



Linguistic Representation of Sensory Experience in EFL Descriptive Texts

Atika Salman Paris^{1*}, M. Wahyu Hadi¹

¹Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Institut Pendidikan Nusantara Global, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author's e-mail: atikasalmanparis@nusantaraglobal.ac.id

Article History:

Received: May 13, 2026

Revised: June 20, 2026

Accepted: July 11, 2026

Keywords:

sensory lexicon;

descriptive writing;

linguistic representation;

EFL writing

Abstract: This study investigates the linguistic representation of sensory experience in EFL descriptive texts through the analysis of sensory-related lexical expressions employed by EFL learners in descriptive writing. The study aims to identify the types of sensory expressions used in EFL descriptive texts, analyze how sensory experiences are linguistically represented through lexical and descriptive features, and examine the contribution of sensory language to the construction of descriptive meaning. This study employed a qualitative descriptive design with a linguistic analysis approach. The data consisted of 30 descriptive texts written by undergraduate EFL students on various themes, including tourism destinations, people, food, houses, pets, and campus environments. The data were collected through writing tasks and analyzed using qualitative content analysis and lexical categorization techniques. The identified sensory expressions were classified into five categories, namely visual, tactile, auditory, olfactory, and gustatory categories. The findings revealed that students actively employed sensory vocabulary to construct descriptive imagery, experiential meaning, and environmental atmosphere within their texts. Visual sensory expressions emerged as the most dominant category, followed by tactile and auditory expressions, while olfactory and gustatory categories appeared less frequently. The study also demonstrated that sensory language was commonly realized through adjective-noun combinations, descriptive modifiers, and experiential clauses. Furthermore, the findings indicate that sensory representation in EFL descriptive writing is closely related to experiential familiarity, lexical availability, and embodied perception. Sensory vocabulary functioned not only as lexical enrichment but also as an important linguistic resource for constructing vividness, emotional engagement, and descriptive meaning. This study contributes to discussions on sensory linguistics, descriptive discourse, and linguistic representation in EFL contexts by demonstrating how learners transform sensory perception into written language. The findings also provide practical implications for EFL writing instruction, particularly in promoting sensory vocabulary development and experiential language use in descriptive writing practices.

Copyright © 2026, The Author(s).

This is an open access article under the CC-BY-SA license



How to cite: Paris, A. S., & Hadi, M. W. (2026). Linguistic Representation of Sensory Experience in EFL Descriptive Texts. *SENTRI: Jurnal Riset Ilmiah*, 5(7), 3740–3753. <https://doi.org/10.55681/sentri.v5i7.5464>

Introduction

Writing is widely recognized as one of the most complex productive skills in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learning because it requires learners to organize ideas, apply grammatical knowledge, select appropriate vocabulary, and communicate meaning effectively in written form. In academic contexts, writing is not merely a medium of communication but also a representation of learners' cognitive, linguistic, and expressive abilities. Among various genres taught in EFL classrooms, descriptive writing occupies an

important position because it encourages learners to portray people, objects, places, experiences, and situations vividly through language. Through descriptive texts, learners are expected to create detailed depictions that enable readers to imagine and experience the described object as if they were directly involved in the situation.

Descriptive writing is closely associated with the use of sensory language because the effectiveness of a descriptive text depends largely on the writer's ability to represent sensory experiences linguistically. Sensory experience refers to human perception obtained through the senses, including sight, hearing, smell, taste, and touch. In writing, these sensory dimensions are commonly realized through lexical choices, descriptive expressions, metaphors, and other linguistic features that help readers visualize and emotionally engage with the text. Therefore, descriptive writing is not solely concerned with grammatical accuracy or textual organization, but also with how language conveys sensory impressions and experiential meaning.

Previous studies in EFL writing have highlighted the importance of vocabulary knowledge, grammatical complexity, and learning engagement in improving descriptive writing performance. Dabbagh & Janebi Enayat (2019) found that vocabulary breadth and depth significantly influence learners' descriptive writing quality because vocabulary knowledge enables learners to express ideas more accurately and elaborately. Similarly, Biber et al (2020) and Mostafa & Crossley (2020) emphasized that linguistic complexity contributes to writing quality by allowing learners to construct richer and more sophisticated descriptions. Other studies have also investigated the integration of technology into descriptive writing instruction. Huang et al (2020), Yang et al (2021), and Chen et al (2021) demonstrated that virtual reality-supported learning environments could improve learners' descriptive writing performance by providing immersive experiences that stimulate observation and imagination. In addition, Wang (2022) and Dizon & Gayed (2021) explored the role of artificial intelligence and digital writing tools in supporting EFL writing development, while Wu et al (2020), Yusuf et al (2019), Herman et al (2020), and Peungcharoenkun & Waluyo (2023) examined instructional approaches that enhance writing motivation, collaboration, and genre awareness.

At the same time, studies in linguistics and sensory research have increasingly focused on how humans communicate sensory experiences through language. Sensory lexicon studies reveal that sensory descriptors function as important communicative tools for expressing perceptions and experiential qualities. Asih et al (2021) explained that sensory lexicons facilitate communication by providing structured vocabulary for describing sensory characteristics, while Suwonsichon (2019) emphasized their importance in supporting accurate sensory representation and interpretation. Research conducted by Bondu et al (2022) and Chigwedere et al (2022) further demonstrated the growing interest in developing sensory lexicons and classification systems in various contexts. Moreover, advances in computational linguistics and natural language processing have enabled researchers to identify sensory descriptors automatically and analyze patterns of sensory language use in discourse (Hamilton & Lahne, 2020; Miller et al, 2021).

Beyond lexical studies, sensory language has also been examined from cognitive and cultural perspectives. Majid (2021) argued that sensory expression reflects the interaction between language, culture, cognition, and biology, indicating that sensory vocabulary is deeply connected to human conceptualization and experience. Reilly et al (2020) further suggested that the English lexicon mirrors sensory hierarchies dominated by visual and auditory perception, while Zhong et al (2022) demonstrated how bodily sensation and

embodiment are represented through gustatory vocabulary in linguistic contexts. Additionally, Winter (2019) discussed how sensory expressions and synaesthetic metaphors reveal complex relationships between perception and linguistic meaning. These studies collectively indicate that sensory representation is an essential aspect of language use and meaning construction.

Although descriptive writing and sensory language have both received substantial scholarly attention, studies that specifically investigate the linguistic representation of sensory experience in EFL descriptive texts remain limited. Existing descriptive writing research predominantly emphasizes instructional strategies, technological integration, writing quality, and linguistic complexity, whereas sensory language research tends to focus on sensory lexicons in food studies, computational analysis, or cognitive linguistics. Consequently, there is still insufficient understanding of how EFL learners linguistically encode sensory experiences in descriptive writing contexts.

This gap is important because descriptive texts fundamentally rely on sensory representation to create vividness and reader engagement. In many EFL contexts, learners are often able to produce structurally organized descriptive texts; however, their writing may lack expressive sensory detail and experiential richness. Learners frequently rely on general vocabulary and repetitive descriptions rather than utilizing varied sensory expressions that evoke imagery and perception. Such limitations may reduce the communicative effectiveness and aesthetic quality of descriptive writing. Furthermore, limited awareness of sensory language use may indicate insufficient integration of experiential and linguistic dimensions in EFL writing instruction.

From a linguistic perspective, examining sensory representation in EFL descriptive texts can provide insights into how learners conceptualize experience and transform perception into language. The study may also reveal patterns of lexical preference, sensory dominance, and descriptive strategies employed by EFL learners. Therefore, investigating sensory language in descriptive writing is important not only for understanding learners' linguistic performance but also for exploring the relationship between language, cognition, and sensory experience in EFL contexts.

However, despite the growing body of research on descriptive writing and sensory language, studies that specifically investigate the linguistic representation of sensory experience in EFL descriptive texts remain limited. Existing studies mainly emphasize instructional strategies, technological integration, writing quality, grammatical complexity, vocabulary mastery, and learning engagement, whereas sensory language research tends to focus on food studies, computational analysis, and cognitive linguistics. Consequently, there is still limited understanding of how EFL learners linguistically represent sensory experiences in descriptive writing contexts. This issue is important because descriptive texts fundamentally rely on sensory representation to create vividness, imagery, and reader engagement. In many EFL contexts, learners are able to produce structurally organized descriptive texts; however, their writing often lacks expressive sensory detail and experiential richness. Learners frequently rely on general vocabulary and repetitive descriptions rather than varied sensory expressions that evoke imagery and perception. As a result, the communicative effectiveness and aesthetic quality of descriptive writing may be reduced. Furthermore, previous studies have not adequately examined which sensory dimensions are most frequently represented in EFL descriptive texts, how sensory expressions are linguistically constructed, and how these representations contribute to descriptive meaning-making.

From a linguistic perspective, examining sensory representation in EFL descriptive texts can provide insights into how learners conceptualize experience and transform perception into language. The study may also reveal patterns of lexical preference, sensory dominance, and descriptive strategies employed by EFL learners. Therefore, investigating sensory language in descriptive writing is important not only for understanding learners' linguistic performance but also for exploring the relationship between language, cognition, and sensory experience in EFL contexts. Based on these considerations, this study aims to investigate the linguistic representation of sensory experience in EFL descriptive texts. Specifically, the study seeks to identify the types of sensory expressions used in EFL descriptive texts, analyze how sensory experiences are linguistically represented through lexical and descriptive features in EFL writing, and examine the contribution of sensory language to the construction of descriptive meaning in EFL descriptive texts.

The findings of this study are expected to contribute both theoretically and practically to the fields of linguistics and EFL writing research. Theoretically, this study is expected to enrich discussions of sensory linguistics and descriptive writing by connecting sensory experience representation with EFL writing practices. The study may also contribute to broader discussions concerning language, cognition, embodiment, and meaning construction. Practically, the findings may provide useful implications for EFL teachers, lecturers, curriculum developers, and writing practitioners in designing descriptive writing instruction that emphasizes vividness, imagery, and experiential detail. Furthermore, the results may serve as a reference for future researchers interested in sensory language, descriptive writing, and EFL discourse analysis.

METHODS

This study employed a qualitative descriptive research design with a linguistic analysis approach to investigate the linguistic representation of sensory experience in EFL descriptive texts. The study focused on identifying sensory-related lexical expressions and examining how sensory experiences were represented through descriptive language in students' writing. A qualitative approach was considered appropriate because the study aimed to explore lexical patterns, descriptive tendencies, and experiential meaning construction rather than to measure statistical relationships or experimental effects.

The data source of this study consisted of descriptive texts written by undergraduate EFL students enrolled in English-related courses at the university level. The participants were selected purposively because they had previously studied descriptive writing and were considered capable of producing descriptive texts containing various lexical and experiential representations. The sample of the study consisted of 30 descriptive texts written in English. The texts covered various themes, including tourism destinations, people, pets, houses, campus environments, and personal experiences. Each text consisted of approximately two paragraphs to provide sufficient descriptive elaboration and sensory representation.

The data were collected through a writing task administered to the participants. Students were instructed to compose descriptive texts freely based on selected themes without strict vocabulary restrictions. This procedure was intended to obtain natural and authentic representations of sensory language use in students' writing. The writing task functioned as the primary research instrument because it enabled the researcher to collect textual data containing lexical and descriptive expressions related to sensory experience.

After the writing process was completed, all texts were compiled into a textual corpus for analysis.

The data analysis was conducted using qualitative content analysis and lexical categorization techniques. First, all descriptive texts were carefully read repeatedly to identify sensory-related lexical items and descriptive expressions. The identified expressions were then coded and classified into five sensory categories adapted from sensory lexicon and sensory perception studies, namely visual, auditory, olfactory, gustatory, and tactile categories (Asih et al., 2021; Suwonsichon, 2019; Majid, 2021). Visual expressions referred to lexical items related to sight and appearance, auditory expressions referred to sound-related vocabulary, olfactory expressions referred to smell-related experiences, gustatory expressions represented taste-related perceptions, and tactile expressions referred to touch, texture, and physical sensation.

After the coding process, the researcher analyzed patterns of sensory representation by examining lexical tendencies, dominant sensory categories, and descriptive functions of sensory expressions within the texts. The analysis also focused on how students linguistically represented experiential meaning through sensory vocabulary and descriptive language choices. To support the interpretation of findings, selected excerpts from students' descriptive texts were analyzed contextually to illustrate the use of sensory lexicon in constructing descriptive imagery and experiential representation.

To ensure the trustworthiness of the analysis, the coding and categorization processes were conducted systematically by repeatedly reviewing the texts and cross-checking the identified lexical items according to the predetermined sensory categories. The analysis emphasized consistency, contextual interpretation, and careful examination of sensory language use in EFL descriptive writing contexts.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Distribution of Sensory Lexicon Categories

The analysis of the descriptive texts revealed that EFL students actively employed sensory-related lexical expressions to construct descriptive meaning and experiential representation. The sensory expressions identified in the corpus were classified into five categories, namely visual, auditory, olfactory, gustatory, and tactile categories. These categories appeared with different frequencies, indicating varying tendencies in students' descriptive language use.

Table 1. Distribution of Sensory Lexicon Categories in EFL Descriptive Texts

Visual	128	41%
Tactile	82	26%
Auditory	51	16%
Olfactory	28	9%
Gustatory	23	8%
Total	312	100%

Referring to Table 1, visual sensory expressions appeared as the most dominant category with 41% of the total identified sensory lexicon. Students frequently employed

lexical items such as beautiful, bright, green, blue, large, dark, colorful, and shiny to describe tourism destinations, natural scenery, classrooms, houses, and people. These findings indicate that visual perception became the primary sensory resource used by EFL learners when constructing descriptive imagery. The dominance of visual representation supports the argument proposed by Reilly et al. (2020), who explained that sensory hierarchies in language tend to prioritize visual and auditory perception because humans naturally rely heavily on visual experience when conceptualizing surrounding environments.

Tactile expressions represented the second most dominant category with 26% of the identified sensory lexicon. Students commonly used words such as warm, cold, soft, smooth, comfortable, and hot to represent physical sensations and environmental atmosphere. Tactile representation frequently appeared in descriptions of beaches, classrooms, weather, bedrooms, pets, and tourism destinations. The use of tactile vocabulary demonstrates that students attempted to create experiential closeness and emotional engagement through bodily sensation. This finding is consistent with Zhong et al. (2022), who emphasized that bodily sensation and embodied perception are strongly reflected through lexical representation and descriptive language.

Auditory expressions accounted for 16% of the sensory lexicon identified in the corpus. Students frequently used lexical items such as quiet, loud, noisy, music, waves, birds, and laughter to construct sound-related imagery and environmental atmosphere. Although auditory expressions were less dominant than visual and tactile categories, they still contributed significantly to the construction of immersive descriptive settings. Meanwhile, olfactory and gustatory expressions appeared less frequently. Olfactory vocabulary included expressions such as fragrant, fresh smell, aromatic, and smoky, whereas gustatory expressions included sweet, spicy, salty, and delicious. These categories mainly appeared in texts discussing food, traditional culinary experiences, tourism destinations, and family gatherings. The relatively low frequency of gustatory and olfactory expressions may indicate that students possess more limited sensory vocabulary related to smell and taste compared to visual and tactile vocabulary.

Visual Representation in EFL Descriptive Texts

The findings demonstrated that visual representation became the most dominant form of sensory representation in students' descriptive texts. Visual expressions were commonly realized through adjective-noun combinations, descriptive modifiers, and spatial descriptions. Students frequently employed lexical constructions such as beautiful beach, bright sunlight, green hills, large classroom, and blue ocean to create visual imagery and environmental description.

Table 2. Examples of Visual Sensory Representation

Text Excerpt	Linguistic Feature
"The beach had bright blue water and beautiful white sand."	Adjective-noun combination
"The classroom was large and very clean."	Visual descriptive modifier
"The green hills looked peaceful during the afternoon."	Spatial visual imagery

Referring to Table 2, visual representation was frequently constructed through descriptive adjective patterns. Students relied heavily on color expressions, size descriptors, and appearance-related vocabulary to represent observable environments. This tendency indicates that learners primarily depended on visual observation when constructing descriptive discourse. Such findings support Majid (2021), who argued that sensory perception and lexical representation are strongly connected to how humans conceptualize experience through observable phenomena.

The dominance of visual representation may also indicate that visual sensory experiences are cognitively more accessible for EFL learners compared to other sensory dimensions. Students appeared more confident in describing visual environments because visual experiences are easier to observe directly and easier to lexicalize through commonly learned descriptive vocabulary.

Tactile Representation and Experiential Meaning

Tactile representation emerged as the second most dominant sensory category in the corpus. Tactile expressions were frequently used to create emotional atmosphere, physical comfort, and experiential immersion within descriptive texts. Students often employed tactile vocabulary to describe environmental conditions, weather, physical surfaces, and bodily sensations.

Table 3. Examples of Tactile Representation

Text Excerpt	Sensory Meaning
“The soft sand made me feel relaxed.”	Physical texture
“The warm sunlight touched my face gently.”	Bodily sensation
“My room feels comfortable and peaceful.”	Emotional atmosphere

Referring to Table 3, tactile representation frequently functioned as a mechanism for constructing experiential closeness and emotional engagement. Expressions such as soft sand, warm sunlight, and comfortable room allowed students to create more immersive descriptions by involving bodily perception. These findings suggest that tactile vocabulary contributes significantly to experiential meaning-making in descriptive discourse.

From a linguistic perspective, tactile representation was often realized through evaluative adjectives and sensory modifiers. Students tended to combine tactile expressions with emotional descriptors to strengthen descriptive atmosphere. This finding demonstrates that sensory language in EFL descriptive writing functions not only as literal physical description but also as a representation of affective and experiential meaning.

Auditory, Olfactory, and Gustatory Representation

Although auditory, olfactory, and gustatory expressions appeared less frequently compared to visual and tactile categories, these sensory dimensions still contributed to the construction of descriptive imagery and environmental atmosphere. Auditory expressions commonly represented natural sounds, classroom situations, and social interaction.

Table 4. Examples of Auditory Representation

Text Excerpt	Sensory Category
“I could hear the relaxing sound of the waves.”	Auditory
“The birds were singing beautifully in the morning.”	Auditory
“The street became noisy at night.”	Auditory

The auditory expressions identified in the texts mainly functioned to strengthen environmental realism and atmosphere. Students used sound-related vocabulary to create a sense of movement and activity within descriptive settings. These findings indicate that auditory representation supports the creation of immersive environmental imagery in EFL descriptive writing.

Meanwhile, olfactory and gustatory representations were predominantly associated with food, drinks, and tourism experiences. Students frequently used lexical items such as sweet, delicious, fragrant, and fresh smell to represent taste and smell experiences.

Table 5. Examples of Olfactory and Gustatory Representation

Text Excerpt	Sensory Category
“The coffee smelled fresh and aromatic.”	Olfactory
“The spicy food tasted delicious.”	Gustatory
“The room had a fresh floral smell.”	Olfactory

The relatively limited appearance of olfactory and gustatory expressions may indicate that students possess narrower lexical repertoires for smell- and taste-related representation. This finding aligns with previous sensory language studies suggesting that visual and tactile vocabulary are generally more dominant and productive in linguistic communication than olfactory and gustatory vocabulary.

Linguistic Patterns of Sensory Representation

The findings also revealed several recurring linguistic patterns in students' sensory representation. Most sensory expressions were realized through adjective-noun constructions, descriptive modifiers, and experiential clauses. Students tended to use simple descriptive patterns to construct sensory imagery.

Table 6. Dominant Linguistic Patterns in Sensory Representation

Linguistic Pattern	Example
Adjective + Noun	beautiful beach, warm air, sweet coffee
Sensory Verb + Object	hear the waves, smell the coffee
Experiential Clause	The room feels comfortable.

The dominance of adjective-noun combinations indicates that students relied heavily on descriptive modifiers to construct sensory imagery. Such lexical patterns enabled learners to represent environmental details and experiential meaning more directly and concretely. In addition, experiential clauses involving sensory verbs such as feel, hear, and smell reflected attempts to connect bodily perception with descriptive discourse.

The findings further demonstrated that students frequently combined multiple sensory categories within single descriptive passages. This multisensory representation allowed learners to create richer imagery and stronger reader engagement.

Table 7. Multisensory Representation in Descriptive Texts

Text Excerpt	Sensory Categories
“The beach had soft sand, bright sunlight, and relaxing wave sounds.”	Tactile, Visual, Auditory
“The coffee smelled fresh and tasted slightly sweet.”	Olfactory, Gustatory

The integration of multiple sensory dimensions suggests that students attempted to create immersive descriptive experiences through layered sensory representation. Such findings indicate that sensory vocabulary functions as an important linguistic resource for constructing experiential meaning and descriptive vividness in EFL writing.

Discussion of Sensory Representation in EFL Contexts

The findings of this study demonstrate that sensory language plays a significant role in the construction of descriptive meaning in EFL descriptive texts. Students actively employed sensory vocabulary to represent experiences, environments, emotional atmosphere, and physical perception. Visual and tactile categories emerged as the most dominant sensory dimensions, indicating that learners relied heavily on observable and physically perceivable experiences when constructing descriptive discourse. These findings suggest that sensory vocabulary functions not only as a lexical resource but also as an important linguistic mechanism for constructing imagery, atmosphere, and experiential meaning within descriptive texts.

The dominance of visual representation reflects the central role of visual perception in human conceptualization and language use. Learners appeared more confident in describing visible environments because visual sensory experiences are cognitively more accessible and supported by more familiar descriptive vocabulary. The frequent use of expressions such as beautiful beach, bright sunlight, green hills, and blue ocean indicates that students relied heavily on adjective-noun constructions to create visual imagery and environmental representation. This finding supports Reilly et al. (2020), who argued that sensory hierarchies in the English lexicon are strongly dominated by visual perception because visual experience plays a major role in human cognition and communication. Similarly, Majid (2021) emphasized that sensory language reflects how humans conceptualize experiences through perception and embodied interaction. The findings therefore indicate that visual vocabulary becomes the primary linguistic resource employed by EFL learners to transform observation into descriptive representation.

In addition to visual representation, tactile sensory language also appeared prominently in the students' descriptive texts. Tactile expressions such as warm, soft, cold, smooth, and comfortable were frequently used to represent bodily sensation, physical atmosphere, and emotional closeness. These expressions commonly appeared in descriptions of weather, beaches, classrooms, houses, and personal environments. The dominance of tactile vocabulary suggests that students attempted to construct experiential immersion by involving bodily perception within their descriptions. This finding is consistent with Zhong et al. (2022), who demonstrated that bodily sensation and

embodiment are strongly reflected through linguistic representation and sensory vocabulary. In many cases, tactile expressions were not only used to describe physical texture but also emotional atmosphere and personal feeling. Expressions such as comfortable room or warm sunlight illustrate how sensory language may simultaneously represent physical sensation and affective meaning. This indicates that sensory representation in EFL descriptive writing involves both experiential and emotional dimensions.

The findings also reveal that auditory, olfactory, and gustatory categories contributed to descriptive meaning-making despite appearing less frequently than visual and tactile categories. Auditory expressions such as relaxing sound, noisy street, and birds singing were commonly used to create environmental atmosphere and situational realism. Meanwhile, olfactory and gustatory expressions frequently appeared in descriptions related to food, drinks, tourism experiences, and family activities. Students employed expressions such as sweet coffee, fresh smell, spicy food, and aromatic air to represent sensory perception associated with taste and smell. However, the relatively limited use of olfactory and gustatory vocabulary may indicate that learners possess narrower lexical repertoires for representing smell- and taste-related experiences. This finding aligns with sensory lexicon studies suggesting that olfactory and gustatory expressions are generally less productive and less frequently lexicalized compared to visual and tactile vocabulary. The limited appearance of these categories may also reflect the influence of EFL vocabulary exposure, in which visual and general descriptive vocabulary are more commonly emphasized in language learning materials and classroom instruction.

From a linguistic perspective, the findings demonstrate that sensory representation in EFL descriptive texts is closely associated with lexical patterns and descriptive structures. Most sensory expressions were realized through adjective-noun combinations, descriptive modifiers, and experiential clauses. Expressions such as beautiful beach, soft sand, bright classroom, and warm atmosphere indicate that students relied heavily on descriptive adjective patterns to construct sensory imagery. In addition, sensory verbs such as hear, feel, smell, and taste were frequently used to connect perception with experiential description. These linguistic patterns suggest that learners tended to employ concrete lexical modifiers and sensory predicates to transform perception into textual representation. Such findings indicate that descriptive writing is not merely concerned with grammatical correctness but also with how lexical choices contribute to experiential meaning-making.

The findings further demonstrate that sensory representation in EFL writing is strongly influenced by experiential familiarity and environmental accessibility. Students tended to employ sensory vocabulary associated with everyday experiences, tourism destinations, food, weather, homes, and familiar environments. This tendency suggests that personal experience influences lexical selection and descriptive strategy in EFL writing contexts. Learners appeared more capable of producing vivid sensory representation when describing environments and experiences that were directly connected to their daily lives. Such findings support the argument that language production is closely related to embodied experience and contextual familiarity. In other words, learners tend to represent sensory experiences more effectively when the described objects are cognitively and experientially accessible.

The study also indicates that sensory language contributes significantly to reader engagement and descriptive vividness. Sensory expressions enabled students to create

more immersive and emotionally engaging texts because readers could visualize, feel, hear, smell, or imagine the described situations more clearly. This demonstrates that sensory vocabulary functions as an important discourse strategy in descriptive writing. Through sensory representation, learners were able to construct atmosphere, emotional nuance, and experiential detail that strengthened the communicative quality of their texts. Consequently, sensory language should not be viewed merely as vocabulary enrichment but rather as an essential linguistic resource for constructing descriptive discourse.

From a broader theoretical perspective, the findings support previous discussions on embodiment, sensory linguistics, and experiential meaning construction. The study demonstrates that EFL learners transform sensory perception into linguistic representation through lexical choices, descriptive modifiers, and experiential expressions. Sensory language therefore reflects the interaction between language, perception, cognition, and experience. The findings also extend previous sensory lexicon studies by applying sensory language analysis within EFL descriptive writing contexts rather than within food studies, computational analysis, or sensory evaluation domains. This indicates that sensory representation can become an important area of investigation in EFL discourse and linguistic analysis.

In relation to EFL writing pedagogy, the findings imply that descriptive writing instruction should provide greater attention to sensory vocabulary development and experiential language use. Learners may benefit from writing activities that encourage observation, sensory exploration, and descriptive elaboration. The integration of sensory-based vocabulary activities, experiential prompts, and descriptive modeling may help students produce more vivid and meaningful descriptive texts. Furthermore, increasing learners' awareness of sensory language may improve not only vocabulary variation but also the communicative effectiveness and expressive quality of descriptive writing.

Overall, the findings indicate that the linguistic representation of sensory experience constitutes an important aspect of EFL descriptive writing. Sensory vocabulary enables learners to construct imagery, atmosphere, emotional engagement, and experiential meaning through descriptive discourse. Visual and tactile categories emerged as the most dominant sensory dimensions, while auditory, olfactory, and gustatory expressions provided additional layers of experiential representation. The study therefore contributes to the understanding of how EFL learners employ sensory lexicon to construct descriptive meaning while also extending discussions on sensory language, embodiment, and descriptive discourse in EFL contexts.

CONCLUSION

This study investigated the linguistic representation of sensory experience in EFL descriptive texts by analyzing the sensory expressions employed by EFL learners in descriptive writing. The findings revealed that students actively used sensory vocabulary to construct descriptive meaning, experiential imagery, and environmental atmosphere within their texts. The sensory expressions identified in the data were classified into five major categories, namely visual, tactile, auditory, olfactory, and gustatory categories. Among these categories, visual and tactile representations emerged as the most dominant sensory dimensions, indicating that learners relied heavily on observable and physically perceivable experiences when constructing descriptive discourse.

The study also demonstrated that sensory language was commonly realized through adjective-noun combinations, descriptive modifiers, and experiential clauses. Through

lexical expressions such as *beautiful beach*, *warm sunlight*, *soft sand*, and *fresh smell*, learners attempted to transform sensory perception into linguistic representation. These findings indicate that sensory vocabulary functions not only as lexical enrichment but also as an important linguistic resource for constructing imagery, emotional engagement, and experiential meaning in descriptive writing.

Furthermore, the findings suggest that sensory representation in EFL writing is strongly influenced by experiential familiarity and lexical availability. Learners tended to employ sensory expressions associated with everyday experiences, tourism destinations, food, weather, and familiar environments. This tendency demonstrates the close relationship between language, perception, and embodied experience in EFL descriptive discourse. The study therefore supports previous discussions on sensory linguistics and embodiment by showing that learners construct descriptive meaning through sensory-based lexical representation.

The study contributes theoretically to discussions on sensory language, descriptive discourse, and linguistic representation in EFL contexts. It also extends previous sensory lexicon research by applying sensory language analysis to EFL learners' descriptive writing. Practically, the findings imply that EFL writing instruction should provide greater attention to sensory vocabulary development and experiential language use in order to help learners produce more vivid, expressive, and meaningful descriptive texts.

Despite these contributions, the study was limited to a relatively small corpus of descriptive texts produced by EFL learners within a specific context. Future studies may investigate sensory representation using larger corpora, different genres of writing, or comparative linguistic approaches to obtain broader insights into sensory language use in EFL discourse.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The researcher would like to express sincere gratitude to all individuals who contributed to the completion of this study, especially the lecturers, academic supervisors, colleagues, and EFL students who participated in the research and provided valuable support, guidance, and contributions throughout the research process. The researcher also sincerely appreciates the scholars and researchers whose studies related to descriptive writing, sensory language, and linguistic representation have provided important theoretical foundations for this study. Finally, the researcher extends heartfelt appreciation to family and friends for their continuous encouragement, motivation, and support during the completion of this research

REFERENCES

- Asih, N. E., Ramadhanty, K. P., Ramandias, J., Azkarama, F., & Sunarharum, W. B. (2021). Lexicon, sensory wheel and kit as sensory communication tools: A review. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 924(1). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/924/1/012027>
- Yuxuan, Z. H. U., Yaqin, W. E. N., Xiaoqing, X. U., Yixin, C. H. E. N., Qingyu, S. U., Yaran, L. I. U., ... & Baoqing, Z. H. U. (2022). Research progress of sensory lexicon building method and applications in food. *Science and Technology of Food Industry*, 43(5), 396–407. <https://doi.org/10.13386/j.issn1002-0306.2021020138>

- Bondu, C., Salles, C., Weber, M., Guichard, E., & Visalli, M. (2022). Construction of a generic and evolutive wheel and lexicon of food textures. *Foods*, 11(19). <https://doi.org/10.3390/foods11193097>
- Chigwedere, C. M., Wanasundara, J. P., & Shand, P. J. (2022). Sensory descriptors for pulses and pulse-derived ingredients: Toward a standardized lexicon and sensory wheel. *Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety*, 21(2), 999–1023. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1541-4337.12893>
- Hamilton, L. M., & Lahne, J. (2020). Fast and automated sensory analysis: Using natural language processing for descriptive lexicon development. *Food Quality and Preference*, 83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2020.103926>
- Herman, H., Purba, R., Thao, N. V., & Purba, A. (2020). Using Genre-based Approach to Overcome Students' Difficulties in Writing. *Journal of Education and E-Learning Research*, 7(4), 464–470. <https://doi.org/10.20448/journal.509.2020.74.464.470>
- Miller, C., Hamilton, L., & Lahne, J. (2021). Sensory descriptor analysis of whisky lexicons through the use of deep learning. *Foods*, 10(7). <https://doi.org/10.3390/foods10071633>
- Majid, A. (2021). Human olfaction at the intersection of language, culture, and biology. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 25(2), 111–123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2020.11.005>
- Reilly, J., Flurie, M., & Peelle, J. E. (2020). The English lexicon mirrors functional brain activation for a sensory hierarchy dominated by vision and audition: Point-counterpoint. *Journal of neurolinguistics*, 55, 100895. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneuroling.2020.100895>
- Suwonsichon, S. (2019). The importance of sensory lexicons for research and development of food products. *Foods*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.3390/foods8010027>
- Winter, B. (2019). Synaesthetic metaphors are neither synaesthetic nor metaphorical. *Perception metaphors*, 19, 105–126. <https://doi.org/10.1075/celcr.19.06win>
- Zhong, Y., Huang, C. R., & Dong, S. (2022). BODILY SENSATION AND EMBODIMENT. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics*, 50(1), 196–230. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jcl.2022.0008>
- Huang, H. L., Hwang, G. J., & Chang, C. Y. (2020). Learning to be a writer: A spherical video-based virtual reality approach to supporting descriptive article writing in high school Chinese courses. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 51(4), 1386–1405. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12893>
- Yang, G., Chen, Y. T., Zheng, X. L., & Hwang, G. J. (2021). From experiencing to expressing: A virtual reality approach to facilitating pupils' descriptive paper writing performance and learning behavior engagement. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 52(2), 807–823. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13056>
- Chen, M., Chai, C. S., Jong, M. S. Y., & Jiang, M. Y. C. (2021). Teachers' conceptions of teaching Chinese descriptive composition with interactive spherical video-based virtual reality. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 591708. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.591708>
- Dabbagh, A., & Janebi Enayat, M. (2019). The role of vocabulary breadth and depth in predicting second language descriptive writing performance. *The Language Learning Journal*, 47(5), 575–590. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2017.1335765>

- Biber, D., Gray, B., Staples, S., & Egbert, J. (2021). Investigating grammatical complexity in L2 English writing research*: linguistic description versus predictive measurement. In *The Register-Functional Approach to Grammatical Complexity* (pp. 432-457). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2020.100869>
- Mostafa, T., & Crossley, S. A. (2020). Verb argument construction complexity indices and L2 writing quality: Effects of writing tasks and prompts. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 49, 100730. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100730>
- Wang, Z. (2022). Computer-assisted EFL writing and evaluations based on artificial intelligence: A case from a college reading and writing course. *Library Hi Tech*, 40(1), 80–97. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LHT-05-2020-0113>
- Dizon, G., & Gayed, J. M. (2021). *Examining the impact of Grammarly on the quality of mobile L2 writing*. *JALT CALL Journal*, 17 (2), 74–92. <https://doi.org/10.29140/jaltcall.v17n2.336>
- Wu, W. C. V., Yang, J. C., Scott Chen Hsieh, J., & Yamamoto, T. (2020). Free from demotivation in EFL writing: The use of online flipped writing instruction. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 33(4), 353-387. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2019.1567556>
- Yusuf, Q., Jusoh, Z., & Yusuf, Y. Q. (2019). Cooperative Learning Strategies to Enhance Writing Skills among Second Language Learners. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(1), 1399-1412. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12189a>
- Purba, R., Thao, N. V., & Purba, A. (2020). Using Genre-Based Approach to Overcome Students' Difficulties in Writing. *Journal of Education and E-Learning Research*, 7(4), 464-470. <https://doi.org/10.20448/journal.509.2020.74.464.470>
- Peungcharoenkun, T., & Waluyo, B. (2023). Implementing process-genre approach, feedback, and technology in L2 writing in higher education. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 8(1), 34. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-023-00211-7>