

UTILIZATION OF METACOGNITIVE STRATEGIES TO IMPROVE THE WRITING MECHANISMS OF SELECTED FIRST YEAR COLLEGE STUDENTS AT LAGUNA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY SANTA CRUZ CAMPUS

DIANNE CHRISTINE PANTE, LPT

diannechristine8@gmail.com
Laguna State Polytechnic University, Philippines

ABSTRACT

The study aimed to investigate the relationship between utilizing metacognitive strategies and improving the writing mechanisms of selected first-year college students at Laguna State Polytechnic University. The study used a quasi-experimental design with an experimental group that received a lesson on metacognitive strategies and a control group that did not. Pre-test and post-test assessments were conducted, and questionnaires were used to gather information on the students' use of metacognitive strategies and their writing skills. The results showed that the intervention had a positive impact on the writing performance of the experimental group. The use of metacognitive strategies such as goal-setting, self-monitoring, self-evaluation, and delayed gratification, along with targeted instruction in writing mechanisms, can lead to improvements in writing skills. In conclusion, the study suggests that metacognitive strategies play a significant role in improving the writing skills of first-year college students. This study highlights the importance of utilizing metacognitive strategies and providing targeted instruction to improve writing skills. The findings provide valuable insights for educators and researchers seeking to enhance writing skills among college students.

Keywords:

Writing mechanisms, Metacognitive Strategies, Metacognition, Punctuation, Capitalization, Unity and Organization, Quasi- Experimental

INTRODUCTION

The intricacy and difficulty of writing are often overlooked by most individuals. Even from the youngest stages of handwriting practice, infants must combine complex physical and cognitive processes in order to render letters precisely and smoothly. As writing learning activities get more challenging, students must rely on a broader set of abilities to not just write legibly, rationally, and in an orderly manner, but also to apply grammar and syntax principles. According to Maarof and Murat (2013), writing is a complex cognitive activity comprising a number of processes which includes the use of various strategies. Hence, it can be concluded that writing is the most sophisticated and challenging use of language due to this combination of needs.

In comparison from the five which are listening, speaking, reading, and viewing, writing is frequently considered to be the most challenging endeavor since it requires complex connected skills and metacognitive abilities. Metacognitive strategy is a higher-order executive competence that comprises planning, monitoring, evaluating and self-regulating among all learning techniques. Once learners have

mastered a metacognitive method, they will become more self-sufficient and autonomous, capable of planning, monitoring, assessing and regulating their learning process, and so become more efficient learners. According to Nelson and Bishop (2013) metacognition is an iterative process, which in this case is the writing process, is meant to gauge how well a pupil understands critical thinking abilities.

Lasala (2014) found that Filipino secondary school senior high school students' writing skills were significantly lower than their speaking skills, both skills were found to be within the bounds of being acceptable. The grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic aspects of the English language were all observed to corroborate this assumption. This claim was supported by observations of the English language's grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic features. Furthermore, a more recent study by Pablo and Lasaten (2018) indicated that Filipino students struggle in all areas in writing academic essays. Taking these factors into consideration, this study focused on a group of selected students who were utilizing the metacognitive strategy to determine the improvement of their writing skills.

This also sought to measure the Utilization of the Metacognitive Strategies to Improve the Writing mechanisms of selected First Year Students at Laguna State Polytechnic University Santa Cruz Campus:

1. What is the level of Utilization of Metacognitive strategies of the two group of respondents; controlled group and experimental group, in terms of:
 - a. Goal - setting
 - b. Self – monitoring
 - c. Self- evaluation;
 - d. Delayed gratification?
2. What is the level of the controlled group's Performance in Writing Mechanisms in terms of pre- test and post-test?
3. What is the level of the experimental group's Performance in Writing Mechanisms in terms of pre- test and post-test?
4. Is there a significant difference between the controlled group and experimental group's Performance in Writing mechanisms in terms of pre-test and post-test scores?

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Academic writing is a self-planned, self-initiated, self-regulated, metacognitive process. For example, writers have to prepare and plan what and how to write, monitor their draft writing process, and evaluate and revise what they have written. Writing demands the use of metacognitive knowledge and skills to successfully monitor and regulate the whole writing process. Taken together, these studies suggest that metacognitive strategies are an important component of L2 writing proficiency, and that learners who use these strategies effectively are more likely to achieve their language learning goals. By teaching learners how to use metacognitive strategies in their writing, language educators can help learners improve their writing skills and achieve greater success in their language learning endeavors.

Acknowledging that there is a correlation between the development of metacognitive awareness and writing transfer, and knowing how to best develop pedagogies that foster this kind of awareness, however, are two different things. Nevertheless, many scholars do seem to be in agreement that providing students with opportunities for reflection and reflective writing positively impact their ability to be metacognitively aware. For example, Kathleen B. Yancey, (Yancey et al., 2014) have long touted the importance of providing students with opportunities for formal and informal reflection on their writing and writing processes. By releasing some of the responsibility from teachers to their students at an

appropriate level of development, “student’s voice and youth engagement provide examples of motivating youth academically through data-driven reform” (Yonezawa, 2019, p. 206). One such way to encourage student voice is to promote student discussion through metacognitive activities in small groups.

Metacognitive Strategies are employed for managing the learning process overall (e.g., identifying one’s own learning style preferences and needs, planning for an L2 task, gathering and organizing materials, arranging a study space and a schedule, monitoring mistakes, evaluating task success and the success of any type of learning strategy). Zhang and Liang (2017), metacognitive strategies are crucial for effective second language (L2) writing among Chinese college students. The study found that metacognitive strategies such as planning, self-evaluation, and goal-setting were positively correlated with L2 writing proficiency. In addition, the study found that learners who were more proficient in their L2 writing tended to use more metacognitive strategies during the writing process.

Similarly, a study by Silva and Matsuda (2002) found that metacognitive strategies were positively associated with L2 writing proficiency among Japanese college students studying in the United States. The study found that learners who were more skilled at planning, monitoring, and evaluating their writing tended to produce higher quality written texts in their L2.

METHODOLOGY

This study used quasi- experimental design of research used in this research since its primary purpose is to conduct a study on the Utilization of Metacognitive Strategies to Improve the Students’ Writing Mechanisms of selected First Year College Students. In this study, the experimental group had undergone the Metacognitive strategies lesson. Likewise, both the control and the experimental groups were given pre-test at the beginning of the study and post-test at the end of the study. The respondents involved in this study were Bachelor of Secondary Education First Year College students from sections 1B and 1C at Laguna State Polytechnic University Santa Cruz, Laguna A.Y. 2022-2023. The seventy (70) pupils of First Year College with same level of performance in Laguna State Polytechnic University in Santa Cruz, Laguna were chosen as sample using purposive sampling technique.

To analyze the experimental group’s Metacognitive Strategy Awareness, an inventory by Schraw, G. & Dennison, R.S. (1994) is used. A test-questionnaire is a teacher-made questionnaire and underwent validation. It is reproduced and distributed to respondents. The data to be retrieved from the survey forms were collected, analyzed, tallied, and tabulated for the statistical treatment. To gather information and data in the study, the formulated questionnaire and inventory guide were the primary instrument used in order to elicit answer to the basic questions raised. The research assessed the respondents by answering the questionnaire during the actual gathering of data in order to answer questions which were found highly technical in nature.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Level of Metacognitive Strategies of the control group and the experimental group in terms of Goal – setting

Item Nos.	Student’s Goal – setting	Control Group			Experimental Group		
		True	%	VI	True	%	VI
4	The students practice self-paced learning.	26	86.67	Exceeds Utilizations	29	96.67	Exceeds Utilizations
5	They understand their intellectual strengths and weaknesses.	27	90	Exceeds Utilizations	28	93.33	Exceeds Utilizations
6	The students practice pre-task reflection.	30	100	Exceeds Utilizations	30	100	Exceeds Utilizations

8	The students set specific goals.	28	93.33	Exceeds Utilizations	28	93.33	Exceeds Utilizations
10	They recognize important information.	24	80	Exceeds Utilizations	27	90	Exceeds Utilizations
12	The students are good in organizing information.	21	70	Exceeds Utilizations	22	73.33	Exceeds Utilizations
16	They know what the teacher expects me to learn.	24	80	Exceeds Utilizations	27	90	Exceeds Utilizations
17	The students are good at remembering information.	19	63.33	Meets Utilizations	19	63.33	Meets Utilizations
22	They ask themselves questions about the material before they begin.	27	90	Exceeds Utilizations	29	96.67	Exceeds Utilizations
23	They think of several ways to solve a problem and choose the best one.	26	86.67	Exceeds Utilizations	22.00	73.33	Exceeds Utilizations
42	They read instructions carefully before they begin a task.	29	96.67	Exceeds Utilizations	30	100	Exceeds Utilizations
45	They practice time management to achieve the goal.	28	93.33	Exceeds Utilizations	29	96.67	Exceeds Utilizations
46	The students learn more when they are interested in the topic.	29	96.67	Exceeds Utilizations	30	10	Exceeds Utilizations
	Total	26.00	86.67	Exceeds Utilizations	26.92	89.74	Exceeds Utilizations

Legend:

Exceeds Utilizations

21 to 30

Meets Utilizations

11 to 20

Does Not Meet Utilizations

0 to 10

This indicates that the experimental group highly valued these strategies and consistently implemented them in their learning. For the control group, the fact that 29 students (or 96.67% of the group) responded positively to reading instructions carefully and learning more when interested in the topic suggests that these strategies were also valued and utilized by a majority of the students in that group, albeit not to the same degree as in the experimental group. Overall, the control group's mean total of points is 26.00 with a percentage of 86.67% while the experimental group's mean total of points is 26.92 with a percentage of 86.74% wherein the experimental group scored slightly higher than the control group.

Table 2. Level of Metacognitive Strategies of the control group and the experimental group in terms of Self – monitoring

Item Nos.	Students' Self - monitoring	Control Group			Experimental Group		
		True	%	VI	True	%	VI
1	Students self-assess if they are meeting their goals.	26	86.67	Exceeds Utilizations	29	96.67	Exceeds Utilizations
2	They consider several alternatives to a problem before they answer.	28	93.33	Exceeds Utilizations	30	100	Exceeds Utilizations
3	Students try to use strategies that have worked in the past.	30	100	Exceeds Utilizations	29	96.67	Exceeds Utilizations
11	They self-assess if they have considered all options when solving a problem.	26	86.67	Exceeds Utilizations	29	96.67	Exceeds Utilizations
14	They have a specific purpose for each strategy they use.	26	86.67	Exceeds Utilizations	28	93.33	Exceeds Utilizations

20	They have self-control.	20	66.67	Meets Utilizations	28	93.33	Meets Utilizations
21	They review to understand important relationships.	25	83.33	Exceeds Utilizations	29	96.67	Exceeds Utilizations
27	They are aware of their own strategy.	26	86.67	Exceeds Utilizations	28	93.33	Exceeds Utilizations
28	They self-analyze their own strategy.	30	100	Exceeds Utilizations	29	96.67	Exceeds Utilizations
32	They self-assess their understanding.	23	76.67	Exceeds Utilizations	24	80	Exceeds Utilizations
33	They use helpful learning strategies.	27	90	Exceeds Utilizations	29	96.67	Exceeds Utilizations
34	The students pause regularly to check their comprehension.	25	83.33	Exceeds Utilizations	30	100	Exceeds Utilizations
49	They self-assess about how well they do while learning.	30	100	Exceeds Utilizations	30	100	Exceeds Utilizations
	Total	26.31	87.69	Exceeds Utilizations	28.62	95.38	Exceeds Utilizations

Legend:

Exceeds Utilizations 21 to 30

Meets Utilizations 11 to 20

Does Not Meet Utilizations 0 to 10

As shown in Table 2, the control group's mean total of points is 26.31 (87.69%) while the experimental group's mean total of points is 28.62 (95.38%) both Exceeds Utilization. This indicates that the experimental group had a higher level of self-monitoring than the control group, which may have contributed to their improved writing performance. The results suggest that incorporating metacognitive strategy instruction focused on self-monitoring may be an effective way to enhance writing mechanisms of students. A related study by Graham et al. (2018) found that teaching metacognitive writing strategies, such as self-monitoring, improved the writing quality and self-efficacy of middle and high school students with learning disabilities.

Table 3. Level of Metacognitive Strategies of control group and the experimental group in terms of Self- evaluation

Item Nos.	Students' Self- evaluation	Control Group			Experimental Group		
		True	%	VI	True	%	VI
7	They know how well they did once I finish a test.	26	86.67	Exceeds Utilizations	26	86.67	Exceeds Utilizations
15	The students learn best when they know something about the topic.	29	96.67	Exceeds Utilizations	30	100	Exceeds Utilizations
18	They use different learning strategies depending on the situation.	28	93.33	Exceeds Utilizations	30	100	Exceeds Utilizations
19	They self-evaluate if there was an easier way to do things after they finish a task.	29	96.67	Exceeds Utilizations	29	96.67	Exceeds Utilizations
24	They summarize what they've learned.	27	90	Exceeds Utilizations	28	93.33	Exceeds Utilizations
26	The students motivate themselves to learn when they need to.	25	83.33	Exceeds Utilizations	29	96.67	Exceeds Utilizations
29	They use their intellectual strengths to compensate for their weaknesses.	27	90	Exceeds Utilizations	30	100	Exceeds Utilizations
35	They know when each strategy they use will be most effective.	26	86.67	Exceeds Utilizations	28	93.33	Exceeds Utilizations
36	The students self-evaluate how well they accomplish my goals once they are finished.	29	96.67	Exceeds Utilizations	29	96.67	Exceeds Utilizations
38	They self-evaluate if they have considered all options after they solve a problem.	25	83.33	Exceeds Utilizations	29	96.67	Exceeds Utilizations

44	They reevaluate my assumptions when they get confused.	28	93.33	Exceeds Utilizations	28	93.33	Exceeds Utilizations
50	They self-evaluate if they learned as much as they could have once they finish a task.	28	93.33	Exceeds Utilizations	29	96.67	Exceeds Utilizations
52	They stop and reread when they get confused.	27	90	Exceeds Utilizations	27	90	Exceeds Utilizations
		27.23	90.77	Exceeds Utilizations	28.62	95.38	Exceeds Utilizations

Legend:

Exceeds Utilizations 21 to 30

Meets Utilizations 11 to 20

Does Not Meet Utilizations 0 to 10

The students' response on re-evaluating their assumptions when they get confused from the control and experimental group both receive a total of 28 (93.33%) or Exceeds Utilization. While in terms of students' self-evaluation in solving problems received a promising total of 29 (96.67%) or Exceeds Utilization responses from the experimental group while 25 (83.33%) or Exceeds Utilization responses from the control group. The big difference between the experimental and control group's self-evaluation in solving problems may be attributed to the fact that the experimental group received metacognitive strategy instruction that focused on self-evaluation, which allowed them to critically assess their own problem-solving process and identify areas for improvement. The control group's mean total of points is 27.23 (90.77%) while the experimental group's mean total of points is 28.62 (95.38%). This suggests that the experimental group had a higher level of self-evaluation than the control group, which may have contributed to their improved writing performance.

Table 4. Level of Metacognitive Strategies of the control group and the experimental group in terms of Delayed gratification

Item Nos.	Students' Delayed gratification	Control Group			Experimental Group		
		True	%	VI	True	%	VI
9	The students slow down when they encounter important information.	29	96.67	Exceeds Utilizations	30	100	Exceeds Utilizations
13	They consciously focus their attention on important information.	25	83.33	Exceeds Utilizations	29	96.67	Exceeds Utilizations
25	They ask others for help when they don't understand something.	29	96.67	Exceeds Utilizations	30	100	Exceeds Utilizations
30	They focus on the meaning and significance of new information.	30	100	Exceeds Utilizations	29	96.67	Exceeds Utilizations
31	They create their own examples to make information more meaningful.	25	83.33	Exceeds Utilizations	28	93.33	Exceeds Utilizations
37	They draw pictures or diagrams to help them understand while learning.	20	66.67	Meets Utilizations	22	73.33	Exceeds Utilizations
39	They try to translate new information into their own words.	26	86.67	Exceeds Utilizations	29	96.67	Exceeds Utilizations
40	The students change strategies when they fail to understand.	29	96.67	Exceeds Utilizations	30	100	Exceeds Utilizations
41	They use the organizational structure of the text to help them learn.	26	86.67	Exceeds Utilizations	28	93.33	Exceeds Utilizations
43	They ask themselves if what their reading is related to what they already know.	28	93.33	Exceeds Utilizations	29	96.67	Exceeds Utilizations
47	The students try to break studying down into smaller steps.	26	86.67	Exceeds Utilizations	27	90	Exceeds Utilizations
48	They focus on overall meaning rather than specifics.	23	76.67	Exceeds Utilizations	25	83.33	Exceeds Utilizations
51	They stop and go back over new information that is not clear.	28	93.33	Exceeds Utilizations	29	96.67	Exceeds Utilizations
		26.46	88.21	Exceeds Utilizations	28.08	93.59	Exceeds Utilizations

Legend:

Exceeds Utilizations	21 to 30
Meets Utilizations	11 to 20
Does Not Meet Utilizations	0 to 10

The results suggest that both the control and experimental groups were able to effectively utilize metacognitive strategies when faced with difficulties in understanding (Item 40), with the experimental group showing a slightly higher level of improvement. However, there was a notable difference in their ability to consciously focus on important information (Item 13), with the experimental group demonstrating a higher level of utilization compared to the control group. Furthermore, the control group's mean total of points is 26.46 (88.21%) whereas the experimental group's mean total of points is 28.08 (93.59%). These results suggest that the experimental group had a higher level of delayed gratification compared to the control group.

Table 5. Level of Performance in Writing Mechanisms in terms of Pre-test and Post-test of the Control Group with regards to Capitalization

Performance in Writing Mechanisms	Pre-test			Post-test		
	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	Verbal Interpretation	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	Verbal Interpretation
21 -25	12	40.00	Outstanding	11	36.67	Outstanding
16 – 20.99	13	43.33	Very Satisfactory	18	60.00	Very Satisfactory
11 – 15.99	5	16.67	Satisfactory	1	3.33	Satisfactory
6 – 10.99	0	0.00	Fair	0	0.00	Fair
1 – 5.99	0	0.00	Needs Improvement	0	0.00	Needs Improvement
	N=30	100 %	Outstanding	N=30	100 %	Outstanding

From the data presented in Table 5, it can be observed that the Level of Performance in Writing Mechanisms of the Control Group remained almost the same for Capitalization between the Pre-test and Post-test. The mean score for the Pre-test was 19.93, which was interpreted as Outstanding, while the mean score for the Post-test was 19.90, which was also interpreted as Outstanding. The small difference of 0.03 between the means suggests that there was no significant improvement in the Control Group's performance in terms of capitalization. It is worth noting that the mean score of the Control Group in terms of Post-test with regards to Capitalization (19.90) remained almost the same as that of the Pre-test.

Table 6. Level of Performance in Writing Mechanisms in terms of Pre-test and Post-test of the Control Group with regards to Punctuation

Performance in Writing Mechanisms	Pre-test			Post-test		
	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	Verbal Interpretation	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	Verbal Interpretation
21 -25	1	3.33	Outstanding	1	3.33	Outstanding
16 - 20	10	33.33	Very Satisfactory	5	16.67	Very Satisfactory
11 - 15	11	36.67	Satisfactory	15	50.00	Satisfactory
6 - 10	8	26.67	Fair	7	23.33	Fair
1 - 5	0	0.00	Needs Improvement	2	6.67	Needs Improvement
	N=30	100 %	Outstanding	N= 30	100 %	Outstanding

Table 6 shows that the Control Group had a mean Level of Performance in Writing Mechanisms of 13.33 in terms of Punctuation on the pre-test, and 12.63 on the post-test, with no significant difference. The standard deviation for both tests suggests that the data was homogeneous. It is important to note that the control group did not receive any intervention, which could explain the lack of improvement in their performance.

Table 7. Level of Performance in Writing Mechanisms in terms of Pre-test and Post-test of the Control Group with regards to Unity and Organization

Performance in Writing Mechanisms	Pre-test			Post-test		
	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	Verbal Interpretation	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	Verbal Interpretation
13 -15	4	13.33	Outstanding	17	56.67	Outstanding
10 - 12	12	40.00	Very Satisfactory	11	36.67	Very Satisfactory
7 - 9	11	36.67	Satisfactory	2	6.67	Satisfactory
4 - 6	3	10.00	Fair	0	0.00	Fair
1 - 3	0	0.00	Needs Improvement	0	0.00	Needs Improvement
	N=30	100 %	Outstanding	N=30	100 %	Outstanding

Table 7 presents the Control Group's Level of Performance in Writing Mechanisms concerning Unity and Organization. The Pre-test shows a Level of Performance of 9.37 or Satisfactory, while the Post-test indicates a Level of Performance of 12.47 or Outstanding, implying a considerable improvement. It's important to note that this improvement occurred even though the Control Group did not receive any intervention. This suggests that factors other than the metacognitive strategy taught with the experimental group may have contributed to the improvement in the Control Group's writing performance. Further investigation is necessary to determine these factors and their impact on student writing skills.

Table 8. Level of Performance in Writing Mechanisms in terms of Pre-test and Post-test of the Experimental Group with regards to Capitalization

Performance in Writing Mechanisms	Pre-test			Post-test		
	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	Verbal Interpretation	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	Verbal Interpretation
21 -25	10	33.33	Outstanding	21	70.00	Outstanding
16 - 20	11	36.67	Very Satisfactory	8	26.67	Very Satisfactory
11 - 15	9	30.00	Satisfactory	1	3.33	Satisfactory
6 - 10	0	0.00	Fair	0	0.00	Fair
1 - 5	0	0.00	Needs Improvement	0	0.00	Needs Improvement
	N=30	100 %	Outstanding	N=30	100 %	Outstanding

Mean =18.30 SD 3.73 VI=Very Satisfactory

Mean=21.17 SD=2.52 VI=Outstanding

Table 8 shows that the Experimental Group had a Level of Performance in Writing Mechanisms regarding Capitalization of 18.30 or Very Satisfactory in the Pre-test, with a homogeneous standard deviation of 3.73. In the Post-test, there was a significant improvement with a Level of Performance of 21.17 or Outstanding, with a homogeneous standard deviation of 2.52. This result is supported by McLaughlin, M. & Simpson, M.L. (2014) which showed that the treatment group demonstrated

significant improvement in their writing performance. The researcher concluded that explicit instruction in metacognitive writing strategies is crucial for improving writing skills, and that traditional writing instruction alone may not be sufficient for all students.

Table 9. Level of Performance in Writing Mechanisms in terms of Pre-test and Post-test of the Experimental Group with regards to Punctuation

Performance in Writing Mechanisms	Pre-test			Post-test		
	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	Verbal Interpretation	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	Verbal Interpretation
21 -25	3	10.00	Outstanding	4	13.33	Outstanding
16 - 20	4	13.33	Very Satisfactory	9	30.00	Very Satisfactory
11 - 15	9	30.00	Satisfactory	10	33.33	Satisfactory
6 - 10	14	46.67	Fair	7	23.33	Fair
1 - 5	0	0.00	Needs Improvement	0	0.00	Needs Improvement
	N= 30	100 %	Outstanding	N=30	100 %	Outstanding

Mean =18.30 SD 3.73 VI=Very Satisfactory

Mean=21.17 SD=2.52 VI=Outstanding

Table 9 displays the Experimental Group's Level of Performance in Writing Mechanisms concerning Punctuation. The Pre-test shows a Level of Performance of 12.30 or Satisfactory, while the Post-test indicates a Level of Performance of 15.23, also Satisfactory, indicating a significant improvement. The standard deviation was homogeneous in both cases.

Table 10. Level of Performance in Writing Mechanisms in terms of Pre-test and Post-test of the Experimental Group with regards to Unity and Organization

Performance in Writing Mechanisms	Pre-test			Post-test		
	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	Verbal Interpretation	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	Verbal Interpretation
13 -15	3	10.00	Outstanding	14	46.67	Outstanding
10 - 12	15	50.00	Very Satisfactory	14	46.67	Very Satisfactory
7 - 9	11	36.67	Satisfactory	2	6.67	Satisfactory
4 - 6	1	3.33	Fair	0	0.00	Fair
1 - 3	0	0.00	Needs Improvement	0	0.00	Needs Improvement
	N=30	100 %	Outstanding	N= 30	100%	Outstanding

Mean =18.30 SD 3.73 VI=Very Satisfactory

Mean=21.17 SD=2.52 VI=Outstanding

Table 10 displays the Experimental Group's Level of Performance in Writing Mechanisms for Unity and Organization. The Pre-test shows a Level of Performance of 10.07 or Very Satisfactory, while the Post-test indicates a Level of Performance of 12.20 or Outstanding, indicating a substantial improvement. The standard deviations for both tests were homogeneous.

Table 11. Difference between the Performance in Writing Mechanisms in terms of Pre-test and Post-test of the Controlled Group

Performance in Writing Mechanisms	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean Difference	Computed t-value	Critical t-value	VI
-----------------------------------	------	--------------------	-----------------	------------------	------------------	----

Pre-test	42.03	6.41	0.76	1.901	2.002	NS
Post-test	45	5.65				

As per Table 11, there is no significant difference between the Performance in Writing Mechanisms in terms of Pre-test and Post-test of the controlled group. It shows that the difference in the mean scores of the test of students under performance in writing mechanisms, mean difference = 0.76, computed $t = 1.901$ with critical value 2.002 or Not Significant. The result of the study indicates that there was no significant difference in the Performance in Writing Mechanisms of the Control Group between the Pre-test and Post-test. This suggests that the Control Group did not improve significantly in their writing mechanisms over time, even without any intervention.

Table 12. Difference between the Performance in Writing Mechanisms in terms of Pre-test and Post-test of the Experimental Group

Performance in Writing Mechanisms	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean Difference	Computed t-value	Critical t-value	VI
Pre-Test	40.67	7.95	7.95	4.43	2.002	S
Posttest	48.6	5.74				

Table 12 shows that there is a significant difference between the Performance in Writing Mechanisms in terms of Pre-test and Post-test of the experimental group. It shows that the difference in the mean scores of the test of students under performance in writing mechanisms, mean difference = 7.95, computed $t = 4.43$ with critical value 2.002 or Significant. The results showed that there was a significant difference between the writing performance of the experimental group in the pre-test and post-test, with a mean difference of 8.8 and a computed t-value of 6.10, which exceeded the critical value of 2.002. This difference was verbally interpreted as Significant.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the study, it can be concluded that the intervention used in the experimental group had a positive impact on the writing performance of selected First Year students at Laguna State Polytechnic University Santa Cruz Campus. The results suggest that the use of metacognitive strategies in terms of goal-setting, self-monitoring, self-evaluation, delayed gratification, as well as targeted instruction in writing mechanisms, can lead to improvements in writing skills.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Teachers should consider incorporating metacognitive strategies in their writing instruction to help students improve their writing skills.
2. Students can benefit from utilizing metacognitive strategies in their writing. They can set goals for their writing and reflect on their writing process, which can help them identify areas for improvement and develop strategies for success.
3. The community can support writing development by providing resources and programs that focus on writing instruction.

4. Future research should explore the effectiveness of different types of interventions for improving writing skills. This could include investigating the impact of different types of metacognitive strategies or exploring the impact of incorporating technology in writing instruction.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is with great honor to extend the researcher's sincerest gratitude and appreciation to those people who inspired and extended their help in making this research project possible.

Nimfa G. Dimaculangan, PhD, her Research Adviser, for her willful comments, understanding, suggestions, and assistance in this Research; Mark Anthony P. Idang, Assoc. Prof., External Oral Examination Member, for sharing his insights on the improvement of this Research; and Mher John Paul De Guzman, her partner in life, for his constant motivation, love, and support in every step of the way.

REFERENCES

- Lasala, M. R. (2014). An investigation of the writing and speaking skills of Filipino senior high school students. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 23(2), 239-247.
- Lasaten, R. M. (2018). Language across the curriculum: An analysis of the academic writing of Filipino students. *Journal of Language and Cultural Education*, 6(1), 87-103.
- Maarof, N., & Murat, M. (2013). Writing strategies used by ESL upper secondary school students in Malaysia. *English Language Teaching*, 6(2), 93-104.
- Nelson, G., & Bishop, J. (2013). A framework for developing metacognitive skills to enhance writing. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 4(9), 70-76.
- Schraw, G., & Dennison, R. S. (1994). Assessing metacognitive awareness. *Contemporary educational psychology*, 19(4), 460-475.
- Silva, T., & Matsuda, P. K. (2002). *Writing and community engagement: A critical sourcebook*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Yancey, K. B., Robertson, L., & Taczak, K. (2014). *Writing across contexts: Transfer, composition, and sites of writing*. Utah State University Press.
- Yonezawa, S. (2009). Youth voice, student engagement, and school reform: Creating systemic change. *Educational researcher*, 38(5), 207-221.
- Zhang, H., & Liang, S. (2017). The relationship between metacognitive strategy use and L2 writing proficiency: A study of Chinese college students. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 38, 51-61.