A STUDY ON THE APPLICATION OF "MOBILE MICRO-WRITING + AUTOMATIC CORRECTION + ENGLISH WECHAT" MODEL IN THE INSTRUCTION OF COLLEGE ENGLISH WRITING IN CHINA[i]

Yang Feng[ii]
PhD, Assistant Professor,
School of English Studies,
Zhejiang International Studies University,
Hangzhou, China

Abstract:

In order to change the problems of low teaching efficiency and slow development of students' writing ability in the course of College English Writing in China, this paper puts forward a teaching model of "mobile micro-writing + automatic correction + English WeChat", and conducted a 32-class-hour instructional reform experiment in 16 weeks to two classes of sophomores majoring in English. The results show that more than 90% of the students in the experimental class support the teaching model, and their interest in English writing, self-awareness of writing and English writing ability have been significantly improved, especially their average score of English writing has increased by 25.51%. Furthermore, they have significant advantages over the control class in writing time, word number, composition score, writing length, vocabulary use, sentence length, and so on. In the meantime, this study analyzes the existing problems of the intelligent correction system, which provides a reference for the non-English speaking countries' English writing teaching.

Keywords: China; College English writing; teaching reform; experimental research

1. The Current Situation of College English Writing Instruction in China

At present, the traditional teaching model of "*previewing before class, explaining in class, arranging composition and homework after class, teachers correcting and commenting on students' homework*" is commonly adopted in the instruction of College English writing in China. There are many problems such as students' low interest in English writing and

---

[ii] Correspondence: email yang.feng@zisu.edu.cn

---

slow development of writing ability (Zhang, 2019). Many senior English teachers (Zhang, 2020; Chang, 2019; Zhou &Wei, 2019) think that the main reasons for this situation are as follows：

1) Most college students in China have poor English foundation in middle school, especially underperformed in English writing and lack of interest in English writing course.

2) The pre-class preparation of College English writing is often not supervised and checked by teachers, which is not effective. Many students do not even carry out pre-class preparation at all.

3) In the classroom teaching of English writing, teachers cannot get response, and students cannot bring up the problems in writing and the lack of interaction between teachers and students.

4) After class, students cannot write compositions and get timely guidance, which leads to a small number of students copy online compositions and submit in a perfunctory manner.

5) Many teachers have to mark more than 100 students' English compositions in a week. They also need to collect the main problems existing in students' compositions to complete the teaching summary. Due to the heavy workload, the time cycle to correction is long and the feedback to students is limited, so the teaching efficiency is not high.

English writing ability can only be improved gradually through a large number of writing exercises (Zhao, 2019). Therefore, in order to improve the English writing ability of Chinese students, we should improve their interest in writing and sense of achievement, and let them do enough writing exercises from simple to difficult, from short to long, and get timely and effective guidance in English writing practice.

Therefore, based on many years of English teaching practice and experience, the researcher proposes to adopt a reforming teaching model of "mobile micro-writing + automatic correction + English WeChat" to improve the teaching efficiency.

"Mobile micro-writing" refers to the practice of writing English essay anytime and anywhere through mobile phones or tablet computers; "automatic correction" refers to the feedback of artificial intelligence that can be obtained immediately after submitting the text written on mobile phones or tablets to an online platform, Pigai Online; "English WeChat" refers to the establishment of WeChat group for English writing teaching, communication between teachers and students, and students were asked to write in English.

2. Theoretical Basis and Feasibility Analysis

2.1 Theoretical basis

The theory of "mobile micro-teaching + automatic correction + English WeChat" English writing instruction reform is proposed according to task-based instruction, which emphasizes "learning by doing", is developed from communicative teaching method and

widely used in the global language education. The teaching theory of "learning by doing" holds that mastering a language is mostly the result of using the language in activities and practices, rather than simply training language skills and learning linguistic knowledge. Therefore, this method of instruction requires teachers to design specific and operable tasks based on specific communication and language projects in instructions. Students complete tasks through various forms of linguistic activities such as expression, communication, negotiation, explanation, inquiry, etc., so as to achieve the purpose of learning and mastering the language (Harmer, 2001).

Task-based approach is a learning-centered approach, which focuses on the cognitive and psycholinguistic processes of second language teaching and tries to provide opportunities for learners to participate in communication tasks through meaning-focused activities in the classroom (Harmer, 2001). In the process of completing task, learners will pay attention to the meaning of language communication, make full use of the target language resources they have obtained, acquire the required information through communication, and complete the task. The learning process is to achieve the expected teaching objectives.

What is the essential difference between task and traditional exercise or activity?

First, the task is purposeful. The word "purpose" here has twofold meaning, one is the non-teaching purpose contained in the task itself, the other is the teaching purpose that the task designer expects the participants to achieve, while the practice usually only has the teaching purpose.

Second, tasks usually produce non-verbal results, while exercises always lead to linguistic results. For example, how to arrange a picnic according to the weather forecast information or choose which trains can arrive on time according to the schedule of trains and cars. The post-task results are non-verbal, while the results of classroom exercises, such as using phrases to make sentences and prepositions to fill in the blanks, are always linguistic.

Third, the task is open, that is to say, there is not a set of predetermined mode or way to perform the task, or a unified result will be achieved. The way to complete the task, including the using of language, is optional, non-fixed and non-restrictive.

Fourth, tasks are communicative or interactive. Tasks are usually collective and cooperative activities. Tasks are usually performed in a way of communication or interaction, which can be bilateral or multilateral interaction among students, students and teachers, and students and input materials.

2.2 Feasibility analysis
A. Mobile micro-teaching

Sophomores and senior students in English Major in China have to attend the national unified examination of TEM-4 (Test for English Majors-Band 4) and TEM-8 (Test for English Majors-Band 8), which includes listening, reading, writing and translation. The writing part TEM-4 and TEM-8 of require to write a composition more than 200 and 300 words within 45 minutes. In addition, the composition requires the content to be

substantial, the language to be fluent, the words to be used properly, and the expression to be appropriate (Cui, 2018; Zhao, 2018).

In the Internet age, most college students in China have a smart phone. Nearly 90% of the students use the mobile phone 4-6 hours per day on average (Yu, 2019). Therefore, 200-300 words of English short composition can be written anytime and anywhere through mobile micro-writing.

B. Automatic correction

Pigai Online is an online platform of English composition automatic assessment system based on cloud computing, with a basically consistent rate of 91.55% (Li, 2020) between the automatic and manual assessment, which is in a leading position in technology in the world. It is the most paid and applied corpus based artificial intelligence composition marking online platform in China and very popular among universities. Students can use it free of charge, and generate scores and overall comments of students' compositions in real time, as well as important information feedback such as "comment by sentence". Students can also revise their compositions according to comments many times. The advantage can improve students' interest and sense of achievement in English writing.

The mobile app of Pigai Online provides a more convenient and professional communication platform for teachers and students. Teachers and students can use mobile phones to view and learn English writing anytime and anywhere. Teachers can use mobile phones to arrange, view and mark compositions (including by voice comment), explain the requirements of writing, and specify the deadline for submission of assignments. Students can use mobile phones to submit works and view comments. The system provides comments and scores through "*vocabulary, sentence, text structure, content relevance*" and other aspects, and also provides comments by sentence function, online consultation, students' mutual evaluation, discussion and communication functions, so that students can use mobile phones and tablet computers to receive teaching tasks assigned by teachers in a timely and convenient way, and then submit assignments, view composition scores, and comment within the specified time. Teachers can automatically scan various parameters of students' compositions with the marking network, and then make more accurate and objective comments. Through the system, they can manage the class well, check the class students' messages and compositions submitted by students, and further summarize the problems in compositions and make objective evaluation.

C. English WeChat

WeChat is the most widely used social software in China. More than 85% of college students use WeChat for an average of 2-4 hours a day, half of which for chatting in Chinese (Ji, 2018). If both teachers and students in the WeChat group of English writing use English words to chat and communicate, even if everyone uses 10-20 minutes per day on average, they will practice hundreds of words of English writing in a semester, which will surely help students' interest and ability in English writing.

3. Designation of experiment

In order to verify the effectiveness of the above-mentioned English writing teaching model, the researcher conducted a 16-week teaching reform experiment in two college English writing classes of sophomore major in English in Zhejiang International Studies University.

3.1 Research questions

The specific problems of this study are as follows: compared with the traditional teaching mode, if the "mobile micro-writing + automatic correction + English WeChat" teaching mode of English writing is adopted,

1) Can students' writing interest and independent writing consciousness be cultivated better?
2) Can students' English writing ability be improved more effectively?
3) How do students evaluate this mode?

3.2 Research subject and experimental scheme

The subjects of this empirical study are 53 students from two parallel classes in the sophomore year of English teachers major in Zhejiang International Studies University, China. One class was randomly selected as the experimental class (26 students), and the teaching mode of "mobile micro-writing + automatic correction + English WeChat" was adopted for teaching; the other class was the control class (27 students), and the traditional teaching mode was adopted for teaching.

The curriculum, teaching materials and teaching schedule of the two classes are completely consistent. The teacher of the two classes are the researcher. Students need to complete a composition related to the theme of the text after each unit of module is completed.

The experimental period of teaching reform is 16 weeks in one semester, and 32 class hours in classroom teaching. Students are required to have more than 32 class hours of pre-class preview and post class practice.

3.3 Research methods and tools

In this study, quantitative and qualitative methods are used.

The quantitative methods include using SPSS 22.0 to conduct independent sample t-test before and after the experiment to compare students' English writing scores and questionnaire results and analyze whether there is a significant difference between the two classes. By using Wordsmith 6.0 software, the data of posttest composition in experimental class and control class were collected.

English writing course for students in English major in Chinese universities is usually divided into two semesters. The teaching reform experiment is carried out in the second semester. Therefore, the results of English writing test at the end of last semester

are used as the pre-test results, and the English writing test results at the end of this semester are used as posttest results.

The qualitative research is mainly based on the teacher's daily observation records and the students' answers to the interview, so as to compare with the experimental results.

The questionnaire and the interview outline on College English writing instruction were developed as survey tools. The questionnaire and interview outline mainly focused on the following questions:

1) Do students like the teaching model of this semester's English writing course? Why?
2) Which one do students prefer between intelligent correction and teacher manual correction?
3) Is there any change in students' writing interest, self-awareness and ability?
4) How much time do students spend in English writing this semester? What tools are used to write? How many English compositions have written in total? How many words in total?

3.4 Teaching reform model for experimental class

The teaching reform model for the experimental class aims to divide the teaching content into different tasks according to the theory of task-based instruction.

With task as the main line, the knowledge is designed into task list. Students complete the learning content driven by the task, and their learning enthusiasm is improved, which makes the students change from accepting knowledge passively to exploring knowledge actively. The implementation process of the teaching model is divided into three stages: pre-class preview, in-class practice and after-class consolidation. This model realized student-centered individualized teaching and improved students' independent learning ability.

A. Preview before class

The teacher determines the composition theme according to the content of the next course, provides the background information, records the micro video and uploads it to the online platform of school curriculum, and releases the preview and a task (write a 300-word short composition) through the class WeChat group. After receiving the task, students log in Pigai Online to preview according to the micro class video, and complete the first draft of composition through mobile phones or tablet computers. In this process, they can record the problems they are puzzled about for discussion or questions in the last class. It takes about one class hour for pre-class preview and composition writing.

B. Classroom instruction

Each classroom teaching lasts for 2 class hours and 90 minutes, and the following 5 steps are generally arranged:

1) Introducing instructional content and learning vocabulary in 10 minutes.

2) Fifteen minutes for the discourse construction phase, which lets students start the app of Pigai Online, complete a diagnosis, and construct a mind map.

3) Teacher focuses on the instruction of writing style and academic English, and answers the students' questions.

4) The writing training session lasts for 40 minutes. Students modify the first draft of their composition that written before class. After the composition is submitted, the system of Pigai Online will immediately provide scores, comments on the whole essay and comments by sentences through sentence analysis, semantic analysis, and language point analysis and other steps. Students can click "continue to improve" according to the real-time feedback information such as recommended usage, wrong usage and ways to fix provided by sentence comment, combined with the teacher's comments and feedbacks, and make repeated online revision and submit again until they are satisfied.

Students who has any doubt about the intelligent correction can evaluate each other's work or ask the teacher to find out the problems in this composition, and further modify the composition and upload it for real-time intelligent correction. Teachers need to review and comment on the compositions written by low-level students, and in the meantime, they need to comment on the excellent compositions to recommend them to other students for reading, comparison and reference.

1. In the 10 minutes of evaluation and summary, the teacher summarizes and analyzes the common problems in students' composition writing and gives solutions. Teachers should analyze the common weak points and discuss the "weak point analysis report" provided by Pigai Online with students in class timely, and select a few excellent compositions and erroneous compositions to read, comment with students, and answer questions about students' confusion in the process of writing or revision.

C. After class exercises
The teacher arranges a composition of the same type, and the students practice and consolidate it after class. Generally, it needs 0.5-1 class hour.

3.5 Traditional teaching model of control class
Students in the control class adopt the traditional teaching mode of "preview before class - key points of writing skills explained in class - composition arrangement - homework after class - teacher's correction - main problems of students' homework pointed out by teachers".

4. Experimental results and analysis

After the 16-week teaching experiment, SPSS 22.0 was used to carry out independent sample t-test on the scores of the pre- and post-test of English writing for the experimental class and the control class. Furthermore, Wordsmith 6.0 was used to collect the corpus

information of composition in the post-test of the experimental class and the control class. The test results are analyzed in combination with the results of the interview and questionnaire.

4.1 Comparison of English writing achievements
A. A comparison of English writing scores before the experiment

Before the experiment, an independent sample t-test was conducted and its results are shown in the following table:

Table 1: Composition writing scores of experimental class and
control class in pre-test (Full score 100, independent sample t-test)

Group	Number (N)	Means (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)	Intergroup Difference (t-value)	Significance (P-value two-tailed test)
Experiment Class	26	64.736	6.037	-1.411	.143
Control Class	27	65.241	7.628		

It can be seen from Table 1 that the average score of the control class is 0.505 higher than that of the experimental class, and there is no significant difference between the two groups in writing performance (t = -1.411, P = 0.143 > 0.05). It shows that the composition writing level of the two classes is equal, which is suitable for the experimental research.

B. A comparison of English writing scores after the experiment

After the experiment, independent sample t-test was carried out for the post-test scores of two classes' compositions, and the results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Composition writing scores of experimental class and
control class in post-test (full score 100, independent sample t test)

Group	Students (N)	Means (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)	Intergroup Difference (t-value)	Significance (P-value, two-tailed test)
Experiment class	26	81.253	4.701	9.024	.000
Control class	27	69.622	6.533		

Table 2 shows that through the 16-week instructional reform, compared with the pre-test results, the English writing scores of the two classes are improved, but the average scores of the experimental class are 11.631 points higher than that of the control class, and this advantage is statistically significant (P = 0.000 < 0.05). The increasing rate of the students' scores in composition writing of the experimental class is 25.51% and that of the control class is 6.72%, which shows that the new instructional reform model for the experimental class has significant advantages.

4.2 A comparative study of post experiment composition materials

The quality of composition should not only be examined by writing achievements, but also by the number of words, the richness of vocabulary and the length of sentences. Table 3 is the statistical information of corpus of post-test composition written by experimental class and control class obtained by Wordsmith 6.0 software.

Table 3: Corpus statistics table of post-test
composition of experimental class and control class

Text file	File size	Tokens	Types	Standardized TTR	Mean word length	Mean sentences length (in words)
Experiment class	13 786	12174	1636	36.03	4.99	16.73
Control class	10 634	9315	1187	33.61	4.37	15.25

Note: TT R = type/token ratio STT R basis =1000.

It can be seen from Table 3 that the experimental classes' composition corpus is larger than that of the control class in terms of its file size, tokens, types, standardized TTR, mean word and sentence length and other indicators. The experimental class has a file size of 13,786, while the control class has a file size of 10,634. According to Wang Chuming (2000), the length of writing can be used as an indicator of writing quality. The different requirements on the number of words in the composition of the TEM-8 and TEM-4 in China also reflect that the length of writing is one of the criteria for evaluating writing ability. The standard type/token ratio can be used to reflect the richness of vocabulary. The larger the ratio, the greater the change of vocabulary. Compared with the control class, 36.03 in the experimental class is larger than 33.61 in the control class, so the students in the experimental class use more words. Mean word length and mean sentence length can partly reflect the complexity of words and sentences. According to the data in Table 3, the words and sentences in the composition of the experimental class are more abundant than those of the control class.

To sum up, the experimental class has obvious advantages over the control class in composition score, composition length, vocabulary use, sentence length, etc.

4.3 Analysis of questionnaire results

In order to further test the experimental data results and understand the students' attitudes and opinions on the two teaching models, a questionnaire survey on the students of two classes was conducted after the instruction reform experiment, and 53 questionnaires collected from the two classes were all valid. The survey results are shown in Table 4:

Table 4: Comparison of answers to main questions in the questionnaire

Items	Experiment class N=26 Students (N) Percentage (%)	Control class N=27 Students (N) Percentage (%)	Significance in Difference P-value
Evaluation of teaching model	Very satisfied 17 (65.38%)	Very satisfied 1 (3.70%)	.000
	Satisfied 8 (30.77%)	Satisfied 4 (14.81%)	.000
	Neutral 1 (3.85%)	Neutral 7 (25.93%)	.000
	Unsatisfied 0 (0.00%)	Unsatisfied 9 (33.33%)	.000
	Very unsatisfied 0 (0.00%)	Very unsatisfied 6 (22.22%)	.000
Evaluation of the correction model	Very satisfied 18 (69.23%)	Very unsatisfied 0 (0.00%)	.000
	Satisfied 6 (23.08%)	Satisfied 3 (11.11%)	.000
	Neutral 2 (7.69%)	Neutral 11 (40.74%)	.000
	Unsatisfied 0 (0.00%)	Unsatisfied 6 (22.22%)	.000
	Very unsatisfied 0 (0.00%)	Very unsatisfied 7 (25.93%)	.000
Self-evaluation of writing interest and autonomous writing consciousness	Greatly improved 18 (69.23%)	Greatly improved 5 (18.52%)	.000
	Little improved 8 (30.77%)	Little improved 12 (44.44%)	.000
	No improvement 0 (0.00%)	No improvement 10 (37.04%)	.000
Self-evaluation of writing ability	Greatly improved 19 (73.08%)	Greatly improved 5 (18.52%)	.000
	Little improved 7 (26.92%)	Little Improved 11 (40.74%)	.000
	No improvement 0 (0.00%)	No improvement 11 (40.74%)	.000
Average English writing practice time per week	1.83 hours	0.77 hours	.000
How many compositions and words were written on average in this semester	33.62 compositions, 13448 words	15.74 compositions, 5133 words	.000
Writing models	Electronic writing	Paper writing	

It can be seen from Table 4 that 65.38% of the students in the experimental class are very satisfied with the new teaching model and 30.77% are satisfied with the new instruction mode through the one semester teaching reform experiment; 69.23% of the students are very satisfied with the intelligent real-time correction system, and 23.08% are satisfied. They think that the online intelligent correction can reduce language errors, and their content and vocabulary of composition are richer than before. In addition, 69.23% of the students believe that their interest in writing and self-awareness of writing had been significantly improved, and 73.08% hold that their English writing ability has been significantly improved.

On the contrary, 55.55% of the students in the control class are not satisfied with the traditional teaching model, 48.15% of the students are not satisfied with or very dissatisfied with the teacher's composition correction, 81.48% of the students think that the improvement of writing interest and independent writing awareness is not significantly changed or even unchanged, 81.48% of the students think that their English writing ability is not significantly changed or unchanged.

At the same time, the students in the experimental class need 3.5-4 class hours to complete the task of an English writing class through online pre-class autonomous learning, classroom practice, and post-class composition practice. They need to write a composition of 300-400 words before and after class respectively with a mobile phone or tablet computer. In one semester, they have written an average of 33.62 English short compositions, a total of 13, 448 words.

Meanwhile, in the control class, teacher cannot grade students' compositions and can only explain the key points of writing skills and the main problems of students' assignment. The teacher-student interaction is not satisfactory. After class, students write a paper composition to teachers, and they cannot get on-the-spot correction, which is hard for them to have enthusiasm for writing. However, the workload of composition correction for teacher is huge and the cycle is long, so only one of students' composition can be marked every week. Students wrote an average of 15.74 short compositions, about 5,133 words, during the experimental period and their writing ability developed slowly.

4.4 Analysis of interview results

Through many group interviews with the students of the two classes, the study has found that the students in the experimental class are very supportive of the new teaching model. They think that the mobile micro-writing, automatic correction and English WeChat class group mobilized their enthusiasm for independent writing with their mobile phones and stimulate their confidence and interest in writing. Many students often communicate in English in WeChat group. Although they often wrote a few to a dozen short sentences once, the total amount of English writing in a semester is relatively large, which is helpful to improve the use of words and grammar in their English writing. Students can also correct each other's wrong sentences, improve their confidence in writing and their sense of self-efficacy in their writing ability, and significantly reduce the anxiety in their writing ability. Meantime, through WeChat group, the teacher-student communication is easier and smoother, and more than 80% of students in experimental class like this kind of teacher-student communication.

On the contrary, more than 50% of the students in the control class are not satisfied with the traditional teaching model and the manual correction of compositions. More than 80% of the students think that their enthusiasm and writing ability have not been effectively developed.

Most of the students in the experimental class think that the intelligent marking system has the following advantages:

A. The evaluation is quick and timely, and the objective and detailed evaluation report is provided, which is more efficient than the teacher's evaluation. After submitting the composition online, the platform will immediately make an evaluation, mark scores, automatically identify common errors such as spelling, vocabulary, collocation, grammar, etc., give suggestions for revision and provide related extended training, recommend on collocation, show sample sentences, etc., students can modify the composition at any time according to the evaluation to improve their scores. The sense of achievement and satisfaction in English writing has been greatly improved. In the process of online revision based on feedback and comments from the online assessment and teachers, students play the role of both readers and teachers, have certain knowledge of their English writing level and problems in writing, and constantly search and select errors such as words, sentence structure and text structure in their compositions by using

the network and the corpus provided in the process of choosing and modifying independently. Therefore, students' writing potential is exploited. When the score changes from lower to higher, students feel unprecedented sense of achievement and satisfaction in this process-oriented writing. As the students said, "*intelligent real-time correction can point out mistakes, the direction of English writing improvement, and allow revisions. The sense of achievement in writing is also established in the process of improving scores.*"

B. A large number of detailed and reliable writing materials are provided to help students improve their autonomous learning ability. More than 90% of the students will use the retrieval function of the online corpus to retrieve examples, linguistic chunks, collocations, paragraphs, knowledge points, and compositions of the same subject. Students can discover, think and explore language rules in real linguistic cases, and improve their autonomous learning ability under the data driven learning model. Many students lack the interest in English writing because their scattered structure of written text, incoherent logic, vague central topic, and unclear language expression. Students in the experimental class hold that "*the platform of Pigai Online can check the mistakes in the composition, standardize the structure of the article and remind the use of transitional words, which promotes the organization of the composition of the author. The online platform also prompts us how to make sentences more perfect, lets us learn more advanced vocabulary, and encourages us to use long sentences and advanced vocabulary, which is conducive to our courage to try and practice academic English and master writing skills. Through this kind of study, our fear of writing has been greatly reduced.*"

C. The file system is efficient and convenient. The platform of Pigai Online provides students with personal learning files and learning logs, and the track of their compositions and evaluation reports are kept in the electronic files, which is very helpful for students to understand their own learning process, master the learning situation and reflect. The students of the experimental class think that the "composition recommendation" of the online platform is very good, which recommends not the traditional sample essay, but the high score composition of the students in this writing. Therefore, students will pay more attention to it. They will compare with their own compositions from different aspects, such as the theme, structure, word usage and angle of logical thinking. They will learn from the part that their peers performed better than their own, complete "understandable input", enhance their writing confidence, and improve their sense of self-efficacy in writing ability.

After each time of instruction, the students summarize the writing situation of this composition in detail, such as common weak points, words, ideas, coherence, appropriateness and so on, and also agree with the teaching method of "sharing documents" uploaded to the online platform. They hold a view that these summaries are very useful for their review and writing.

However, some students have some opinions on the preview. They think that the preview quantity is large, and they need to write a short composition.

Meanwhile, students also found some problems in the actual use of the intelligent correction system:

- The comments are too mechanical and not specific, which is consistent with the findings of some researchers (Long, 2019). The online intelligent correction platform evaluates students' composition mainly by spelling, vocabulary and syntax, and gives few feedbacks on the structure, ideological content, logic, cohesion and coherence, critical thinking and other aspects of writing, which also reflects a major defect of computer evaluation, that is, it fails to "appreciate" an article like a person on the technical level (Wang, 2018).
- Intelligent correction can point out some grammatical structural errors and "Chinglish" that students often make, but it does not give correct opinions. Sometimes students cannot correct themselves, so teachers need to give specific feedback.
- The accuracy needs to be improved. Some students think that the online platform cannot evaluate the genre of composition accurately. For example, if students make mistakes in the genre of composition, they may still get high scores. Some of them do not read the whole sentence according to the sentence comments, and judge the sentence mistakes arbitrarily. Therefore, we should not blindly praise the composition scores given by the online platform, but treat them objectively.

5. Conclusions and Suggestions

5.1 Conclusions

In the 16-week and 32-hour College English writing course, the average English writing time of the experimental class is 1.83 hours per week, and 33.62 short English compositions were written in one semester, with a total of about 13,448 words; the average score of English writing of the experimental class is 81.25, 25.51% higher than that of the last semester; more than 90% of the experimental class students agree with the English writing teaching reform mode of "mobile micro-writing + automatic correction + English WeChat", and their interest in English writing, independent writing awareness and English writing ability has been greatly improved.

The average writing time of the students in the control class is 0.77 hours per week, and they have completed 15.74 short compositions, about 5,133 words; the average score of writing is 69.62, which is 6.72% higher than that in the last semester; more than 50% of the students in the control class are not satisfied with the traditional teaching mode and manual correction of composition, and more than 80% of the students think that their enthusiasm and writing ability are developing slowly.

The new and reforming instructional model gives full play to the advantages of social platform, online teaching and real-time intelligent correction. Meanwhile, it pays attention to communication and discussion in teaching, so that the students in the

experimental class have obvious advantages over the control class in English writing time, word number, composition score, composition length, vocabulary use, sentence length, etc.

It is found that although the rise of AI marking has greatly improved the efficiency of composition marking, reduced the workload of teachers, and provided students with rich learning resources to cultivate their ability of independent learning, there are still some defects in the current platform, such as too general comments, unable to fully evaluate the content, text structure, logic and other aspects. The platform cannot recognize sentences with complex structures, give reference to low-frequency warning in Chinglish, and cultivate students' writing ability from the perspective of critical thinking. Therefore, Pigai Online needs to be further upgraded and improved. At the same time, teachers cannot completely rely on intelligent marking to determine students' writing performance.

5.2 Suggestions

This study provides a reference for the teaching of English writing in non-English speaking countries. It is suggested that we should change the teaching model that simply taught by teachers, make full use of information technology, use a variety of information-based teaching methods and social software, and build an information-based teaching environment that is conducive to students' autonomous learning and inquiry learning to improve teaching efficiency and effectively promote students' initiative in autonomous learning.

References

Cui, Yanli (2018). Analysis of new listening questions and coping strategies in CET-4. *Journal of Higher Education*, (07), 44-48.

Chang, X. (2019). A data-based survey of College Students' English writing proficiency. *Overseas English*, (21), 26-29.

Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (3rd ed.). Essex: Pearson Education.

Ji, J. (2018). A survey of WeChat use and loneliness of college students. *Shaanxi Education (Higher Education)*, (11), 78-82.

Long, T. (2019). Survey and analysis of English Writing Teaching Based on the network of assessment and correction. *Journal of Yantai Vocational College*, 25 (04), 65-67 + 84.

Li, Q. (2020). A study on the feedback effect of middle school students' English writing level based on Yuku.com. *Educational Information Technology*, (01), 111-114.

Wang, X. (2018). Empirical research on College English Writing Teaching in the era of big data. *Comparative Study on Cultural Innovation*, 2 (27), 127+129.

Wang, C. (2000). Promoting learning by writing: an experiment of English writing teaching reform. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, (3), 207-212.

Yu, N. (2019). A study on the correlation between mobile phone use and visual fatigue of college students. *Higher Medical Education in China*, (02),46-49.

Zhang, Z. (2019). Problems and Countermeasures in traditional college English writing teaching. *Reading and Writing (Journal of education and teaching)*, 16 (12), 10-16.

Zhao, J. (2019). A study on the teaching mode of College English academic writing. *Modernization of Education*, 6 (99), 151-157.

Zhao, X. (2018). Genre analysis and English writing level 8. *Overseas English*, (06), 66-69

Zhang, Y. (2020). College English Writing Teaching Reform in the era of big data. *Education and Teaching Forum*, (06), 369-373.

Zhou, Y. & Wei, J. (2019). Problems and strategies in Contemporary College Students' English writing. *Overseas English*, (23), 73-76.