

FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND VIETNAMESE

THE EFFECTS OF STRATEGY INSTRUCTION ON WRITING PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS OF DIFFERENT PROFICIENCY LEVELS

LE THI NGOC HA* - NGUYEN THI CUC PHUONG**

ABSTRACT: This study investigates the effects of explicit writing strategy instruction on the French writing proficiency of Vietnamese university students from University of Foreign Languages, the University of Da Nang. A total of eighty-one participants were categorized into three proficiency groups: high, average, and low. The research aimed to evaluate how targeted writing strategy instruction could impact these different proficiency levels. Findings reveal that explicit writing strategy instruction had a beneficial effect on the writing abilities of all three groups, with the most pronounced gains observed in the average and low proficiency groups. This improvement underscores the value of integrating explicit writing strategies into French language curricula. The study contributes empirical evidence supporting this pedagogical approach, suggesting that writing strategy instruction can enhance both strategic learning and overall writing performance.

KEY WORDS: writing skill; language learning strategies; writing strategies instruction; CALLA; writing performance.

RECEIVED: September, 26th, 2024.

EDITED: November, 22nd, 2024

1. Introduction

This research is grounded in over fifteen years of teaching French as a Foreign Language (FLE), during which we observed significant deficiencies in students' argumentative writing skills. To address this issue, we explored Vietnamese students' challenges in constructing French argumentative texts by interviewing four teachers from the University of Foreign Language Studies – the University of Danang. Teachers identified key difficulties in content generation, text organization, vocabulary, and syntax.

An amount of subsequent literature reviews confirmed the importance of writing strategies in overcoming these challenges. Researches consistently highlight the positive impact of explicit strategy instruction on writing proficiency and autonomy (Boulet & Savoie-Zajc, 2011; Manchón et al., 2007; Sasaki, 2004; Sengupta, 2000). However, there is a dearth of research investigating the relationship between strategy knowledge, acquisition methods, and writing performance (De Silva, 2010).

Given the critical role of written communication in higher education and the potential of writing strategies to enhance student outcomes, this study aims to examine the effects of explicit writing strategy instruction on Vietnamese FLE learners' argumentative writing. Specifically, we seek to improve students' strategy knowledge and writing performance while contributing to the broader understanding of language learning strategy instruction.

2. Writing strategies

In the 1980s, research on writing strategies primarily concentrated on cognitive orientation, viewing writing production as a recursive, cognitively demanding, and problem-solving task (Manchón et al., 2007). Since the 1990s, there has been a shift towards emphasizing the social aspects of writing, which posits that writing is a cognitive, communicative, and socially situated activity. This shift has led to the post-process movement in writing theory, research, and pedagogy (Kent, 1999). Mirroring the evolution in L1 literature, research on L2 writing strategies is gradually transitioning from a cognitive to a socio-cognitive approach.

*Dr.; *University of Foreign Language Studies, the University of Danang; Email: ltnha@ufl.udn.vn*

**Dr.; *Hanoi University; Email: phuongntc@hanu.edu.vn*

What are writing strategies? According to Beck (2002), writing strategies are conscious decisions made by writers to solve a writing problem. Similarly, Wong (2005, p.31) defines writing strategies as “decisions taken to cope with the problems (both linguistic and rhetorical) posed by the writing task as perceived by the writers” (Flower & Hayes, 1980). In essence, writing strategies refer to the actions or behaviors that writers consciously choose throughout the writing process to address the problems posed by a writing task.

Recognizing the importance of these strategies, educators have emphasized the need to equip students with this knowledge. Chamot et al., (1990) argued that the goal of teaching writing strategies is twofold: to raise students' awareness of the writing process itself and to teach them specific strategies associated with good writing. Chamot (2004) later elaborated on this concept, highlighting the role of explicit strategy instruction. By helping students recognize the strategies they already use and by modeling strategic thinking themselves, teachers can empower students to become more conscious and effective writers.

This focus on strategy instruction is well-supported. Numerous studies (Ransdell et al., 2002; Sasaki, 2000, 2002) have shown that effective instruction can influence how learners use strategies. Studies by De Silva (2015), Lo & Hyland (2007), Mastan et al., (2017), Mohseniasl (2014), Rao (2007), and Sengupta (2000) demonstrated a clear link between effective strategy instruction and improved writing quality. Additionally, research by Ching (2002) and Nguyen & Gu (2013) suggested that learner-internal factors also play a role.

In light of this evidence, it is clear that effective strategy instruction offers a powerful tool for educators. A wealth of research consistently supports the positive impact of teaching writing strategies on student writing. For instance, Lo and Hyland (2007) found that pre-writing strategies significantly boosted students' writing quality, motivation, and ability to generate ideas. Similarly, Mastan et al. (2017) demonstrated that writing strategy instruction improved the writing performance of intermediate ESL learners by enabling them to write more complex and meaningful sentences.

Several studies, such as Mohseniasl (2014), demonstrate specific improvements in content, organization, vocabulary, and language use resulted from writing strategy instruction. However, the overall impact transcends these details. Learners exposed to explicit strategy instruction consistently outperformed their counterparts on post-tests compared to pre-tests, and compared to those who haven't received this training (Al-Shaer et al., 2014; De Silva, 2015; Mahnam & Nejadansari, 2012; Rao, 2007; Sengupta, 2000).

This highlights a critical gap in research, despite the promising results. While research on writing strategy instruction yields positive outcomes, there's a lack of studies focusing on FLE learners, particularly in the Vietnamese context. Existing studies, largely focused on ESL or EFL learners, rarely explore writing strategy instruction for FLE learners. Furthermore, previous research often targeted specific writing stages, such as planning or revision. This study aims to address these limitations by examining the impact of teaching writing strategies across the entire writing process on the written work of Vietnamese FLE students.

3. Methodology

3.1. Participants

This study involved 81 third-year students from the French Department at the University of Foreign Languages, The University of Da Nang. To analyze writing performance before and after the Intervention, the students were divided into three groups (weak, average, and high-performing learners) based on their overall GPA, according to the University's grading scale (University of Foreign Languages – The University of Da Nang, 2017). Specifically, students with a GPA above 7.0 were classified as high-performing, those with a GPA between 5.5 and 6.9 were placed in the average-performing group, and students with a GPA below 5.4 were categorized as weak-performing.

3.2. Intervention

Based on the recommendations of Oxford (1990) and Manchón et al. (2007) regarding the integration and duration of strategy instruction, this study implemented a 15-week intervention to teach 12 metacognitive strategies within an advanced French reading and writing course (B2 level). The selection of these strategies was informed by previous research (Le, 2020) and classroom observations to address students' specific needs. The teaching process adhered to the CALLA model proposed by Chamot and O'Malley (1994), which comprises five steps: preparation, presentation, practice, evaluation, and expansion. The study aimed to enhance students' strategy use and improve their writing quality.

3.3. Data collection tools

Participants completed two argumentative writing assessments: a pre-test and a post-test. Before each assessment, participants were briefed on the task and given opportunities to clarify any doubts. Administered one week prior to the intervention, the pre-test established baseline writing abilities, identified challenges, and revealed the strategies participants employed. The post-test, conducted upon completion of the intervention, allowed for a comparison of pre- and post-intervention performance, thereby enabling an evaluation of the strategy instruction's impact on writing outcomes.

The quantitative data collected from the pre-tests and post-tests were entered into SPSS for statistical analysis. A paired samples t-test was conducted to compare the mean scores of the pre- and post-tests, determining whether there was a statistically significant difference in writing performance which followed the strategy instruction intervention. The paired samples t-test was deemed appropriate for this analysis, as the data consisted of paired measurements from the same participants at two different time points. This analysis allowed for a precise evaluation of the impact of strategy instruction on students' writing performance.

4. Test results and evaluation criteria of learner groups

The test results and evaluation criteria for different learner groups provide a comprehensive overview of their writing performance. By analyzing these results, we can identify specific areas of strength and weakness across the groups, allowing for a more targeted approach to improve writing skills. This section details the significant findings for each learner group, highlighting the impact of the intervention on their writing abilities.

4.1. Test results and evaluation criteria of low-performing learners

Table 1. Comparison of test scores of low-performing learners before/after the intervention

		M	SD	t	df	p	Gain	
Results of writing tests	Pre-test	10,97	2,33	-6,660	22	,000	2,53	10,1%
	Post-test	13,50	2,19					

The table indicates a significant difference between the total pre-test and post-test scores ($t = -6660$; $df = 22$; $p = .000$). Additionally, there is an increase in the average scores favoring the post-test.

Table 2. Comparison of evaluation criteria scores of low-performing learners before/after the intervention

Evaluation Criteria		M	SD	t	df	p	Gain	
Compliance with instructions	Pre-test	1,27	0,37	-4,335	22	,000	0,30	15,0%
	Post-test	1,58	0,21					
Sociolinguistic correctness	Pre-test	1,03	0,27	-4,058	22	,001	0,17	8,5%
	Post-test	1,21	0,29					

Ability to present facts	Pre-test	1,03	0,30	-4,885	22	,000	0,36	12,0%
	Post-test	1,39	0,33					
Ability to argue a position	Pre-test	0,91	0,28	-5,703	22	,000	0,51	17,0%
	Post-test	1,42	0,38					
Coherence and cohesion	Pre-test	1,74	0,62	-4,700	22	,000	0,48	12,0%
	Post-test	2,22	0,55					
Vocabulary range	Pre-test	0,90	0,26	-2,206	22	,038	0,11	5,5%
	Post-test	1,01	0,23					
Vocabulary mastery	Pre-test	0,78	0,16	-3,945	22	,001	0,20	10,0%
	Post-test	0,98	0,25					
Spelling mastery	Pre-test	0,58	0,18	-1,817	22	,083	-	-
	Post-test	0,64	0,13					
Grammatical control	Pre-test	1,84	0,42	-2,434	22	,024	0,22	5,5%
	Post-test	2,05	0,46					
Degree of sentence elaboration	Pre-test	0,95	0,27	-2,642	22	,015	0,13	6,5%
	Post-test	1,08	0,28					

The results indicate substantial differences in nine sub-categories of evaluation: compliance with instructions ($t = -4335$; $df = 22$; $p = .000$), sociolinguistic correctness ($t = -4058$; $df = 22$; $p = .001$), ability to present facts ($t = -4885$; $df = 22$; $p = .000$), ability to argue ($t = -5703$; $df = 22$; $p = .000$), coherence and cohesion ($t = -4700$; $df = 22$; $p = .000$), vocabulary range ($t = -2206$; $df = 22$; $p = .038$), vocabulary mastery ($t = -3945$; $df = 22$; $p = .001$), grammatical control ($t = -2434$; $df = 22$; $p = .024$), and degree of sentence elaboration ($t = -2642$; $df = 22$; $p = .015$).

4.2. Test results and evaluation criteria of middle-performing learners

Table 3. Comparison of test scores of middle-performing learners before/after the intervention

		M	SD	t	df	p	Gain	
Results of writing tests	Pre-test	13,04	1,90	-15,933	36	,000	3,29	13,2%
	Post-test	16,33	1,46					

The reading of Table 3 shows us certain differences in test scores ($t = -15.933$; $df = 36$; $p = .000$). The higher score is that of the post-test.

Table 4. Comparison of evaluation criteria scores of middle-performing learners

Evaluation Criteria		M	SD	t	df	p	Gain	
Compliance with instructions	Pre-test	1,49	1,90	-6,341	36	,000	0,33	16,5%
	Post-test	1,82	1,46					
Sociolinguistic	Pre-test	1,22	0,28	-5,099	36	,000	0,20	10,0%

correctness	Post-test	1,43	0,21					
Ability to present facts	Pre-test	1,24	0,18	-9,969	36	,000	0,53	17,7%
	Post-test	1,77	0,22					
Ability to argue a position	Pre-test	1,18	0,41	-12,862	36	,000	0,64	21,3%
	Post-test	1,82	0,33					
Coherence and cohesion	Pre-test	2,24	0,36	-7,954	36	,000	0,53	13,3%
	Post-test	2,77	0,33					
Vocabulary range	Pre-test	1,07	0,50	-1,961	36	,058	-	-
	Post-test	1,14	0,45					
Vocabulary mastery	Pre-test	0,85	0,17	-7,450	36	,000	0,25	12,5%
	Post-test	1,10	0,25					
Spelling mastery	Pre-test	0,72	0,10	-1,535	36	,134	-	-
	Post-test	0,76	0,09					
Grammatical control	Pre-test	1,97	0,35	-6,306	36	,000	0,50	12,5%
	Post-test	2,47	0,41					
Degree of sentence elaboration	Pre-test	1,12	0,23	-3,876	36	,000	0,22	11,0%
	Post-test	1,34	0,36					

Based on the obtained results, we found statistically great differences for eight evaluation elements. These include compliance with instructions ($t = -6.341$; $df = 36$; $p = .000$), sociolinguistic correctness ($t = -7.177$; $df = 36$; $p = .000$), ability to present facts ($t = -9.969$; $df = 36$; $p = .000$), ability to argue a position ($t = -12.862$; $df = 36$; $p = .000$), coherence and cohesion ($t = -7.954$; $df = 36$; $p = .000$), vocabulary mastery ($t = -7.450$; $df = 36$; $p = .016$), grammatical control ($t = -6.306$; $df = 36$; $p = .000$), and degree of sentence elaboration ($t = -3.876$; $df = 36$; $p = .000$).

4.3. Test results and evaluation criteria of high-performing learners

Table 5. Comparison of test results of high-performing learners before/after the intervention

		M	SD	t	df	p	gain	
Results of writing tests	Pre-test	17,89	2,32	-11,069	20	,000	2,23	8,92%
	Post-test	20,12	2,04					

We observe that the difference between the average scores of high-performing learners in the pre-test and post-test is evident ($t = -11.069$; $df = 36$; $p = 0.000$) in favor of the post-test.

Table 6. Comparison of evaluation criteria results of high-performing learners before/after the intervention

Evaluation Criteria		M	SD	t	df	p	Gain	
Compliance with instructions	Pre-test	1,77	0,22	-3,005	20	,007	0,17	8,50%
	Post-test	1,94	0,11					

Sociolinguistic correctness	Pre-test	1,50	0,26	-4,564	20	,000	0,18	9,00%
	Post-test	1,68	0,20					
Ability to present facts	Pre-test	2,07	0,44	-6,501	20	,000	0,35	11,67%
	Post-test	2,42	0,28					
Ability to argue a position	Pre-test	2,06	0,43	-7,108	20	,000	0,44	14,67%
	Post-test	2,50	0,26					
Coherence and cohesion	Pre-test	2,94	0,59	-4,503	20	,000	0,39	9,75%
	Post-test	3,33	0,41					
Vocabulary range	Pre-test	1,38	0,23	-2,961	20	,008	0,10	5,00%
	Post-test	1,48	0,22					
Vocabulary mastery	Pre-test	1,35	0,31	-5,458	20	,000	0,20	10,00%
	Post-test	1,55	0,26					
Spelling mastery	Pre-test	0,77	0,08	-2,169	20	,042	0,05	5,00%
	Post-test	0,82	0,12					
Grammatical control	Pre-test	2,73	0,43	-5,123	20	,000	0,25	6,25%
	Post-test	2,98	0,43					
Degree of sentence elaboration	Pre-test	1,49	0,24	-,810	20	,428	-	-
	Post-test	1,51	0,26					

The results indicated significant differences across nine evaluation criteria for writing performance tests. These criteria include compliance with instructions ($t=-3.005$; $df=20$; $p=.007$), sociolinguistic correctness ($t=-4.564$; $df=20$; $p=.000$), ability to present facts ($t=-6.501$; $df=20$; $p=.000$), ability to argue ($t=-7.108$; $df=20$; $p=.000$), coherence and cohesion ($t=-4.503$; $df=20$; $p=.000$), vocabulary range ($t=-2.961$; $df=20$; $p=.008$), vocabulary mastery ($t=-5.458$; $df=20$; $p=.000$), spelling mastery ($t=-2.169$; $df=20$; $p=.042$), and degree of sentence elaboration ($t=-5.123$; $df=20$; $p=.000$).

5. Discussion

Before delving into the discussion of these findings, it is important to synthesize the key results and their implications. The data indicate that the intervention positively impacted writing performance across different learner groups, with distinguished improvements in overall scores and specific evaluation criteria for weak, average, and high-performing learners. This section will now explore the broader significance of these results, examining the potential reasons behind the observed patterns and comparing them with existing literature.

The quantitative data demonstrate an increase in overall scores among weaker learners, indicating that their writing performance improved following strategy training. However, there were no substantial changes in scores for vocabulary and grammar. These findings are consistent with previous studies, such as those by Sasaki (2000) and De Silva (2015). Sasaki (2000) found that Japanese EFL learners showed improved composition scores after strategy instruction, with significant gains in organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. Similarly, De Silva (2015) observed that less skilled writers improved their overall scores, particularly in coherence and organization, attributing these improvements to a focus on cohesion and organization in the strategy teaching program, areas where students were generally weak. The lack of significant differences in

other evaluation criteria could be attributed to the limited scoring range (0-5) for each sub-competence. In comparison with Sasaki (2000), the present study shares similarities with De Silva's (2015) research in the improvement of scores related to content aspects, such as coherence and organization, but not in vocabulary and grammar. This suggests that the strategies acquired during the intervention were more effective in improving content rather than form in the texts of weaker learners.

Similar to the results for weaker learners, the data analysis suggests that the intervention positively impacted the post-test scores of average students. Upon examining the evaluation components, we observed that average learners made progress in text content and grammar. In terms of lexical competence, their improvements were primarily in vocabulary mastery. Additionally, a comparison of the average scores across each criterion between the pre-test and post-test indicated an overall enhancement in writing performance. However, there is no existing research that directly corroborates these findings.

For high-performing learners, the results indicated significant differences in overall scores between the pre-test and post-test, suggesting that the writing instruction contributed to improving the writing performance of skilled writers. In terms of evaluation elements, high-performing learners showed progress in argumentation, coherence, and vocabulary (excluding vocabulary mastery). These results partially corroborate the findings of De Silva (2015), where significant improvements were noted in coherence, organization, and grammar for high-performing writers.

Overall, all three learner groups showed significant gains in total scores and certain evaluation criteria in the post-test, implying that the training is beneficial for writing performance across different learner groups, regardless of their skill level.

However, it is noteworthy that the teaching of strategies influenced argumentative writing performance differently across the groups. Average learners achieved higher scores in the overall post-test results compared to other groups, a trend that was also reflected across the evaluation criteria, where they consistently outperformed their peers.

Additionally, when examining the results of subcategories related to the content of the written text, we observe that improvements were more pronounced in average and weaker learners compared to high-performing learners. This variation might be attributed to the choice of metacognitive strategies used in teaching. Previous studies have shown that more proficient language learners generally employ metacognitive strategies more frequently than their less proficient counterparts (O'Malley et al., 1985; Vandergrift, 1997). As a result, metacognitive strategy awareness was likely a novel concept for less proficient learners, while those with higher language proficiency may have already been familiar with these strategies, diminishing their impact on post-test performance. The explanation provided is consistent with the findings from the mentioned research.

Regarding lexical skills, it is evident that none of the learner groups significantly improved their results, except for vocabulary mastery. We question whether the improvement in vocabulary mastery is due to the frequent use of the vocabulary modification strategy by learners who followed the intervention. A slight increase in scores was also observed in grammatical skills, excluding average-level writers. However, other researches in this area have recorded significant improvements in grammar scores among learners following strategy training (De Silva, 2010; Mastan et al., 2017).

In summary, the above analyses lead us to conclude that writing strategy instruction was more beneficial for average and weak learners, in terms of their performance in argumentative text production. It is worth noting that regarding the use of writing strategies for these two groups, the training was also beneficial. These results seem to contradict other studies (Green & Oxford, 1995; Griffiths, 2003), which reported that less competent learners used fewer strategies than their more competent counterparts and made relatively less progress in language learning.

6. Conclusion and recommendations

The study results indicate that explicit writing strategy instruction has positively impacted the writing proficiency of students across different levels of proficiency. Significant improvements were observed particularly in the average and low proficiency groups, while high-performing students also showed progress, albeit to a lesser extent. Data analysis reveals that, although there were overall increases in scores and certain evaluation criteria, improvements in vocabulary and grammar skills were not as pronounced.

Notably, average learners demonstrated more noticeable improvements across all evaluation criteria, possibly due to their initial unfamiliarity with these strategies (O'Malley et al., 1985; Vandergrift, 1997) making them more receptive to new methods. In contrast, high-performing students might have been already familiar with some of these strategies, leading to less noticeable improvements.

Based on these results, we propose the following recommendations:

Enhance Strategy Training: Continue integrating explicit writing strategies into French language curricula, with a focus on improving text organization and coherence.

Provide Targeted Instruction: For low and average proficiency students, design specific strategy training programs aimed at improving particular skills such as grammar and vocabulary to complement the gains made in text structure.

Encourage Metacognitive Strategy Use: Implement metacognitive strategies flexibly and appropriately for each student group, especially for those with lower proficiency levels, to maximize the benefits of strategy awareness and application.

Conduct Ongoing Assessment: Regularly assess student progress and adjust teaching strategies as needed to ensure that all proficiency groups receive appropriate and effective support.

In summary, this study provides valuable insights into the effectiveness of explicit writing strategy instruction for students in varied proficiency levels and offers directions for enhancing writing instruction methods.

REFERENCES

Vietnamese

1. Lê Thị Ngọc Hà (2020), "Khảo sát việc sử dụng chiến lược viết của sinh viên học tiếng Pháp tại Đại học Đà Nẵng". Tạp chí *Ngôn ngữ & Đời sống*, 8(301), 65–71.

English

2. Beck, A. (2002), Writing strategies worksheet. *TESOL Journal*, 11(1), 34–35.
3. Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1994), *The CALLA handbook: Implementing the cognitive academic language learning approach*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company New York.
4. De Silva, R. (2015), Writing strategy instruction: Its impact on writing in a second language for academic purposes. *Language Teaching Research*, 19(3), 301–323.
5. Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1980), The cognition of discovery: Defining a rhetorical problem. *College Composition and Communication*, 31(1), 21–32.
6. Green, J. M., & Oxford, R. (1995), A closer look at learning strategies, L2 proficiency, and gender. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(2), 261–297.
7. Griffiths, C. (2003), Patterns of language learning strategy use. *System*, 31(3), 367–383.
8. Kent, T. (Ed.). (1999), *Post-process theory: Beyond the writing-process paradigm*. SIU Press.
9. Manchón, R. M., Roca de Larios, J., & Murphy, L. (2007), A review of writing strategies: Focus on conceptualizations and impact of first language. *Language Learner Strategies: Thirty Years of Research and Practice*, 229–250.

10. 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.
11. 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).
12. Rao, Z. (2007), Training in brainstorming and developing writing skills. *ELT Journal*, 61(2), 100–106.
13. Sasaki, M. (2004), A multiple-data analysis of the 3.5-year development of EFL student writers. *Language Learning*, 54(3), 525–582.
14. Sengupta, S. (2000), An investigation into the effects of revision strategy instruction on L2 secondary school learners. *System*, 28(1), 97–113.
15. Wong, A. T. (2005), Writers' mental representations of the intended audience and of the rhetorical purpose for writing and the strategies that they employed when they composed. *System*, 33(1), 29–47.

Tác động của việc dạy chiến lược đến năng lực viết của sinh viên có trình độ khác nhau

Tóm tắt: Nghiên cứu này khảo sát tác động của việc giảng dạy chiến lược viết đối với năng lực viết tiếng Pháp của sinh viên Việt Nam tại Trường Đại học Ngoại ngữ, Đại học Đà Nẵng. Tham gia nghiên cứu là tám mươi một sinh viên, được phân thành ba nhóm trình độ: Khá-Giỏi, Trung bình, và Yếu. Mục tiêu của nghiên cứu là đánh giá cách thức giảng dạy chiến lược viết có thể ảnh hưởng đến người học ở các trình độ khác nhau như thế nào. Kết quả cho thấy việc giảng dạy chiến lược viết một cách rõ ràng có tác động tích cực đến năng lực viết của cả ba nhóm, trong đó sự cải thiện rõ rệt nhất được ghi nhận ở cả nhóm Trung bình và Yếu. Những kết quả này nhấn mạnh tầm quan trọng của việc tích hợp giảng dạy chiến lược viết vào chương trình giảng dạy tiếng Pháp. Nghiên cứu cũng cung cấp bằng chứng thực nghiệm hỗ trợ cho phương pháp sư phạm này, gợi ý rằng việc giảng dạy chiến lược viết có thể nâng cao cả kỹ năng học tập chiến lược lẫn năng lực viết tổng thể.

Từ khóa: kỹ năng viết; chiến lược học ngôn ngữ; giảng dạy chiến lược viết; CALLA; năng lực viết.