Exploring the Relationship between Sociocultural Identity and Lexical Richness: Insight from High School Students' Writing

Mohamad Syafri*, Atna Akhiryani, Anna Mardiah, Melly Andini
Faculty of Science and Technology, Islamic State University Datokarama Palu, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author Email: syafri@uindatokarama.ac.id

Abstract

Background: Many variables, including culture and social conditions, bind language. The study of cultural aspects and language learning still has many gaps, such as exploring writing skills. Writing is considered a productive language skill that correlates with how students express and understand their circumstances and environments.

Objective: Therefore, this research explores sociocultural identity with Lexical Richness in text writing.

Methods: This research was conducted using a quantitative method. The research design is correlational analysis. The research participants were 86 eleventh grade students selected by purposive random sampling. The results showed that the significance value was 0.575, so it was concluded that there was no significant relationship between sociocultural identity and lexical richness in writing.

Findings: In addition, the research also found a high gap among students in expressing ideas with diverse words, where the range between the most and least varied text was 47% and the average 56.9%. It is hypothesized that the students' basic ability to use English will be a crucial indicator that influences competence before other external factors, such as their cultural background interference. In addition, this research can serve as a basis for future studies, especially considering that external factors in learning can play a role depending on prerequisite conditions.

Conclusion: For teachers and educators, this research could give insight into a more applicable way to develop vocabulary and writing.

Keywords: Lexical Richness; Sociocultural; Writing

Introduction

All humans are born with genealogical things, inherited values, and culture. Understanding culture is becoming increasingly important, especially in the context of education. Culture is the set of values, customs, and norms of a society that affect not only the affective aspects but also the cognitive constructs and social interactions of individuals. Cultural identity is the result of a person's interaction with others in their community. The way a person learns, understands, and expresses their knowledge is a reflection of the culture in which they are embedded (Annisa et al., 2023; Mohammadi & Izadpanah, 2019; Pourkalhor & Esfandiari, 2017). This means that culture influences how people, especially students, go through the learning process. Language learning is no exception, as it involves transferring and adopting meaning systems. Numerous studies have tried to explore how social and cultural constructs correlate with language learning (Mohammadi & Izadpanah, 2019; Sarmiento-Campos et al., 2022; Yee Wan & Tjin Ai, 2023). However, these two variables, sociocultural and language learning, should be explored accordingly. One should first understand their nature to explore how sociocultural and language learning correlate.

Language learning should be understood as a complex process in which students not only acquire technical language skills but are also influenced by various cultural factors that intersect with the identity of the language. Factors such as mentality, lifestyle, beliefs, values, and even gender play an important role in language learning. (Akmal et al., 2023). When people learn a language, they are not just learning grammatical structures and vocabulary but also the cultural values embedded in the language. How language is absorbed in the family and friendship environment is very much coloured by informal language styles and according to the cultural context. A more formal and structured language will be found in the classroom learning conditions (Kushartanti, et al., 2019).

The social environment influences a person by absorbing language, values, views, and mindsets. When they use language, they are actually expressing their socio-cultural background. This is where the close relationship between a person's language ability and their sociocultural background can be seen (Altugan, 2015; Mohammadi & Izadpanah, 2019), how values of politeness and social hierarchy will affect one's choice of vocabulary.

The next question is how these aspects affect foreign language learning, especially English. Understanding language learning as a form of cultural penetration means we realize that learning a foreign language is not just about learning vocabulary and grammar but also absorbing the views and ways of life that lie behind it (Meng, 2020). In the language pedagogy approach, six important aspects are closely related to culture and language: intercultural communication, culture itself, innovation, activity, dialog, and criticism (Kim, 2020). When one learns a language, one also learns to situate oneself in the new socio-cultural context contained in the language (Peirce, 1995). This process confirms that language learning is closely related to aspects of the learner's socio-cultural identity.

One of the main aspects of language learning is writing. The ability to write is not only a representation of mastery of the target language but also shows the ability of a language learner to formulate and express ideas. Writing a foreign language, such as English, requires more than just mastery of vocabulary or grammar. It demands deep concentration as well as complex steps in formulating ideas and structuring the writing (Floranti & Adiantika, 2019; Han & Hiver, 2018; Taufiqulloh, 2014). In this case, learning to write should be understood as a holistic process, where language skills and understanding the cultural context come together.

The choice of vocabulary will affect the quality of the text produced. The words chosen often reflect the writer's perspective and ideas, influenced by their sociocultural background. The vocabulary chosen will help the writer to convey ideas clearly and avoid confusing the reader (Vy et al., 2022). Many studies agree lexical richness itself is a good measure of the quality of a student's foreign language (Astridya, 2018; Lu, 2012). Certain factors, such as gender, can affect lexical richness (Hossain & Samin, 2022). Therefore, lexical richness is not just a technical process in writing but also shows the dynamics of thought and the richness of ideas rooted in the knowledge and social background of individuals.

There are many studies related to the relationship between sociocultural and language learning. In general, several literature studies on these two aspects suggest a positive relationship (Altugan, 2015; Panhwar et al., 2016). In addition, experimentally, positive results were also found on the implementation of sociocultural scaffolding in the students' speaking achievement (Sarmiento-Campos et al., 2022). On the other hand, some findings suggest a demotivate or

negative relationship between sociocultural and language learning (Mohammadi & Izadpanah, 2019).

With this perspective, it is interesting to analyze how a language learner's sociocultural background affects lexical richness in his/her writing. This research aims to fill the gap in sociocultural studies in language learning, especially considering the characteristics of urban areas in Indonesia, which tend to be heterogeneous. Being a sociocultural-oriented study in Indonesia is very interesting. In more detail, this research aims to see the correlation between sociocultural and lexical richness in writing ability.

Literature Review

Sociocultural in Language Learning

Sociocultural identity reflects how a person defines himself through the experience of social and cultural interaction. Philosophically, the theoretical conception that is the basis of sociocultural emphasizes the relationship between individuals and their environment (Castanelli, 2023). So that an individual's identity will not be static but dynamic and continues to develop along with the accumulation of relationships and experiences built in a particular environment manifested in concrete actions (Annisa et al., 2023; Musaeus, 2006). This will then form a process of cultural transmission, both horizontal and vertical.

The process of cultural transmission provides a foundation for a person to adjust to the times and the new environment (Pourkalhor & Esfandiari, 2017). Each individual in a particular community learns about values, symbols, language, and traditions, strengthening a sense of belonging to a shared identity through dialog and negotiation between old and new values. This then directly relates to the relationship between culture and learning, including language learning.

Among the aspects that become themes in language learning are related to the sociocultural approach. It is known that culture can provide benefits for both learners and teachers (Byram & Wagner, 2018). A learning system that is more responsive to cultural conditions can lead to successful learning (Rachmawaty et al., 2018). This approach emphasizes the importance of social interaction and cultural context in the development of language competence, including writing skills.

Within the framework of sociocultural theory, writing ability is not only a technical skill but also part of a broader social practice. Theoretically, social identity can manifest in the way individuals use language (Hernández Castro & Samacá Bohórquez, 2011; Holmes, 2013). It is postulated that students in foreign language learning will face challenges when confronted with diverse social contexts (Aldawood & Almeshari, 2019). One figure of reference in this field is Vygotsky, a central figure in sociocultural studies and second language acquisition (SLA) (Newman, 2018).

Vygotsky's sociocultural theory is an important foundation for understanding how language, including writing skills, is learned. Vygotsky argued that cognitive development occurs through communication and social interaction (Zhou, 2024). Writing is a fundamental social activity because of its contribution to cognitive development and mental analysis processes (Corral-Robles et al., 2017). In another perspective, people think, investigate, analyze, and interpret, related to and affected by their sociocultural environment (Torres-Velsquez, 2000; Zhou, 2024). Thus, writing skills cannot be separated from the social environment in which the individual is located.

Vygotsky also introduced the concept of Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), which describes the distance between a person's ability to perform a task independently and the ability that can be achieved with the help of others who are more experienced. In the teaching of writing, the ZPD concept emphasizes the importance of scaffolding (Zhou, 2024), where teachers or peers provide appropriate support to help students achieve higher writing ability.

In addition to Vygotsky's theory, the dialogic approach developed by Mikhail Bakhtin also provides an important view of the relationship between language and social context. Bakhtin argues that all language use, including writing, is dialogic, meaning that it always involves responding to the words or ideas of others (Bakhtin, 2004). Writing is not only an individual activity, but also part of a wider social conversation.

In an educational context, this dialogical theory implies that students' writing skills can develop through interaction and the exchange of ideas with others. Students also learn to write from social interaction. In the sociocultural approach, writing is seen as a social practice bound to specific cultural, social, and historical contexts.

The writing process is influenced not only by individuals' cognitive abilities but also by the norms, values, and practices of their social environment. In language learning, culture has a role in shaping context and meaning (Karlik, 2023). Each cultural and social context has its own way of developing and valuing writing skills.

Students from different cultural backgrounds may have different preferences in terms of writing style, text structure, or even the content they consider important. In a sociocultural approach, it is important for teachers to be aware of and value these aspects of culture and its diversity so that the writing process becomes more meaningful and relevant to each individual.

The sociocultural approach to writing instruction has several important implications for teachers. First, teachers must create a learning environment that supports collaboration and social interaction. This is because language learning is closely related to students' motivation to learn, which is connected to academic and social aspects (Olaniran, 2009). Students' rich social and cultural backgrounds will also provide rich perspectives. Secondly, teachers need to pay attention to the role of culture in the writing-learning process. Every student brings their own cultural experiences and knowledge into the classroom, and this can affect the way they write. Third, the sociocultural approach also emphasizes the importance of feedback in teaching writing. Feedback provided by teachers or peers serves as a form of scaffolding that helps students improve and develop their writing skills (Newman, 2018). It is crucial to then pay attention to the social and cultural meanings of a piece of writing.

Learning writing within the framework of sociocultural theory provides a rich perspective on how writing skills develop through social and cultural interactions. By positioning writing as a social practice, the sociocultural perspective underscores the importance of collaboration, dialogue, and cultural awareness in teaching writing that can ultimately improve students' writing abilities in various contexts.

Lexical Richness

In language learning, lexical richness is an essential component that determines one's ability to communicate effectively. It refers to the variety and breadth of words a language learner can use in various communication contexts. Lexical richness itself is the vocabulary that a person knows and can use (Allagui & Naqbi, 2024; Halim, 2018; Siskova, 2012)

To be known, a person's construct of the meaning of vocabulary will be closely related to the understanding of the context (Nagy, 1995). Therefore, a person's lexical richness is not only associated with the number of words known but also includes a deep understanding of the use of words in various contexts.

The richer a person's vocabulary, the higher his or her ability to understand and express ideas, thoughts, and emotions effectively in the target language (Putri & Wahyuni, 2019). In addition, lexical richness also allows language learners to be more flexible in choosing words that are not only correct but also appropriate.

In the context of language education, lexical richness includes three main aspects: lexical diversity, lexical density, and lexical sophistication (Indarti, 2021; Siskova, 2012). Lexical diversity refers to the variety of words used, Lexical density indicates the proportion of meaningful words in a text or conversation, while lexical sophistication refers to the use of words that are considered more complex. These three aspects indicate how effective and competent a person is in mastering a language.

Language learning and research are strongly linked and rooted in lexical richness (C. Zhang, 2021). For example, in reading skills, students who have a rich vocabulary will be better able to understand readings with high complexity, including idiomatic words, formal expressions and technical terms.

Lexical richness also affects writing skills (Allagui & Naqbi, 2024; Ayadi, 2023). Many studies agree lexical richness itself to be a good measure of the quality of a student's foreign language (Astridya, 2018; Lu, 2012). Certain factors, such as gender, can affect lexical richness (Hossain & Samin, 2022). Writers with an extensive vocabulary can better express their ideas in varied and richer ways, thus improving the quality and readability of the writing. This can then expand the possibilities for constructing more complex sentences so that the reader can more clearly understand the ideas conveyed.

In addition, lexical richness also plays an essential role in understanding the culture behind language. Every language reflects the culture of its speakers (Jiang, 2000; Kramsch, 2014), and many words or phrases have indirect meanings or certain connotations. By having a rich vocabulary, language learners can more easily understand the cultural aspects inherent in the language (Wang & Huang, 2017).

Lexical richness in language learning is influenced by various important factors that affect how quickly and effectively one expands his or her vocabulary. One of the main factors is comprehensible input, which is adequate exposure to the target language in contexts that are comprehensible and relevant to the learner.

In addition to the above factors, students' social and educational backgrounds are also influential. Students from an environment rich in language exposure tend to have higher lexical richness than those with less exposure. Among those exposures are practical and social contexts. These social factors form a strong foundation in language learning (Castanelli, 2023; Newman & Latifi, 2021) because an environment that supports early exposure, supportive social environment, to language allows for more effective and natural development of linguistic skills.

In language learning research, lexical richness is often measured to see the development of a person's language skills. Lexical richness measurement is usually done using the type-token ratio (TTR) and lexical diversity as the primary indicators (Allagui & Naqbi, 2024). The type-token ratio is the ratio of the number of unique words to the total number of words in a text or conversation, which gives an idea of the variety of vocabulary used. In addition, lexical density and lexical sophistication are also used to measure the extent to which students are able to use varied and complex words (Allagui & Naqbi, 2024; Siskova, 2012).

Seeing the importance of lexical richness, experts keep exploring this topic. Linking it with language learning at almost all levels (Allagui & Naqbi, 2024; Indarti, 2021; Thawarom & Singhasiri, 2020; Vold, 2023). However, there are still unexplored aspects, including seeing lexical richness as a variable that is affected, not affecting. This research tries to fill those gaps by exploring factors, sociocultural, that are assumed to correlate with lexical richness.

Overall, lexical richness is a major component that determines success in language learning. The richer a learner's vocabulary, the broader and deeper their ability to understand and express ideas, emotions, and thoughts. In the language learning process, it is important for educators to pay more attention to the development of students' vocabulary through various effective and relevant learning methods.

Method

This research uses a quantitative, non-experimental approach (Creswell, 2014). It used a correlational design to test the relationship between the variables of the research results and provide new evidence and explanation of the correlation between sociocultural aspects and lexical richness in writing.

The study population was the XI grade students of MAN 2 Palu City who had met the predetermined criteria: had a minimum score of 80 for English subjects and got a recommendation from their English teacher. The criteria are given to minimize the gap in English capability among students based on the consideration of the writing assessment they took. This study used purposive sampling, where the total number of samples was 100% of the total population of 86 students. The number of participants has fulfilled the minimum requirement for a correlational study: 50 (Mahat et al., 2024). The characteristics of the participants were reviewed in various aspects, such as gender, social, and economic. This is to see the conditions and characteristics of the participants.

The research participants consisted of 26 men and 60 women, with various ethnic backgrounds, dominated by the Bugis and Kaili tribes. In addition to the two aspects above, the participants' characteristics also showed quite diverse variations in terms of economic background.

The research instrument on sociocultural aspects uses an instrument developed by Cheek (Cheek et al., 1994, 2002), which measures sociocultural aspects in five main factors: Personal Identity, Relational Identity, Collective Identity, Social Identity, and Special. This instrument is then formulated as a close-ended questionnaire using a Likert scale of 44 items. The instrument's validity and reliability have been tested using SPSS ver. 22. The result is 0.722, higher than the r-table (0.213). Therefore, the instruments are valid and reliable.

Reflecting on the Sociocultural instrument developed by Cheek, MAN 2 Kota Palu offers unique and purposeful relevance where students come from various backgrounds, ethnicities, economic, and others. Not to mention that the school is also located in the central city of Palu, a city that long become a melting pot of cultures.

The lexical richness variable is measured using a corpus linguistic application, AntConc, developed by Anthony Laurance (Anthony, 2005). This application is one of the most popular

in corpus linguistic measurement (Arum & Winarti, 2019; Iswari et al., 2021; Zih et al., 2020). This application measures in detail the level of vocabulary (tokens) used by students in the writing test used in this study.

The data obtained will first be sorted to ensure that the results are in accordance with the criteria set. Data that is then inappropriate will be eliminated and not included in the subsequent analysis stage. Data analysis in this study was carried out statistically using the SPSS ver. 22 application. The data analysis stage is carried out by testing the normality of the data distribution obtained. Then, the data will be tested using Pearson's Product Moment formula. This is to determine the correlation between the two variables.

Findings

The data description summarizes the respondent's answers to the various questions or statements asked in the questionnaire and written tests conducted. Based on a survey involving 86 respondents, the researcher then reduced the number that could be processed to 78. This is based on the results of the answers of the students who have met the criteria. The researcher described their answers in detail and classified them through descriptive statistics. By using a numerical index, an overview of the respondents' views on each variable indicator that was applied in this study can be obtained.

Sociocultural

Sociocultural aspects, based on the instrument developed by Cheek (Cheek et al., 1994, 2002), consist of 5 levels or loci of self: Personal, Relational, Social, Collective, and Special. Based on that, the level of descriptive analysis based on the locus of self is presented. The following descriptive presentation describes the findings in the field.

The overall Sociocultural aspects can be presented in more detail in the table 1.

Table 1. Sociocultural

Level	N	Score	Mean
Personal Identity (PI)	78	318.3	4.08
Relational Identity (RI)	78	313.3	4.02
Social Identity (SI)	78	283.5	3.66
Community Identity (CI)	78	273.5	3.51
Special (SP)	78	293.8	3.77
Average		296.5	3.81

The findings on sociocultural variables based on five levels, namely Personal Identity (PI), Relational Identity (RI), Social Identity (SI), Community Identity (CI), and Special (SP), with a total of 78 respondents, produced a more comprehensive picture of the students' condition. The overall mean average of all identity levels is 3.81, which refers to the socio-cultural characteristics of the students.

Personal Identity (PI) has the highest mean of 4.08, indicating that respondents have a solid personal identity or feel most connected to this aspect. In contrast, Community Identity (CI) recorded the lowest mean of 3.51, indicating that respondents may feel less attached to or understand the community aspect less than other aspects. From this point, it can be illustrated that the sociocultural conditions of the students are more inclined to the values of the self that they believe in. This is quite relevant considering that the context studied is students at the Islamic Senior High School level (*Madrasah Aliyah*) who generally have high self-role characteristics. On the other hand, the community aspect is low. This point can be an assumption that community values are not too attached to the students. This can be explained by considering that students come from diverse cultural backgrounds, so local value shifts are very likely to occur in the context of assimilation and adaptation. Additionally, the city they live in, Palu, is a melting pot of people from various cultures.

This data indicates differences in the strength of identity at various sociocultural levels, with a tendency to be stronger at the personal and relational levels.

Lexical Richness

A study on linguistic richness in English descriptive text involving 86 participants was conducted at MAN 2 Palu City. However, only 76 students were able to finish the writing test accordingly. The 76 were then analyzed for the subsequent stage. Lexical richness is one of the important elements that reflect students' ability in language, especially in writing.

Data collection was conducted through a descriptive text writing test, during which the students spent 45 minutes with the same theme of "Palu City." The use of the same theme ensured the level of familiarity between the students. The writing test was given in the form of a class assignment in which the students were gathered in the same room. In doing the test, researchers first ensured the clarity of the instruction and gave guidance accordingly. Then, within 45 minutes, the students directly draft their descriptive texts. The writing results were then analyzed to calculate the total number of words (tokens) and the variety of words used (types) and calculate the percentage of lexical richness (Juanggo, 2018; Y. Zhang et al., 2023). These parameters were used to measure the extent to which students were able to apply a variety of vocabulary in their writing. In more detail, the findings are presented in the following table:

Table 2. Writing Test

	N	Tokens	Types	Percentage
Writing Test	78			
- Maximum		346	161	81.2%
- Minimum		54	35	34.2%
- Average		173.4	96.2	56.9%

The analysis showed that the average number of words (tokens) used by students was 173.4 words per writing. The maximum value reached 346 words, while the minimum value was recorded at 54 words. This data indicates a significant difference in student's ability to produce texts of a certain length. Some students were able to write longer and more informative texts, while other students seemed to have difficulty in developing ideas to produce texts of shorter length.

The variation in the number of word types also showed similar results. The average word type used by students was 96.2 types per piece of writing, with the maximum value reaching 161 types and the minimum value at 35 types. Word types reflect the variety of vocabulary used in the writing. The greater the number of word types, the more varied the vocabulary used in the text. This data indicates that some students have a fairly good command of vocabulary, allowing them to produce writing with a wider variety of words, while some other students tend to repeat the same words. This leads to the assumption that some students have limited vocabulary.

Furthermore, the percentage of lexical richness was calculated by comparing the number of word variations (types) to the total words (tokens) in each text. The maximum percentage of lexical richness was recorded as 81.2%, while the minimum value was 34.2%, with an average of 56.9%. This percentage of lexical richness gives an idea of the level of vocabulary selection in the texts produced compared to the length of the texts they produced.

The significant variation in this data suggests a large difference in vocabulary acquisition ability among students. Some students were able to utilize a broader vocabulary to convey their ideas more diversely and creatively. In contrast, students with lower lexical richness scores may have difficulty in selecting and using appropriate words to describe their ideas.

However, although some students performed well, the significant disparity between the maximum and minimum scores on all parameters suggests that there are groups of students who have difficulty developing a variety of vocabulary in English writing. This can be seen in the minimum score of lexical richness, which is only 34.2%. This indicates that the students could only use about one-third of the unique vocabulary in their texts, while the rest consisted of repeating the same words.

This difference highlights that vocabulary acquisition among students is still uneven. Of course, some assumptions can be built from the description of the data generated, whether aspects of writing ability, vocabulary mastery, or other factors that could influence this variable. On the other hand, this data becomes the key data in conducting further analysis in this study. The lexical richness variable in writing descriptive text is the dependent variable that becomes the main object of study in this research.

Correlational Analysis

Based on the research findings, the next step is to conduct statistical tests to see the relationship between Sociocultural variables and Lexical Richness. In this study, data reduction was carried out to be processed based on the quality of the descriptive text of the research participants. From a total of 78 descriptive texts, 43 texts were taken that fit the required range where the range of text length was above 150 words.

Based on the results of Pearson correlation analysis in the table above, the relationship between Sociocultural variables and Lexical Richness shows a Pearson Correlation (r) value of 0.088. This value indicates that the correlation between the two variables is very weak and positive. Although the relationship is positive, meaning that when the sociocultural score increases or is high, the vocabulary selection score also tends to increase or be high, the effect is very small and almost not practically significant. Therefore, considering the significance value, this provisional conclusion needs to be strengthened.

Furthermore, the Sig. (2-tailed) The relationship between the two variables is 0.575, much greater than the significant threshold of 0.05. If the significance value is more than 0.05 (Sig>0.05), it means that variable X (Sociocultural) and variable Y (vocabulary selection) do not have a statistically significant correlational relationship. Thus, the null hypothesis (Ho) - There is no significant relationship between sociocultural identity and lexical richness in writing - is accepted, and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) - There is a significant relationship between sociocultural identity and lexical richness in writing - is rejected.

Overall, these results suggest no strong evidence to support a significant relationship between sociocultural aspects and lexical richness in this dataset. These two variables do not seem to influence each other or be significantly related. This result is a key point for further interpretation.

Discussions

The Correlation of Sociocultural and Lexical Richness

This study explores the relationship between individual sociocultural identity and lexical richness in writing English descriptive texts. Based on the results of Pearson correlation analysis, the Pearson Correlation value (r = 0.088) was obtained, which indicates that the relationship

between the two variables is very weak and positive. This means that as the sociocultural value increases, the lexical richness value tends to increase, but the effect is so small that it is almost not practically significant. Furthermore, the Sig. (2-tailed) of 0.575, which is well above the significant threshold (0.05), indicates that the relationship between sociocultural identity and lexical richness is not statistically significant. With this result, the null hypothesis (H$_0$), which states that there is no significant relationship between sociocultural identity and lexical richness, is accepted, while the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is rejected.

This finding has several important implications. First, this result shows that sociocultural factors, such as cultural background, social experience, or individual identity, do not have a significant correlation with the level of vocabulary variety used in writing. This finding is actually in line with Mohammadi and Izadpanah (2019), who state that sociocultural is a demotivative variable towards language learning. While this result does not go to the extreme of stating that sociocultural is negative, the findings of this study found the absence of a significant correlation. Several reasons could lead to these findings, such as their feelings towards English and social factors that do not require much understanding of English. This is in line with Mohammadi and Izadpanah, though for the Iranian context, political factors are also believed to contribute to the negative result.

On the other hand, this study's findings contradict the research conducted by Altugan (2015), Panhwar (2016), and Campos (2022), which found a positive relationship between sociocultural aspects and language learning. In this case, there are assumptions related to why the results of this study contradict previous researchers. Altugan and Panhwar's findings are based on literature studies that have not been practically tested or implemented in the field. While the current research was conducted based on real circumstances, students in Palu. Factors like cultural differences and viewpoints can more concretely show sociocultural roles in English learning.

Unlike the previous reviewers, Campos is an expert who found his conclusions based on field studies. His study, in the form of experimental research using treatment based on Vygotsky's Sociocultural Scaffolding theory, found the effectiveness of treatment on speaking ability. The difference in findings between the current study and Campos is assumed to occur due to several aspects, namely, the research design developed and the perception of sociocultural variables.

Campos developed an experimental-based research method in which he conducted treatment on the research participants. The second point is the perception in looking at sociocultural variables, where in this study, the sociocultural aspect is used to assess students' conditions and perceptions. Campos, on the other hand, sees sociocultural aspects in terms of the scaffolding theory developed by Vygotsky, where this theory does assist in learning.

Research findings that are in line with or different from these findings can provide insight into the sociocultural function in learning and strengthen a more in-depth analysis.

This indicates that other aspects, such as language competence, learning methods, or level of exposure to English, may have a more significant influence. Other factors, such as the mindset of the surroundings, play some roles. It can be seen from numerous works where sociocultural perspectives are implemented in a more practical way (Sarmiento-Campos et al., 2022; Yee Wan & Tjin Ai, 2023). However, it can create a backfire effect when teachers or educators are unable to diagnose or understand the circumstances of their current sociocultural condition. It is reflected in Mohammadi and Izadpanah's work (2019). Therefore, in the context of language education, this finding suggests that teaching strategies should focus more on vocabulary enrichment through practical exercises and direct exposure to the target language rather than relying solely on students' sociocultural identity. In another word, sociocultural condition better be treated an alternative alarm to identify what developments and treatment should be made.

The contradiction between this finding and the literature-based studies builds an assumption on how the sociocultural aspect has not made an impact when some prerequisite conditions have not been established, such as proficient linguistic ability and exposure level.

Of course, further research is needed to identify other factors that are essential in increasing lexical richness, such as motivation, learning intensity, or access to English materials.

Thus, this study concludes that while sociocultural identity may impact lexical richness, the impact is very small and not statistically significant. Therefore, practical and experiential approaches are more relevant in improving students' lexical richness in the context of English language learning. It is important for teachers to identify what kind of vocabulary the students need or can enhance their creativity with. As can be seen from the research, students still face challenges to develop and express their ideas, despite the relatively close topic. In future development, of course, those with better exposure or supportive social conditions could give a bigger proportion to the sociocultural aspects in enhancing their learning process.

Conclusion

This study shows that the sociocultural identity among students is more robust in the Personal Identity aspect (mean 4.08), while the level of students' lexical richness in writing English descriptive text is at a moderate level (56.9%) with a significant disparity in competence. The significant disparity is also reflected with quite a big gap (47%) between the top-tier (81.2%) and low-tier (34.2%) in terms of lexical richness. It also can be seen from the variety of the words (Types) used, 161 Types stands at the top and 35 Types for the lowest. Pearson correlation analysis found a very weak or insignificant relationship between sociocultural identity and lexical richness (r = 0.088, Sig. = 0.575); thus, the null hypothesis was accepted. These results differ from some previous studies, possibly due to differences in research design and participant conditions. In addition, the current research is not without limitations; conditions like perception towards the target language and limitation texts' variation to be evaluated could become considerations. Further research is recommended to explore factors such as motivation, learning strategies, or teaching methods based on Vygotsky's Scaffolding theory. On the other hand, practitioners, teachers, and curriculum developers could explore teaching strategies and materials that could enrich students' vocabulary. The findings of current research unveil some challenges in terms of lexical richness.

Acknowledgements

References

Akmal, S., Fauza, N., Chamisah, & Syahabuddin, K. (2023). Classifying "culture" in
    Indonesian secondary public education EFL textbooks. *Indonesian Journal of English*

Education, *10*(1), 83–105. https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v10i1.29924

Aldawood, A. A., & Almeshari, F. (2019). Effects of learning culture on English-language learning for Saudi EFL students. *Arab World English Journal*, *10*(3), 330–343. https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol10no3.23

Allagui, B., & Naqbi, S. Al. (2024). The contribution of vocabulary knowledge to summary writing quality: Vocabulary size and lexical richness. *Tesl-Ej*, *28*(1), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.55593/ej.28109a5

Altugan, A. S. (2015). The relationship between cultural identity and learning. *5th World Conference on Learning, Teaching and Educational Leadership 2014*, *186*, 1159–1162. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.161

Annisa, N., Mirizon, S., & Silvhiany, S. (2023). Vocational high school students' identity and investment in learning English in a rural area. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *10*(2), 926–942. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v10i2.27167

Arum, E. R., & Winarti, W. (2019). The use of antconc in providing lexical and sintactical information of the texbook of radiographic positioning and related anatomy: A corpus linguistic study. *Jurnal Sosioteknologi*, *18*(1), 106–112. https://doi.org/10.5614/sostek.itbj.2019.18.1.8

Astridya, F. W. (2018). Lexical richness of the expository writing in Indonesian senior high school students. *Lingual: Journal of Language and Culture*, *5*(1), 23. https://doi.org/10.24843/ljlc.2018.v05.i01.p04

Ayadi, M. (2023). Lexical richness and syntactic complexity as predictors of academic writing performance. *Journal of English Studies in Arabia Felix*, *2*(1), 23–33. https://doi.org/10.56540/jesaf.v2i1.43

Bakhtin, M. M. (2004). Dialogic origin and dialogic pedagogy of grammar: Stylistics in teaching Russian language in secondary school. *Journal of Russian & East European Psychology*, *42*(6), 12–49. https://doi.org/10.1080/10610405.2004.11059233

Byram, M., & Wagner, M. (2018). Making a difference: Language teaching for intercultural and international dialogue. *Foreign Language Annals*, *51*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12319

Castanelli, D. (2023). Sociocultural learning theory and assessment for learning. *Medical*

Education, *57*(5), 382–384. https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.15028

Cheek, J. M., Smith, S., & Tropp, L. R. (2002). Relational identity orientation: A fourth scale for the AIQ (Aspects of Identity Questionnaire). *Relational Identity Orientation: A Fourth Scale for the AIQ (Aspects of Identity Questionnaire)*, *April*. https://doi.org/10.13140/2.1.1643.7763

Cheek, J. M., Tropp, L. R., Chen, L. C., & Underwood, M. K. (1994). Identity orientations: Personal, social, and collective aspects of identity. *Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association*, *August 1994*. http://academics.wellesley.edu/Psychology/Cheek/aiq_iii.html

Corral-Robles, S., Madrid, D., & Gonzalez-Gijon, G. (2017). Cultural diversity and its implications for second language writing. *The International Journal of Diversity in Education*, *48*(24), 399–399. https://doi.org/10.1177/002205749804802402

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publication, Inc.

Floranti, A. D., & Adiantika, H. N. (2019). Grammatical error performances in Indonesia EFL learners' writing. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, *3*(2), 277–295.

Halim, S. W. (2018). Lexical richness in English language and culture department students' undergraduate theses. *Journal of English Language and Culture*, *8*(2), 140–151. https://doi.org/10.30813/jelc.v8i2.1098

Han, J., & Hiver, P. (2018). Genre-based L2 writing instruction and writing-specific psychological factors: The dynamics of change. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *40*(November 2017), 44–59. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2018.03.001

Hernández Castro, O., & Samacá Bohórquez, Y. (2011). A study of EFL students' interpretations of cultural aspects in foreign language learning. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, *8*, 38. https://doi.org/10.14483/22487085.171

Holmes, J. (2013). An introduction to sociolinguistics. In G. Leech & M. Short (Eds.), *Language* (4th Edition, Vol. 70, Issue 3). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.2307/416511

Hossain, M. Z., & Samin, A. M. (2022). Analysis of male and female speakers' word choices in public speeches. *Arxiv*, *2001*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.06366v1

Indarti, D. (2021). Lexical richness of students' writings. *Wanastra: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, *13*(1), 47–53. https://doi.org/10.31294/w.v13i1.9683

Iswari, W. P., Suhatmady, B., Asih, Y. U., Wardani, I., Ramadhan, A., & Anastasya, D. (2021). Using concordance software to generate academic words in applied linguistics. *Educational Studies: Conference Series*, *1*(1), 31–41. https://doi.org/10.30872/escs.v1i1.882

Jiang, W. (2000). The relationship between culture and language. *ELT Journal*, *54*(4), 328–334. http://eltj.oxfordjournals.org/

Juanggo, W. (2018). Investigating lexical diversity and lexical sophistication of productive vocabulary in the written discourse of Indonesian EFL learners. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *8*(1), 38–48. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v8i1.11462

Karlik, M. (2023). Exploring the impact of culture on language learning: How understanding cultural context and values can deepen language acquisition. *International Journal of Language, Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, *2*(5), 5–11. https://doi.org/10.1075/ijolc.1.1.00edi

Kim, D. (2020). Learning language, learning culture: Teaching language to the whole student. *ECNU Review of Education*, *3*(3), 519–541. https://doi.org/10.1177/2096531120936693

Kramsch, C. (2014). Language and culture. *AILA Review*, *27*, 254–255. https://doi.org/10.1177/003803856800200229

Kushartanti, B., Saraswati, A., Yowono, U. (2019). Variation of first person singular pronouns in Indonesian-speaking children-speech. *Advances in Social Science, Education, and Humanities Research*, *338*(PRASASTI), 85–90.

Lu, X. (2012). The relationship of lexical richness to the quality of ESL learners' oral narratives. *The Modern Language Journal*, *96*(2), 190–208. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01232.x

Mahat, D., Neupane, D., & Shrestha, S. (2024). Quantitative research design and sample trends: A systematic examination of emerging paradigms and best practices. *Cognizance Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, *4*(2), 20–27. https://doi.org/10.47760/cognizance.2024.v04i02.002

Meng, Q. (2020). Study on the construction of mother tongue cultural identity in intercultural communication. *4th International Conference on Culture, Education and Economic Development*

on Modern Society (ICCESE 2020), *416*(ICCESE), 582–585.

https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200316.128

Mohammadi, H., & Izadpanah, S. (2019). A study of the relationship between Iranian learners' sociocultural identity and English as a foreign language (EFL) learning proficiency. *International Journal of Instruction*, *12*(1), 53–68. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.1214a

Musaeus, P. (2006). A sociocultural approach to recognition and learning. *Outlines. Critical Practice Studies*, *8*(1), 19–31. https://doi.org/10.7146/ocps.v8i1.2096

Nagy, W. (1995). On the role of context in first- and second-language vocabulary learning. In *ACM SIGART Bulletin* (Issue 627).

Newman, S. (2018). Vygotsky, Wittgenstein, and sociocultural theory. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, *48*(3), 350–368. https://doi.org/10.1111/jtsb.12174

Newman, S., & Latifi, A. (2021). Vygotsky, education, and teacher education. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *47*(1), 4–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2020.1831375

Olaniran, B. A. (2009). Culture and language learning in computer-enhanced or assisted language learning. *Learning Culture and Language through ICTs: Methods for Enhanced Instruction*, *1*(September), 73–87. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-60566-166-7.ch005

Panhwar, A. H., Ansari, S., & Ansari, K. (2016). Sociocultural theory and its role in the development of language pedagogy. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, *7*(6), 183–188. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.7n.6p.183

Peirce, B. N. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, *29*(1), 9–31.

Pourkalhor, O., & Esfandiari, N. (2017). Culture in language learning: Background, issues and implications. *International Journal of English Language and Translation Studies*, *05*(01), 23–32.

Putri, Z. M., & Wahyuni, E. (2019). Vocabulary learning strategy employed by high-achiever university students at Malang. *A Journal of Culture English Language Teaching Literature & Linguistics*, *6*(1), 78. https://doi.org/10.22219/celticumm.vol6.no1.78-89

Rachmawaty, N., Wello, M. B., Akil, M., & Dollah, S. (2018). Do cultural intelligence and language learning strategies influence students' english language proficiency? *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *9*(3), 655–663. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0903.27

Sarmiento-Campos, N. V., Lázaro-Guillermo, J. C., Silvera-Alarcón, E. N., Cuellar-Quispe, S.,

Huamán-Romaní, Y. L., Apaza, O. A., & Sorkheh, A. (2022). A look at Vygotsky's sociocultural theory (SCT): The effectiveness of scaffolding method on EFL learners' speaking achievement. *Education Research International*, *2022*. https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/3514892

Siskova, Z. (2012). Lexical richness in EFL students' narratives. *University of Reading Language Studies Working Papers*, *4*(August), 26–36.

Taufiqulloh. (2014). A self-assessment model in teaching academic writing for Indonesian EFL learners. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, *3*(1), 1–9.

Thawarom, T., & Singhasiri, W. (2020). Lexical richness of one-minute speaking task by science and technology university students. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, *17*(1), 70–86. https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2020.17.1.5.70

Torres-Velsquez, D. (2000). Sociocultural theory standing at the crossroads. *Remedial Adn Special Education*, *21*(2), 66–69.

Vold, E. T. (2023). Development of lexical richness among beginning learners of French as a foreign language. *Nordic Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, *10*(2), 182–211. https://doi.org/10.46364/njltl.v10i2.1007

Vy, N. N. T., Van, D. T., Nhu, N. T. H., Tien, N. T. T., Long, T. N., & Tuyet, N. T. N. (2022). An investigation into the common errors of word form used in writing of the freshmen: A case study. *European Journal of Education Studies*, *9*(12), 62–74. https://doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v9i12.4561

Wang, W. Y., & Huang, Y. M. (2017). Interactive syllable-based English vocabulary learning in a context-aware environment. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, *55*(2), 219–239. https://doi.org/10.1177/0735633116663212

Yee Wan, E. W., & Tjin Ai, J. T. (2023). Early second language learning and arts integration in Malaysian multicultural context: A sociocultural perspective. *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (MJSSH)*, *8*(5), e002297. https://doi.org/10.47405/mjssh.v8i5.2297

Zhang, C. (2021). Community engagement under the mass line for counterterrorism in China. *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, *44*(10), 799–817. https://doi.org/10.1080/1057610X.2019.1585636

Zhang, Y., Wang, L., Hu, W., & Yao, X. (2023). A contrastive corpus study on lexical features of the English translation of the report of the 20th and 19th CPC National Congress. *SHS Web of Conferences*, *155*, 03017. https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202315503017

Zhou, X. (2024). Sociocultural theory in early childhood education. *Lecture Notes in Education Psychology and Public Media*, *51*(1), 190–196. https://doi.org/10.54254/2753-7048/51/20240981

Zih, H., El Biadi, M., & Chatri, Z. (2020). Evaluating the effectiveness of corpus linguistic software in analyzing the grammatical structure: LancsBox and AntConc as case studies. *Colloquium in Information Science and Technology, CIST*, *2020-June*, 515–519. https://doi.org/10.1109/CiSt49399.2021.9357285