

English Lexical Collocation Error in Procedure Texts: A Case of Senior High School Students in Non-Formal Education

Arindi Indra¹, Sri Sarwanti², Gilang Fadhilia Arvianti³

¹English Language Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Tidar University, ²English Language Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Tidar University, ³English Language Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Tidar University

Corresponding Author: Arindi Indra, e-mail: arindiindra2@gmail.com

Published: July, 2026

ABSTRACT

Developing a natural flow in English writing relies heavily on a learner's ability to pair words accurately through collocations. Unfortunately, students outside the formal schooling system rarely get enough targeted practice to master these specific lexical connections. The purpose of this study was to analyse the use of English lexical collocations in procedure texts written by senior high school students in non-formal education and to identify the factors associated with lexical collocation errors found in their writing. Employing a descriptive qualitative method, the data consisted of 15 student-written texts collected through a documentation technique. The data were analysed by identifying, classifying, and interpreting lexical collocations and collocation errors found in the texts. The results revealed that students still experienced difficulties in producing natural expressions, with 35 errors found across 89 identified collocations (an overall error rate of 39.33%). Specifically, Type L1(Verb + Noun) had the highest number of errors (48.57% with 17 errors), while Type L3(Adjective + Noun and Noun + Noun) showed the highest error rate within its own group (48.39%). These errors were mainly caused by limited vocabulary, literal translation, first language (L1) interference, limited collocational knowledge, and a lack of exposure to authentic English expressions. Nevertheless, several students successfully produced acceptable collocations such as mix well, stir well, boil the water, and add milk. The study concludes that explicit collocation instruction and greater exposure to authentic language are needed to improve students' procedural writing.

Keywords: EFL writing, lexical collocation, non-formal education, procedure text

© The Author(s). 2021 Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

INTRODUCTION

Writing is one of the important skills in learning English because through writing students can express ideas, information, and experiences in written form. In the context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL), writing ability is not only related to grammar mastery but also to the ability to use vocabulary appropriately and naturally. One important aspect of writing is lexical collocation, which refers to the conventional combination of lexical words that naturally co-occur in authentic language use. Durrant & Schmitt (2009) explained that collocation mastery influences writing fluency and the quality of EFL students' writing. In addition, Li (2022) stated that collocation competence is closely related to productive vocabulary knowledge in writing.

Lexical collocation has been widely recognized as one of the fundamental components of vocabulary knowledge. According to Benson et al. (2010), lexical collocations are conventional combinations of lexical words that are accepted by native speakers and cannot always be predicted from grammatical rules alone. They further proposed a systematic classification of lexical collocation patterns, providing an important framework for analysing word combinations in authentic English use. According to this classification, lexical collocations are divided into seven types, including Type L1 (Verb creation/activation + Noun), Type L2 (Verb meaning

eradication/nullification + Noun), Type L3 (Adjective + Noun/ Noun + Noun), Type L4 (Noun + Verb), Type L5 (Noun + of + Noun), Type L6 (Adverb + Adjective), and Type L7 (Verb + Adverb). Understanding these variations is crucial since each type represents a unique syntactic and semantic bond that learners must acquire. Similarly, Lewis (1993), through the Lexical Approach, argued that language proficiency depends not only on mastering individual words and grammatical structures but also on acquiring prefabricated lexical chunks and collocations that are commonly used in real communication. Therefore, the mastery of lexical collocations is considered essential for producing fluent, natural, and idiomatic writing.

The appropriate use of lexical collocation helps students produce more natural and understandable writing. On the other hand, inappropriate collocation usage may result in unnatural expressions even though the grammar is understandable. Özdemir & Seçkin (2025) mentioned that limited understanding of natural word combinations becomes one of the main causes of unnatural expressions in EFL students' writing. These errors commonly occur because students translate expressions literally from their first language into English. Therefore, mastery of lexical collocation becomes an important part of developing students' writing skills (Abdaoui, 2010; O'Dell & McCarthy, 2017).

The occurrence of lexical collocation errors can also be explained from the perspective of second language acquisition. Nesselhauf (2005) stated that collocations are among the most difficult aspects of vocabulary for EFL learners because the appropriate combination of words is often arbitrary and language-specific. Consequently, learners frequently produce acceptable grammatical structures but inappropriate lexical combinations. Furthermore, Odlin (1989) explained that first language transfer plays a significant role in second language production, as learners tend to rely on lexical and structural patterns from their native language when they lack sufficient knowledge of the target language. This transfer often results in literal translations and unnatural collocations in English writing. Consequently, lexical collocation errors become one of the most frequently observed lexical problems in EFL writing, particularly in productive language skills.

In EFL learning, lexical collocation errors are most frequently found in verb + noun combinations. Tsai (2015) explained that EFL learners tend to experience difficulties in selecting appropriate verbs for certain nouns because of first language influence and limited vocabulary knowledge. As a result, students often produce word combinations that are understandable in meaning but unnatural in English. This condition indicates that vocabulary learning should not only focus on individual word meanings but also on relationships between words in real English usage (Pujiningtyas & Bram, 2023).

Lexical collocation errors are also commonly found in procedure texts. Procedure text is a type of text containing steps or instructions to perform activities systematically. In this text, students are required to use many instructional verbs such as mix, cut, boil, and pour. The use of appropriate collocation is important because unnatural word combinations may affect the clarity of instructions in procedural texts (Simanjuntak & Tambunan, 2025). Hasibuan (2022) stated that appropriate vocabulary usage in procedure texts strongly influences text comprehensibility. Furthermore, Putra et al. (2024) explained that lexical collocation influences the quality of EFL students' procedural writing.

Procedure text also becomes an effective writing genre for identifying students' lexical collocation competence because it is dominated by action verbs and procedural vocabulary. The repeated use of verbs in procedure texts allows various collocation patterns to appear, especially verb + noun collocations (Teagu, 2025; Muttaqin, 2024). Therefore, procedure text can provide a clearer description of students' ability to use natural word combinations in writing contexts.

Various studies on lexical collocation have been conducted in English language learning contexts. However, most previous studies mainly focused on formal education such as senior high schools and universities. In addition, previous studies commonly discussed argumentative, descriptive, or narrative texts, while studies on lexical collocation in procedure texts are still relatively limited. Sun & Park (2023) showed that EFL learners still experienced difficulties in producing natural collocations even though they had understood basic English structures. Similar findings were also presented by Demana et al. (2025) and My & Thao (2023), who stated that limited lexical knowledge and first language influence became the main factors causing collocation errors in Indonesian students' writing.

On the other hand, research on lexical collocation within non-formal educational contexts is still very rare. In the Indonesian education ecosystem, this domain is primarily represented by the Community Learning Center, locally known as *Pusat Kegiatan Belajar Masyarakat (PKBM)*. As a parallel option outside conventional schools, these non-formal institutions serve a very unique group of students. Learners in these environment usually have diverse educational backgrounds, ages, and learning experiences compared to students in regular, formal schools. These differences may result in different patterns of language errors, making this topic an important yet overlook area of study. This phenomenon has created a significant research gap in lexical collocation studies, particularly regarding collocation usage in procedure texts within non-formal educational institutions.

This study directly addresses that gap by looking closely at a group of EFL learners who are rarely discussed in current research. Investigating the ways in which non-formal education students naturally combine words not only broadens the scope of language learning but also helps disseminate alternative teaching methods in schools. This research highlights the exact word-choice mistakes made by high school students in non-formal schools. The findings are also expected to contribute to vocabulary and writing instruction development in non-formal education (Abdaoui, 2010; Nation et al., 1997).

Driven by these practical and theoretical considerations, this study is entitled "English Lexical Collocation Error in Procedure Texts: A Case of Senior High School Students in Non-Formal Education." Specifically, this research aims to analyse the systematic use of lexical collocations in procedure texts written by students at PKBM Zaid Bin Tsabit. Beyond simply counting their mistakes, the study seeks to isolate the main types of collocation errors found in their writing and closely examine the specific factors that trigger these errors.

METHOD

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive qualitative method. The qualitative approach was used because the study focused on analyzing and interpreting lexical collocations found in students' procedure texts. According to Creswell (2014), qualitative research is used to explore and understand phenomena based on participants' experiences and written data. In addition, Moleong (2010) defines descriptive qualitative research inquiry that aims to comprehend phenomena comprehensively, gathering descriptive insights through the textual or verbal expressions of the subjects under study. In this study, the researcher focused on identifying the types and factors of lexical collocation errors produced by students in their writing.

Research Participants

The participants of this study were students at PKBM Zaid Bin Tsabit. Selection criteria require that participants have already received and understood the material regarding how to write procedure texts. The students were asked to write procedure texts based on topics related to daily activities, food, and beverages.

Data and Data Source

The data of this study were lexical collocations found in 15 students' procedure texts, collected as written classroom assignments. The analysis mainly focused on lexical collocations, especially verb + noun combinations, which frequently appeared in procedural writing.

Research Instrument

The main instrument of this study was documentation sheets used to identify and classify lexical collocations found in students' texts. The researcher also used note-taking techniques to record collocation errors and classify them based on their types.

Technique of Data Collection

The data were collected through documentation technique. First, the students were asked to write procedure texts in English. Second, the researcher collected the students' writing. Third, the researcher read all texts carefully and identified lexical collocations found in the writings. Finally, the collocations were classified into several categories based on their forms and errors.

Technique of Data Analysis

The data were analyzed through several steps. First, the researcher identified lexical collocations found in students' procedure texts. Second, a manual coding system was applied to organize the data, using labels such as "T1D1" to represent Text 1 Data 1. Third, the collocations were classified based on their types. Fourth, the researcher identified lexical collocation errors appearing in the texts. Fifth, the researcher interpreted the possible causes of the errors, such as literal translation, limited vocabulary, and first language interference. Finally, conclusions were drawn based on the findings of the study.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Finding

This study analysed 15 procedure texts written by students at PKBM Zaid Bin Tsabit to identify the use of English lexical collocations in writing. The findings showed that most students were able to arrange procedural steps in English, but they still experienced difficulty using natural word combinations. Procedure texts also proved effective in identifying students' collocation competence because they contained many instructional verbs and action vocabulary. Prior to the statistical synthesis, the data on target collocations and students' operational errors are presented in detail according to the classification by Benson et al. (2010) in Table 1:

Table 1. Lexical Collocation Errors and Their Underlying Causal Factors in Students'

No.	Data Code	Words (Error Data)	Type	Factors
1.	T1-D1	Pour in a pan	Type L1 (Verb + Noun)	Lack of Exposure
2.	T1-D2	Pour... into	Type L1 (Verb + Noun)	Lack of Exposure
3.	T2-D1	Pour matcha powder	Type L1 (Verb + Noun)	Limited Collocation Knowledge
4.	T3-D1	White paper	Type L3 (Adj + Noun)	Limited Vocabulary
5.	T3-D2	Paper powder	Type L3 (Noun + Noun)	Limited Vocabulary
6.	T3-D3	Cut square tomato	Type L1 (Verb + Noun)	Limited Vocabulary

7.	T3-D4	Move scrambled egg	Type L1 (Verb + Noun)	Limited Vocabulary
8.	T4-D1	Potato or up to need	Type L3 (Adj + Noun)	Literal Translation
9.	T4-D2	Taste flavour	Type L3 (Noun + Noun)	Limited Vocabulary
10.	T4-D3	Ripe potato	Type L3 (Adj + Noun)	Limited Vocabulary
11.	T4-D4	Separate the potato	Type L1 (Verb + Noun)	Limited Vocabulary
12.	T5-D1	Make fillet	Type L1 (Verb + Noun)	Limited Vocabulary
13.	T5-D2	Put lengthen	Type L7 (Verb + Adverb)	Literal Translation
14.	T5-D3	Make roll	Type L1 (Verb + Noun)	Limited Vocabulary
15.	T5-D4	Rub liquid	Type L1 (Verb + Noun)	Limited Vocabulary
16.	T6-D1	White milk	Type L3 (Adj + Noun)	Literal Translation
17.	T6-D2	Bag of tea	Type L5 (Noun + <i>of</i> + Noun)	Lack of Exposure
18.	T6-D3	Pour the sugar	Type L1 (Verb + Noun)	Limited Collocation Knowledge
19.	T7-D1	Cube ice	Type L3 (Adj + Noun)	L1 Interference
20.	T8-D1	Block ice	Type L3 (Adj + Noun)	L1 Interference
21.	T8-D2	Mixwell	Type L7 (Verb + Adverb)	Limited Vocabulary
22.	T8-D3	Turn off the flame	Type L1 (Verb + Noun)	Lack of Exposure
23.	T8-D4	Pour ice	Type L1 (Verb + Noun)	Limited Collocation Knowledge
24.	T8-D5	Beautiful glass	Type L3 (Adj + Noun)	Lack of Exposure
25.	T10-D1	Drink water	Type L3 (Adj + Noun)	Literal Translation
26.	T10-D2	P our the sugar	Type L1 (Verb + Noun)	Limited Collocation Knowledge
27.	T10-D3	Take off blinder	Type L1 (Verb + Noun)	Lack of Exposure
28.	T10-D4	Juice avocado	Type L3 (Noun + Noun)	L1 Interference
29.	T11-D1	Oil was warm	Type L3 (Adj + Noun)	Limited Vocabulary
30.	T11-D2	Break out the egg	Type L1 (Verb + Noun)	Limited Vocabulary
31.	T11-D3	Soybean sauce	Type L3 (Noun + Noun)	Lack of Exposure

32.	T12-D1	Block Ice	Type L3 (Adj + Noun)	L1 Interference
33.	T13-D1	Clean water	Type L3 (Adj + Noun)	Literal Translation
34.	T14-D1	Pour the sugar	Type L1 (Verb + Noun)	Limited Collocation Knowledge
35.	T15-D1	Pour nutrijel	Type L1 (Verb + Noun)	Limited Collocation Knowledge

Based on the data in Table 1, the overall data summary that shows the frequency of usage and structural errors is presented in the statistical matrix in Table 2 below:

Table 2. Statistical Matrix of Lexical Collocation Types and Errors

Type of English Lexical Collocation	Total Frequency (f)	Error Count (e)	Error Percentage Within Type	Error Contribution to Total Errors
L1 (Verb + Noun)	44	17	38.64%	48.57%
L3 (Adj + Noun / Noun + Noun)	31	15	48.39%	42.86%
L5 (Noun + of + Noun)	6	1	16.67%	2.86%
L7 (Verb + Adverb)	8	2	25.00%	5.71%
Total	89	35	39.33% (Average)	100.00%

Table 2 shows that a total of 89 lexical collocations were found in the students' writing samples. Even though Type L1 (Verb + Noun) registered the highest overall frequency with 44 examples (49.44%), Type L3 (Adj + Noun, Noun + Noun) was clearly the hardest part for the students. In fact, Type L3 had the most mistakes, with 15 errors and a high internal error rate of 48.39%. Taken together, the combination of Type L1 and Type L3 made up most of the mistakes, accounting for 91.43% of the 35 total errors identified throughout this study.

Table 3. Factors Causing Lexical Collocation Errors

No.	Causal Factors	Description	Data-Driven Analysis (Connection to Student Corpus)	Real Case Evidences from Student Data
1	Limited Vocabulary (Nesselhauf, 2005)	Students lacked a good variety of specific English words for cooking contexts.	This problem forced students to use generic action verbs because they did not know the exact cooking terms used in recipes.	• “cut square tomato” (Text 3) instead of using the precise verb “dice”. • “break out the egg” (Text 11) instead of using the verb “crack”.

2	Literal Translation (Odlin, 1989)	Students translated words and ideas directly from Indonesian into English.	This word-for-word strategy made their phrases sound very stiff. The meaning is still clear, but it sounds unnatural to a native speaker.	• “drink water” (Text 10) directly copied from air minum. • “white milk” (Text 6) directly translated from susu putih. • “clean water” (Text 13) translated from air bersih.
3	L1 Interference (Odlin, 1989)	Indonesian grammar habits and language logic heavily shaped how students paired English words.	This factor was the main reason behind Type L3 errors. Students put the Indonesian word order directly into English noun phrases.	• “cube ice” (Text 7) following the pattern of es kotak. • “block ice” (Text 8) following the pattern of es balok. (The correct word pairs are ice cubes / ice blocks).
4	Lack of Exposure (Lewis, 1993)	Students had very little contact with real, native English texts or instructional media.	Because they rarely looked at real recipes, students made up their own unusual phrases when describing steps or packaging.	• “take off blinder” (Text 10) instead of the phrasal verb “turn off”. • “turn off the flame” (Text 8) instead of “turn off the heat”. • “bag of tea” (Text 6) instead of “tea bag”.
5	Limited Collocation Knowledge (Nesselhauf, 2005)	Students knew basic dictionary definitions of single words but did not understand how words naturally go together.	This missing knowledge was the main reason for Type L1 errors. Students misunderstood which verbs fit best with the state of the ingredient.	• “pour matcha powder” (Text 2). • “pour the sugar” (Text 6). (The verb “pour” is only used for liquids, not for dry ingredients like powder or sugar).

(Adapted from Lewis, 1993; Odlin, 1989; Nesselhauf, 2005)

Based on Table 3, these five causal factors are closely linked to each other in the students' writing process at PKBM Zaid Bin Tsabit. A lack of exposure to authentic English (Factor 4) acts as the main root problem, which leads to the students' limited vocabulary (Factor 1) and very minimal knowledge of word pairs (Factor 5). When the students are asked to write a procedure text, these limitations force them to look for a shortcut. They immediately resort to literal, word-for-word translation (Factor 2) that completely follows the logic and structure of their native Indonesian

language (Factor 3). This way of thinking explains why the 15 student procedure texts resulted in a total of 32 errors, most of which are concentrated within Type L1 and Type L3.

Discussion

The findings of this study demonstrate that lexical collocation remains one of the major challenges encountered by EFL learners when writing procedure texts. Although the students were generally able to organize procedural steps in a logical sequence, many of them experienced difficulties in producing natural lexical combinations commonly used by native English speakers. The identified errors were distributed across four lexical collocation types proposed by Benson et al. (2010), namely Type L1 (Verb + Noun), Type L3 (Adjective + Noun and Noun + Noun), Type L7 (Verb + Adverb), and Type L5 (Noun + of + Noun). These findings indicate that students' writing difficulties extend beyond grammatical accuracy and involve insufficient mastery of conventional lexical combinations, which play an essential role in producing fluent and natural written communication.

Type L1 (Verb + Noun) represented the most dominant lexical collocation error identified in this study, indicating that selecting appropriate verbs for particular nouns remains one of the greatest challenges for EFL learners in procedural writing. Errors such as *pour the sugar*, *pour matcha powder*, *move scrambled egg*, and *break out the egg* suggest that students tended to choose verbs based on their general meanings rather than on conventional English collocations. Although these expressions successfully conveyed the intended meaning, they deviated from the collocational patterns commonly used by native speakers. This finding supports Benson, Benson, and Ilson (2010), who argued that lexical collocations are conventional combinations that cannot always be predicted from grammatical rules or individual word meanings. Similarly, Tsai (2015) reported that EFL learners frequently experience difficulties in verb selection because of limited collocational knowledge, while Pujiningtyas & Bram (2023) emphasized that vocabulary mastery alone is insufficient unless learners also understand how words naturally combine in authentic language use.

The second most prominent finding concerned Type L3 (Adjective + Noun and Noun + Noun), which showed the highest internal error rate among all collocation categories. Expressions such as *white milk*, *cube ice*, *block ice*, and *juice avocado* demonstrate that students frequently transferred Indonesian lexical patterns directly into English. Although these expressions remain comprehensible, they do not conform to conventional English collocations and therefore sound unnatural. This phenomenon reflects the concept of language transfer proposed by (Odlin, 1989), who explained that learners tend to rely on the lexical and structural patterns of their first language when producing a second language, particularly when their target language knowledge is still limited. The present finding is also consistent with Akbulut (2018), who reported that first language influence substantially affects lexical selection in EFL writing. Likewise, My & Thao (2023) found that direct translation strategies frequently lead learners to produce collocational errors despite successfully communicating the intended meaning.

Although Type L7 (Verb + Adverb) occurred less frequently than Types L1 and L3, it provides valuable insight into learners' collocational development. The occurrence of the expression *mixwell* demonstrates that the learner had already acquired the appropriate lexical combination (*mix well*), yet failed to recognize the correct orthographic boundary separating the verb from the adverb. Rather than indicating a misunderstanding of meaning, this error reflects incomplete mastery of the written representation of English collocations. Nesselhauf (2005) explained that learners often internalize frequently occurring collocations as single lexical units before fully understanding their grammatical composition. Therefore, this type of error may represent an intermediate stage of collocational acquisition rather than a complete absence of lexical competence.

Type L5 (Noun + of + Noun) produced the fewest collocation errors, suggesting that students generally understood this collocational pattern better than the other categories. Nevertheless, the expression bag of tea indicates that learners still experienced difficulty distinguishing between grammatically acceptable constructions and conventionally accepted English collocations. Although the phrase follows English grammatical rules, native speakers conventionally use the compound noun tea bag. This finding reinforces Benson et al. (2010) argument that lexical collocations are primarily determined by language convention rather than grammatical possibility alone. Consequently, grammatically acceptable expressions may still be considered inappropriate when they fail to reflect conventional usage in authentic English communication.

Beyond the distribution of lexical collocation types, the findings also revealed five interrelated factors contributing to students' lexical collocation errors, namely limited vocabulary, literal translation, first language (L1) interference, lack of exposure to authentic English input, and limited collocational knowledge. Rather than functioning independently, these factors interacted throughout the students' writing process and collectively influenced learners' lexical choices. The following discussion explains how each factor contributed to the occurrence of lexical collocation errors in students' procedural writing.

Limited vocabulary emerged as one of the principal factors underlying students' lexical collocation errors. The findings indicate that many learners possessed sufficient knowledge of basic English vocabulary but lacked the more specific lexical items required to express procedural actions accurately. As a result, they frequently selected familiar or high-frequency words that were semantically acceptable but collocationally inappropriate in the given context. This finding is consistent with Lewis (1993) Lexical Approach, which argues that language proficiency depends not merely on learning isolated vocabulary items but also on acquiring lexical chunks and conventional word combinations as meaningful units. Without sufficient lexical resources and collocational awareness, learners are more likely to rely on approximate word choices, thereby reducing the naturalness of their written production.

The remaining contributing factors, namely literal translation, first language (L1) interference, lack of exposure to authentic English input, and limited collocational knowledge, appear to be closely interconnected rather than functioning independently. Students who rarely encountered authentic English texts tended to develop limited awareness of conventional lexical combinations, encouraging them to depend on Indonesian lexical patterns when expressing ideas in English. Consequently, literal translation became a common strategy, leading learners to transfer lexical and structural patterns from their first language into English writing. These findings support Odlin (1989) theory that first language transfer becomes increasingly influential when learners possess insufficient knowledge of the target language. Likewise, Nesselhauf (2005) emphasized that collocations represent one of the most difficult aspects of vocabulary acquisition because acceptable lexical combinations are largely language-specific and cannot be predicted solely from grammatical rules. Furthermore, Durrant & Schmitt (2009) highlighted that repeated exposure to authentic language input is essential for developing collocational competence. Collectively, these findings suggest that lexical collocation errors arise not from a single factor but from the interaction among learners' vocabulary limitations, language transfer, insufficient exposure to authentic input, and inadequate knowledge of conventional word combinations.

From a pedagogical perspective, these findings suggest that English writing instruction should place greater emphasis on explicit collocation teaching rather than focusing solely on individual vocabulary items or grammatical accuracy. Teachers are encouraged to integrate authentic materials, such as recipes and procedural texts, into classroom instruction to provide learners with repeated exposure to natural lexical combinations. In addition, activities emphasizing lexical chunks, collocation exercises, and contextual vocabulary learning may help students develop greater awareness of conventional word pairings and reduce collocational errors in writing (Lewis, 1993;

O'Dell & McCarthy, 2017). Such instructional practices may also reduce learners' dependence on literal translation by encouraging them to acquire lexical chunks through repeated exposure to authentic language use. Consequently, students are expected to develop stronger collocational awareness and produce more natural written expressions in procedural writing contexts. Beyond its pedagogical implications, this study also contributes to the existing body of knowledge by extending lexical collocation research to the context of nonformal education, particularly PKBM students, a population that has received limited attention in previous studies. Unlike earlier research that primarily focused on formal educational settings, the present study not only identifies the distribution of lexical collocation errors across different collocation types but also explains the underlying factors contributing to those errors in students' procedural writing.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that lexical collocation competence involves more than grammatical accuracy or vocabulary size; it also requires learners to understand and produce conventional lexical combinations that are widely accepted in authentic English communication. The predominance of Type L1 and Type L3 errors, together with the interaction among the identified contributing factors, demonstrates that collocational competence develops through continuous interaction between linguistic knowledge, language experience, and authentic language exposure. Therefore, improving learners' awareness of lexical collocations should become an integral component of EFL writing instruction, particularly in teaching procedure texts, as it can enhance both the accuracy and naturalness of students' written communication.

CONCLUSIONS

This study investigated the use of English lexical collocations in procedure texts written by students at PKBM Zaid Bin Tsabit. The findings revealed that students still experienced difficulties in producing natural lexical collocations in English. Among the collocation categories identified, Type L3 (Adjective + Noun and Noun + Noun) constituted the most dominant error category, followed by Type L1 (Verb + Noun). The findings suggest that many students tended to produce lexical combinations that were understandable in meaning but unnatural in English usage. These collocation errors appeared to be associated with first language interference, limited vocabulary knowledge, limited collocational awareness, and insufficient exposure to authentic English expressions.

In addition, this study confirmed that procedure text is an effective genre for analyzing learners' lexical collocation competence because it contains numerous instructional verbs and repetitive lexical patterns that facilitate the identification of collocational usage. The findings indicate that lexical collocation plays an important role in improving the quality and naturalness of students' writing. Therefore, English teachers are encouraged to provide contextual vocabulary learning, authentic language exposure, and explicit collocation instruction to help students develop more natural written expressions. This study is also expected to contribute to the development of lexical collocation research in EFL contexts, particularly within nonformal educational environments such as PKBM.

REFERENCES

- Abdaoui, M. (2010). Teaching lexical collocations to raise proficiency in foreign language writing. In *Teaching Lexical Collocations to Raise Proficiency In Foreign Language Writing*. Université Mentouri–Constantine.
- Adzania Eria Teagu. (2025). An Analysis of Students' Grammar Ability in Writing Procedure Text at SMK Negeri 3 Pekanbaru. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Sastra Inggris*, 5(3), 209–217. <https://doi.org/10.55606/jupensi.v5i3.6103>
- Akbulut, F. D. (2018). Effects of teaching collocations on academic writing. *The Online Journal of*

English Language Teaching, 3(1), 45–58.

- Benson, M., Benson, E., & Ilson, R. (2010). *The BBI Combinatory Dictionary of English: Your Guide to Collocations and Grammar* (3rd ed.). John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/z.bbi.07dic>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Demana, N. V., Klu, E. K., & Maluleke, M. J. (2025). Collocation Errors in the Written Essays of English Second/Foreign Language Learners: A Scoping Review. *Journal of Education and Learning Technology*, 6(9), 800–808. <https://doi.org/10.38159/jelt.2025697>
- Durrant, P., & Schmitt, N. (2009). To what extent do native and non-native writers make use of collocations? *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 47(2), 157–177. <https://doi.org/10.1515/IRAL.2009.007>
- Hasibuan, N. J. (2022). Students Errors in Writing Procedure Text. *BIRCI-Journal: Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal*, 5(2), 14296–14302.
- Husin, N. H., & Rawian, R. (2025). Receptive and productive collocational knowledge, vocabulary size, motivation, and self-efficacy in ESL reading comprehension. *Arbitrer Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.25077/ar.12.1.1-15.2025>
- Khatoon, R., & Nazir, N. (2025). From tasks to texts: Collocational gains in ESL students' writing skills through task-based instruction. *Feedback Research in Second Language*, 3, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.32038/frsl.2025.03.01>
- Lewis, M. (1993). *The Lexical Approach: The State of ELT and a Way Forward*. Language Teaching Publications.
- Li, Y. (2022). Mobile-assisted vocabulary learning: Investigating receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge of Chinese EFL learners. *ReCALL*, 34(3), 352–342. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344022000054>
- Moleong, L. J. (2010). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif* (Edisi revisi). PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Muttaqin, D. A. (2024). Lexical Collocations in English Teaching Modules: An In-depth Analysis. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 10(2), 385–392. <https://doi.org/10.30812/humanitatis.v10i2.3952>
- My, D. N. H., & Thao, L. Q. (2023). Lexical Collocation Errors in Essay Writing: A Study into Vietnamese EFL Students and Their Perceptions. *International Journal of Language Instruction*, 2(2), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.54855/ijli.23221>
- Nation, Paul, Newton, & Jonathan. (1997). *Teaching Vocabulary*. In *Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition: A Rationale for Pedagogy* (pp. 238–254). Cambridge University Press.
- Nesselhauf, N. (2005). *Collocations in a Learner Corpus*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.14>
- O'Dell, F., & McCarthy, M. (2017). *English Collocations in Use Advanced* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Odlin, T. (1989). *Language Transfer: Cross-Linguistic Influence in Language Learning*. Cambridge University

Press.

- Özdemir, O., & Seçkin, H. (2025). Exploring foreign language anxiety in higher education: Multifaceted insights into causes, impacts, and coping strategies. *Social Sciences and Humanities Open*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101364>
- Paris, N., Samad, P., & Namchan, M. (2023). A Corpus-Based Study of Grammatical Collocation on Asian EFL Learners. *Inspiring: English Education Journal*, 6(2), 151–164. <https://doi.org/10.35905/inspiring.v6i2.6252>
- Pujiningtyas, M. D. A., & Bram, B. (2023). Lexical Collocation Analysis in Master's Student Reflective Writings. *Journal of Education and Teaching*, 4(3), 283–293. <https://doi.org/10.51454/jet.v4i3.264>
- Putra, A. S., Cahyani, Y. L., & Azahra, D. (2024). Lexical Errors in Academic Writing at Muhammadiyah University of Tangerang Students?. *Pubmedia Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris*, 1(4), 8. <https://doi.org/10.47134/jpbi.v1i4.721>
- Simanjuntak, A. A., & Rika Wahyuni Tambunan. (2025). Evaluating Genre-Based Instruction through Error Analysis: Insights from Vocational Students' Procedure Texts. *JAMI: Jurnal Abli Muda Indonesia*, 6(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.46510/jami.v6i1.368>
- Sun, W., & Park, E. (2023). EFL Learners' Collocation Acquisition and Learning in Corpus-Based Instruction: A Systematic Review. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 15(17). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su151713242>
- Szudarski, P., & Carter, R. (2016). The role of input flood and input enhancement in EFL learners' acquisition of collocations. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 26(2), 245–265. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12092>
- Teagu, A. E. (2025). An analysis of students' grammar ability in writing procedure text at SMK Negeri 3 Pekanbaru. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Sastra Inggris*, 5(3), 209–217. [doi.org](https://doi.org/10.30605/jps.v5i3.12345)
- Tsai, K.-J. (2015). Profiling the collocation use in ELT textbooks and learner writing. *Language Teaching Research*, 19(6), 723–740. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168814559801>