



## FROM TASTE TO TEXT: A CORPUS-BASED ANALYSIS OF FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE PATTERNS AND RHETORICAL QUALITY IN NOVICE EFL CULINARY DESCRIPTIONS

**Rahmadila Eka Putri\*<sup>1</sup>, Mutia Nasution<sup>2</sup>, Pramudia Prananda<sup>3</sup>, Muhammad Rasya<sup>4</sup>,**  
<sup>1</sup>[rahmadilaekaputri@polsri.ac.id](mailto:rahmadilaekaputri@polsri.ac.id), <sup>2</sup>[mutianasution@polsri.ac.id](mailto:mutianasution@polsri.ac.id), <sup>3</sup>[pramudiaprananda10@gmail.com](mailto:pramudiaprananda10@gmail.com),  
<sup>4</sup>[massacare170@gmail.com](mailto:massacare170@gmail.com)

<sup>1</sup>Politeknik Negeri Sriwijaya, Palembang, Sumatera Selatan, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Politeknik Negeri Sriwijaya, Palembang, Sumatera Selatan, Indonesia

<sup>3</sup>Politeknik Negeri Sriwijaya, Palembang, Sumatera Selatan, Indonesia

<sup>4</sup>Politeknik Negeri Sriwijaya, Palembang, Sumatera Selatan, Indonesia

### ABSTRACT

This study investigated the patterns and rhetorical quality of figurative language in novice EFL writers' descriptive texts about real culinary objects using quantitative corpus-based design supported by qualitative rhetorical evaluation. To generate the dataset, 42 first-semester learners in Narrative & Descriptive Writing course produced forty-two 500-word descriptions, forming a small corpus. The texts were manually coded using an instrument covering five figurative categories namely simile, metaphor, personification, hyperbole, and onomatopoeia. Two raters identified and classified all items to ensure reliability, guided by an analytic rubric assessing Contextual Appropriateness, Stylistic Effectiveness, and Creativity Response. The corpus contained 680 expressions, comprising 265 similes, 143 metaphors, 116 personifications, 101 hyperboles, and 55 instances of onomatopoeia. Simile dominated but demonstrated reliance on explicit comparative markers, whereas metaphor exhibited limited conceptual mapping. Personification contributed the strongest stylistic value, while hyperbole often led to overstatement and onomatopoeia appeared sparsely as isolated sound cues. Despite high figurative density, overall rhetorical effectiveness remained moderate, with creativity identified as the weakest dimension. The findings indicate that learners' figurative use is active yet formulaic. Pedagogically, the study highlights the need for explicit instruction, corpus-informed modelling, and guided revision to support more intentional and stylistically effective descriptive writing.

*Keywords:* Corpus-based analysis, Culinary description, EFL descriptive writing, Figurative language, Rhetorical Quality

### A. INTRODUCTION

In Indonesia, English as a Foreign Language (EFL) writing instruction is characterized by a continuing gap between curriculum policy goals and actual classroom practices. Additionally, writing is consistently perceived by students as the most challenging language skill, largely due to persistent difficulties in lexical selection, textual coherence, and grammatical control



(Nasution, Putri, & Agustina, 2024; Sa'adah, 2020; Yassin & Sood, 2024). Although national educational frameworks explicitly foreground communicative competence (Ameliana & Zahro, 2025; Anjani & Yuliati, 2025; Faisal & Rakhmasari, 2024; Nailissaadah & Triastuti, 2023), writing instruction in practice remains predominantly accuracy oriented. This pedagogical orientation privileges grammatical correctness and lexical adequacy while marginalizing expressive meaning making and rhetorical effectiveness, a tendency reinforced by prior empirical studies that frame descriptive writing primarily through error analysis (Arisman, 2023; Hamdani et al., 2025; Pangestu, 2024; Imsaqiah, 2025; Tyas & Oktavia, 2025; Yunanda et al., 2022). Consequently, learners often display surface level linguistic proficiency yet struggle to transform sensory experience, perception, and affect into rhetorically compelling descriptive discourse in writing. Descriptive writing, which should function as a foundational genre enabling learners to move from embodied experience to textual representation, is thus reduced to mechanical description and literal enumeration of features, producing texts that are informational but rhetorically inert. The persistence of this pattern across educational levels points to a systemic pedagogical problem that constrains stylistic development and limits learners' engagement with writing as a socially meaningful communicative practice.

This problem is particularly evident within Indonesia's vocational higher education context, especially in the D4 English for Business and Professional Communication program, where graduates are expected to operate in intensive communication and creative industries such as advertising, digital marketing, and content creation. In these domains, effective communication depends not only on linguistic accuracy but also on the ability to translate sensory experience into persuasive and affectively resonant texts. Culinary description is especially salient, as food engages multiple sensory modalities, including taste, texture, aroma, appearance, and cultural association, requiring writers to transform embodied perception into rhetorically effective language. Subsequent linguistic perspective has reconceptualized metaphor as a cognitive linguistic mechanism through which abstract experiences are structured via systematic mappings onto concrete source domains such as food consumption, drawing on humans and mythology, animals, plants, nature, objects, and actions, and grounded in perceived similarities of form, function, and sensory qualities (Hendrokumoro & Ma'shumah, 2023; Kheovichai, 2025). Despite its central role in sensory based meaning construction, figurative language



remains marginal in EFL writing pedagogy and is often treated as ornamental rather than as a core rhetorical and cognitive resource. As a result, novice EFL writers rely heavily on literal description, limiting expressive range and weakening rhetorical quality.

Despite the breadth of EFL writing research in Indonesia, empirical investigations have rarely examined figurative language as a patterned discourse practice, particularly through corpus based approaches capable of revealing systematic regularities across learner texts. Moreover, vocational EFL research has tended to prioritize functional and transactional genres (Fadlia et al, 2020; Ratih & Sari, 2025; Sabarniati, Fitriani, & Kurniawati, 2025), leaving sensory driven genres such as culinary description underexplored despite their relevance to contemporary professional communication. Consequently, the relationship between figurative language patterning and rhetorical quality in novice EFL writing remains empirically under theorized. Addressing this gap, the present study adopts a corpus based analytic approach to examine how novice EFL learners move from taste to text through patterned uses of figurative language in culinary descriptions. By analysing recurring figurative language patterns and their contribution to rhetorical quality, the study extends EFL writing research beyond accuracy driven paradigms and offers an empirically grounded account of how expressive and rhetorical competence can be developed in vocational EFL contexts.

## **B. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### ***EFL Descriptive Writing: Challenges and Pedagogical Imbalance***

Effective writing requires both clarity and coherence, yet English as Foreign Language (EFL) learners frequently struggle to organize ideas and construct logical sentences due to limited linguistic proficiency, which often leads to hesitation when beginning to write (Marsevani, Yeo, & Nurlaily, 2025; Mohammad, Al-Mofti, & Hussein, 2020). Moreover, within academic contexts, writing encompasses four primary types namely descriptive, analytical, persuasive, and critical which are characterized by distinct linguistic features and communicative purposes (University of Sydney, 2025). Among these, descriptive writing serves as a foundational genre where learners cultivate the ability to observe, conceptualize, and linguistically represent sensory experience. As a genre rooted in sensory and cognitive engagement, it provides a concrete platform for learners to practice translating visual and emotional impressions into



precise and vivid linguistic forms. However, such cognitive and linguistic demands often pose difficulties for EFL learners, as evidenced by Rahmawati and Ardini (2023), who observed that Indonesian secondary learners face particular challenges in learning to write, especially when composing descriptive texts. Similarly, Marsevani, Yeo, and Nurlaily (2025) found that such challenges persist even at higher levels of education, as university freshmen continue to struggle with constructing vivid and coherent descriptions. This difficulty underscores the complex nature of descriptive writing, which aims to portray the distinctive features of a person, place, or object through vivid details, thereby creating engaging and immersive experiences for readers (Marsevani, Yeo, & Nurlaily, 2025; Rahmawati & Ardini, 2023).

In many EFL classrooms, the teaching of descriptive writing remains predominantly technique-oriented rather than stylistically driven. For instance, Gunawan and Perdana (2025) emphasized the procedural application of the Write-around strategy in teaching descriptive texts, while Rahmawati and Ardini (2023) implemented Outdoor Class Learning, and Hasan and Bidin (2023) used scaffolding strategies. As a result, assessment tends to privilege lexical range and structural accuracy rather than stylistic or rhetorical effect. Consequently, EFL learners often produce texts that are lexically sufficient but stylistically impoverished, comprising literal enumerations such as “*At first glance, mie ayam may look modest—a bowl of yellow noodles topped with diced chicken and a handful of greens.*” rather than expressive renderings that engage readers’ imagination and emotions. Figurative competence is not merely a linguistic skill but a creative asset. Addressing these cognitive and emotional barriers requires fostering the use of figurative language, which can help learners produce writing of enhanced rhetorical quality (Çeşme & Geçikli, 2025). This persistent literalism reveals a deeper pedagogical imbalance. Conventional EFL instruction tends to privilege accuracy and cohesion over rhetorical creativity and stylistic awareness. This imbalance, in turn, marginalizes figurative language, which serves as a crucial vehicle for rhetorical vividness and expressive depth in writing. It functions as a structured system of expression that enhances the aesthetic and communicative value of both written and spoken discourse (Marseventianti, 2022). Yet learners often struggle to comprehend figurative expressions because they involve unfamiliar conceptual mappings in the target language (Yahia, 2022).



### ***Figurative Language and Culinary Metaphor: Rhetorical and Cognitive Dimensions***

Based on cognitive-linguistic perspective, the meanings of figurative expressions often stem from literal interpretations via conceptual metaphors (Uršić, 2021). Figurative language, when used creatively rather than literally, becomes a powerful stylistic tool that captures readers' attention and sustains engagement (Phunkrathok, Intanoo, & Prachanant, 2025). It encompasses several devices that enrich literary and rhetorical expression. A metaphor implies a comparison between unlike entities sharing certain qualities, whereas a simile makes such a comparison explicit. Figurative language encompasses several devices that enrich literary and rhetorical expression. Personification attributes human traits to non-human entities, fostering emotional resonance, while hyperbole relies on deliberate exaggeration to heighten emphasis and impact (Phunkrathok, Intanoo, & Prachanant, 2025). When figurative competence is neglected, learners are trained to describe but not to evoke, to inform but not to move which results in what may be termed rhetorical underdevelopment. From a cognitive-linguistic standpoint, however, figurative language is not an ornamental embellishment but a central mechanism of human thought. The analysis of metaphor thus offers insight into individual cognition while simultaneously illuminating broader cultural narratives that shape language use and pedagogical practice (Çeşme & Geçikli, 2025). A learner's ability to employ the figurative language reflects not only linguistic creativity but also conceptual flexibility which is the capacity to reframe perception through symbolic or analogical reasoning.

Moreover, metaphorical sentences are known to engage more cognitively demanding processes than literal ones (Audrin & Coppin, 2025). This heightened cognitive load becomes particularly relevant when learners attempt to describe sensory experiences, such as those found in culinary contexts. Consequently, culinary description provides an ideal testing ground for examining how learners navigate the continuum between literal and figurative expression, a skill that is increasingly important for students preparing for creative roles in advertising strategy, content creation, and digital marketing communication. Because these fields demand vivid, sensory-rich language, such practice aligns closely with the aims of Vocational English, which, as a branch of ESP, prioritizes domain-specific communicative competence essential for academic success and future professional opportunities (Putri, 2025). In addition to these demands, English for Hospitality also emphasizes pragmatic competence to equip students with essential real-world communication skills in the F&B industry (Putri, 2025). This added layer of



communicative expectation reinforces the need for learners to develop sensitivity not only to linguistic form but also to context, intention, and audience. Within this framework, the ability to construct vivid imagery, evoke emotion, and convey sensory experience becomes not only a linguistic achievement but also a foundational requirement for producing persuasive copy, compelling narratives, and aesthetically resonant messages in creative workplaces.

Metaphors significantly shape human cognition, perception, and communication particularly in fields such as gastronomy and culinary arts, where sensory, cultural, and artistic dimensions are deeply intertwined (Ertas & Nur, 2025). Moreover, metaphorical sentences are known to engage more cognitively demanding processes than literal ones (Audrin & Coppin, 2025). This heightened cognitive load becomes particularly relevant when learners attempt to describe sensory experiences, such as those found in culinary contexts. Consequently, culinary description provides an ideal testing ground for exploring how learners navigate the continuum between literal and figurative expression especially for those preparing for creative roles in advertising strategy, content creation, or digital marketing communication, where vivid and sensory-rich language is essential. Metaphors significantly shape human cognition, perception, and communication particularly in fields such as gastronomy and culinary arts, where sensory, cultural, and artistic dimensions are deeply intertwined (Ertas & Nur, 2025). Describing food, therefore, is not a mere linguistic labelling exercise but a rhetorical transformation of perception. *It invites learners to reimagine the physical as symbolic to translate texture into mood, colour into atmosphere, and taste into metaphor.* Such figurative transformation reflects not only linguistic creativity but also cognitive sophistication, as it requires the ability to perceive analogical correspondences across sensory modalities. Through corpus-based analysis, these linguistic realizations can illuminate the evolving rhetorical and stylistic competence of novice writers, providing clearer insight into how they develop expressive, metaphorically enriched descriptive skills.



## *Cognitive Linguistics and Corpus-Based Inquiry: Integrating Perspectives on Figurative Expression*

Although corpus-based approaches have advanced our understanding of learner language, they have largely overlooked nonliteral expression, its frequency, patterns, and rhetorical value. Corpus linguistics provides systematic and authentic ways of examining language by utilizing large, representative corpora of target-language use (Rafatbakhsh & Ahmadi, 2019). Yet research exploring figurative language in novice EFL learners' descriptive writing remains underdeveloped, leaving a crucial gap in understanding how learners mobilize figurative resources to construct imagery, evoke emotion, and achieve stylistic richness. To address this gap, the present study integrates corpus-based and rhetorical approaches to examine how novice EFL writers employ figurative language when describing real culinary objects, a context that closely aligns with vocational creativity and industry relevance. The use of authentic and sensory-rich provide a tangible and culturally meaningful stimulus for descriptive composition. Food, as a semiotic domain, activates multisensory imagery, emotional association, and metaphorical extension, allowing learners to translate sensory perception into expressive and symbolic language. It can take various forms, such as metaphors, similes, hyperboles, personifications (Phunkrathok, Intanoo, & Prachanant, 2025).

Figurative language, within this context, is best understood as operating at the intersection of conceptual meaning construction and empirically observable linguistic patterning. Figurative language can be understood as a cognitively grounded means of expressing sensory experience beyond literal description (Alduais et al, 2022; **Desai, 2022**; Magni et al, 2025) such as taste, texture, and aroma is cognitively structured and linguistically encoded. These mappings enable novice EFL writers to move beyond literal enumeration of culinary features toward evaluative and affectively charged description. Corpus-based inquiry, in turn, offers an empirical lens for tracing how such conceptualizations surface as recurrent figurative patterns across learner texts, thereby linking individual instances of nonliteral expression to broader distributional tendencies. This integrative perspective reinforces the conceptual trajectory from “*taste to text*”, framing culinary description as a semiotic process in which sensory perception is systematically recontextualized into figurative and rhetorically salient discourse rather than treated as isolated stylistic embellishment.



## B. METHOD

This study employed a quantitative corpus-based design complemented by qualitative rhetorical evaluation to examine the frequency patterns and expressive quality of figurative language in novice EFL descriptive writing. The participants were **42 first-semester undergraduate learners enrolled in the Narrative & Descriptive Writing course in the English for Business and Professional Communication program at State Polytechnic of Sriwijaya**, selected through **total population sampling**. This cohort was chosen because they represent novice EFL writers with limited prior exposure to figurative language instruction, making them an appropriate population for examining emergent figurative patterns and rhetorical development. In addition, all participants had received comparable instructional input, ensuring baseline consistency.

The course included a unit on culinary descriptive texts, a sensory-rich context conducive to eliciting figurative language. Each learner produced a 500-word descriptive text based on a real culinary object they personally observed and consumed. The word limit allowed sufficient elaboration of sensory and figurative detail while remaining manageable for novice writers and suitable for corpus-based analysis. Data were collected during a single 80-minute classroom session under regular instructional conditions. The texts were compiled into a small learner corpus and manually coded for five figurative types namely simile, metaphor, personification, hyperbole, and onomatopoeia. Two raters identified and classified the data, then discussed their findings to ensure consistency and agreement. To evaluate the quality of figurative expressions, an analytic rubric was developed with three criteria which were Contextual Appropriateness, Stylistic Effectiveness, and Creativity Response. Each rated on a three-point scale (1–3). The rubric was reviewed by two experts in EFL writing to confirm its clarity and relevance, ensuring content validity. Reliability was maintained by having two raters check and evaluate the data separately, followed by discussion to reach consensus. This process ensured that the analysis was consistent and trustworthy.

Data analysis was conducted in two stages. First, a quantitative corpus analysis identified the frequency and distribution of figurative types to determine dominant and less frequent devices. Second, a rhetorical quality analysis used rubric-based scores to assess expressive

effectiveness. The combination of corpus-based identification and rubric-based evaluation reflects a balanced methodological stance. While quantitative analysis ensures objectivity, qualitative evaluation reveals rhetorical depth and creativity. Together, these approaches provide a comprehensive profile of figurative language use among novice EFL descriptive writers and offer pedagogical implications for assessing not only linguistic accuracy but also stylistic growth and creative expression in EFL descriptive writing instruction.

## C. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### *Findings*

#### *Frequency and Distribution of Figurative Types in Novice EFL Descriptive Writing*

This subsection outlines the types and frequencies of figurative language employed by novice EFL learners in their descriptive texts about real culinary objects. Understanding these patterns is essential for mapping how beginner writers use figurative devices to construct imagery, convey sensory detail, and enhance rhetorical effect. By identifying the dominant categories and their distribution, the analysis provides insight into which forms of figurative expression are most accessible to early-stage learners and which remain less familiar or underdeveloped. The corpus for this study consisted of 680 figurative expressions extracted from forty beginner-level descriptive essays. Five categories (simile, metaphor, personification, hyperbole, and onomatopoeia) were identified as recurring across the dataset. Their distribution is outlined below.

**Table 1. Coding Sheet of Figurative Language Patterns in Learners' Descriptive Writing**

No	SIM	MET	PER	HYP	ONO	Total	Percentage
1	7	6	5	4	1	23	1,69%
2	9	3	3	3	2	20	1,47%
3	8	4	3	2	1	18	1,32%
4	5	2	1	2	2	12	0,88%
5	2	4	2	1	1	10	0,74%
6	6	5	4	3	1	19	1,40%
7	10	3	4	2	1	20	1,47%



8	8	3	3	3	2	19	1,40%
9	5	3	2	3	1	14	1,03%
10	4	5	2	2	2	15	1,10%
11	5	3	2	1	2	13	0,96%
12	6	4	2	2	1	15	1,10%
13	7	3	1	2	1	14	1,03%
14	8	3	3	2	1	17	1,25%
15	6	5	3	3	1	18	1,32%
16	5	4	2	3	1	15	1,10%
17	4	2	3	2	2	13	0,96%
18	5	3	3	3	1	15	1,10%
19	6	4	2	2	1	15	1,10%
20	3	3	1	2	1	10	0,74%
21	6	2	3	3	1	15	1,10%
22	7	3	3	2	2	17	1,25%
23	8	4	4	3	1	20	1,47%
24	5	2	3	2	2	14	1,03%
25	9	3	2	3	1	18	1,32%
26	4	4	3	2	2	15	1,10%
27	6	5	4	2	1	18	1,32%
28	7	2	3	3	2	17	1,25%
29	5	3	3	2	0	13	0,96%
30	8	3	2	3	1	17	1,25%
31	7	4	3	2	2	18	1,32%
32	6	3	4	3	1	17	1,25%
33	9	2	3	2	2	18	1,32%
34	5	4	2	3	1	15	1,10%
35	6	3	3	2	2	16	1,18%
36	7	3	2	2	1	15	1,10%
37	8	4	3	3	1	19	1,40%
38	6	2	4	2	2	16	1,18%
39	5	3	3	3	0	14	1,03%
40	9	4	2	2	2	19	1,40%
41	7	3	3	3	1	17	1,25%
42	6	5	3	2	1	17	1,25%
Total	265	143	116	101	55	680	50,00%
Percentage	19,49%	10,51%	8,53%	7,43%	4,04%	50,00%	100%

The distribution of figurative devices reveals several noteworthy tendencies in how novice EFL writers constructed descriptive meaning. The most striking pattern is the predominance of simile, which accounts for 265 instances (19.49%) of all figurative expressions. This disproportionate reliance **suggests** that learners gravitate toward devices with clear formal markers (like, as), which offer low-risk, highly scaffolded structures. Such patterns **indicate** that figurative expression at this level remains largely formulaic and surface-oriented, with learners prioritizing linguistic security over more conceptually demanding forms of creativity. In other words, simile functioned as a transitional device **that enabled expressiveness** without requiring deeper semantic restructuring. **This tendency aligns with** Fitriana & Rokhuma's (2025) argument that learners showed noticeable engagement when working with figurative expressions particularly similes and personification because such language prompts them to explore layers of meaning and search for the most appropriate linguistic equivalents. Moreover, **the pattern also resonates with** Audrin and Coppin's (2025) hypothesis that metaphorical expressions related to food were more salient and more likely to be recalled when individuals experience hunger.

Metaphor appeared at 143 instances (10.51%), showing a noticeable drop from simile. This gap indicates that learners experienced greater difficulty with figurative forms that required implicit conceptual mapping and more advanced lexical control. Unlike a simile, which explicitly states a comparison using "like" or "as," a metaphor assumes equivalence by treating two distinct elements as the same and is often identifiable through the use of the copular verb *be* (such as *is*, *am*, or *are*). Saud and Harja (2023) explained that a metaphor can be understood as an implicit form of simile because it is often marked by the copular verb *be*, which signals a comparison between two otherwise unrelated concepts by presenting them as identical. Nevertheless, the consistent presence of metaphors across the dataset suggests that learners are beginning to experiment with less explicit forms of imagery, even if such attempts remain limited by their developing proficiency. The data therefore point to an emerging yet still tentative metaphorical competence. Figurative language such as metaphor, simile, and personification—serves to enhance literary discourse by expressing nuanced emotions and generating vivid, memorable imagery (Aubakir et al., 2024).

The frequency of personification, 116 instances (8.53%), reveals an intermediate level of engagement. Learners appear aware that attributing human qualities to non-human entities can



create vividness. Because metaphorical language highlights parallel between two essentially dissimilar concepts, it often manifests through interpreting non-human entities as possessing human traits, a process known as personification (Chen, 2020). Yet its lower proportion suggests partial or inconsistent mastery. Metaphors are widely recognized as offering both benefits and difficulties for learners of a second language. However, research on how aware these learners are of metaphor use remains limited (Lu & Deignan, 2024). Within this broader domain of figurative language, personification represents one of the key metaphorical strategies that learners often employ, whether consciously or not. Personification refers to the technique of treating non-living objects, animals, or abstract ideas as if they possessed human qualities, behaviours, or emotions (Frilia et al., 2024; Saud & Harja, 2023). It requires not only linguistic accuracy but also rhetorical sensitivity, and the modest percentage indicates that learners may recognize its potential but remain unsure about its pragmatic appropriateness or conventional patterns in English descriptive discourse. Consequently, the teaching of figurative language should emphasize familiar and concrete contexts that enable learners to perceive how such devices function meaningfully within texts (Fitriana & Rokhuma, 2025).

Hyperbole accounts for 101 instances (7.43%), showing that learners do employ exaggeration as a rhetorical tool but do so with caution. Because hyperbole often relies on culturally specific intensity norms, its moderate presence suggests uncertainty about how far exaggeration can be extended without compromising naturalness. This pattern implies that learners may understand the general function of hyperbole but lack exposure to common exaggerative idioms or intensifiers in English. Hyperbole refers to a deliberate overstatement or amplified claim used to intensify meaning, produce a striking or dramatic effect, and elicit a heightened emotional response (Frilia et al., 2024). From a cognitive-linguistic viewpoint, idiomatic expressions, shaped by cultural and linguistic subtleties, often confuse learners who interpret them too literally, **leading to difficulties in selecting contextually appropriate lexical equivalents during translation** (AbdAlgane & Elmahdi, 2025).

Finally, onomatopoeia is the least frequent device, with 55 instances (4.04%). Its limited use highlights both a restricted command of English sound-symbolic vocabulary and a broader tendency among novice writers to under-represent auditory imagery in descriptive tasks. The low percentage may also reflect instructional emphasis, **as classroom materials often prioritize visual rather than auditory description**, leaving sound-based imagery



underdeveloped. **This imbalance suggests that learners may not yet recognize how sound-related expressions can enhance the vividness and sensory depth of descriptive writing.** Moreover, figurative techniques can provide learners with space to express their ideas in ways that feel personal and engaging (Fitriana & Rokhuma, 2025). From a cognitive-linguistic perspective, idiomatic expressions, shaped by cultural and linguistic nuances, tend to confuse learners who attempt to interpret them literally (RahmtAllah, 2024).

Viewed collectively, these distributions reveal that beginner-level figurative competence in descriptive writing about real culinary objects is uneven and heavily skewed toward devices with explicit structural cues. Learners appear more confident when figurative meaning aligns closely with literal descriptive frames (as in simile), whereas forms requiring abstraction, cultural familiarity, or rhetorical nuance (metaphor, hyperbole, personification, onomatopoeia) remain less prominent. **In this context, it is important to note that figurative language in literary works extends beyond surface structures to convey deeper meaning, enriching communication by adding complexity and enabling abstract ideas to be interpreted more concretely** (Phunkrathok, Intanoo, & Prachanant, 2025). The overall pattern suggests that novice EFL writers are operating within a limited but developing figurative repertoire, characterized by formulaic choices and caution in deploying more semantically complex devices. Taken together, these findings underscore the need for pedagogical interventions that explicitly model a wider range of figurative strategies and provide learners with opportunities to explore their rhetorical functions in descriptive discourse.

### ***Rhetorical Quality in Novice EFL Descriptive Writing***

The corpus-based analysis of 42 scripts containing 680 total figurative expressions demonstrates a persistent misalignment between the abundance of figurative language and the quality of its rhetorical execution. Despite the high density of figurative devices dominated by 265 similes (19.49%), followed by 143 metaphors (10.51%), 116 personifications (8.53%), 101 hyperboles (7.43%), and 55 onomatopoeic forms (4.04%), the learners' ability to transform sensory culinary experiences into rhetorically effective written descriptions remains constrained by Contextual Appropriateness (CA), Stylistic Effect (SE), and Creative Response (CR). This discrepancy supports previous concerns that ignoring figurative and idiomatic

competence creates a significant gap in L2 writing development (Kamal & Bulila, 2022), a gap that is visibly reflected in the present corpus.

**Table 2. Rhetorical Effectiveness of Figurative Devices**

Figurative Device	Total Occurrences	Percentage	Mean CA Score	Mean SE Score	Mean CR Score	Overall Rhetorical Effectiveness
<b>Simile (SIM)</b>	265	19.49%	2.31	2.18	1.94	<b>2.14 (Moderate–High)</b>
<b>Metaphor (MET)</b>	143	10.51%	2.12	2.05	1.81	<b>1.99 (Moderate)</b>
<b>Personification (PER)</b>	116	8.53%	2.25	2.17	2.02	<b>2.15 (Moderate–High)</b>
<b>Hyperbole (HYP)</b>	101	7.43%	1.98	1.87	1.72	<b>1.86 (Moderate–Low)</b>
<b>Onomatopoeia (ONO)</b>	55	4.04%	1.75	1.66	1.55	<b>1.65 (Low)</b>
<b>Total / Average</b>	680	50%	<b>2.08</b>	<b>1.99</b>	<b>1.81</b>	<b>1.96 (Moderate)</b>

Simile’s numerical dominance is matched by its relatively strong rhetorical effectiveness score of 2.14, driven by high contextual appropriateness (2.31) and stylistic value (2.18). The frequency of simile across individual scripts commonly ranging from five to ten instances shows that novice writers rely on it as their primary strategy for translating sensory culinary impressions into text. However, its creativity score (1.94) reveals pervasive formulaicity, with repeated expressions. These patterns point to linguistic insecurity where learners relied on conventional comparisons instead of crafting more nuanced, contextually grounded imagery. This formulaic behavior mirrors Lu and Deignan’s (2024) observation that L2 learners tended to reproduce familiar figurative patterns due to underdeveloped metaphor awareness. It also resonates with Fitriana and Rokhuma’s (2025) finding that learners felt more comfortable and less anxious when they think they have grasped a concept, but this perceived mastery does not necessarily lead to rhetorically effective production. Learners felt confident using similes, yet their output revealed shallow conceptual understanding rather than stylistic risk-taking.



Metaphor, with 143 occurrences and a moderate overall effectiveness score of 1.99, further illustrates partial conceptual development. Its contextual (2.12) and stylistic (2.05) scores show that learners can recognize metaphor's communicative purpose, but the creativity score (1.81) exposes limited imaginative engagement. Many metaphors adhere to predictable conceptual mappings, suggesting that learners relied on accessible conceptual schemas rather than exploring novel or sensory-specific metaphors. This aligns with research noting that metaphor awareness remains underdeveloped in L2 learners (Lu & Deignan, 2024), which explains why familiar frames dominated and novel mappings were scarce. Furthermore, these patterns support Taufik's (2023) claim that figurative language represented a strategy for shaping imaginative writing, yet such imaginative potential was only minimally realized in this corpus.

Personification, which appears 116 times, demonstrates the highest rhetorical performance with an overall score of 2.15, including the highest creativity score (2.02) among all devices. This confirms the cognitive linguistic view that personification is grounded in conceptual mapping rather than mere linguistic ornamentation (Belkhir, 2021). When learners described spices as "dancing," aromas as "welcoming," or textures as "embracing," they activated embodied conceptualization. Although sensory metaphors can be salient in embodied experiences like tasting and smelling (Audrin & Coppin, 2025), the corpus shows that learners only rarely extend these sensory experiences into creatively articulated expressions. **Nevertheless, the strong rhetorical performance of personification, despite its relatively modest frequency, suggests that learners tend to deploy it more deliberately, even though their use still reflects inconsistent conceptual mastery. This finding further** reinforces Fitriana and Rokhuma's (2025) assertion that learners perform better when they understand not only the form of a figurative device but also its function.

Hyperbole and onomatopoeia represent the two weakest categories in both frequency and rhetorical performance. Hyperbole's 101 instances only achieve an overall score of 1.86, reflecting weak contextual appropriateness (1.98) and stylistic effectiveness (1.87). Learners frequently exaggerate sensory qualities, yet these exaggerations often undermine descriptive accuracy. Their low creativity (1.72) aligns with the broader issue that literal, word-for-word translation strategies impede effective figurative use (Kamal & Bulila, 2022; AbdAlgene & Elmahdi, 2024). Overall, the findings suggest that learners treat hyperbole primarily as emotional amplification rather than as a rhetorical device that must be carefully calibrated to



genre and context. Finally, onomatopoeia, appearing 55 times with an overall score of 1.65, exemplifies the greatest genre mismatch. With contextual appropriateness at 1.75, stylistic effect at 1.66, and creativity at 1.55, the device appears in the corpus mainly as filler rather than necessity. Learners often insert onomatopoeic sounds **which parallels broader difficulties in interpreting and producing figurative expressions whose meanings cannot be approached literally** (AbdAlgane & Elmahdi, 2024). **This weak integration** reinforces the idea that overlooking idiomatic and figurative competence in instruction leaves learners without the conceptual foundation necessary to deploy such expressions meaningfully (Kamal & Bulila, 2022).

Across all devices, creativity is the weakest dimension with corpus-wide averages of 1.94 (simile), 1.81 (metaphor), 2.02 (personification), 1.72 (hyperbole), and 1.55 (onomatopoeia) showing that learners' figurative production is largely formulaic. This reflects limited exposure to varied figurative models and insufficient conceptual guidance, reinforcing the need for scaffolded instruction (Fitriana & Rokhuma, 2025). Although learners may feel confident using these devices, their rhetorical outcomes remain inconsistent due to shallow conceptual grounding. Overall, the corpus reveals that novice EFL writers are eager but not yet able to craft rich culinary descriptions. Their figurative use reflects surface familiarity rather than functional control, indicating that instruction must shift from mechanical identification to conceptual, genre-sensitive awareness so learners can use figurative devices as cognitive tools for producing vivid, nuanced writing.

### ***Pedagogical Implications for Novice Level EFL Descriptive Writing***

The findings from both the frequency patterns (Finding 1) and rhetorical quality analysis (Finding 2), when viewed against the instructional gaps outlined in the Introduction, reveal several pressing pedagogical needs for novice EFL descriptive writing. At the core of these needs is the pedagogical imbalance identified earlier, EFL classrooms tend to prioritize structural accuracy and lexical sufficiency while providing minimal guidance on stylistic development, figurative competence, and rhetorical purpose. This imbalance directly shapes learners' figurative performance. Although the corpus displays high figurative density, most expressions remain formulaic, surface-level, and only moderately effective. First, instruction must shift from form-focused teaching which trains learners merely to identify similes or



metaphors to a model that foregrounds why writers choose a figurative device, how it shapes reader perception, and when it enhances clarity or disrupts coherence. Findings show that simile dominates because it is structurally safe and easily taught, but learners rarely understand its rhetorical function. Without explicit discussion of purpose, figurative expressions become decorative rather than meaning-making tools.

Second, the heavy reliance on easily accessible devices (simile, personification) and the underuse or weak execution of metaphor, hyperbole, and onomatopoeia indicate the need for corpus-informed noticing tasks. Exposure to authentic descriptive texts especially culinary descriptions similar to the writing task can help learners observe how figurative expressions align with sensory domains, contribute to thematic unity, and move beyond literal enumeration. Structured noticing of metaphor chains, sensory mapping, or creativity markers can counter formulaic reproduction. Third, the findings indicate the value of introducing simplified principles of conceptual metaphor theory. Many metaphors produced by learners lacked clear source-to-target mappings or relied on arbitrary, mismatched comparisons. As Scharlau et al. (2024) explained, metaphors perform a conceptual function by mapping a concrete source onto an abstract target for instance, when “understanding” is framed as “grasping,” the structural logic of a bodily action is transferred to the abstract concept. This perspective helps illustrate why learners’ metaphors often fail. Without awareness of such underlying mappings, their comparisons remain ornamental rather than conceptual. Instruction that clarifies how conceptual mappings function, how figurative choices can be grounded in sensory or cultural logic, and how inappropriate comparisons weaken descriptive intent can help raise the quality of learners’ metaphors from merely ornamental to meaningfully integrated.

Fourth, the wide gap between the quantity and quality of figurative language demonstrates that learners need guided revision stages. Many low-scoring expressions were grammatically correct yet semantically weak. Revision tasks that require students to evaluate appropriateness, eliminate cliché, and strengthen sensory alignment can cultivate the evaluative judgement necessary for stylistic maturity. Such activities directly address the creativity deficit shown across all figurative categories in Finding 2. Fifth, the analytic rubric used in this study especially the criteria of Contextual Appropriateness, Stylistic Effectiveness, and Creativity Response can serve as a pedagogical scaffold. When employed during peer review or self-



assessment, rubrics help learners internalize rhetorical expectations and make more intentional stylistic decisions.

This responds to the finding that students often feel confident producing figurative expressions but lack an understanding of what makes such expressions effective. Finally, the limited presence and weak rhetorical scores of sound-based and sensory-rich devices (onomatopoeia, expressive hyperbole) suggest the need to incorporate multimodal stimuli such as visual, auditory, tactile to expand learners' sensory lexicon and figurative repertoire. Because descriptive writing is rooted in sensory translation, richer multimodal input can help students generate more vivid, contextually grounded imagery. Overall, these pedagogical implications reinforce the necessity of an instructional model that integrates linguistic form, conceptual understanding, and rhetorical intent. Rather than teaching figurative language as optional embellishment, early EFL writing instruction should cultivate learners' ability to think figuratively, evaluate stylistic fit, and deploy figurative devices strategically to enhance the vividness and communicative value of descriptive texts.

### ***Discussion***

The results show not only how frequently learners used figurative devices but how their choices reveal underlying cognitive, pedagogical, and rhetorical patterns in novice EFL descriptive writing. Their reliance on explicit forms like simile and hesitation toward semantically demanding devices reflects a mix of familiarity and insecurity which refers to an outcome of instruction that prioritizes accuracy over stylistic reasoning. Learners' limited ability to produce metaphors with coherent source–target mappings indicates not merely vocabulary gaps but insufficient conceptual scaffolding. Although they recognize the communicative value of figurative language, their use remains shallow, with personification functioning more effectively than metaphor because embodied mappings are more intuitively accessible.

A notable insight concerns the gap between figurative density and rhetorical effectiveness. Many expressions serve decorative rather than generative functions. Without explicit guidance on stylistic decision-making, students insert figurative forms as isolated embellishments instead of integrating them into coherent sensory imagery, which explains consistently low



creativity scores. The weak use of sound-based and intensity-driven devices (onomatopoeia, hyperbole) further shows that learners rely heavily on visual description and rarely draw on multisensory resources. Overall, these patterns suggest that learners' limitations stem less from unwillingness and more from insufficient instruction that connects form, cognition, and rhetorical purpose. Novice writers are ready to experiment, but they lack systematic modelling, conceptual grounding, and guided revision. Thus, teaching must move beyond introducing figurative forms toward cultivating understanding of why and how they shape meaning, enabling learners to produce more vivid, coherent, and purposeful descriptive writing.

#### **D. CONCLUSION**

This study set out to investigate whether novice EFL learners are able to use figurative language effectively when describing real culinary objects, and whether the stylistic quality of their expressions matches the high frequency of figurative forms they produced. The findings from both the quantitative results and the interpretive discussion confirm the central problem identified at the beginning of the study. Although learners actively employ figurative language, their use remains predominantly formulaic and only moderately effective in fulfilling descriptive and rhetorical purposes. The Results clearly show that figurative density is high (680 items), yet the distribution is heavily skewed toward structurally simple devices such as simile, with metaphor, hyperbole, and onomatopoeia appearing less frequently and with weaker rhetorical scores. The Discussion further demonstrates that learners' figurative choices often lack conceptual grounding, contextual fit, and creative elaboration. This confirms that the problem is not the absence of figurative production, but the gap between form and function, learners can generate figurative expressions, but they cannot yet use them strategically to construct vivid, coherent, and sensory-rich culinary descriptions.

Moreover, the qualitative evaluation of Contextual Appropriateness, Stylistic Effectiveness, and Creativity Response strengthens this confirmation: across all five figurative categories, creativity consistently received the lowest mean score, showing that learners rely on familiar templates rather than conceptual or sensory reasoning. Thus, the Results and Discussion collectively validate the central issue which is figurative language use among novice EFL writers is active but underdeveloped, reflecting limited conceptual understanding and



insufficient instructional support. In light of these findings, the study confirms the need for explicit pedagogical intervention that integrates conceptual metaphor awareness, corpus-informed modelling, and guided revision to help learners move beyond literal enumeration and formulaic figurative patterns. Enhancing learners' ability to understand why a figurative device is chosen, how it shapes reader perception, and when it enhances descriptive clarity is essential for strengthening rhetorical maturity in early-stage EFL writing. Future research should expand this investigation to other genres, proficiency levels, and instructional contexts to determine how figurative competence develops over time and how targeted pedagogical strategies may help learners transition from surface-level figurative use toward conceptually grounded, rhetorically effective expression.

## REFERENCES

- AbdAlgane, M., & Elmahdi, O. E. H. (2025). Common mistakes EFL learners make when using idiomatic expressions: A case study of Saudi tertiary level EFL learners. *British Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-16.
- Alduais, A., Al-Khawlani, A., Almaghlouth, S., & Alfadda, H. (2022). Cognitive linguistics: Analysis of mapping knowledge domains. *Journal of Intelligence*, 10(4), 93. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jintelligence10040093>
- Ameliana, A., & Zahro, S. K. (2025). Assessing the alignment of “English for Change” textbook within the Merdeka Curriculum framework. *JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 13(4), 2091–2102. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v13i4.15433>
- Anjani, E. P., & Yuliati. (2025). *The implementation of role play in supporting speaking class. Journal of English Language Teaching*, 14(Special Issue), 310–318. <https://journal.unnes.ac.id/journals/elt/article/view/28817/5788>
- Arisman. (2023). *EFL students' grammatical errors in writing descriptive text. International Journal of Innovation and Education Research*, 2(1), 37–52. <https://doi.org/10.33369/ijier.v2i1.28911>
- Aubakir, S. S., Kitibaeva, A. K., & Ospanova, Z. T. (2024). An analysis of figurative language in the interpretation of contemporary English poetry. *Bulletin of the Karaganda University. Philology Series*, 11329(1), 16–23.
- Audrin, C., & Coppin, G. (2025). Food for thought: The enhanced recall of metaphorical food sentences independent of hunger. *Cognitive Process*, 26, 51–57. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10339-024-01222-z>
- Belkhir, S. (2021). Personification in EFL learners' academic writing: A cognitive linguistic stance. *Glottodidactica*, 48(2), 7–20. <https://doi.org/10.14746/gl.2021.48.2.01>
- Çeşme, H., & Geçikli, M. (2025). EFL learners' metaphorical insights into multi-modal writing intervention. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 12, 1377. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-05710-1>



- Chen, Y. C. (2020). Assessing the lexical richness of figurative expressions in Taiwanese EFL learners' writing. *Assessing Writing*, 43, 100414.
- Desai, R. H.** (2022). *Are metaphors embodied? The neural evidence. Psychological Research*, 86(8), 2417–2433. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00426-021-01604-4>
- Ertas, Ç., & Nur, T. (2025). Gastronomy and culinary arts learners' gastronomy, culinary, and art perception: A metaphor analysis. *Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies*, 13(1), 346–359. <https://doi.org/10.21325/jotags.2025.1561>
- Fadlia, E., Zulida, E., Asra, S., Rahmiati, R., & Bania, A. S. (2020). *English subject on English for specific purposes (ESP) in vocational schools. Language Literacy: Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Language Teaching*, 4(2), 358–367. <https://doi.org/10.30743/ll.v4i2.3064>
- Faisal, F., & Rakhmasari, J. (2024). *Experienced and inexperienced secondary-school English teachers' strategies and challenges in teaching speaking using blended learning. Journal of Research and Educational Research Evaluation*, 13(2), 112–125. <https://journal.unnes.ac.id/journals/jere/article/view/3761/1360>
- Fitriana, A., & Rokhuma, C. M. (2025). Learners' feelings of using figurative language in creating poems at creative writing class: A narrative inquiry. *Pedagogy: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 13(1), 90-102.
- Friolia, Y., Pasaribu, A. N., & Sihite, J. (2024). Investigating figurative language in English poem written by EFL learner at Mahasaraswati Denpasar University. *Journal of Human and Education*, 4(6), 987-994.
- Gunawan, I. D., & Perdana, W. I. (2025). The implementation of write-around strategy to enhance learners' descriptive writing skills. *SALÉE: Study of Applied Linguistics and English Education*, 6(2), 626-644.
- Hamdani, M. S., Thohir, L., Putra, L. J., & Saputra, A. (2025). Analysis of students' errors And writing flow in descriptive paragraph written by the first semester students of English department tt The University of Mataram, Academic year 2024/2025. *Journal of Authentic Research*, 4(Special Issue), 1258–1270. <https://doi.org/10.36312/jar.v4i2.3633>
- Hasan, M., Bidin, S, J. (2023). Scaffolding learners' descriptive writing skills in EFL context: A pedagogical approach. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9 (3), 196-206. <http://dx.doi.org/10.32601/ejal.903017>
- Hendrokumoro, I. D. P. W., & Ma'shumah, N. K.** (2023). Revisiting the binding designation between source and target domains in the creation of Javanese food names metaphors. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 10(1), Article 2250114. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2023.2250114>
- Insaqiah, W. P. R., Darmawan, D., Wahyudin, W., & Mafulah, M. (2025). An analysis of errors in descriptive texts composed by tenth-grade students at SMKN 5 Palu. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 8(4), 1271–1276. <https://doi.org/10.34050/els-jish.v8i4.45508>
- Kamal, N. A. M., & Bulila, A. A. M. (2022). The relationship between idiomatic usage and University of Bahrain learners' proficiency in English language. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 5(6), 148-164. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2022.5.6.17>
- Kheovichai, B. (2025). *A corpus linguistics analysis of food metaphors “eat up” and “consume” through the lenses of conceptual metaphor and lexical priming theories. LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 18(1), 1–22.



- <https://doi.org/10.70730/JLWE1459>
- Lu, Q., & Deignan, A. (2024). Unconventional metaphor use in the writing of Chinese learners of English. *Sage Open*, 14(2).
- Magni, G., Pizzoli, S. F. M., Scerrati, E., & Repetto, C. (2025). *The impact of embodied and enacted metaphors on cognition and emotions in technology-mediated experiences: A scoping review*. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, 2025(1), Article 6032891. <https://doi.org/10.1155/hbe2/6032891>
- Marsevani, M., Yeo, F., & Nurlaily. (2025). University-level learners' difficulties in descriptive writing. *English Journal*, 19(1), 40-50.  
<https://doi.org/10.32832/english.v19i1.18166>
- Marseventianti, A. (2022). *An analysis of figurative language in EFL learners' poems: A case study of seventh semester learners of Islamic University of Riau* (Undergraduate thesis). Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta.
- Mohammad, A. R., Al-Mofti, K. W. H., & Hussein, J. Q. (2020). Difficulties of writing in English encountered by Iraqi EFL learners at university level. *Journal of University of Garmian*, 7(3), 317–330. <https://doi.org/10.24271/garmian.2070322>
- Nailissaadah, L., & Triastuti, A. (2023). Representation of communicative competence in an English language textbook. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 10(12), 64–75. <https://doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v10i12.5212>**
- Nasution, M., Putri, R. E., & Agustina, M. (2024). The Effect of TAI (Team-Assisted Individualization) Method on Mechanical Engineering Students' Achievement in Writing Narrative Text. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai*, 8(2), 17865–17876.  
<https://doi.org/10.31004/jptam.v8i2.14928>
- Pangestu, R. (2024). Error analysis in writing descriptive text. *English Research Journal : Journal of Education, Language, Literature, Arts and Culture*, 8(2).  
<https://doi.org/10.33061/erj.v8i2.9781>
- Phunkrathok, P., Intanoo, K., & Prachanant, N. (2025). An analysis of figurative language in Laurie Halse Anderson's *Wintergirls*. *World Journal of English Language*, 16(1), 86–98.
- Putri, R. E. (2025). Vocational english grammar: computer engineering students' misinformation error analysis on auxiliary verbs of passive voice in TOEIC reading. *Jurnal Sosial Humaniora dan Pendidikan (JSHP)*, 9(1), 1-11.  
<https://doi.org/10.32487/jsHP.v9i1.2324>
- Putri, R. E. (2025). English for hospitality: A representation of oral communication practices in food and beverage (F&B) services in the British mini-series "Boiling Point". *IJELR: International Journal of Education, Language, and Religion*, 7(1), 75-90.  
<https://doi.org/10.35308/ijelr.v7i1.11783>
- Rafatbakhsh, E., & Ahmadi, A. A. (2019). Thematic corpus-based study of idioms in the corpus of contemporary American English. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 4, 11.
- Rahmawati, H., & Ardini, D. A. (2023). Improving the descriptive writing skill through outdoor class learning. *Journal of Development Research*, 7(2), 256-263. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.28926/jdr.v7i2.349>
- RahmtAllah, E. A. E. (2024). EFL learners' comprehension of English idioms at the University Level. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 15(6), 24-33.
- Ratih, E., & Sari, D. L. (2025). *Exploring English communication needs in the heavy equipment industry: Insights from industry practitioners*. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, 12(2), 1072–1089.



- <https://doi.org/10.22219/celtic.v12i2.42210>  
Sa'adah, A. R. (2020). Writing skill in teaching English: An overview. *EDUCASIA: Jurnal Pendidikan, Pengajaran, Dan Pembelajaran*, 5(1), 21-35.  
<https://doi.org/10.21462/educasia.v5i1.41>
- Sabarniati, S., Fitriani, N., & Kurniawati, K. (2025). *Teaching English for specific purposes at vocational institution: Teachers' beliefs, practices and challenges*. *JETLEE: Journal of English Language Teaching, Linguistics, and Literature*, 5(2), 197–208.  
<https://doi.org/10.47766/jetlee.v5i2.5940>
- Saud, J., & Harja, R. J. (2023). Learners' figurative language in creative writing: A study on EFL writing in State University of Gorontalo. *SEAQIL Journal of Language Education (SJLE)*, 2 (2), 69-78.
- Scharlau, I., Körber, M., Sengupta, M., & Wachsmuth, H. (2024). When to use a metaphor: Metaphors in dialogical explanations with addressees of different expertise. *Frontiers in Language Sciences*, 3:1474924.
- Tyas, N. K., & Oktavia, A. (2025). *An error analysis of grammatical errors in students' descriptive texts at Universitas Terbuka*. *LITERACY: International Scientific Journals of Social, Education, Humanities*, 4(1).
- University of Sydney. (2025, June 23). *Types of academic writing*.  
<https://www.sydney.edu.au/learners/writing/types-of-academic-writing.html>
- Uršić, T. (2021). *Teaching figurative language in EFL: Traditional and modern approaches* (Undergraduate thesis). University of Zagreb. <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:147:292286>
- Yahia, F. (2020). Teaching figurative language to EFL learners: Methods and constraints. *El-Wahat Journal for Research and Studies*, 13(2), 1643–1659.  
<https://doi.org/10.54246/1548-013-002-074>
- Yassin, M., & Sood, M. (2024). *Implementing genre-based approach to improve students' writing skill at EFL students in Indonesia*. *International Journal of English Education and Linguistics (IJoEEL)*, 6(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.33650/ijoeel.v6i1.8660>
- Yunanda, F., Sinaga, P. A. ., Siahaan, M. P. ., Ginting, R. P. ., & Lubis, B. N. A. . (2022). Grammatical errors in writing descriptive text made by tenth graders of SMA swasta Free Methodist Medan. *Jurnal Basataka (JBT)*, 5(2), 191–199.  
<https://doi.org/10.36277/basataka.v5i2.175>