EFFECT OF PRODUCT AND PROCESS APPROACH ON STUDENTS' COMPOSITION WRITING COMPETENCE: AN EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

Maria Socorro Yvonne H. Ramos[1] , Manilyn V. Miñoza[2] , Ericson O. Alieto[3]
Graduate School, College of Teacher Education[1]
Bachelor of Elementary Education Department, College of Teacher Education[2]
Bachelor of Secondary Education Department, College of Teacher Education[3]
Western Mindanao State University[1,2,3]
Normal Road, Zamboanga City, 7000 Philippines[1,2,3]

For correspondence: *ramosabie6@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT*: This study is based on the input hypothesis of Krashen, which theorizes that a comprehensible input can bring out better output. The effect of the product and the process approach in the teaching of composition writing was investigated. Results of analyses showed that both approaches are effective in teaching composition writing. The sample consisted of sixty-freshmen AB –English, and Journalism students who were randomly grouped into control and experimental classes. Quantitative data analyses were utilized. The study had three stages: pretest, treatment, and posttest. In the pretest, the composition writing test using a series of pictures was administered to both the control and the experimental classes. In the treatment stage, the control group was taught composition writing using the traditional or product approach while the experimental group was taught composition writing using the process approach. At the end of the treatment stage, the posttest in composition writing using the same series of pictures was administered to both groups. Using mean, standard deviation, t-test, ANCOVA and multiple regression the following findings surfaced: 1). Prior treatment, the students had a very poor performance in writing composition based on the pretest of Product and Process approach; 2). The students improved in both approaches in composition writing; 3). The process and the product approach were both effective in mechanics, however, the process approach was better than the product approach in teaching content and organization, and 4). The variables sex, ethnicity, and type of school did not influence the performance of the students in composition writing.*

Keywords: Product approach, Process approach, Composition writing

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Students nowadays clearly manifested difficulty in expressing themselves through writing because of the limited knowledge they possessed in producing good written output.This issue is confirmed by **[1]**. They claimed that majority of the students do not have the needed skills which hinder their capacity in communicating constructively through writing which is a critical aspect for their success upon graduation.

It is about time that students of the new generation may start to consider the benefits that they could get in writing because they are experiencing difficulty when it comes to this skill particularly in conceptualizing how to go about this activity. This could help them come up with a well-written output since writing is experienced in different contexts **[2]** We could not deny the fact that writing is evident in the teachers' instruction particularly in pedagogy as well as in research which can be considered as one of the changes that need to be embraced in considering global aspects **[3]**. Hence, writing plays a significant role in students' learning as this serves as the bridge for them to easily grasp concepts and ideas.

However,**[4]** pointed out that the essence and significance of writing are somehow neglected in the teaching and learning in the sense that it serves only as a part of the teaching process when it comes to grammar and syntax, which is a clear manifestation that this could hinder its development. It was only then, that this concern was given much attention in the language of education, particularly for the improvement of this skill in the field of teaching and learning. Furthermore,**[5]** indicated as cited by **[6]** that teachers also consider English writing instruction as a complex task and responsibility to engage in specifically for those who are non-native speakers of English**.[7]** mentioned that the teachers' role in the teaching and learning process particularly in a writing class has been proven to be one of the factors that can significantly improve students' performance in writing.

Considering the importance of writing in higher education, teachers should do their role and responsibility in making students write effectively to be globally ready in the field of work even this concern is a big challenge on their part. The need to provide input for content-wise at the same time demonstrate how this skill is done in communicating with the help of utilizing productive tools should be evident.

Also,**[8]** emphasized that the need to teach writing to students by the teachers is a must as this is as significant as speaking, listening, and reading which is fundamental in language skills that students should be equipped with. Likewise,**[2]** stressed the importance of practice in writing for students to be productive which talent of an individual could not even satisfy. More importantly,**[9]** indicated that students should also take into consideration the four components in writing such as content, organization, grammar, and mechanics as part of the writing process. At this point, researchers and educators are already prioritizing the need to finding ways and means to look into the essence of this skill and the effective methods to utilize in the

teaching and learning process particularly in a writing class**[10].**

With this,[11**]** indicated that there are a lot of ways in teaching writing which have been known in the early years that can be of help for educators. Some of these approaches are product approach and process approach which are already utilized by teachers. However, the difference between these two leads to be the center of discussion among educators. **[12]** explained that the approach that focuses more on the development of students' writing output that is based on their knowledge about the language structures through imitation as inputs are provided solely by the teachers is known as product approach. Likewise,**[12]** in **[11]** also mentioned that the main objective of this approach is on the output of the students instead of how the students go about the process of writing. While according to **[13]** in **[11]** process approach is beneficial on the part of the students as this approach puts emphasis more on making students understand the process of learning the essence of writing rather than on how this is being imparted by the teachers. But the good thing about these two approaches was confirmed by **[14]** that these two approaches have influenced significantly in the field of teaching writing particularly in EFL/ESL classrooms. Thus, teachers considered both approaches in their teaching knowing that these two can be beneficial for students because both have their pros and cons. That is why teachers should pay close attention to their teaching strategies nowadays to help students improve their writing skills in a written composition by having a common goal and objective by emphasizing how students can effectively learn and master this skill and be ready in the world of work for globalization concern. Thus, the researchers are being challenged to determine the effectiveness of both the process and the product approach in the teaching and developing of writing skills. At the same time, this study hopes to find out the influence of the variables: gender, ethnicity, and type of school on the writing skills of the respondents in composition writing.

1.2 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The study was conducted to find out the effectiveness of product and process approach in teaching composition writing among freshman students. Specifically, it sought answers to the following questions:

1. What is the level of performance of the students in composition writing based on the pretest of both the control and the experimental group?

2. Is there a significant difference in the mean scores in composition writing between the pretest and the posttest of the two groups?

3. Is there a significant difference between the mean scores in the posttest of the two groups?

4. Is there a significant difference in the mean scores between the two groups based on the following elements of composition writing, namely:
a. Content
b. Organization
c. Mechanics?

5. Do sex, ethnicity, and type of school influence the writing skills of the students in writing a composition?

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. RESEARCH DESIGN

This study employed a descriptive quantitative design to be able to explain the effect of product and process approach in teaching composition writing. According to**[15]**, it is considered quantitative when the following processes like the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data as well as its written results are included. Likewise, **[16]** in **[17]** stated that a study can be considered descriptive when its main objective is to give a description to a particular event or phenomenon. Similarly, **[18]** in **[19]** stated that a study is still referred as descriptive when it involves gathering ,computing and tabulating data which are considered relevant to the current situation and trend . This study also utilized an experimental design. As explained by **[15]** that when the objective of the author is to find out in the result whether there is an effect that occurs in the intervention applied in the given samples it is considered as experimental design. Likewise, the researchers in this type of design has the capacity to control which of the two groups will be the control one and the experimental one through random sampling. This random sampling is utilized in a true experiment study to enable the researchersto assign individuals to treatment groups. This study particularly utilized a pretest-posttest with control group design. According to **[20]** this design allows the researcher sto randomly group individuals into two. It is understood that the first group or Group A serves as the experimental group who will be receiving the intervention or treatment while the second group or Group B will be considered the control group who will not undergo the intervention.

The quantitative aspect of the study is true experimental Pre-test, Post Test Equivalent Design. Illustration below was adapted from **[21].**

Group 1 01 03
----------X--------
Group 2 02 04

01 and 02 corresponding to the pretest while the 03 and 04 corresponded to the posttest of the control and the experimental groups, respectively. The assignment of treatment (X) was basically at random.

2.2. PARTICIPANTS OF THE STUDY

The study was conducted in one of the state universities in Mindanao, Philippines. It has a student population of almost eighteen thousand to include those in the external studies units. Specifically, the study included freshman students of the College of Liberal Arts.

The freshman college students of AB-English and AB-Journalism were utilized in this study. These were the students enrolled in the section and subject assigned to the researchers. These students may have had the minimum

writing ability since they have been enrolled in the course where the minimum wrote and oral ability in English is a requirement for admission.

During the enrolment, a careful selection of the respondents was made. The factors considered were the respondent's English final grade in high school which should be 80% or better; the CET score was 60% or better; and enrolled as a freshman student in either AB-English or AB-Journalism. In addition to the fact that these two courses admit incoming students with English final grades in high school of 80% or better and the CET score of 60% or better, these two factors may provide additional information as to how these students will perform in the writing classes. The English final grades of 80% or better perhaps indicate that these students may have performed better in written or oral English than those students whose grades in English are below 80%. This set of criteria was imperative to equate the respondents of the study. Sixty samples from a total eighty freshman Journalism and English students enrolled in the English 101 class were randomly selected and distributed in two sections. One group was designed control group and the other as the experimental group. The classes were scheduled on the same day and in the morning. Since the open system of enrolment was followed there was no other available schedule wherein freshman Journalism and English students could be grouped in two classes for this study. Thus, one class was scheduled at 7:00 AM and the other at 8:30 AM. A coin was tossed to randomly assign one class to process approach teaching (experimental) and the other one to product or traditional approach. Each class had an equal number of respondents from each course. Furthermore, random sampling was utilized in this study. As stated by **[22]** in **[15]** that the purpose of this sampling is advantageous for every individual in the population because each one has an equal opportunity to be included in the sample.

2.3 RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

The following instruments were prepared, adapted and utilized to gather the necessary data:

a.)Information Sheet. This was prepared by the researchers in accordance with what information is needed in the study. It was photocopied according to the number of respondents. It was used to gather the data of the respondents that included gender, ethnicity, course, and type of school graduated from. The information on ethnicity was used to group the compositions of the students according to ethnic groups such as *Zambaongueño*, *Cebuano*, *Tausug*, *Yakan* and *Tagalog* to find out if ethnicity affected their performance in writing composition. Likewise, the data on gender, male or female, were utilized to investigate whether gender also affected the performance of the students in composition writing. Finally, the details on the type of school, private or public, were used to find out if the school graduated from affected student's performance in writing composition.

b.) Composition writing Test Through Picture Series Stimulus This test was adapted from **[23].** It included asking the student to write a composition with three parts: the introduction, the body, and the conclusion. This composition writing test was administered to the samples in both classes at the start and the end of the study. It was used to find out the level of performance of the students in composition writing before the experiment and the effectiveness of the product and the process approach in teaching composition writing at the end of the study. The students were required to write a composition based on their interpretation of the pictures presented. The pictures controlled the situation and content of the composition. In this test, the students gave their title to their composition.

As **[23]** pointed out, the use of pictures in composition writing is an excellent device for providing both purpose and content for writing. A picture or series of pictures not only provides students with basic material for their composition but also stimulates their imaginative powers. Also, pictures provide a shared experience for students in the class, a common base that leads to a variety of language use. Another advantage of this instrument is that the students cannot reproduce phrases and sentences as in purely verbal. In this study, these pictures served as a medium for the students to write their compositions based on their interpretations of the pictures. Several pictures were used as the story was shown in four parts. The first picture showed a woman with a basket on her left hand looking at the caps displayed on a store. While she was concentrating on the beauty of the caps, a man in a jacket and a cap on his head pulled the bag of the woman out of the basket. The second picture presented the woman trying to get help while the man was running away with the woman's bag on his right hand. Near the guy was an old man sitting on a bench with a cane on his hands. At that moment, the old man saw the woman running after the man who got her bag. In the third picture, the old man had understood what had happened, came to the rescue. He pushed his cane forward and hit the feet of the snatcher. This caused the man with the stolen bag to fall. Finally, the fourth picture showed the policeman arrived and caught the snatcher. The woman got her bag back and thanked the old man for the bold act. Through this instrument, the composition writing test was administered. The students wrote their compositions about these pictures prior and after using the product approach of teaching writing to the control class and the process approach to the experimental class.

Although composition writing test is often questioned on the ground of its unreliability, the composition is still widely used as a means of measuring the writing skills **[23]**. Likewise, **[2**0] believed that because of the inherent unreliability in composition marking, it is necessary to compile a banding system, or, at least, a brief description of the various grades of achievement expected to be attained by the class. Thus, the compositions in this study were scored by competent raters using the suggested rating scale of **[23].**

2.4 PROCEDURE

The study commenced a week after classes started. Before the writing instruction began, the respective classes were given proper orientation on the conduct of the study. At a later time, the information sheets were distributed to the two groups to get the data on the ethnic group, gender and school graduated from. The respondents were aptly instructed to fill

in the vital data that the information sheet sought to obtain. These sheets were retrieved after the students accomplished the task

The pretest on composition writing was then administered. The test instrument included four pictures of a lady whose bag was snatched in the market and how the old man helped her get back her stolen bag. These were shown simultaneously so as not to disturb the flow of thoughts of the students. Three experts who are doctors of philosophy in English, as well as coordinators of a writing club, rated the first compositions using the criteria for checking composition, namely: content, organization, and mechanics. The pretest scores served as the baseline data of the respondents' performance in composition writing. The teaching aspect lasted for three months. The group that was taught composition writing using the process approach was exposed to three stages of writing, namely: pre-writing, writing and post writing before submitting the final composition. Pre-writing included finding a topic, finding out about the topic, and thinking about it in such a way that ideas were generally shaped, refined and organized. Also, pre-writing included considering the audience or reader and the purpose of the writing task. Writing entailed the putting down of words that express the ideas. The post-writing stage required the students to do peer evaluation as defined in the process approach. The peer evaluation was done in pairs. The students were guided by a proofreading checklist, which included questions on sentence structure and agreement, forms of verbs and capitalization, punctuation and spelling. After peer evaluation, the students returned the composition to the owner. The students then wrote their second draft following the corrections made by their classmates.

After writing the second draft, the students submitted it to the teacher. The teacher read the draft three times; to get the overall idea or essence of what was written about; second, to write comments about content; and third, to note grammatical problems or word choices and to write comments. Then the writing workshop was done consisting of instruction on some elements of writing necessary for the students to do their composition. Individual consultations regarding comments given on the second draft were done with the teacher. Another revision was done. Finally, the students edited their work using the provided instrument. The process continued until the students get satisfied with their written composition. A final draft was submitted to the teacher. On the other hand, the group that was taught composition writing using the product approach was given grammar lessons and exercises before formal writing. Further, the grammar lessons concentrated on basic errors, possession, abbreviations and numbers, parallelism, misplaced modifiers, simple tenses of the verbs, agreement of subject and verb, voice, punctuation marks, commonly misplaced words, vocabulary, and prepositions. These lessons were presented through a lecture method. The exercises were concentrated on sentence constructions using the grammar lessons as a vehicle for the students to write effective sentences. They were given model compositions to pattern their works after. The teacher was the sole evaluator of the compositions. Both groups wrote 10 compositions, consisting of some narrations, descriptions, comparison and contrasts and argumentations. The written outputs were graded, recorded and returned to the students.

2.5 METHOD OF ANALYSIS

2.5.1 STATISTICAL TOOLS USED IN THE STUDY

Question 1. The general means in the pretest was computed to find out the level of performance of the students in composition writing. Question 2. The t-test for dependent samples was used to answer this question because a comparison between the pretest and the posttest of the control and the experimental groups was needed. Questions 3 and 4. The Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was used to answer these questions because a test of homogeneity of regression coefficients was needed.

2.5.1 SCORING PROCEDURE FOR THE WRITING OUTPUT

In rating of the content, the scale is as follows: 30-27: Excellent to Very good, 26-22: Good to Average, and 21-17: Fair to Poor, 16-13 Very poor. For organization, the utilized scale for rating is: 20-18: Excellent to Very good, 17-14: Good to average, 13-10: Fair to poor, and 9-7: Very poor. For the aspect of language use, the rating scale is: 25-22: Excellent to very good, 21-28: Good to average, 17-11 Fair to poor, and 10-5: Very poor. For Mechanics, 5: Excellent to very good, 4: Good to Average, 3: Fair to poor, and 2: Very poor.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Level of Performance of the Students in Composition Writing

Table 3: Students' Pretest mean scores in Composition Writing on both Approaches

	Control		Experimental	
	F	%	F	%
95-100 Excellent	0		0	
90-94 Very good	0		1	3.3%
85-89 Good	0		0	
80-84 fair	1	3.3%	2	6.7%
75-79 Poor	3	10%	3	10%
74- below Very Poor	26	86.7%	24	80%
Gen. Mean	65.97		70.97	

The level of performance of the students in composition writing was based on the pretest scores in composition writing of both the product and the process approach. Table 3.1 shows the students' mean scores in composition writing and the frequency of those who got very good, fair, poor and very poor. The mean scores of 66 and 71 for both the control and the experimental groups reveal that the students were very poor in composition writing. These data serve as baseline information on the students' performance in composition writing. This perhaps proves that the students were not ready to produce an effective composition. Thus, the teacher's ability to make them learn how to write is very vital. The teacher who teaches writing must know as to which approach in the instruction of writing will satisfy the needs of the learners. Likewise, the importance of writing must be emphasized.

3.2. Difference in the mean scores in the composition writing between the pre-test and posttest of the two groups

Table 4: Students' Pre-post Test Mean Scores in Composition Writing for Both Control and Experimental Groups

Group	Mean		Standard Deviation		T-value	2-tail sig.
	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest		
Control	65.97	74.07	7.2	5.36	7.81	.000
Experimental	70.97	74.88	6.14	6.26	4.42	.000

Note: p-Value< 0.05 alpha is significant
p-Value>0.05 alpha is not significant

The difference between the mean scores of the pretest and the posttest of the control and the experimental groups in composition writing was established. The table shows the mean scores of the students in composition writing between the pretest and posttest of both groups. The control group has a mean of 65.97% or 66 with a standard deviation of 6. 805 in the pretest and a mean of 74.07 with a standard deviation of 5.36 in the posttest. The experimental group has a mean of 70.97 or 71 with a standard deviation of 6. 206 in the pretest and a mean of 74.88 with a standard deviation of 6.26 in the posttest. The t-value of the control group is 7.81 and 4.42 for the experimental group. Based on the aforementioned data, the difference between the pretest and the posttest of the control group is found to be very significant. This means that with the use of the product approach the students' performance had improved significantly in terms of the numerical score the students got. On the other hand, the difference between the pretest and the posttest of the experimental group is also significant. The students learned how to write using the process approach. Thus, it is safe to say that both approaches have helped the students improve their composition writing skills. Thus, hypothesis 2, which states that there is no significant difference in the mean scores in composition writing between the pretest and the posttest of the control and the experimental groups is rejected. This implies that teacher factor is necessary to consider in the success of the students in the classroom. It is presumed that the approaches may not be the direct factor to improve students' performance in writing but the teacher who exerted effort in using the strategies comprehensively – whether the approach is traditional or process. This result is supported by **[7]** that to enable students to perform better in writing, teachers have to exert effort in utilizing varied techniques in a writing class such as engaging students in creative writing, reflective essay activities and the like. Further, from the table above, it can be seen that both approaches when applied to two separate groups, control and experimental, have resulted in a significant difference.

3.3 DIFFERENCE IN THE MEAN SCORES IN THE POSTTEST OF THE TWO GROUPS

Table 5: Regression Coefficients and Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) on the Posttest for Control and Experiemental Groups

Group	Pretest	Posttest	Sum Products	Adjusted Sum of Squares
Control	822.97	831.87	517.73	506.16
Experimental	1116.97	1134.7	795.9	567.58
Total	1939.93	1966.59	1313.63	1073.74

F=56.17

Source of Variation

	Between Groups	Within Groups
Mean Square	658.09	18.90

F=34.83

The difference between the means of the posttest of the control and the experimental groups was established through the analysis of covariance (ANCOVA). Using ANCOVA, the homogeneity of regression across experimental groups was tested. The sum of squares of the control group in the pretest is 822.97 and 831.87 in the posttest. It has a sum of products of 517.73 and the adjusted sum of squares is 506.16. The experimental group has a sum of squares of 1116.97 in the pretest and 1134.7 in the posttest. It has a sum of products 795.9 and the adjusted sum of squares of 567.58. The value of F=56.17. This means that there is a significant difference in the regression coefficients that can be obtained based on the observations derived from both the control and experimental groups. This further means that the slope in predicting the posttest (X) from the knowledge of the pretest (Y) differs from one group to the other.

Moreover, the source of variance for this section shows the test of homogeneity of regression coefficients and ANCOVA for the data on pretest and posttest for control and experimental groups.

The value of F is 34.83 for the source of variation between groups of 658.09 and 18.90 for within groups. Despite the violation of the homogeneity of regression coefficients, the means obtained from the posttest results for both control and experimental groups turned out to be significantly different. Thus, hypothesis 3, which states that there is no significant difference in the mean scores between the posttests of the two groups is rejected. Nonetheless, although not completely supported by one of the assumptions for ANCOVA, the treatment that was applied to the experimental group seemed to be better than the one, which was used in the control group.

3.4 Regression Coefficient of both Control and Experimental Groups using ANCOVA for Content in Composition Writing

Table 6: Difference in the mean scores between groups based on content as writing element

Sum of Squares				
Group	Pretest	Posttest	Sum of Products	Adjusted sum of squares
Control	128.97	111.2	40.4	98.54
Experimental	88.17	39.47	40.67	20.71

Total	217.13	150.67	81.07	119.25

F=56.54

Source of Variation

	Between Groups	Within Groups
Mean Square	124.45	2.11

F=58.88

The results for content in the composition writing of the students is reflected in table 6. The presented data shows the regression coefficients and ANCOVA for pretest and posttest of both groups. The control group has a sum of squares of 128.97 in the pretest and 111.2 in the posttest. Its sum of products is 40.4 and the adjusted sum of products of 98.54. The experimental group has a sum of squares of 88.17 in the pretest and 39.47 in the posttest. Its sum of products 40.67 and the adjusted sum of products of 20.71. In this case, the F value at 56.54 shows above the critical value of F at .01 level of significance. This shows that the regression coefficients or the slopes for predicting the posttest (X) given the pretest (Y) are distinct from one group to the other. Notwithstanding such failure, it is still interesting to note that based on the sum of squares from both sources of variation: between groups is 124.45 and within groups is 2.11, a value of F ratio equals 58.88 follows that difference between the two means in posttest, with respect to the content in the composition writing, is significant at .01 level of significance. In this case, the process approach could be considered a better approach to teaching composition writing when it comes to content.

Students taught composition writing using the process approach had the chance of enriching their content because of the three stages they were exposed to. They talked about the subject matter in peers to give much sense to what is written. Thus, the saying, "Two heads are better than one." On the other contrary, the students taught composition writing using the product approach worked alone when writing. They were not given the chance to share their ideas with others neither to listen to the ideas of others. These students were only exposed to a model composition to pattern after their composition.

The result supports the findings of The result supports the findings that process approach is better than product approach because according to **[24]** process approach in writing is beneficial on the part of the students as this will allow them to be aware of their capabilities at the same time they will be able to find out strategies that are suited in their respective styles in learning.

3.4.1Regression Coefficient of both Control and Experimental Groups using ANCOVA for Organization

Table 7: Difference in the mean scores between groups based on organization as writing element

	Sum of squares			
Group	**pretest**	**posttest**	**Sum of products**	**Adjusted sum of squares**
Content	62.67	44.7	39	31.28
Experimental	39.37	54.07	20.43	44.36
Total	102.03	99.67	49.43	75.64

F= 56.06

Source of variation

	Between groups	Within groups
Mean square	12.72	1.33

F= 9.58

In a situation where an organization in composition writing is taken into consideration, Table 7 shows the test of homogeneity of regression coefficients and ANCOVA for the data on the pretest and posttest of both groups. The control group has a sum of squares of 62.67 in the pretest and 44.7 in the posttest. Its sum of products is 29 and the adjusted sum of squares is 31.28.

The experimental group has a sum of squares of 39.37 in the pretest and 54.07 in the posttest. Its sum of products is 20.43 and the adjusted sum of squares is 44.36. the regression coefficients are tested to be also not homogeneous. This is based on the F-ratio of 56.06, which is very above the critical value of F at .01 level of significance.

Despite this failure as an assumption for ANCOVA, the mean squares derived from the source of variation between groups of 12.72 and from within groups of 1.33, turned F-ratio to 9.58. Such computed value for F-ratio is greater than the critical value for F at .01 level of significance, so that the mean scores, obtained from the respective posttest results, are significantly different.

This implies that the process approach is more effective in the teaching of an organization in composition writing than the product approach. This is because much time was given to the students in the process approach class to finalize their work. In the same manner, they were given the chance to improve their work during the post-writing stage. On the contrary, the students in the product approach submitted their compositions after their first attempt for final evaluation. They did not have any chance of correcting the organization of their work.

3.4.2 Test of Homogeneity Showing Regression Coefficients and ANCOVA for the Pretest and Posttest of the Control and the Experimental Groups in Mechanics

Table 8: Difference in the mean scores between groups based on mechanis as writing element

Group	Sum of Squares pretest	posttest	Sum of products	Adjusted sum of squares
Control	12.97	6.17		5.39
Experimental	11.47	7.37		6.99
Total	24.44	13.54		12.38

F=56.11

Source of Variation

	Between Groups	Within Groups
Mean Square	0.014	0.217

F=0.65

The test of homogeneity of regression coefficients is similar to the rest of the elements in composition writing as shown in Table 3.3.2. The value of F ratio which is 56.11 means that the coefficients are significantly different. The control group has a sum of squares of 12.97 in the pretest and 6.17 in the posttest. Its sum of products is 3.17 and the adjusted sum of squares is 5.39. The experimental group has a sum of squares of 11.47 in the pretest and 7.37 in the posttest. Its sum of products is 2.07 and the adjusted sum of squares is 6.99. But as far as the mechanics in composition writing is concerned, the mean squares 5.39. The experimental has a sum of squares of 11.47 in the pretest and 7.37 in the posttest. Its sum of products is 2.07 and the adjusted sum of squares is 6.99. But as far as the mechanics are composition writing is concerned, the mean squares computed from the sources of variation between groups which is .014 and within groups which are .217 turned F ratio to 0.65. Since it is way below the critical value for F at 0.01 level of significance or even at 0.05, then the mean scores that were obtained from both posttest results are not significantly different. In this case, both approaches in teaching composition writing concerning mechanics are of the same effects. Similar to language use, the students in both approaches had enough exposure to lessons about mechanics. Likewise, the presentation of these lessons differed. The students in the product approach class had it before writing while the students in the process approach class had it after writing. Both groups were also given the chance to check their errors on spelling, punctuation, and capitalization before finally submitting their composition. Therefore, hypothesis 4 which states that there is no significant difference in the mean scores between the two groups based on the five elements in composition writing is partially rejected because the process approach came out to be better than the product approach in improving the quality of content, vocabulary, and organization. Nevertheless, no significant difference exists between the mean scores of the two groups in language use and mechanics. The result supports the findings that process approach is better than product approach because according to **[24]** process approach in writing is beneficial on the part of the students as this will allow them to be aware of their capabilities at the same time they will be able to find out strategies that are suited in their respective styles in learning. Conversely, this study proves that both approaches are effective in improving language use.

3.5 Regression Coefficient on the Pretest Results of the Control Group

Table 9: ***Regression : Pretest results of the control group***

Variables	Regression coefficient	T value	Significant T
GENDER	-2.29	-0.95	0.35
ETHNICITY	-0.014	-0.015	0.98
TYPE OF SCHOOL	2.297	1.592	0.12
Constant		11.580	
Multiple R= .3167			
R square –=0.10030			
Adjusted R SQUARE =-0.0035			
F = .96613		Significant F- O.42	

It can be noted that each of the independent variables is not linearly associated with the pretest results for the control group as shown in table 3.4. This is due to the significance of all the T-values, which are 0.35 for sex, 0.98 for ethnicity, and 0.12 for the type of school. Looking at the entire set of independent variables, the significance of the computed F which is 0.42, is very much greater than 0.01 or 0.05. This means that there is no linear relationship between the pretest results and the set of independent variables. This means that the scores of the students in the pretest for the control group can never be predicted based on gender, ethnicity, and type of school. In other words, the said set of independent variables does not influence the performance of the students in composition writing.

3.5.1 Regression Coefficient on the Posttest Results of the Control Groups

Table 10: Regression : Posttest results of the control group

Variables	Regression coefficient	T value	Significant T
GENDER	-1.683	-0.722	0.47
ETHNICITY	0.561	0.611	0.55
TYPE OF SCHOOL	2.099	2.073	0.05
Constant	68.66	18.748	
Multiple R= .37685			
R square –=0.14202			
Adjusted R SQUARE =-0.04302			
F = 1.43		Significant F- O.2554	

The regression model for the posttest results of the control group as shown in table 10 proves that not one of the independent variables has a significant linear relationship with the posttest results. This is because of the significance of each T value; .47 for gender. .55 for ethnicity and .05 for the type of school is greater than 0.01. Moreover, the entire set of independent variables is not linearly associated with the posttest results, which means that these variables: gender, ethnicity, and type of school, did not have any influence on the results of the posttest in composition writing in so far as the control group is concerned.

3.5.2 Regression Coeeficient on the Pretest Results of the Experimental Group

Table 11:Regression : Pretest results of the experimental group

Variables	Regression coefficient	T value	Significant T
GENDER	-1.15	-0.403	0.69
ETHNICITY	-0.635	-0.571	0.57
TYPE OF SCHOOL	0.8529	.499	0.62
Constant	71.958	15.977	
Multiple R= 0.17312			
R square –=0.02997			
Adjusted R SQUARE =-0.08196			
F = 0.26776		Significant F- O.8480	

In the same manner, the regression model for the pretest results of the experimental group in table 3.4.2 shows that each independent variable corresponds to a T value with a significance way below the acceptable level. These are 0.69. 0.57, and 0.62. taking the variables as one, the value of F = 0.26776 with a significant level of 0.8480, means that there is no relationship between the pretest results and the entire set of independent variables. Again, gender, ethnicity, and type of school have not, in any way, influenced the students' performance in composition writing.

3.5.3Regression Coefficient on the Posttest Results of the Experimental Group

Table 12:Regression : Posttest results of the experimental group

Variables	Regression coefficient	T value	Significant T
GENDER	-0.821633	-0.279	.78
ETHNICITY	-0.353956	-0.308	.76
TYPE OF SCHOOL	0.171902	0.097	.92
Constant			
Multiple R = .17636			
R square = -0.02884			
Adjusted R = -0.07881			
Significant F- O.9883			

Similar to the results reflected in the preceding tables, it is clearly shown in the regression model for the posttest results of the experimental group in Table 3.4.3 that not one of the independent variables turned out to be linearly associated with the posttest results as far as the experimental group is concerned. This is supported by T values for ethnicity, gender, and type of school, with the following significant levels: 0.76, 0.78 and 0.92, respectively. The entire set of independent variables is not linearly related to the posttest results. This is because the significance of F ratio = 0.557 is 0.9883 and this is much greater than .05. In this connection, any posttest result can never be predicted from the knowledge of the students' ethnicity, gender or type of school graduated from. This indicates also that these independent variables do not influence the students' performance in writing a composition. Thus, hypothesis 5 which states that gender, ethnicity, and type of school do not influence the writing skills of the students in composition writing is accepted. There is evidence to say that a male or a female; a *Zamboañgueo*, a *Tausug*, a *Maranao* or whatever ethnic

group the learner belongs; and a student of a private or a public school is not a significant issue to be considered when teaching composition writing. The teacher's strategies are raised to the best in teaching the elements necessary for a good output. The input must be delivered well by the teacher so the learners can give the best output.

4. CONCLUSION

There is enough evidence to conclude that the product and the process approaches can both be used in teaching composition writing. This has been proven by **[14]** that these two approaches are both useful. It could be either be the process approach or the product approach is productive and effective for the learners. In other words, these two approaches are interrelated and supplement one another. Furthermore, the result shows that the process approach is more effective than the product approach, particularly on content, organization, and vocabulary. This has been affirmed by **[24]** that the process approach in writing is beneficial on the part of the students as this will allow them to be aware of their capabilities at the same time they will be able to find out strategies that are suited in their respective styles in learning. Furthermore, according to **[12]** in this process, the significant role of the teachers serves only as facilitators without giving much attention to providing knowledge to students. Moreover, the performance of the students in composition writing can be influenced by other variables. Some students found writing naturally difficult because they have to think and to master grammar rules in any writing task. In addition, the expanded theory generated from this study is that since the variables gender, ethnicity and type of school did not influence the performance of the students in composition writing, other individual differences could have influenced their writing performance. As **[25]** has written, ' a theory of second language learning that does not provide a central place for individual differences among learners cannot be considered acceptable'. In this case, the selection of an approach in teaching writing may not be based on the variables of the present study but on other factors that may influence the teaching of writing effectively.

REFERENCES

[1] Defazio, J., Jones, J., Tennant, F., & Hook, S.A., Academic literacy: The importance and impact of writing across the curriculum – a case study. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*. **10**(2), 34-47 (2010)

[2] Agustiana, V., Combining product and process based-approaches to teaching writing discussion texts. *English Review*.**4**(2), 195-208 (2016)

[3] Hashemnezhad, H., & Hashemnezhad, N., A comparative study of the product, process, and post-process approaches in Iranian EFL students' writing skills, *Journal of Language Teaching and Research.* **3**(4),722-729 (2012)

[4] Fareed, M., Ashraf, A., & Bilal, M.,ESL learners' writing skills: problems, factors, and suggestions. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*. **4**(2): 83-94 (2016)

[5] Gen, G., A strategic Approach to Teaching English Writing. *CELEA Journal*, **28**(6), 110-116 (2005)

[6] Mehr, H.K.,The impact of product and process approach on Iranian EFL learners' writing ability and their attitudes toward writing skill. *International Journal of English Linguistics.***7**(2),158-166 (2017)

[7] Palpanadan, S., Salam, A.R., & Ismail, F., Comparative analysis of process versus product approach of teaching writing in Malaysian schools: review of literature. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*.**22**(6),789-795 (2014)

[8] Ghufron, A.,Process-genre approach, product approach, and students' self-esteem in teaching writing. *Indonesian EFL Journal: Journal of ELT, Linguistics, and Literature*.**2**(1),37-54 (2016)

[9] Agesta, S., & Cahyono, B.,Effect of process-genre approach on the Indonesian EFL writing achievement across personality. *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research*.**5**(3),39-48.

[10] Alodwan,T.A., & Ibnian,S.S., The effect of using the process approach to writing on developing university students' essay writing skills in EFL. *International Journal of Linguistics and Communication*. **2**(2),147-163 (2014)

[11] Rusinovci, X.,Teaching writing through process-genre based approach. *US-China Education Review A, David Publishing*.**5**(10),699-705 (2015)

.

[12]Badger,R.& White,G., A process genre approach to teaching writing.*ELT Journal*.**54**(2),153-160 (2000)

[13] Hyland, K.,Genre-based pedagogies: A social response to process. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, ***12***, 17-29 (2013)

[14] Hasan, K, & Akhand, M.M.,Approaches to writing in EFL/ESL context: balancing product and process in writing class at tertiary level. *Journal of NELTA*, **15**(1-2), 77-98 (2010)

[15]Creswell, J. W., *Research design, qualitative, quantitative & mixed methods approaches*(4th ed.). Los Angeles/London/New Delhi/Singapore/Washington D.C.: SAGE (2014)

[16] Johnson, B.,Toward a New Classification of Nonexperimental Quantitative Research. *Educational Research*. 3-13 (2000)

[17] Perez, A.L., & Alieto, E., "Change of "Tongue" from English to a local language: A correlation of Mother Tongue proficiency and Mathematics achievement". *The Asian ESP Journal*, **14**(7.2):136-150 (2018)

[18] Calderon, J., *Methods of research and thesis writing (2nd Ed.).* Mandaluyong City: National Bookstore (2006)

[19]Rillo, R., & Alieto, E., Indirectness Markers in Korean and Persian English Essays: Implications for Teaching Writing to EFL Learners. *English as an International Language*, **13**(2.2), 165-184 (2018)

[20] Levy Y., & Ellis T.,A guide for novice researchers on experimental and quasi-experimental studies in information systems research. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Information, Knowledge, and Management*. **6**, 151-156 (2011)

[21] Calmorin, L., & Calmorin, M., *Methods of Research and Thesis Writing*. Quezon City: Rex Printing Company (1995)

[22] Keppel, G., & Wickens, T. D., *Design and analysis: A researcher's handbook* (4th ed.).Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall (2003)

[23] Heaton, J.B., Writing English Language Tests. London and New York: Longman Group,Ltd.(1998)

[24] Dokchandra, D., The effects of process writing approach on performance of an overcrowded EFL writing class at a university in Thailand in The 1st Annual International Conference on Language and Literature. *KnE Social Sciences and Humanities*.191–206 (2018)

[25] Selinker, L., & Douglas, D., Wrestling with context in interlanguage theory. Applied Linguistics. **6**(2), 190-204 (1986)