2020 International Conference on Educational Training and Educational Phenomena (ICETEP2020)*, 98–101. <https://doi.org/10.38007/Proceedings.0000918>
- Mah Boon Yih. (2015). Web-based-cognitive-writing-instruction-wecwi-a-theoretical-and-pedagogical-e-framework-for-language-development. *International Journal of Information and Communication Engineering*, 9(2), 425–429.
- Mah Boon Yin. (2023). WeCWI-enhanced 21CLD: Transform learning into enriched pedagogical experience. <https://www.Wecwi.Com/Post/Wecwi-Enhanced21cld>.
- Mangundu, J. (2022). Higher education institutional innovation: An analysis of challenges to e-academic advising during emergency remote teaching. *SA Journal of Information*

- Management*, 24(1). <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajim.v24i1.1569>
- Mishra, M., & Allen, M. S. (2023). Face, construct and criterion validity, and test-retest reliability, of the adult rejection sensitivity questionnaire. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000782>
- Ondé, D., & Alvarado, J. M. (2020). Reconsidering the conditions for conducting confirmatory factor analysis. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 23, e55. <https://doi.org/10.1017/SJP.2020.56>
- P. Nishantha De Silva, D. S., Chinna, K., & Ferdous Azam, S. M. (2019). An exploratory factor analysis on variables affecting the profitability of Sri Lankan local commercial banks. *European Journal of Management and Marketing Studies*, 4. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3556982>
- Perera, C. H., Nayak, R., & Nguyen, L. V. T. (2022). Quantitative data presentation and analysis: Descriptive analysis. In *Social Media Marketing and Customer-Based Brand Equity for Higher Educational Institutions* (pp. 169–186). Springer Nature Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-5017-9_5
- Peter McPhee. (2022). Academic challenges and solutions in higher education: An Australian perspective. In *Reclaiming Public Universities* (pp. 53–69). Routledge India.
- Ramma, Y., Bhola, A., & Watts, M. (2020). *Guided Discovery—Robert Gagné* (pp. 191–208). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-43620-9_14
- Shrestha, N. (2021). Factor analysis as a tool for survey analysis. *American Journal of Applied Mathematics and Statistics*, 9(1), 4–11. <https://doi.org/10.12691/ajams-9-1-2>
- Spoto, A., Nucci, M., Prunetti, E., & Vicovaro, M. (2023). Improving content validity evaluation of assessment instruments through formal content validity analysis. *Psychological Methods*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000545>
- Sturm, B. L. T., & Flexer, A. (2023). Validity in music information research experiments. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2301.01578>
- Sun, L. (2024). The impact of college English teaching on improving students' writing effectiveness in the context of big data. *Applied Mathematics and Nonlinear Sciences*, 9(1), 13. <https://doi.org/10.2478/amns.2023.1.00356>
- Taber, K. S. (2018). The use of cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. *Research in Science Education*, 48(6), 1273–1296. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2>
- TAN Huining. (2022). Thoughts and practices on cultivating college students' English writing ability. *Journal of Cultural and Religious Studies*, 10(9), 541–544. <https://doi.org/10.17265/2328-2177/2022.09.007>
- Tan, X. (2019). Research on college English writing teaching under the background of big data: taking leshan normal university as an example. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 9(1), 60. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0901.09>
- Tao, Y. (2020). The reform of English writing teaching for college students in the big data age. *Proceedings of the 2019 International Conference on Education Science and Economic Development (ICESED 2019)*. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icesed-19.2020.91>
- Tough, D. (2012). A Focus on Robert Gagné's instructional theories: Application to teaching audio engineering. *Journal of the Music and Entertainment Industry Educators Association*, 12(1), 209–220. <https://doi.org/10.25101/12.9>
- Van Allen, J., & Zygouris-Coe, V. "Vicky" I. (2020). Preparing teachers to integrate digital tools that support students' online research and comprehension skills. In *Handbook of Research on Literacy and Digital Technology Integration in Teacher Education* (pp. 47–77). <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-1461-0.ch003>
- Ying, Z. (2018). Exploring construction of college English writing course from the perspective of output-driven hypothesis. *English Language Teaching*, 11(2), 188.

<https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n2p188>

- Zhang, L. (2016). Reflections on the pedagogical imports of western practices for professionalizing ESL/EFL writing and writing-teacher education. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 39(3), 203–232. <https://doi.org/10.1075/aral.39.3.01zha>
- Zhang, L. (2022a). Improved collaborative filtering automatic assessment system for teaching English writing in college. *Advances in Multimedia*, 2022, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/7092811>
- Zhang, L. (2022b). Improved collaborative filtering automatic assessment system for teaching English writing in college. *Advances in Multimedia*, 2022, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/7092811>