



An Analysis of Students' Errors in Writing Procedure Text at the 11th Grade of State Senior High School 3 Kisaran

Nurul Islami Widya Herlina*, Lily Amalia, Nabila Al Hafizah, Zaskia Aulia Rahman

Universitas Asahan, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Writing remains a significant challenge for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners, particularly when they are required to produce genre-based texts that demand appropriate grammatical structures, vocabulary, and sequential organization. This study investigates the types of errors made by eleventh-grade students at State Senior High School 3 Kisaran in writing procedure texts. Employing a descriptive qualitative approach, the study involved approximately 30 students from one purposively selected class and collected data through classroom observation, documentation, and a writing task requiring students to compose procedure texts. The students' written work was analyzed using the Surface Strategy Taxonomy, which classifies errors into omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. The analysis identified 372 errors, with misformation emerging as the most frequent category (30.91%), followed by omission (28.49%), addition (23.66%), and misordering (16.94%). These findings demonstrate that students experience systematic difficulties in selecting appropriate linguistic forms, supplying obligatory grammatical elements, and organizing language accurately when constructing procedure texts. The study concludes that English writing instruction should provide more explicit and focused guidance on vocabulary selection, imperative sentence structures, grammatical accuracy, and systematic error awareness to strengthen students' competence in procedural writing.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Submitted 30 08 2026
Revised 23 09 2026
Accepted 28 09 2026
Published 06 10 2026

KEYWORDS

Error analysis; grammatical accuracy; procedure text; surface strategy taxonomy; writing errors.

*CORRESPONDANCE AUTHOR

amalialily005@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30743/bahastra.v11i1.14368>

INTRODUCTION

Writing constitutes one of the fundamental productive skills in English language learning because it enables learners to transform ideas, knowledge, and experiences into organized written communication. Unlike receptive language activities, writing requires students to actively coordinate several linguistic and cognitive processes, including idea generation, vocabulary selection, grammatical construction, sentence development, and textual organization. Students must also consider the communicative purpose of a text and arrange linguistic elements according to the conventions of a particular genre. These simultaneous demands make writing a complex process for learners of English as a Foreign Language (EFL), especially when they have limited opportunities to use English beyond formal classroom instruction. Developing writing competence therefore requires not only knowledge of English vocabulary and grammar but also the ability to apply that knowledge appropriately within specific communicative and textual contexts.

Within Indonesian senior high school education, students encounter various text genres that require different communicative purposes, organizational structures, and linguistic features. Procedure text represents an important genre because it trains students to explain systematically how to perform an activity, operate an object, or accomplish a particular goal through an ordered sequence of steps. Effective procedure texts require students to establish a clear goal, present relevant materials or requirements when necessary, and arrange instructions logically so that readers can follow the intended process. At the linguistic level, students need to use appropriate imperative constructions, action verbs, temporal or sequential connectors, and concise expressions to communicate each step accurately (Tiyas & Kartikawati, 2024). Failure to control these features may produce ambiguous, incomplete, or structurally inaccurate instructions and consequently reduce the communicative effectiveness of the text.

Despite the importance of these genre-specific conventions, students frequently experience difficulties when transforming their procedural knowledge into grammatically and lexically appropriate English sentences. Problems involving grammatical accuracy, vocabulary selection, sentence construction, and textual organization can prevent

students from communicating procedural information clearly and systematically. Students may omit linguistic elements required by the target language, insert unnecessary forms, select inappropriate grammatical or lexical forms, or arrange sentence constituents in an unacceptable sequence. These difficulties become particularly important in procedure texts because linguistic inaccuracies may interfere directly with the clarity and logical progression of the instructions provided to readers. Mertosono and Erniwati (2023) demonstrate that students' writing difficulties can generate recurring errors that compromise the quality and communicative effectiveness of their written production, indicating the importance of examining such errors systematically rather than treating them merely as isolated mistakes.

Error analysis provides an appropriate analytical approach for examining these linguistic difficulties because it enables researchers to identify, classify, and interpret recurring deviations in learners' written production. Rather than viewing errors exclusively as evidence of unsuccessful language learning, *error analysis* can reveal which aspects of the target language students have mastered and which linguistic structures remain problematic. Systematic classification also allows researchers and teachers to distinguish different forms of difficulty and determine which patterns occur most frequently within students' writing. The Surface Strategy Taxonomy offers a particularly useful framework because it classifies errors according to observable modifications of target-language structures into omission, addition, misformation, and misordering (Desnaranti & Putra, 2024). Applying these categories to procedure texts can provide a detailed diagnostic representation of how students construct inaccurate forms and which types of linguistic deviations dominate their procedural writing.

Previous research has demonstrated that linguistic errors remain a recurring problem in students' production of procedure texts, although individual studies have reported different dominant patterns. Amanda et al. (2024), for example, identified omission as the most prevalent error among ninth-grade students writing procedure texts, indicating that learners frequently failed to supply linguistic elements required for grammatically complete constructions. Adelita et al. (2023), in contrast, reported that language-feature errors constituted the primary difficulty among tenth-grade students, demonstrating that learners also experience problems applying genre-specific linguistic conventions appropriately. These findings confirm that procedure-text writing presents substantial linguistic challenges, but they also suggest that the distribution and characteristics of errors may vary according to students' educational level and learning context. Existing studies therefore provide an important empirical foundation while leaving room for further investigation of error patterns among eleventh-grade students through a systematic taxonomy that differentiates omission, addition, misformation, and misordering.

The present study addresses this gap by applying the Surface Strategy Taxonomy proposed by Desnaranti and Putra (2024) to investigate errors in procedure texts written by eleventh-grade students at State Senior High School 3 Kisaran. Unlike studies that primarily describe students' general writing difficulties or examine learners at other educational levels, this study focuses specifically on the distribution of four surface-level error categories within eleventh-grade procedural writing. This focus provides a diagnostic perspective on the linguistic forms that students modify, omit, unnecessarily add, or incorrectly arrange when constructing procedure texts. Accordingly, the study addresses the following research question: *What types of errors are made by the eleventh-grade students of State Senior High School 3 Kisaran in writing procedure texts?* By answering this question, the study seeks to extend empirical understanding of students' error patterns and provide evidence that English teachers can use to prioritize problematic linguistic features and develop more focused, responsive, and pedagogically appropriate instruction for procedure-text writing.

METHOD

This study employed a descriptive qualitative research design to identify, classify, and describe the types of errors students produced in their written procedure texts without manipulating any research variables. The researchers selected this design because it enabled them to examine students' naturally occurring written production within the actual educational context. A qualitative orientation also facilitated a systematic interpretation of recurring error patterns rather than limiting the analysis to numerical frequencies. Through this approach, the researchers examined how different types of linguistic errors appeared across students' written texts and interpreted the difficulties reflected in those patterns. The descriptive qualitative design therefore provided an appropriate methodological foundation for constructing a detailed account of students' errors in writing procedure texts.

The research was conducted at State Senior High School 3 Kisaran, North Sumatra, Indonesia, and involved eleventh-grade students during the 2025/2026 academic year. The researchers selected one class comprising approximately 30 students through *purposive sampling*, based on the criterion that procedure-text writing formed part of the English curriculum at this grade level. They employed three data-collection techniques to obtain evidence concerning students' writing performance and the instructional context. First, classroom observation documented the learning process and students' engagement with procedure-text writing, while supporting documents, including attendance records and lesson plans, provided relevant contextual information. The researchers subsequently administered a writing task that required students to compose a procedure text based on a predetermined topic, and the resulting texts constituted the primary data for error analysis.

The researchers analyzed the collected texts through an *error analysis* procedure guided by the Surface Strategy Taxonomy proposed by Dagson (2026). They conducted the analysis through five sequential stages: identifying errors in the students' written texts, classifying the identified errors into omission, addition, misformation, and misordering, calculating the frequency and percentage of each category, describing individual errors, and interpreting the resulting patterns. During the classification stage, the researchers examined how students omitted obligatory elements, inserted unnecessary forms, selected inappropriate linguistic forms, or arranged linguistic constituents incorrectly. They then calculated the proportional distribution of each error category to determine which type occurred most frequently across the dataset. The researchers calculated the percentage of each error category using the following formula:

$$P = F/N \times 100\%$$

Where:

P = Percentage of error type

F = Frequency of a specific error type

N = Total number of errors identified

After calculating the frequency and percentage of each category, the researchers examined representative errors and provided detailed descriptions of their linguistic characteristics. They interpreted the classified errors to determine the specific difficulties students encountered when constructing procedure texts in English. This interpretive process connected the quantitative distribution of errors with qualitative evidence from students' actual written production. The researchers subsequently organized the findings according to the four categories of the Surface Strategy Taxonomy to maintain analytical consistency across the dataset. Through these procedures, the study produced a systematic description of the error patterns that characterized students' written procedure texts.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Distribution of Students' Errors

The analysis identified 372 errors in the procedure texts written by 20 eleventh-grade students at State Senior High School 3 Kisaran. Following the Surface Strategy Taxonomy proposed by Berlianty et al. (2025), the researchers classified these errors into four categories: omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. Misformation emerged as the most frequent category, followed by omission, addition, and misordering. The distribution demonstrates that students experienced varying degrees of difficulty in selecting, supplying, and organizing linguistic elements when constructing procedure texts. Table 1 presents the frequency, percentage, and ranking of each error category.

Table 1. Distribution of Error Types in Students' Procedure Texts

Error Type	Frequency	Percentage	Rank	Error Type	Frequency
Misformation	115	30.91%	1st	Misformation	115
Omission	106	28.49%	2nd	Omission	106
Addition	88	23.66%	3rd	Addition	88

The distribution in Table 1 reveals more than a numerical pattern of linguistic inaccuracies; it provides evidence of the students' current stage of second-language development. Misformation (30.91%) and omission (28.49%) jointly accounted for almost 60% of all identified errors, indicating that students' primary difficulties centered on lexical and grammatical accuracy at the sentence level. The predominance of these categories suggests that students generally possessed sufficient knowledge to communicate procedural content but encountered substantial difficulty selecting appropriate linguistic forms and supplying obligatory grammatical elements. Students could therefore construct recognizable procedural instructions while still producing inaccurate lexical and grammatical realizations of those instructions. This pattern indicates a discrepancy between students' functional understanding of procedural writing and their ability to express that understanding with the linguistic precision required in written English.

Omission Errors: When Less Becomes a Problem

Omission constituted the second most frequent error category, with 106 occurrences representing 28.49% of the total errors. The researchers identified recurring omissions of subjects and other obligatory grammatical elements that English generally requires for structurally complete clauses. Such omissions frequently resulted in sentence fragments or constructions whose intended meanings remained understandable despite their grammatical incompleteness. The pattern deserves particular attention because Indonesian and English differ substantially in the extent to which contextual information can support the omission of explicitly expressed sentence elements. Table 2 presents representative examples of omission errors identified in the students' procedure texts.

Table 2. Representative Examples of Omission Errors

Students' Error	Explanation	Correction
<i>more efficient</i>	The subject and verb are omitted; the expression does not constitute a complete sentence.	<i>It is more efficient.</i>
<i>releases a fragrant and savory taste</i>	The subject (<i>garlic</i>) is omitted at the beginning of the sentence.	<i>Garlic releases a fragrant and savory taste.</i>
<i>know how to make fried rice</i>	The subject is omitted before the verb, resulting in an incomplete clause.	<i>We can know how to make fried rice.</i>

The patterns presented in Table 2 indicate that fragments such as "*more efficient*" and "*releases a fragrant and savory taste*" represent recurring structural tendencies rather than isolated inaccuracies. Cross-linguistic influence may contribute to these patterns because Indonesian permits greater contextual recovery of omitted elements in particular communicative contexts, whereas English generally requires explicit subjects in finite declarative clauses (Dwisnu, 2023; Masita, 2023). When students transfer familiar first-language patterns into English writing, they may produce incomplete constructions that do not satisfy the syntactic requirements of the target language. These errors therefore suggest incomplete acquisition of important structural distinctions between Indonesian and English rather than simple carelessness during writing. Soraya (2020) supports the need for targeted instruction that helps learners recognize obligatory English sentence elements within meaningful writing contexts, particularly when constructing declarative statements and genre-appropriate imperative constructions.

Addition Errors: The Paradox of Trying Too Hard

Addition accounted for 88 errors, representing 23.66% of all identified errors and ranking as the third most frequent category. The researchers observed two prominent patterns within this category: unnecessary descriptive elaboration and excessive insertion of transitional expressions. Students appeared to add linguistic elements in an effort to make their texts more descriptive, explicit, or systematically sequenced, even when the additional forms were unnecessary within the immediate context. These patterns demonstrate that students had acquired certain genre-related features but had not yet developed sufficient control over their appropriate distribution and frequency. Table 3 presents representative examples of addition errors found in the students' procedure texts.

Table 3. Representative Examples of Addition Errors

Students' Error	Explanation	Correction
<i>simple and delicious fried rice</i>	The adjective <i>delicious</i> is unnecessarily added in the intended construction.	<i>simple fried rice</i>
<i>First heat some oil, second chop the garlic, next crack the egg</i>	The transition signals <i>first</i> , <i>second</i> , and <i>next</i> are used excessively within a single step.	<i>Heat some oil. Chop the garlic. Crack the egg.</i>

Students' Error	Explanation	Correction
<i>ingredients first</i>	<i>First</i> is redundant because the preceding context already indicates sequence.	<i>Ingredients</i>

The addition errors presented in Table 3 reveal an important developmental pattern: some students produced inaccuracies while attempting to enrich or clarify their procedural writing. The frequent insertion of descriptive adjectives and successive transition markers suggests that students associated extensive elaboration and explicit sequencing with higher-quality writing but lacked sufficient metalinguistic awareness to determine when these elements became redundant. Nugraha et al. (2022) describe this phenomenon as *overgeneralization*, in which learners extend an acquired linguistic rule or pattern beyond the contexts in which it appropriately applies. Sianipar et al. (2023) similarly observed addition errors in EFL academic writing and associated them with learners' attempts to compensate for perceived linguistic insufficiency by inserting elements they considered characteristic of more formal or elaborate writing. Instruction should therefore preserve students' willingness to elaborate and sequence information while developing their ability to judge grammatical necessity, contextual relevance, and rhetorical sufficiency in procedural writing.

Misformation Errors: The Deepest Lexical Challenge

Misformation represented the most frequent error category, accounting for 115 occurrences or 30.91% of the total errors. These errors occurred when students supplied linguistic forms that approximated their intended meanings but remained grammatically, lexically, or contextually inappropriate. The identified patterns included incorrect word forms, unsuitable lexical choices, inappropriate prepositions, and unnatural expressions. Their prevalence indicates that students frequently possessed partial knowledge of the intended linguistic item but encountered difficulty selecting the precise form required by the immediate context. Table 4 presents representative examples illustrating the range of misformation errors identified in the students' texts.

Table 4. Representative Examples of Misformation Errors

Students' Error	Explanation	Correction
<i>Server the fried rice while it is still hot</i>	Incorrect lexical form; <i>server</i> functions as a noun rather than the required verb.	<i>Serve the fried rice while it is still hot.</i>
<i>the quality of the material</i>	<i>Material</i> is contextually inappropriate; <i>ingredients</i> represents the appropriate domain-specific term.	<i>the quality of the ingredients</i>
<i>Because that is the easiest part from the process</i>	The student uses the inappropriate preposition <i>from</i> instead of <i>of</i> .	<i>Because that is the easiest part of the process.</i>

The examples presented in Table 4 reveal difficulties that extend beyond mechanical spelling inaccuracies. Students frequently selected lexical items that occupied a related semantic field but were morphologically, collocationally, or contextually inappropriate, as illustrated by the use of *server* instead of *serve* and *material* instead of the domain-specific term *ingredients*. Such patterns indicate partial lexical knowledge: students appear to recognize the approximate semantic meaning they wish to communicate but lack sufficient command of word class, collocation, register, and contextually appropriate lexical selection. Syahputri (2018) explains that misformation occurs when learners employ an incorrect form of a morpheme or grammatical structure because they have not fully internalized the relevant target-language rules. This finding also corresponds with Husnayaini et al. (2021) and Khanom (2014), who identified vocabulary misuse as a prominent difficulty in EFL procedure-text writing and consequently highlight the importance of explicitly teaching collocations and domain-specific vocabulary through authentic genre-based writing activities.

Misordering Errors: Structure Known, Execution Incomplete

Misordering constituted the least frequent error category, with 63 occurrences representing 16.94% of the total errors, yet this category carries important implications for the communicative effectiveness of procedure texts. Unlike errors that primarily affect individual lexical or grammatical forms, the identified misordering patterns frequently disrupted the organization and presentation of procedural steps. Students often combined several instructions within a single construction without adequate punctuation, sentence boundaries, or appropriate sequencing devices. Such patterns reduced textual clarity and required readers to infer where one procedural step ended and another began. Table 5 presents representative examples of misordering errors identified in the students' procedure texts.

Table 5. Representative Examples of Misordering Errors

Students' Error	Explanation	Correction
<i>First heat some oil, second chop the garlic</i>	Multiple clauses are combined without appropriate punctuation or clear sentence boundaries.	<i>First, heat some oil. Second, chop the garlic.</i>
<i>Cook for a few minutes until everything is well combined, Serve the friend rice while it is still hot</i>	Two separate procedural steps are written continuously without clear separation.	<i>Cook for a few minutes until everything is well combined. Serve the fried rice while it is still hot.</i>
<i>add egg and scramble. Put in vegetables and cook shortly add noodles</i>	Multiple instructions appear without adequate connectors or punctuation, making the procedural sequence difficult to follow.	<i>Add egg and scramble it. Put in vegetables and cook for a short time, then add noodles.</i>

The patterns presented in Table 5 demonstrate that misordering rarely involved the simple rearrangement of individual words within a clause. Instead, students predominantly merged multiple procedural instructions into single constructions without sufficient punctuation or clearly defined sentence boundaries. This pattern suggests that students generally understood the logical progression of the procedure but had not fully mastered the textual conventions required to represent that progression through clearly delineated and reader-accessible instructions. Within the context of procedure-text writing, misordering therefore operated primarily at the discourse level, reflecting weaknesses in textual organization, punctuation, and the linguistic representation of sequential relationships rather than solely in syntactic knowledge. Students consequently require explicit instruction in organizing each procedural step as a distinct and coherent instruction while using appropriate punctuation and sequencing devices to establish clear relationships between successive actions.

Synthesis: What These Errors Reveal

Taken together, the four error categories represent interconnected dimensions of a broader developmental challenge in students' procedural writing. The findings indicate that students had developed a functional understanding of the basic schema of procedure texts, particularly the need to communicate actions through logically sequenced steps, but had not yet acquired sufficient linguistic precision to realize this schema consistently in written English. The predominance of misformation and omission demonstrates that lexical selection and sentence-level grammatical accuracy constitute the most immediate areas of difficulty, whereas addition errors indicate that students also require greater awareness of linguistic economy and contextual sufficiency. Meanwhile, the discourse-oriented characteristics of misordering demonstrate that sentence-level grammatical instruction alone cannot adequately address the problems identified in students' writing. Effective instruction should therefore integrate lexical development, grammatical accuracy, punctuation, sequencing, and genre awareness so that students can transform their procedural knowledge into linguistically accurate and communicatively accessible texts.

From an academic perspective, these findings provide a grade-specific and genre-specific account of EFL writing errors within the Indonesian secondary-school context. The analysis demonstrates that the four categories of the Surface Strategy Taxonomy capture different but interrelated dimensions of students' developing writing competence, ranging from missing and unnecessarily added linguistic elements to inappropriate forms and inadequately organized procedural instructions. The findings also extend previous research by focusing specifically on eleventh-grade students and systematically examining their procedure-text errors through a unified taxonomic framework. This focus distinguishes the present study from earlier investigations that examined different grade levels or employed broader classifications of writing difficulties. The study therefore contributes empirical evidence that can support more diagnostically informed writing instruction by linking identifiable error patterns with specific areas requiring pedagogical intervention.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that eleventh-grade students at State Senior High School 3 Kisaran produced all four error categories identified in the Surface Strategy Taxonomy proposed by Dulay and Burt (1982) when writing procedure texts. The analysis identified 372 errors, comprising 115 misformation errors (30.91%), 106 omission errors (28.49%), 88 addition errors (23.66%), and 63 misordering errors (16.94%), with misformation emerging as the most dominant category. These findings directly answer the research question by demonstrating that students' primary difficulties involved selecting contextually appropriate vocabulary and applying accurate grammatical forms, while the high frequency of omission errors reflected difficulties in supplying obligatory grammatical constituents, particularly

subjects and auxiliary verbs, partly due to cross-linguistic influence from Indonesian. The findings also demonstrate the diagnostic value of the Surface Strategy Taxonomy for identifying EFL learners' linguistic difficulties at both sentence and discourse levels. English teachers should therefore provide explicit, genre-sensitive instruction that emphasizes verb forms, collocations, domain-specific vocabulary, obligatory grammatical constituents, and systematic opportunities for students to identify and revise errors in their own procedural writing.

This study remains limited by its focus on a single class of twenty students at one school in Kisaran, North Sumatra, which restricts the broader generalizability of the findings across different EFL educational contexts. The exclusive use of written procedure texts also limits the analysis to a single genre and prevents the findings from representing students' error patterns across other text types and productive language skills. Future studies should involve larger and more diverse participant groups across different schools and educational settings and compare error patterns across genres such as narrative, descriptive, and analytical exposition texts. Researchers could also integrate quantitative error analysis with qualitative techniques, including *think-aloud protocols* and semi-structured interviews, to investigate the cognitive and linguistic processes underlying students' written errors more comprehensively. Such investigations could provide a stronger empirical foundation for designing targeted pedagogical interventions that address both the observable forms and underlying causes of errors in second-language writing.

REFERENCES

- Adelita, D., Kurniati, E. Y., & Daulay, S. H. (2023). Difficulties and Strategies in Producing English Writing Text: What do EFL Students' Perceive? *Education and Human Development Journal*, 8(1), 93–108.
<https://doi.org/10.33086/ehdj.v8i1.3698>
- Amanda, D. C., Herlina, & Kartikasari, D. (2024). Linguistic Strategy in a Culinary Context: Procedure Text Approach to Traditional Food and Current Cooking Recipes. *Esteem Journal of English Education Study Programme*, 7(2), 781–788. <https://doi.org/10.31851/esteem.v7i2.16038>
- Berlianty, T., Suhartono, L., & Rosnija, E. (2025). The Effectiveness of TikTok Features in Teaching Writing of Procedure Text. *Journal of English Language and Education*, 10(6), 1142–1153.
<https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v10i6.1702>
- Dagson, K. G. L. (2026). Analysis of Tertiary Learners' Writing Errors through Surface Strategy Taxonomy. *ETDC: Indonesian Journal of Research and Educational Review*, 5(2), 848–873.
<https://doi.org/10.51574/ijrer.v5i2.4321>
- Desnaranti, L., & Putra, F. P. (2024). Implementing Surface Structure Taxonomy in Analyzing Undergraduate Students' Business E-Mail Errors. *Research and Development Journal of Education*, 10(2), 1078.
<https://doi.org/10.30998/rdje.v10i2.23360>
- Dwisnu, E. (2023). Teaching Procedure Text by Using Interactive Activities to Improve The Speaking Ability of The Students. *Jurnal Pendidikan Rafflesia*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.70963/jpr.v1i2.60>
- Heidi Dulay, Marina Burt, S. K. (1982). *Language Two*.
- Husnayaini, I., Rizki, M. T., & Savitri, C. (2021). An Analysis of Students' Grammatical Errors in Writing Procedure Texts. *EEdJ: English Education Journal*, 1(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.32923/eedj.v1i1.1791>
- Khanom, H. (2014). Error Analysis in the Writing Tasks of Higher Secondary Level Students of Bangladesh. *GSTF Journal on Education*, 2(1), 2. <https://doi.org/10.7603/s40742-014-0002-x>
- Masita, M. (2023). Analysis of Cadets' Skill in Envisaging Job Interview through Demonstration Method for Aircraft Maintenance Technology Aviation Polytechnic of Makassar. *Ethical Lingua: Journal of Language Teaching and Literature*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.30605/25409190.555>
- Mertosono, S. R., & Erniwati, E. (2023). Error Analysis: Types and Causes of EFL Learners' Errors in Writing Analytical Exposition Text. *Eralingua: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Asing Dan Sastra*, 7(1), 64.
<https://doi.org/10.26858/eralingua.v7i1.37875>
- Nugraha, B. A., Sodiq, J., & Musarokah, S. (2022). Error Analysis in Writing Procedure Text of The Ninth Grade Students of SMP N 4 Juwana Pati in the Academic Year 2021/2022. *Undergraduate Conference on Applied Linguistics, Linguistics, and Literature*, 2(1), 104–115.
<https://conference.upgris.ac.id/index.php/allure/article/view/2974>
- Sianipar, M. O. C., Simarmata, R. O., Tampubolon, S., & Lumbangaol, S. E. (2023). An Error Analysis of Preposition Usage in Writing Procedure Text by Students at SMA HKBP Sidorame. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran (JUPEJA)*, 1(1), 30–33. <https://doi.org/10.69820/jupeja.v1i1.44>

- Soraya, K. (2020). An Analysis on The Gramatical Error of Procedure Text Writen by The Third Grade of SMPN 286 Jakarta. *Journal of Industrial Engineering & Management Research*, 1(4), 114–122. <https://doi.org/10.7777/JIEMAR.V1I4.108>
- Syahputri, D. (2018). Ananalysis of The Students Error in Writing Descriptive Text. *Edutech: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Dan Ilmu Sosial*, 4(1), 1–10. <https://jurnal.umsu.ac.id:444/index.php/edutech/article/view/1884>
- Tiyas, S. W., & Kartikawati, D. (2024). An Analysis of Tenth Grade Students' Difficulties in Writing Procedure Text. *Variable Research Journal*, 1(2), 1–10. <https://variablejournal.my.id/index.php/VRJ/article/view/82>