International Journal of Social Science and Human Research

ISSN (print): 2644-0679, ISSN (online): 2644-0695

Volume 09 Issue 05 May 2026

DOI: 10.47191/ijsshr/v9-i5-76, Impact factor- 8.361

Page No: 4100-4107

Analysis of Language Errors in Indonesian Expository Writing Using the Guided Writing Method KWL Model

Merlyn Titahena[1], Carolina Sasabone[1], Viona Sapulette[1], Areni Yulitawati Supriyono[1]

[1]Universitas Pattimura

ABSTRACT: This study aims to analyze linguistic errors in Indonesian expository essays written by students of the Guidance and Counselling Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Pattimura University, following the implementation of the KWL (Know–Want–Learned) guided writing model. The study was motivated by students' limited ability to produce expository texts that conform to Indonesian linguistic and academic writing conventions. A qualitative descriptive approach was employed through textual analysis of expository essays written by 20 university students participating in KWL-based writing instruction. Data were collected through writing tests, classroom observations, worksheets, interviews, and field notes. The data were analyzed using Corder's error analysis framework, which includes error identification, classification, explanation, and interpretation. The findings revealed four major categories of language errors: syntactic errors (46.4%), morphological errors (31.1%), lexical errors (14.7%), and phonological errors (7.1%). Syntactic errors emerged as the most dominant category, indicating that students still experienced substantial difficulties in constructing grammatically accurate and coherent sentences. The contributing factors included limited mastery of Indonesian grammatical rules, inadequate academic writing competence, low reading and writing habits, restricted vocabulary, and writing anxiety. The study also found that the KWL model contributed positively to students' ability to organize ideas, structure expository content systematically, and engage actively in the writing process through planning and reflective learning stages. However, the model did not significantly reduce grammatical inaccuracies, particularly in syntax and morphology. The study concludes that guided writing instruction using the KWL model should be integrated with explicit grammar instruction and corrective feedback to improve students' linguistic accuracy and overall academic writing quality. These findings provide pedagogical implications for Indonesian language instruction in higher education, particularly in strengthening students' expository writing competence through the integration of cognitive writing strategies and language-focused instruction.

KEYWORDS: Expository Compositions; Linguistic Error Analysis; KWL Method.

I. INTRODUCTION

Writing competence has become one of the most crucial academic skills in the twenty-first century because it enables learners to communicate ideas, construct arguments, and participate in global knowledge production. Across higher education systems worldwide, academic writing is increasingly recognized as a core indicator of students' literacy, critical thinking, and professional readiness (Graham & Perin, 2007; Hyland, 2019). Universities are expected to produce graduates capable of expressing ideas systematically, analytically, and scientifically through written communication. However, despite the growing importance of academic literacy, studies conducted in various countries continue to report that university students experience substantial difficulties in producing coherent and grammatically accurate academic texts (Fareed et al., 2016; Klimova, 2013). Problems commonly occur in idea organization, sentence construction, vocabulary usage, coherence, and grammatical accuracy, particularly in expository and argumentative writing.

Globally, writing difficulties have become a significant concern in language education because academic writing requires not only linguistic competence but also cognitive and metacognitive abilities. Hyland (2003) emphasized that writing is a socially situated process involving discourse awareness, rhetorical competence, and language control. Similarly, Graham and Harris (2018) argued that effective writing involves planning, drafting, revising, and reflecting processes that demand high levels of cognitive engagement. Nevertheless, many university students still struggle to integrate these components effectively, resulting in low-quality academic texts characterized by grammatical inconsistencies and weak organization. Research conducted in Asia, Africa, and other developing educational contexts also demonstrates that students frequently encounter syntactic and

morphological difficulties due to limited exposure to academic writing conventions and inadequate writing instruction (Ahmed, 2010; Fareed et al., 2016).

In Indonesia, the issue of academic writing competence remains a persistent challenge at various educational levels, including higher education. Indonesian university students often experience difficulties in organizing ideas, developing coherent paragraphs, and applying standard Indonesian grammar correctly in academic writing tasks (Rahman, 2015). Studies on Indonesian language learning consistently report that students' writing products contain substantial errors in syntax, morphology, diction, and spelling conventions (Darmayani et al., 2018; Sejati et al., 2019). These linguistic weaknesses are frequently associated with limited reading culture, low writing practice intensity, and instructional approaches that emphasize theoretical knowledge more than writing performance and revision processes.

The problem becomes even more complex in Eastern Indonesia, where disparities in educational access, literacy development, and language exposure remain significant compared to western regions of Indonesia. Several studies indicate that students in Eastern Indonesian universities often face additional challenges related to limited academic literacy resources, sociolinguistic diversity, and insufficient exposure to formal Indonesian language use in academic contexts (Marcellino, 2008; Musthafa, 2015). In Maluku and surrounding regions, students commonly use local languages or informal Indonesian varieties in daily communication, which may influence their mastery of standard Indonesian grammar and academic writing conventions. Initial observations conducted in the Guidance and Counselling Study Program at Pattimura University also revealed that many students experienced difficulties in producing effective expository essays. Their writing frequently contained sentence structure errors, inaccurate affixation, inappropriate word choices, and incoherent paragraph organization. These conditions indicate that students still require intensive pedagogical support to improve both linguistic competence and writing organization.

Among various forms of academic writing, expository writing plays a central role in higher education because it requires students to explain, analyze, and present information logically and objectively. Expository writing reflects students' ability to organize ideas systematically while simultaneously applying grammatical and rhetorical conventions appropriately (Hyland, 2003). According to Graham and Perin (2007), effective expository writing requires mastery of content development, organization, sentence structure, vocabulary, and language conventions. Consequently, weaknesses in grammatical competence directly affect students' ability to communicate ideas effectively in academic contexts.

To improve students' writing competence, researchers and educators have proposed various instructional models emphasizing active learning and cognitive engagement. One of the most widely discussed approaches is the KWL (Know–Want–Learned) model introduced by Ogle (1986). The KWL strategy encourages learners to activate prior knowledge, identify learning objectives, and reflect on acquired understanding through structured learning stages. Previous studies have shown that KWL contributes positively to reading comprehension, critical thinking, and information organization because it facilitates meaningful learning and metacognitive awareness (Carr & Ogle, 1987; Hasanah, 2020). In writing instruction, KWL has also been reported to improve students' ability to generate ideas, organize paragraphs, and maintain thematic coherence (Sari & Purwanto, 2018).

A systematic review of previous international studies demonstrates that writing instruction research has predominantly focused on cognitive writing strategies, collaborative learning, genre-based pedagogy, and process writing approaches. For example, Graham and Harris (2018), Hyland (2019), and Fareed et al. (2016) highlighted the importance of strategy-based writing instruction in improving students' writing performance. Similarly, Klimova (2013) emphasized that guided writing activities support students' motivation and engagement during academic writing tasks. Other studies have explored error analysis in students' writing and found that syntactic and morphological errors remain dominant across different educational contexts (Ahmed, 2010; Watcharapunyawong & Usaha, 2013).

Research specifically examining KWL has largely concentrated on reading comprehension and content understanding rather than linguistic accuracy in writing. Ogle (1986) originally designed KWL as a reading comprehension strategy to activate learners' background knowledge. Subsequent studies by Carr and Ogle (1987), Hassan (2017), and Yusuf et al. (2020) reported that KWL effectively improves comprehension, classroom participation, and cognitive engagement. In writing contexts, studies by Sari and Purwanto (2018), Yuliana and Mulyanto (2021), and Alqahtani (2020) found that KWL supports idea organization and writing fluency. However, these studies mainly focused on cognitive and organizational aspects of writing rather than detailed linguistic accuracy.

Furthermore, previous studies on Indonesian language errors generally focused on descriptive identification of grammatical mistakes without integrating pedagogical interventions systematically. Darmayani et al. (2018), Sejati et al. (2019), and Ulviani (2025) identified dominant errors in syntax, morphology, and diction among Indonesian language learners, but these studies did not investigate how instructional models could reduce such errors. Similarly, Kristiantari (2010) and Sudarma (2018) emphasized grammar instruction and text organization in expository writing, yet they did not incorporate reflective cognitive frameworks such as KWL into writing instruction.

Based on the synthesis of previous studies, several research gaps can be identified. First, most international studies on KWL focus on reading comprehension and cognitive engagement rather than linguistic error reduction in academic writing. Second, studies on Indonesian expository writing errors tend to emphasize descriptive classification of errors without examining the role of

specific instructional strategies in minimizing those errors. Third, there remains limited empirical research investigating the implementation of KWL in Indonesian higher education contexts, particularly in Eastern Indonesia, where sociolinguistic and literacy conditions differ significantly from other regions. Fourth, very few studies integrate guided writing pedagogy with systematic linguistic error analysis encompassing phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexical dimensions simultaneously.

Therefore, this study seeks to fill these gaps by investigating Indonesian language errors in students' expository writing after the implementation of the KWL guided writing model. Unlike previous studies, this research combines cognitive writing pedagogy with linguistic error analysis to evaluate both organizational and grammatical dimensions of students' writing. The study specifically examines phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexical errors while also exploring how the KWL model contributes to students' writing development in a higher education context in Eastern Indonesia.

This study aims to identify the types of Indonesian language errors committed by university students in expository writing after the implementation of the KWL model, determine the dominant forms of errors, analyze the factors contributing to those errors, and evaluate the pedagogical effectiveness of the KWL strategy in supporting students' academic writing competence. The findings are expected to contribute theoretically to writing pedagogy and practically to the improvement of Indonesian language instruction in higher education contexts.

II. METHODS

This study employed a qualitative approach using a descriptive research method to investigate the forms and causes of Indonesian language errors in students' expository writing after the implementation of the KWL (Know–Want–Learned) guided writing model. Qualitative descriptive research is appropriate for examining language phenomena in their natural context and for providing detailed interpretations of linguistic errors produced by learners (Creswell, 2014). The study focused on identifying, classifying, and interpreting language errors found in students' written texts to obtain a comprehensive understanding of their writing competence.

The participants of this study consisted of 20 students enrolled in the Guidance and Counselling Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Pattimura University, during the 2024/2025 academic year. The participants were selected purposively because they were actively taking Indonesian language courses that required expository writing activities. Of the total participants, 1 student was male and 19 students were female. Most students came from lower-middle socioeconomic backgrounds, with parents predominantly working as fishermen and having educational backgrounds at the senior high school level. These demographic conditions were considered relevant because socioeconomic and educational factors may influence students' literacy exposure and writing development.

The research design applied in this study was Classroom Action Research (CAR) adapted from the spiral model proposed by Kemmis and McTaggart (1988). The implementation was conducted in two cycles, and each cycle consisted of four stages: planning, action, observation, and reflection. In the planning stage, the researchers prepared instructional materials, lesson plans, and learning activities based on the KWL model for expository writing instruction. During the action stage, students participated in guided writing activities using KWL worksheets consisting of three components: identifying prior knowledge (Know), determining learning objectives (Want), and reflecting on acquired knowledge (Learned). Students were guided to organize ideas systematically before composing expository essays.

The observation stage was conducted simultaneously during the instructional process to record students' participation, writing behaviors, classroom interactions, and difficulties encountered during writing activities. Observational data were documented using observation sheets and field notes. Subsequently, the reflection stage was carried out after each cycle to evaluate the effectiveness of the instructional implementation, identify students' progress and weaknesses, and determine necessary improvements for the following cycle.

Data collection techniques in this study included several instruments to ensure data richness and credibility. First, students' expository essays were collected as the primary data source for language error analysis. Second, classroom observations were conducted to examine students' engagement and responses toward the KWL learning activities. Third, semi-structured interviews were administered to explore students' perceptions, difficulties, and experiences during the guided writing process. Fourth, field notes were used to document contextual classroom situations and instructional reflections throughout the research process.

The collected data were analyzed using the language error analysis framework proposed by Corder (1967) and further elaborated by Ellis (2009). The analysis process involved several stages, namely error identification, error classification, error explanation, and error interpretation. Language errors were categorized into four linguistic levels: phonological errors, morphological errors, syntactic errors, and lexical errors. Each identified error was analyzed to determine its frequency, dominant patterns, and possible causes. The analysis also aimed to evaluate the extent to which the KWL model contributed to students' ability to organize ideas and reduce language errors in expository writing.

To ensure the validity and trustworthiness of the findings, the study applied triangulation techniques by comparing data obtained from writing tests, observations, interviews, and field notes. Data triangulation was employed to strengthen the consistency and accuracy of the interpretations regarding students' language errors and learning experiences. Through this

methodological approach, the study sought to provide a comprehensive description of students' linguistic difficulties and the pedagogical implications of implementing the KWL guided writing model in Indonesian language learning at the university level.

III. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

This study generated data concerning the types of Indonesian language errors found in students' expository essays after the implementation of the KWL (Know–Want–Learned) guided writing model. The data were obtained from the analysis of expository texts written by 20 students of the Guidance and Counselling Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Pattimura University. The analysis identified four categories of linguistic errors, namely phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexical errors. The distribution of errors is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of Language Errors by Category

Type of Error	Total Errors	Percentage (%)
Phonology	13	7.1%
Morphology	57	31.1%
Syntax	85	46.4%
Lexical	27	14.7%
Total	**182**	**100%**

Based on Table 1, the total number of language errors identified in students' expository essays was 182. Among the four categories, syntactic errors were the most dominant, accounting for 85 errors or 46.4% of the total errors. This finding indicates that students still experience substantial difficulties in constructing grammatically acceptable and logically organized sentences. The errors primarily involved incorrect sentence patterns, ineffective sentence structures, inappropriate clause combinations, and confusion in the arrangement of subject–predicate–object–complement (SPOK) structures. According to Sneddon (2003), mastery of sentence structure is fundamental in Indonesian academic writing because sentence organization directly influences clarity, coherence, and meaning construction. The high frequency of syntactic errors suggests that students have not fully mastered grammatical rules required for formal expository writing.

Morphological errors constituted the second highest category, with 57 occurrences or 31.1% of the total errors. These errors mainly involved incorrect affixation, misuse of word formation processes, inconsistencies in active and passive constructions, and inappropriate derivational forms. Morphological competence is essential in Indonesian because affixation determines grammatical meaning and sentence function. The findings indicate that students often failed to apply Indonesian morphological rules accurately, resulting in ungrammatical expressions and ambiguous meanings. Similar findings were reported by Darmayani et al. (2018), who found that Indonesian language learners frequently experience difficulties in applying affixes and morphophonemic transformations correctly.

Lexical errors ranked third with 27 occurrences or 14.7%. These errors included inappropriate word choices, semantic inconsistencies, non-standard vocabulary usage, and inaccurate diction in relation to the context of the exposition. Although lexical errors were less dominant than grammatical errors, they still affected the clarity and effectiveness of students' writing. Rahman (2015) emphasized that limited vocabulary mastery often restricts students' ability to express ideas precisely in academic writing contexts. In this study, many students selected words based on informal spoken language habits rather than formal academic conventions, which reduced the coherence and professionalism of their expository essays.

Phonological errors represented the smallest category, with 13 occurrences or 7.1%. These errors were related to spelling conventions, punctuation marks, capitalization, and incorrect word writing. The relatively low percentage indicates that students generally possess basic knowledge of Indonesian spelling rules; however, technical inaccuracies remain evident in written production. Tarigan (1994) argued that spelling accuracy reflects students' awareness of written language conventions and contributes significantly to writing readability and academic quality.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that students' primary weaknesses are concentrated in grammatical aspects, particularly syntax and morphology. Although the KWL model effectively supported students in organizing ideas and developing expository content systematically, it did not sufficiently address linguistic accuracy and grammatical competence. This finding supports Graham and Perin (2007), who stated that effective writing instruction should integrate both cognitive writing strategies and explicit language instruction. Therefore, guided writing models such as KWL need to be accompanied by grammar-focused pedagogical interventions to improve students' overall writing quality comprehensively.

Discussion of Linguistic Error Categories

A. Phonological Errors

Phonological errors in this study mainly involved inaccuracies in spelling conventions, capitalization, punctuation, and word writing. A total of 13 phonological errors (7.1%) were identified. Although the percentage was relatively low, these errors still affected the readability and formal quality of students' writing. According to Tarigan (1994), spelling competence is closely related to phonological awareness because written language reflects the sound system and orthographic rules of a language. Most phonological errors found in this study occurred because students paid insufficient attention to technical writing conventions during the drafting process.

B. Morphological Errors

Morphological errors accounted for 57 occurrences (31.1%) and primarily involved incorrect use of affixes, inappropriate word derivation, and inconsistencies between active and passive constructions. Indonesian morphology relies heavily on affixation processes to determine grammatical meaning; therefore, incorrect affix use can significantly distort sentence interpretation. Sneddon (2003) explained that Indonesian affixation requires both semantic and syntactic accuracy, particularly in formal writing contexts. The findings suggest that students still lack sufficient awareness of Indonesian morphological structures and grammatical transformations.

C. Syntactic Errors

Syntactic errors were the most dominant category, with 85 occurrences (46.4%). The errors included ineffective sentence constructions, overlapping ideas, inappropriate clause combinations, and disorganized sentence structures. Students frequently produced sentences lacking clear subjects or predicates, resulting in ambiguity and weak coherence. According to Ellis (2009), syntactic errors often emerge because learners have not fully internalized grammatical rules during language production. The dominance of syntactic errors in this study indicates that students encounter difficulties in translating ideas into well-structured written language despite receiving guided instruction through the KWL model.

D. Lexical Errors

Lexical errors consisted of 27 occurrences (14.7%) and involved inappropriate diction, semantic mismatches, and the use of informal vocabulary in academic writing. Lexical competence is crucial in expository writing because word choice determines precision and clarity of meaning. Rahman (2015) noted that students with limited academic vocabulary often rely on conversational expressions, resulting in weak argumentative writing. The findings indicate that vocabulary mastery remains one of the challenges faced by students in composing formal Indonesian expository texts.

Discussion of the KWL Model in Writing Instruction

The findings of this study demonstrate that the KWL (Know–Want–Learned) model contributed positively to students' ability to organize ideas and structure expository essays systematically. Through the "Know" stage, students were encouraged to activate their prior knowledge before beginning the writing process. This stage is theoretically consistent with schema theory, which posits that comprehension and knowledge construction occur when learners connect new information with previously acquired cognitive structures (Anderson, 1985). By identifying what they already knew about a topic, students became more prepared to generate relevant ideas and construct meaningful expository content.

The second stage, "Want," facilitated students' critical thinking by encouraging them to formulate questions, determine learning objectives, and identify information gaps that needed to be explored further. This process reflects constructivist learning theory, which emphasizes active learner participation in constructing knowledge through inquiry and reflection. Ogle (1986), the developer of the KWL model, argued that this strategy increases learners' engagement because students become cognitively involved in determining their own learning focus. In the context of expository writing, this stage helped students narrow their discussion topics, organize supporting ideas, and establish clearer paragraph development before drafting their essays.

Meanwhile, the "Learned" stage functioned as a reflective activity that enabled students to evaluate what they had understood and produced during the writing process. Reflection is considered an important component of process-based writing instruction because it promotes metacognitive awareness and self-monitoring abilities. According to Anderson (1985), reflective learning activities improve students' ability to regulate their cognitive processes and evaluate the effectiveness of their learning strategies. In this study, students who actively engaged in reflection tended to produce essays with more coherent organization and clearer thematic development compared to their initial drafts.

These findings support previous studies demonstrating that the KWL model effectively enhances students' comprehension, idea generation, and writing organization. Hasanah (2020) found that KWL improved students' reading comprehension because learners became more active in connecting prior knowledge with newly acquired information. Similarly, Sari and Purwanto (2018) reported that the implementation of KWL in expository writing classes increased students' participation and improved paragraph coherence. The structured stages of KWL enabled students to arrange ideas more logically and maintain focus throughout the writing process.

Furthermore, the results of this study align with Graham and Perin's (2007) argument that effective writing instruction should incorporate cognitive strategies that guide students through planning, drafting, revising, and reflecting stages. The KWL model can therefore be categorized as a cognitive writing strategy because it encourages learners to organize thoughts systematically before composing texts. Students in this study appeared more confident in developing essay content because the KWL worksheet provided a structured framework for brainstorming and organizing information.

However, despite its positive contribution to idea development and content organization, the findings also reveal that the KWL model did not significantly reduce grammatical and linguistic errors, particularly in syntax and morphology. Syntactic errors remained the most dominant category, indicating that students continued to struggle with sentence construction, clause organization, and grammatical consistency even after participating in KWL-guided activities. This finding suggests that cognitive organization alone is insufficient to ensure linguistic accuracy in academic writing.

The persistence of grammatical errors can be explained through second language acquisition theory proposed by Ellis (2009), which states that language learners often experience difficulties internalizing grammatical structures without explicit corrective instruction and repeated practice. While KWL effectively supports conceptual organization, the model primarily focuses on activating prior knowledge and developing content rather than explicitly teaching language structures. Consequently, students may become capable of generating ideas but still lack the grammatical competence required to express those ideas accurately in written form.

This finding is also consistent with Zamel (1983), who argued that process-oriented writing instruction frequently emphasizes idea exploration and fluency but may overlook grammatical precision if language-focused feedback is insufficient. Similarly, Yuliana and Mulyanto (2021) found that guided writing strategies improved students' writing fluency and paragraph organization but did not automatically improve grammatical accuracy. These studies indicate that writing development requires a balance between cognitive processes and explicit language instruction.

Moreover, the dominance of morphological and syntactic errors found in this study reinforces previous research on Indonesian academic writing. Darmayani et al. (2018) reported that Indonesian language learners frequently encounter difficulties in affixation and sentence construction due to limited grammatical awareness and interference from spoken language habits. Sejati et al. (2019) similarly observed that grammatical inconsistencies remain common in academic writing because learners often prioritize content delivery over structural accuracy. The current findings strengthen these arguments by demonstrating that even within a structured learning model such as KWL, students still require intensive grammar reinforcement.

Another important aspect revealed in this study is the relationship between KWL and students' motivation toward writing activities. During classroom observations and interviews, many students reported that the KWL worksheet reduced their anxiety in beginning expository essays because they had a clear framework for planning ideas. This supports the perspective of constructivist pedagogy, which emphasizes learner-centered instruction and active engagement in knowledge construction. By guiding students step-by-step through idea exploration, KWL created a less intimidating writing environment and increased students' confidence in expressing their thoughts.

Nevertheless, the study indicates that KWL should not be implemented as a standalone strategy in academic writing instruction. Instead, the model should be integrated with explicit grammar teaching, corrective feedback, vocabulary enrichment, and sentence-construction exercises. Graham and Perin (2007) emphasized that writing instruction becomes more effective when cognitive writing strategies are combined with direct language instruction and continuous practice. Therefore, integrating KWL with grammar-focused activities may help students achieve both conceptual coherence and linguistic accuracy simultaneously.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that the KWL model has substantial pedagogical value in improving students' idea organization, reflective thinking, and engagement in expository writing activities. However, its effectiveness in reducing language errors remains limited because the model does not specifically target grammatical competence. Consequently, writing instruction in higher education should combine process-oriented learning models such as KWL with systematic language reinforcement to develop students' academic writing skills comprehensively.

CONCLUSIONS

This study concludes that students' expository essays contain four major categories of Indonesian language errors, namely phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexical errors. Among these categories, syntactic errors emerged as the most dominant, followed by morphological errors, indicating that students continue to experience substantial difficulties in constructing grammatically accurate and coherent sentences in formal academic writing. The frequent occurrence of errors in sentence structure, affixation, and word formation demonstrates that students' mastery of Indonesian grammatical conventions remains limited, particularly in organizing ideas into effective and logical written expressions.

The findings also reveal that the implementation of the KWL (Know–Want–Learned) guided writing model contributed positively to students' ability to generate ideas, organize essay content systematically, and engage actively in the writing process. The KWL strategy encouraged students to activate prior knowledge, formulate learning objectives, and reflect on acquired information, which improved the overall coherence and organization of their expository texts. However, although the model

supported cognitive and organizational aspects of writing, it did not significantly reduce grammatical inaccuracies, especially in syntax and morphology.

These findings indicate that writing instruction at the university level should not solely focus on idea development and content organization but must also integrate explicit instruction on grammar, sentence construction, vocabulary use, and Indonesian language conventions. The combination of guided writing strategies and language-focused reinforcement is essential to improve students' academic writing competence comprehensively.

Furthermore, this study contributes theoretically to the field of Indonesian language education by integrating the KWL instructional model with linguistic error analysis in expository writing. Practically, the findings provide pedagogical implications for lecturers and educators to design more balanced writing instruction that combines cognitive writing strategies with systematic grammatical guidance. Future studies are recommended to involve larger participant groups, apply mixed-method approaches, and examine the long-term effectiveness of integrating KWL with explicit grammar instruction in improving academic writing proficiency.

REFERENCES

1) Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. Retrieved from https://www.carnegie.org/publications/writing-next-effective-strategies-to-improve-writing-of-adolescents-in-middle-and-high-schools/
2) Hyland, K. (2019). *Second language writing* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3) Fareed, M., Ashraf, A., & Bilal, M. (2016). ESL learners' writing skills: Problems, factors and suggestions. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 4, 81–92.
4) Klimova, B. F. (2013). The importance of writing. *PAROLE: Journal of Linguistics and Education*, 2(1), 9–11.
5) Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6) Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (2018). An examination of the design principles underlying a self-regulated strategy development study. *Journal of Writing Research*, 10(2), 139–187.
7) Ahmed, A. H. (2010). Students' problems with cohesion and coherence in EFL essay writing in Egypt: Different perspectives. *Literacy Information and Computer Education Journal*, 1(4), 211–221.
8) Rahman, S. (2015). Kesulitan menulis karangan eksposisi pada mahasiswa. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra*, 20(1), 45–58.
9) Darmayani, N. W. S., Artawa, K., & Satyawati, M. S. (2018). Linguistic errors of using Indonesian in foreign learners' writings. *KULTURISTIK: Jurnal Bahasa dan Budaya*, 2(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.22225/kulturistik.2.1.679
10) Sejati, A. P., Suryana, D., & Handayani, S. R. (2019). The overview of lecturers' writing skills in the academic context. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Conference on Language, Literature, Education, and Culture (ICOLLITE 2018)* (pp. 1178–1183). Atlantis Press. https://doi.org/10.2991/conaplin-18.2019.246
11) Marcellino, M. (2008). English language teaching in Indonesia: A continuous challenge in education and cultural diversity. *TEFLIN Journal*, 19(1), 57–69.
12) Musthafa, B. (2015). Teaching English to young learners in Indonesia: Essential requirements. *Educationist*, 9(2), 120–125.
13) Ogle, D. M. (1986). K-W-L: A teaching model that develops active reading of expository text. *The Reading Teacher*, 39(6), 564–570.
14) Carr, E., & Ogle, D. (1987). KWL plus: A strategy for comprehension and summarization. *Journal of Reading*, 30(7), 626–631.
15) Hasanah, N. (2020). Penerapan model KWL untuk meningkatkan pemahaman membaca siswa sekolah dasar. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra*, 15(2), 123–135.
16) Sari, D. P., & Purwanto, A. (2018). Efektivitas model KWL dalam pembelajaran menulis teks eksposisi. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Indonesia*, 8(2), 112–125.
17) Watcharapunyawong, S., & Usaha, S. (2013). Thai EFL students' writing errors in different text types: The interference of the first language. *English Language Teaching*, 6(1), 67–78.
18) Hassan, M. (2017). The effect of KWL strategy on students' reading comprehension achievement. *International Journal of Language Education*, 1(2), 53–59.
19) Yusuf, Q., Jusoh, Z., & Yusuf, Y. Q. (2020). Cooperative learning strategies to enhance writing skills among students. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(1), 139–154.
20) Yuliana, R., & Mulyanto, A. (2021). Improving students' expository writing skills through guided writing strategies. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 12(3), 455–463. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1203.12

21) Alqahtani, M. (2020). The use of KWL strategy in developing students' writing performance. *Arab World English Journal*, 11(2), 141–155.
22) Ulviani, M. (2025). Error analysis in Indonesian language learning: A case study on university students' writing. *Research Square*. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-7598767/v1
23) Kristiantari, N. L. R. (2010). Pengajaran struktur teks dan tata bahasa dalam penulisan karangan eksposisi di perguruan tinggi. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pengajaran*, 43(1), 1–12.
24) Sudarma, I. K. (2018). Model pengajaran menulis berbasis struktur teks untuk meningkatkan koherensi paragraf. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Indonesia*, 7(2), 89–101.
25) Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
26) Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (1988). *The action research planner* (3rd ed.). Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press.
27) Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 5(4), 161–170. https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1967.5.1-4.161
28) Ellis, R. (2009). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
29) Sneddon, J. N. (2003). *The Indonesian language: Its history and role in modern society*. Sydney: UNSW Press.
30) Tarigan, H. G. (1994). *Menulis sebagai suatu keterampilan berbahasa*. Bandung: Angkasa.
31) Anderson, J. R. (1985). *Cognitive psychology and its implications* (2nd ed.). New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.
32) Zamel, V. (1983). The composing processes of advanced ESL students: Six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(2), 165–187. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586647.

There is an Open Access article, distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution – Non Commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/), which permits remixing, adapting and building upon the work for non-commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited.