JoLIE 17:1/2025
doi: https://doi.org/10.29302/jolie.2024.18.1.6

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WRITING STRATEGIES AND WRITING PERFORMANCE OF FRENCH LANGUAGES LEARNERS

Thi Ngoc Ha LE
University of Foreign Language Studies, The University of Danang, Vietnam
Thi Cuc Phuong NGUYEN
Hanoi University, Vietnam

Abstract

The primary objective of this research is to examine the relationship between the employment of metacognitive writing strategies and the argumentative writing performance of Vietnamese students learning French. A sample of 81 students from the University of Foreign Languages, University of Da Nang, Vietnam, participated in the study. Data collection involved the use of the French Writing Strategies Questionnaire developed by Petrić & Czárl (2003) and a B2-level French argumentative writing test. Statistical analyses, performed using SPSS software, revealed a statistically significant positive correlation between the overall use of metacognitive writing strategies and writing performance. The intervention, grounded in the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA) model, proved effective in enhancing students' strategy use, elevating their levels from moderate to frequent. This increase in strategy application corresponded to improved post-test scores across all evaluation criteria, including content and language performance. Among the strategies, planning and revision were found to have the strongest relationship with students' writing achievement. These findings align with prior research emphasising the benefits of strategy instruction in improving writing quality. However, the study also found that the correlation between strategy use and writing performance, while significant, was moderate. This suggests that strategy use, though influential, is not the sole determinant of success. Other factors, such as learner self-efficacy, motivation, and perceptions of strategy use, likely play a role in writing outcomes. Given these findings, the study recommends incorporating writing strategy instruction more extensively into language curricula. Flexible instructional models, such as the CALLA model, can provide opportunities for learners to revisit and apply strategies across various contexts, enhancing their effectiveness.

Keywords: Metacognitive Writing Strategies Use; Argumentative Writing; Writing Performance; French Language Learners.

Received: 17 February 2025
Revised: 05 April 2025
Accepted: 15 May 2025
Published: 15 July 2025

1 Introduction

Formal writing is a multifaceted skill, especially in second language (L2) learning. Initially, research focused on the cognitive aspects of writing as a problem-solving process (Manchón et al., 2007). However, the post-process movement in the 1990s highlighted writing as both a cognitive and socially situated activity (Kent, 1999). In L2 writing, scholars recognise the need for both cognitive and socio-cognitive strategies, as L2 learners must generate ideas in a non-native language while navigating social contexts (Manchón et al., 2007). Argumentative writing, a common but challenging academic genre, requires advanced cognitive and linguistic skills (Flower & Hayes, 1980; Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1987) and often poses difficulties for L2 learners due to limited experience in academic composition (Ferretti et al. 2009). These challenges underline the need for effective instructional approaches to support learners' writing development.

In this context, writing strategies have garnered significant attention in L2 writing research. Scholars define *writing strategies* as conscious decisions or actions taken by writers to address specific challenges during the writing process (Beck, 2002; Petrić & Czárl, 2003; Sasaki, 2004). Among these, *metacognitive strategies*, including planning, monitoring, and revising, are particularly effective in helping writers navigate the complexities of writing tasks. These strategies are essential for overcoming linguistic and rhetorical difficulties, making them integral to successful writing instruction (Manchón et al., 2007).

Despite their recognised importance, the study of writing strategies in the Vietnamese context is not only limited but also urgently needed, particularly in understanding how these strategies are utilised by students learning French as an L2. Vietnamese students face significant challenges in academic writing due to the linguistic differences between Vietnamese and French, coupled with a lack of access to resources and targeted instructional support. These barriers hinder their ability to meet academic demands, especially in argumentative writing—a genre requiring advanced cognitive, linguistic, and rhetorical skills. Addressing these issues is critical to equipping students with the tools needed to succeed academically and professionally.

2 Literature Review

Numerous studies have explored the effects of teaching writing strategies on the writing quality of learners, consistently demonstrating the positive impact of strategy instruction on various aspects of written compositions. For instance, Lo and Hyland (2007) identified significant influences of pre-writing strategies on students' writing performance, motivation, and opportunities for improvement. Their findings showed that, following strategy instruction, the length of students' written compositions increased by an average of 45%, though challenges in organisation, style, and language use persisted. In contrast, Mohseniasl (2014) examined the impact of pre-

writing strategy instruction on the anxiety and writing outcomes of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners, concluding that students who received such instruction exhibited marked improvements in content, organisation, vocabulary, and language use.

Similarly, the research by Mastan et al. (2017) suggests that the instruction of writing strategies enhanced the writing performance of intermediate-level English as a Second Language (ESL) learners. Specifically, these learners were able to construct longer and more coherent sentences by effectively utilising appropriate transition words. The study also highlighted that learners who received explicit strategy instruction demonstrated superior writing quality compared to those who did not receive such intervention. However, because the majority of these studies evaluate outcomes using global writing scores, it remains difficult to determine with precision which specific dimensions of writing are most influenced by the use of strategies.

Further supporting these findings, Arju (2017) reported that explicit training in writing strategies not only improved students' ability to generate ideas but also bolstered their confidence in writing. This aligns with earlier studies by Rao (2007), Talebinezhad and Negari (2007), which provided evidence of the efficacy of various writing strategies in aiding students to generate ideas and refine their thoughts, thereby facilitating their engagement in the complex process of writing. Nevertheless, the emphasis on idea generation in many of these studies raises the question of whether similar benefits extend equally to organisation, argumentation, and language accuracy.

Moreover, the quality of learners' written texts has been reflected in the overall scores they received. Several studies (De Silva, 2015; Mahnam & Nejadansari, 2012; Rao, 2007; Sengupta, 2000) have revealed that learners who underwent explicit strategy instruction achieved significantly higher post-test scores compared to preliminary tests and to those who did not receive such training.

Despite the extensive research on the effects of writing strategy instruction across various contexts, there is a noticeable gap in the literature concerning the specific relationship between metacognitive writing strategies and writing performance among Vietnamese students learning French as a foreign language. While previous studies have predominantly focused on English language learners, little attention has been given to how such strategies influence the writing performance of learners in non-English language contexts, particularly in the context of Vietnamese students learning French. This gap underscores the need for research that examines the correlation between metacognitive writing strategy use and writing achievement in this unique learner group. By addressing this gap, the current study aims to contribute to the broader understanding of how writing strategies can be effectively taught and utilised to enhance writing performance in diverse language learning environments.

More specifically, this study examines how Vietnamese learners of French use metacognitive writing strategies and how strategy instruction affects different components of their argumentative writing. Instead of relying on a single global

score, writing performance is analysed across separate dimensions, distinguishing between content-related components (organisation, coherence, argumentation) and language-related components (vocabulary, grammatical control, sentence elaboration). In addition, the study investigates the extent to which these components are correlated with learners' reported use of metacognitive strategies, in order to obtain a clearer picture of where strategy instruction is most effective. The study aims to answer the following research questions:

1) What is the extent of the use of metacognitive writing strategies by Vietnamese students learning French?
2) How does the use of metacognitive writing strategies influence the argumentative writing performance of Vietnamese students learning French?
3) Is there a significant correlation between the frequency of metacognitive writing strategy use and the writing achievement of Vietnamese students in French argumentative writing?

3 Research Methods

To address these research questions, the study employed a structured methodology detailed in the Research Methods section. This section outlines the profiles of third-year French as a Foreign Language (FLE) students at the University of Foreign Languages, University of Da Nang, focusing on their academic and linguistic backgrounds. It also describes the design and implementation of a 15-week instructional program that integrated metacognitive strategy training into an advanced writing course. It concludes by describing the tools for data collection and data analysis.

3.1 Participants

All participants were third-year students majoring in French as a Foreign Language (FLE) at the University of Foreign Languages, University of Da Nang, Vietnam. Homogeneous in age (19–21 years) and cultural background, they differed primarily in their French language learning experiences. Specifically, six of the 81 participants attended bilingual secondary schools with intensive French instruction and graduated from high school with A2–B1 proficiency. Twenty students studied French as a second foreign language in high school and reached an A1+ level upon graduation. The remaining 54 began their French language studies upon university enrolment. After two years of university instruction, the average proficiency level of the participants was estimated at B1+.

3.2 Intervention

In light of Oxford's (1990) recommendations that language strategy instruction should be integrated into regular coursework rather than treated as an isolated component, and coupled with the suggestions of Manchón et al. (2007) that pedagogical interventions should span at least 10 weeks to achieve satisfactory outcomes, the present study thus implemented a 15-week instructional program. Specifically, this program was incorporated into a writing course designed for third-year students of French as a Foreign Language (FLE) at the University of Foreign Languages, University of Danang.

To elaborate, the intervention was embedded within the "Advanced Reading and Writing Comprehension" course, which was conducted over a fifteen-week period. Following the CALLA model proposed by O'Malley and Chamot (1994), the instructional sessions were structured into five phases: *preparation, presentation, practice, evaluation, and expansion*.

Furthermore, empirical research on writing strategies in second or foreign language contexts frequently indicates that higher proficiency learners employ more metacognitive strategies compared to their less skilled counterparts. These findings suggest that metacognitive strategies are instrumental in facilitating idea generation, development, and the monitoring of writing tasks (De Silva, 2015; Escorcia, 2010; Escorcia & Fenouillet, 2011; Lee, & Mukhlynina, 2018; Raoofi et al., 2017).

Consequently, in light of the findings from previous studies and with the intention of delivering pertinent and effective strategy instruction, a set of metacognitive strategies identified as sufficiently impactful was selected for inclusion in the training program. However, given the constraints of the experimental timeframe, it was deemed impractical to deliver comprehensive instruction on all the strategies encompassed in the questionnaire. Thus, we prioritised the teaching of twelve specific strategies: *making a timetable for the writing process; revising the requirements; writing an outline in French; noting down words and short notes related to the topic; reading the text aloud, focusing on one thing at a time when revising; checking if the essay matches the requirements; making changes in vocabulary; making changes in sentence structure; making changes in the structure of the essay; making changes in the content or ideas; and checking the mistakes after getting back the paper with feedback from the teacher and trying to learn from them*.

The strategy instruction was delivered by the researchers themselves and was conducted alternately in French and Vietnamese to ensure that participants fully understood the objectives and procedures of the instruction.

During the preparation phase, students were invited to recall the strategies they had used in the previous lesson and to share their experiences related to the strategies they were about to learn.

In the theoretical phase, each strategy was explicitly introduced with particular attention to its characteristics, functions, effectiveness, and illustrated with relevant examples. Strategy modelling was incorporated through writing tasks, with demonstrations tailored to each specific strategy.

In the practice phase, students engaged in guided strategy application through structured activities. They were divided into groups of four to five and encouraged to discuss, share opinions, and support one other in the use of writing strategies. This small-group setting enabled the instructor to visit each group and provide scaffolding when necessary. Students were also reminded that no single strategy is universally applicable, and they were encouraged to adopt alternative strategies when needed. At the end of each session, students were asked to recall the strategies learned and to evaluate their effectiveness through a self-assessment form.

Finally, during the expansion phase, students were encouraged to transfer the strategies to other learning contexts and to apply them in a relevant and purposeful manner.

3.3 Data collection tools

The tools utilised for data collection in the study include an adapted writing strategies questionnaire specifically tailored for foreign language learners and pre- and post-tests to evaluate the impact of the intervention. These tools were selected to comprehensively assess participants' strategy use and argumentative writing performance, ensuring alignment with the study's objectives.

3.3.1 Writing strategies questionnaire

In this study, we adapted the writing strategies questionnaire developed by Petrić and Czárl (2003) as a data collection tool for several reasons. Firstly, it was specifically designed for foreign language learners, aligning well with the focus of our study. Secondly, unlike other questionnaires that address general learning strategies (Oxford 1990; O'Malley, & Chamot 1990), this instrument is exclusively concentrated on writing strategies. Thirdly, it has been extensively utilised as a primary instrument in research on writing strategies (Cohen, & Macaro 2007). The questionnaire employed a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (never true) to 5 (always true), and was divided into two sections. It consists of 38 writing strategies categorised according to the stages of writing: before, during, and after writing. Within the scope of this study, we specifically investigated the use of 12 metacognitive learning strategies selected for the intervention. The questionnaires were administered at both the beginning and the conclusion of the intervention.

3.3.2 Writing tests

Similar to the questionnaire, a pre-test and a post-test were administered to participants at the beginning and end of the intervention to assess the impact of strategy instruction on their argumentative writing performance. Both writing tests, designed at the B2 level, required participants to write an argumentative essay on different topics (Internet and social media) to mitigate carryover effects. The topics were selected based on participants' prior knowledge. Students were allocated 60 minutes to complete the tests.

Two experienced teachers evaluated the written work using the detailed CEFR B2 scoring rubric. The evaluation criteria included: *compliance with instructions, sociolinguistic correctness, ability to present facts, ability to argue a position, coherence and cohesion, vocabulary range, vocabulary mastery, spelling mastery, grammatical control, and degree of sentence elaboration*.

To ensure fairness and consistency in assessment, the essays were evaluated by two independent raters who first received joint training on the use of the scoring rubric. Each rater assessed all scripts independently, without consulting the other. The two sets of scores were then compared, and any discrepancies were discussed until agreement was reached, after which an average score was assigned to each script.

3.4 Data analysis

To analyse the data, we used SPSS statistical software. Specifically, we conducted paired t-tests to compare pre- and post-experiment differences in strategy use and writing performance. This process involved entering the pre- and post-test scores into SPSS and running the paired t-test function to generate mean differences, t-values, and p-values, which allowed us to assess the statistical significance of observed changes. Following this, Pearson's correlation coefficient was employed to explore the relationship between strategy use and performance as measured by the tests. In SPSS, the correlation analysis was conducted by selecting the relevant variables, which provided outputs such as correlation coefficients (r-values) and significance levels. These results helped determine the strength and direction of the relationship between the two variables, whether positive, negative, or non-existent. The application of SPSS ensured accurate computations and facilitated a detailed interpretation of the findings.

4 Results and Discussion

The study's key findings and their interpretations are presented, focusing on the impact of metacognitive writing strategies on learners' performance. It examines the changes in strategy use before and after the intervention, evaluates improvements in argumentative writing through pre- and post-tests, and explores the correlation between strategy use and writing outcomes. These results provide insights into the effectiveness of strategy instruction for language learners.

4.1 Use of writing strategies after the intervention

In this section, we aim to understand the difference in terms of participants' use of writing strategies before and after the intervention. The results are presented at two levels: the overall strategies and specific strategies.

Table 1. Comparison of the use of overall writing strategies before/after the intervention

Strategies		M	SD	t	df	sig.
Overall writing strategies	Before	3.06	0.394	-12.690	80	.000
	After	3.48	0.330			

As illustrated by Table 1, the p-value is 0.000, which is less than 0.05, and it was therefore concluded that there was a statistically very significant difference in the use of overall writing strategies following the intervention.

Table 2. Comparison of the use of specific writing strategies before/after the intervention

Strategies		M	SD	t	df	sig.
Making a timetable for the writing process	Before	3.04	1.198	-.971	80	.335
	After	3.16	1.054			
Revising the requirements	Before	4.54	.593	-5.262	80	.000
	After	4.88	.311			
Writing an outline in French	Before	2.33	1.061	-9.696	80	.000
	After	3.53	1.001			
Noting down words and short notes related to the topic	Before	3.19	.976	-2.187	80	.032
	After	3.38	.902			
Reading the text aloud	Before	1.93	.932	-.895	80	.373
	After	2.01	.981			
Focusing on one thing at a time when revising	Before	3.01	.901	-9.500	80	.000
	After	3.94	.713			
Checking if the essay matches the requirements	Before	4.07	.833	-2.101	80	.039
	After	4.22	.775			
Making changes in vocabulary	Before	2.91	.825	-9.080	80	.000
	After	3.88	.781			
Making changes in sentence structure	Before	2.89	.775	-3.560	80	.001
	After	3.19	.937			
Making changes in the structure of the essay	Before	2.27	.758	-1.886	80	.063
	After	2.49	.924			
Making changes in the content or ideas	Before	2.74	.919	-.695	80	.489
	After	2.81	.760			
Checking the mistakes after getting back the paper with feedback from the teacher and trying to learn from them.	Before	3.85	.838	-4.508	80	.000
	After	4.32	.704			

The analysis of Table 2 reveals that the p-values for eight strategies range from 0.000 to 0.039, indicating a statistically significant difference in these specific strategies: “Revising the requirements” ($t = -5.262$, $df = 80$, $p = 0.000$); “Write an outline in French” ($t = -9.696$, $df = 80$, $p = 0.000$); “Noting down words and short notes related to the topic” ($t = -2.187$, $df = 80$, $p = 0.032$); “Focusing on one thing at a time when revising” ($t = -9.500$, $df = 80$, $p = 0.000$), “Checking if the essay matches the

requirements" (t = -2.101, df = 80, p = 0.039); "Making changes in vocabulary" (t = -9.080, df = 80, p = 0.000); "Making changes in sentence structure" (t = -3.560, df = 80, p = 0.001); and "Checking the mistakes after getting the paper back with feedback from the teacher and trying to learn from them" (t = -4.508, df = 80, p = 0.000). Conversely, for the remaining strategies, no statistically significant differences were observed.

Quantitative results indicate a significant increase in the use of overall writing strategies and eight specific strategies following the intervention. Among these, three strategies—*Write an outline in French, Focusing on one thing at a time when revising, and Making changes in vocabulary*—showed the most substantial change. According to Oxford's (1990) classification—where strategy use is categorised as limited (1.0–2.4), moderate (2.5–3.4), and frequent (3.5–5.0)—the participants' usage levels shifted from moderate to frequent. This shift underscores the positive impact of writing strategy instruction on learners' strategy use. Similar findings have been reported in studies by De Silva (2015), Ransdell et al. (2002), and Sasaki (2000, 2002).

The positive impact of writing strategy instruction can be attributed to several key factors. First, the flexibility of the CALLA model (Chamot & O'Malley, 1994) allowed learners to revisit earlier instructional phases as needed, assess their strategy use, and choose strategies that yielded desired outcomes, thereby increasing their usage frequency. Second, integrating strategy instruction with lessons facilitated immediate application in writing tasks and sustained practice across other activities. Third, the effectiveness of the strategies themselves contributed to their increased use, as students reported that these strategies helped them save time, stay focused, organise ideas logically, and maintain text coherence.

However, some strategies did not see increased use despite consistent instruction and practice. This may be due to students already employing these strategies prior to the intervention or being limited by their language proficiency.

4.2 Results of writing tests after the intervention

To determine the differences in writing performance of all participants, the mean scores from the pre-test and post-test were analysed and compared using paired t-tests. The results are displayed in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3. Comparison of Writing Tests Results Before/After the Intervention

		M	**SD**	**t**	**df**	**p**
Results of writing tests	Pre-test	13.71	3.379	-17.574	80	.000
	Post-test	16.51	3.059			

Given the mean scores and the level of significance ($p < 0.05$), there was a statistically significant increase in the mean scores of participants from the pre-test (M = 13.71) to the post-test (M = 16.51). Next, a paired t-test was conducted on the

mean scores of each evaluation criterion of these two tests to obtain a more precise estimate of the learners' progress. The results are reported in Table 4.

Table 4. Comparison of the results of test evaluation criteria before/after the intervention

Evaluation criteria		M	SD	t	df	p
Compliance with instructions	Pre-test	1.50	0.347	-8.096	80	.000
	Post-test	1.78	0.232			
Sociolinguistic correctness	Pre-test	1.24	0.289	-7.888	80	.000
	Post-test	1.43	0.291			
Ability to present facts	Pre-test	1.40	0.563	-12.109	80	.000
	Post-test	1.83	0.495			
Ability to argue a position	Pre-test	1.33	0.570	-14.361	80	.000
	Post-test	1.88	0.517			
Coherence and cohesion	Pre-test	2.28	0.710	-10.105	80	.000
	Post-test	2.76	0.623			
Vocabulary range	Pre-test	1.10	0.293	-3.847	80	.000
	Post-test	1.19	0.286			
Vocabulary mastery	Pre-test	0.96	0.312	-9.737	80	.000
	Post-test	1.18	0.333			
Spelling mastery	Pre-test	0.69	0.143	-3.029	80	.003
	Post-test	0.74	0.128			
Grammatical control	Pre-test	2.13	0.532	-7.412	80	.000
	Post-test	2.48	0.545			
Degree of sentence elaboration	Pre-test	1.17	0.316	-4.574	80	.000
	Post-test	1.31	0.350			

As indicated in the table above, significant differences were observed across all writing performance evaluation criteria. The paired t-test analyses yielded the following results: "Compliance with instructions" ($t = -8.096$, $df = 80$, $p = .000$); "Sociolinguistic correctness" ($t = -7.888$, $df = 80$, $p = .000$); "Ability to present facts" ($t = -12.109$, $df = 80$, $p = .000$); "Ability to argue a position" ($t = -14.361$, $df = 80$, $p = .000$); "Coherence and cohesion" ($t = -10.105$, $df = 80$, $p = .000$); "Vocabulary range" ($t = -3.847$, $df = 80$, $p = .000$); "Vocabulary mastery" ($t = -9.737$, $df = 80$, $p = .000$); "Spelling mastery" ($t = -3.029$, $df = 80$, $p = .003$); "Grammatical control" ($t = -7.412$, $df = 80$, $p = .000$); and "Degree of sentence elaboration" ($t = -4.574$, $df = 80$, $p = .000$). Furthermore, a comparison of the mean scores between the pre-test and post-test for each criterion reveals an improvement in writing performance across all evaluation criteria.

A comparison of the average scores for each criterion between the pre-test and post-test reveals an improvement in writing performance across all evaluation criteria. This suggests that the training effectively enhanced the writing skills of Vietnamese students learning French as a Foreign Language.

These findings align with previous studies (Arju 2017; De Silva 2010; Mastan et al. 2017; Wang 2007), which demonstrated that strategy instruction contributes to improved writing quality. For example, Arju (2017) found that

participants performed better in the post-test than in the pre-test. Similarly, Mastan et al. (2017) showed that after a 12-week intervention, the experimental group significantly outperformed the control group, with a marked increase in post-test scores compared to pre-test scores.

De Silva (2010) reported similar findings in her research, demonstrating that instructional strategies exert a positive influence on writing performance. The researcher posits that cognitive and metacognitive writing strategies enable learners to advance in their writing and develop a more nuanced understanding of its content.

We concur with the researcher's observation regarding the beneficial impact of metacognitive strategies on enhancing learners' academic outcomes. Consequently, we hypothesise that a shift towards the increased use of metacognitive strategies post-intervention could result in improved outcomes in written production.

4.3 Correlation between the use of writing strategies and test results

To have a global view of the correlations between the use of writing strategies and student performance, we grouped the evaluation criteria into two categories: *content* (compliance with instructions, sociolinguistic correctness, ability to present facts, ability to argue a position, coherence and cohesion) and *language* (vocabulary range, vocabulary mastery, spelling mastery, grammatical control, degree of sentence elaboration). Similarly, specific strategies are categorised into two groups: planning strategies and revision strategies.

To evaluate the relationship between these variables, we used the Pearson correlation coefficient. The analyses were conducted at two levels: the entire set of strategies and test results, and their respective categories.

Table 5. Correlations between the use of all strategies and post-test results, content, and language

		Use of all strategies
Post-test results	Pearson Correlation	.354**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001
	N	81
Content	Pearson Correlation	.361**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001
	N	81
Language	Pearson Correlation	.286**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.010
	N	81

***. The correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*

Table 5 indicates significant correlations between the use of all strategies and post-test results ($r = .354$, $N = 81$, $p = .001$); content scores ($r = .361$, $N = 81$, $p = .001$); and language scores ($r = .286$, $N = 81$, $p = .010$). Further details are provided in Table 6, which presents the results of the correlation analyses between the different strategy categories and test outcomes.

Table 6. Correlations between the use of planning and revision strategies and post-test results, content, and language

		Planning strategies	**Revision strategies**
Post-test results	Pearson Correlation	.256*	.300**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.021	.007
	N	81	81
Content	Pearson Correlation	.307**	.274*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005	.013
	N	81	81
Language	Pearson Correlation	.227*	.228*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.041	.041
	N	81	81

** The correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

*** The correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*

Table 6 presents the associations between the two categories of strategies and the post-test results, including language and content scores. For the statistically significant correlations, the coefficients ranged from .227 to .307, all of which were positive. Planning strategies exhibited a positive correlation with post-test scores ($r = .256$, $N = 81$, $p = .021$); content scores ($r = .307$, $N = 81$, $p = .005$); and language scores ($r = .227$, $N = 81$, $p = .041$). Revision strategies demonstrated a significant association with post-test outcomes ($r = .300$, $N = 81$, $p = .007$), content scores ($r = .274$, $N = 81$, $p = .013$); and language scores ($r = .228$, $N = 81$, $p = .021$).

As previously indicated, the utilisation of all strategies exhibits a positive correlation with post-test outcomes, including content and language proficiency. Further correlation analyses reveal a significant association between the use of planning and revision strategies and scores in the post-test, content, and language domains.

Our findings align with previous studies that have identified significant correlations between strategy use and writing performance following the instruction of these strategies (Chen, 2011; De Silva, 2010; Wang, 2007). These studies demonstrated that the employment of strategies is positively correlated with overall writing test scores.

The analyses enable us to conclude that an increased utilisation of strategies corresponds to higher writing production scores among students (Chen, 2011). However, this conclusion warrants cautious interpretation, as correlation does not imply causation between the two variables under investigation (Grasland, 2000).

It is also important to note that the relationship between strategy use and language performance has been extensively documented in the literature (De Silva 2010; Dreyer, & Oxford, 1996; Mu, & Carrington, 2007; Sadik, 2014; Wang, 2007). Nevertheless, this association may manifest differently across various contexts.

Some studies have reported strong correlations (Dreyer & Oxford, 1996; Wang, 2007), whereas others have observed weak correlations (Ehrman & Oxford,

1990; De Silva, 2010) or even non-significant relationships between these variables (Sadik, 2014).

This variation in findings reinforces Bremner's (1999) assertion that strategies effective in one cultural context may yield different outcomes in another. The importance of considering the contextual relevance of strategy use has been highlighted by Weaver and Cohen (1994). Chamot (2004) further emphasises that the efficacy of a particular strategy is contingent upon the value the learner attributes to it in relation to their specific learning goals within a given context.

Based on the benchmarks proposed by Cohen (2013) for interpreting Pearson correlation coefficients—namely, weak correlation (r = 0.1–0.23), moderate correlation (r = 0.24–0.36), and strong correlation (r = 0.37 or higher)—we observe that in the present study, the correlation between strategy use and writing performance is moderate.

Three potential explanations for this moderate correlation will be explored in the subsequent discussion.

First, students may have employed strategies other than those identified in the questionnaires. Indeed, findings from other studies conducted with Asian students (Crookes et al., 1994; Mullins, 1992) suggest the use of strategies not captured in the questionnaires.

Second, it is possible that the application of strategies was inappropriate. Some researchers (Maarof & Murat, 2013; Vann & Abraham, 1990) have noted that less proficient learners were active strategy users but applied them inadequately.

Third, the instruction of strategies may be influenced by other factors not examined in this study, such as learners' self-efficacy (Graham & Macaro, 2007; Peguret, 2014; Rubin et al., 2007), motivation (De Silva, 2010; Defays & Deltour, 2003), or perceptions of strategy use (Wang, 2007).

5 Conclusion

The study aimed to investigate the correlation between the use of writing strategies and writing performance among Vietnamese learners of French. Results indicate a significant positive correlation between the overall use of writing strategies and writing performance, as measured by post-test scores. Specifically, planning and revision strategies demonstrated a strong relationship with both content and language scores.

The intervention, incorporating the CALLA model, effectively enhanced students' strategy use, shifting their levels from moderate to frequent. This increase in strategy use corresponded to improved writing performance across all evaluation criteria. These findings align with previous research highlighting the positive impact of strategy instruction on writing quality.

However, the correlation between strategy use and writing performance is moderate, suggesting that while strategy use contributes to improved writing, it is

not the sole determinant of success. Other factors, such as learner self-efficacy, motivation, and perception of strategy use, may also influence writing outcomes.

Beyond the pedagogical implications, the results also contribute to theoretical discussions on L2 writing by showing that metacognitive regulation plays a central role not only in English as a second language contexts, but also in other L2 writing environments such as French. This suggests that strategy instruction should be conceived not merely as a set of techniques, but as part of a broader self-regulatory process that shapes learners' engagement with writing.

A further limitation of the study concerns the assessment procedure. Although two independent raters evaluated all scripts and resolved discrepancies through discussion, no statistical index of inter-rater reliability was calculated, making it difficult to quantify rating consistency. In addition, the study employed a single-group design without a control group. Consequently, improvements in performance cannot be attributed solely to the intervention, even though the pre-/post-test comparison still provides valuable evidence of learners' progress and engagement with metacognitive writing strategies.

Given the positive outcomes of this study, it is recommended that writing strategy instruction be incorporated more extensively into the curriculum for language learners. Educators should continue to use flexible instructional models, like the CALLA model, to allow for the revisiting of strategies as needed. Additionally, integrating strategy instruction with regular lessons can provide learners with more opportunities to apply these strategies in various contexts, further reinforcing their effectiveness. Future research should explore the potential impact of other factors, such as self-efficacy, motivation, and the learners' perception of strategy use, to gain a more comprehensive understanding of how these elements contribute to writing performance.

References

Arju, S. (2017). Impact of an intervention program on pre-writing strategies in fostering writing achievement of Bangladeshi EFL students. *Konińskie Studia Językowe*, *5*(1), 117–134.

Beck, A. (2002). Writing strategies worksheet. *TESOL Journal*, *11*(1), 34–35.

Bremner, S. (1999). Language learning strategies and language proficiency: Investigating the relationship in Hong Kong. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 55*(4), 490–514. https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.55.4.490

Chamot, A.U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1994). *The CALLA handbook: Implementing the cognitive academic language learning approach*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Chen, Y. (2011). Study of the writing strategies used by Chinese non-English majors. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *1*(3), 245–251. https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.1.3.245-251

Cohen, A.D., & Macaro, E. (2007). *Language learner strategies: Thirty years of research and practice*. Oxford University Press.

Cohen, J. (2013). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203771587

Crookes, G., Davis, K., & LoCastro, V. (1994). Learning strategies and learning environments. *Tesol Quarterly*, *28*(2), 409–414. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587445

De Silva, R. (2010). *The impact of writing strategy instruction on EAP students' writing strategy use and writing performance.* [Doctoral dissertation, The University of Reading]. British Library EThOS.

Defays, J.M., & Deltour, S. (2003). *Le français langue étrangère et seconde : enseignement et apprentissage*. Mardaga.

Dreyer, C., & Oxford, R.L. (1996). Learning strategies and other predictors of ESL proficiency among Afrikaans speakers in South Africa. In R.L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 61-74). University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.

Ehrman, M., & Oxford, R. (1990). Adult language learning styles and strategies in an intensive training setting. *The Modern Language Journal*, *74*(3), 311–327.

Escorcia, D. (2010). Quel rapport entre la métacognition et la performance à l'écrit ? Analyse de la situation d'étudiants en sciences humaines. *Éducation et Didactique*, *4*(3), 63–82.

Escorcia, D., & Fenouillet, F. (2011). Quel rôle de la métacognition dans les performances en écriture ? Analyse de la situation d'étudiants en sciences humaines et sociales. *Revue canadienne de l'éducation*, *34*(2), 53–76.

Ferretti, R.P., Lewis, W.E., & Andrews-Weckerly, S. (2009). Do goals affect the structure of students' argumentative writing strategies? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *101*(3), 577-589. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014702

Flower, L., & Hayes, J.R. (1980). The cognition of discovery: Defining a rhetorical problem. *College Composition and Communication*, *31*(1), 21–32. https://doi.org/10.58680/ccc198015963

Graham, S., & Macaro, E. (2007). Designing Year 12 strategy training in listening and writing: From theory to practice. *Language Learning Journal*, *35*(2), 153–173. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571730701599203

Grasland, C. (2000). Initiation aux méthodes statistiques en sciences sociales. Retrieved August 30, 2023, from http://grasland.script.univ-paris-diderot.fr/STAT98/STAT98.htm.

Gu, Y. (2002). Gender, academic major, and vocabulary learning strategies of Chinese EFL learners. *RELC journal*, *33*(1), 35-54. https://doi.org/10.1177/003368820203300102.

Kent, T. (1999). *Post-process theory: Beyond the writing-process paradigm*. Southern Illinois University Press.

Lee, H.I., & Mukhlynina, I. (2018). Étude comparative sur des stratégies métacognitives développées par les étudiants chinois et russes pour la compréhension orale en FLE. *Francisola : revue indonésienne de la langue et de la littérature françaises*, *3*(1), 1-15.

Lo, J., & Hyland, F. (2007). Enhancing students' engagement and motivation in writing: The case of primary students in Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *16*(4), 219-237. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.06.002

Maarof, N., & Murat, M. (2013). Writing strategies used by ESL upper secondary school students. *International Education Studies*, *6*(4), 47–55.

Mahnam, L., & Nejadansari, D. (2012). The effects of different pre-writing strategies on Iranian EFL writing achievement. *International Education Studies*, *5*(1), 154–160. https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v5n1p154

Manchón, R.M., Roca de Larios, J., & Murphy, L. (2007). A review of writing strategies: Focus on conceptualizations and impact of first language. In A.D. Cohen & E. Macaro (Eds.), *Language Learner Strategies: 30 Years of Research and Practice* (pp. 229–250). Oxford University Press.

Mastan, M.E.B., Maarof, N., & Embi, M. A. (2017). The effect of writing strategy instruction on ESL intermediate proficiency learners' writing performance. *Journal of Educational Research and Review*, *5*(5), 71–78.

Mohseniasl, F. (2014). Examining the effect of strategy instruction on writing apprehension and writing achievement of EFL learners. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, *4*(4), 811-817. https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.4.4.811-817

Mu, C., & Carrington, S.B. (2007). An investigation of three Chinese students' English writing strategies. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language-EJ*, *11*(1), 1–23.

Mullins, P.Y. (1992). Successful English language learning strategies of students enrolled at the Faculty of Arts, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand, *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 53(06), 1829. (UMI No. 9223758).

O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge University Press.

Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Newbury House Publishers.

Peguret, M. (2014). Le sentiment d'autoefficacité et les stratégies d'apprentissage chez les étudiants de français langue seconde venant d'immersion. *Revue des sciences de l'éducation*, *40*(3), 579-599.

Petrić, B., & Czárl, B. (2003). Validating a writing strategy questionnaire. *System*, *31*(2), 187–215. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(03)00020-4

Ransdell, S., Lavelle, B., & Levy, C. M. (2002). The effects of training a good working memory strategy on L1 and L2 writing. In S. Ransdell, & M.-L. Barbier (Eds.), *New directions for research in L2 writing* (pp. 133–144). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-0363-6_7

Rao, Z. (2007). Training in brainstorming and developing writing skills. *ELT Journal*, *61*(2), 100–106. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccm002

Raoofi, S., Binandeh, M., & Rahmani, S. (2017). An investigation into writing strategies and writing proficiency of university students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *8*(1), 191–198. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0801.24

Rubin, J., Chamot, A.U., Harris, V., & Anderson, N.J. (2007). Intervening in the use of strategies. *Language Learner Strategies*, *30*, 29–45.

Sadik, A. (2014). Correlation between cognitive writing strategies and students' writing performance. *Arab World English Journal*, *5*(4), 226-239.

Sasaki, M. (2000). Toward an empirical model of EFL writing processes: An exploratory study. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *9*(3), 259–291. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(00)00028-X

Sasaki, M. (2002). Building an empirically based model of EFL learners' writing processes. In S. Ransdell & M.-L. Barbier (Eds.), *New directions for research in L2 writing* (pp. 49–80). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-0363-6_3

Sasaki, M. (2004). A multiple-data analysis of the 3.5-year development of EFL student writers. *Language Learning*, *54*(3), 525–582. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0023-8333.2004.00264.x

Scardamalia, M., & Bereiter, C. (1987). Knowledge telling and knowledge transforming in written composition. In S. Rosenberg (Ed.), *Advances in applied psycholinguistics* (Vol. 2, pp. 142–175). Cambridge University Press.

Sengupta, S. (2000). An investigation into the effects of revision strategy instruction on L2 secondary school learners. *System*, *28*(1), 97–113. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(99)00063-9

Talebinezhad, M.R., & Negari, G.M. (2007). The effect of explicit teaching of concept mapping in expository writing on EFL students' self-regulation. *Linguistics Journal*, *2*, 69–90. https://jor.ut.ac.ir/article_27675_0e55bb9a2f8e2cace065e42ee533130d.pdf

Vann, R.J., & Abraham, R.G. (1990). Strategies of unsuccessful language learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, *24*(2), 177–198. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586898

Wang, Y. (2007). *Investigating the effects of writing strategy instruction on students' perceptions and performance.* (Doctoral dissertation). University of the West of England Library.

Weaver, S. J. & Cohen, A. D. (1994). Making learning strategy instruction a reality in the foreign language curriculum. In C. Klee (Ed.), *Faces in a crowd: The individual learner in multisection courses* (pp. 285-323). Heinle & Heinle.