SEMANTIC REVIEW ON THE REFORMULATION AS THE FORM OF CLARIFICATION IN APPOSITIONAL CONSTRUCTIONS

Hero Gunawan
English Department, Faculty of Humanities
Widyatama University, Bandung, West Java, Indonesia
Email: hero.gunawan@widyatama.ac.id

Puspita Sari
English Department, Faculty of Humanities
Widyatama University, Bandung, West Java, Indonesia
Email: puspita.sari@widyatama.ac.id

Abstract: This research-based article discusses appositives containing reformulation which is very important in the context of meaning particularly in the form of clarification to the anchor as the antecedent. This reformulation is viewed from the two aspects, i.e., semantic equivalence and coreference. Therefore, this research serves two aims: 1) to elucidate the forms of clarification provided by reformulation as semantic equivalence that makes anchors more comprehensible, and 2) to elaborate whether reformulation and its anchor are coreferential in the appositional constructions. The data sources are taken from English printed media within three levels of distributional coverage, i.e., national, regional and international coverage. The data are analysed through employing the method of qualitative research, that is, the method presenting descriptive data, both written and oral data. To analyse such descriptive data, the distributional method of analysis with the two techniques is used, namely, extracting techniques, and inserting techniques. The results of this research uncover that 1) the forms of clarification provided by the reformulation cover: a) metaphorical expression, b) factual knowledge, c) expression of revision, d) simplified expression, e) short forms (acronyms), f) emphasis through negative reformulation, and g) equivalence in other language; and 1) not all reformulations have coreferences. All of the reformulation forms are given to make the anchor more comprehensible.
Keywords: *appositives; clarification; coreference; reformulation; semantic equivalence.*

INTRODUCTION

The semantic link between two entities serves as a description of the relation of meaning (Hasanah et al., 2020). Because semantic characteristics are aware of word meaning, sentence relationships, discourse, context, etc. (Alsayed, 2019), they help make words more understandable (Fajrah, 2019).

Reformulation's role in semantic equivalences is one that would make for highly enlightening research. Reformulation is the process of creating utterances that are semantically comparable or nearly equivalent utilizing various language tools, such as appellation, identification, and paraphrasing (Tsedryk, 2019; Wongkittiporn, 2022).

We frequently expound on a notion that has been previously expressed in a different fashion, whether in prepared or unprepared conversation (Meurant et al., 2022; Sagala & Rezeki, 2018; Zhang et al., 2022). The presence of reformulation in an appositional construction is not just additional information (Gunawan, 2020), but also a way for semiotic resources (Alipour, 2019, Goodwin, 2018, Sahyoni, 2018) to clarify the anchor's role as the antecedent. According to Al-Sulaimaan & Khoshaba (2018), a term is ambiguous if we do not understand what it means. Reformulation can make a statement more nuanced and simpler to understand by reinterpreting and elaborating. According to Johnson (2019), reformulation is a process of textual reinterpretation for improving the conveying of intended meaning.

Reformulation frequently employs what are known as reformulation markers when displaying the information's contents. In order to establish a connection between the treatment discourse (D2) and the reference discourse (D1), reformulation markers are used (Florea, 2019; Nadal, 2020). Although reformulation markers are important because they signal changes in perspective on what has been stated or invalidate prior formulations due

to their semantic value, speakers can reformulate without them (Jiménez, 2022).

An appositive is a word, phrase, or sentence that explains or modifies other words, phrases, or clauses in order to support them (Alwasilah & Mahdi, 2020; Mutiara, 2019). According to Gunawan and Sari (2019), appositional constructs that place the appositives and their anchor in contrast are seen as offering extra information. The anchor is referred to as the antecedent in this supplementary material. In order to maintain the meaning, the two elements (appositives and anchors) have semantic equivalences (Chotimah et al., 2022). According to Quirk in Gunawan (2021) there are four different sorts of semantic equivalences: appellation, identification, designation, and reformulation. In terms of naming aspects, appellation is semantic equivalence; in terms of providing a specific explanation to the anchor, which is generally of a generic nature, identification is semantic equivalence; in terms of explaining the status of the relationship between an anchor and an appositive, designation is semantic equivalence; and in terms of restating information in a different way while maintaining the same information's content, reformulation is semantic equivalence.

One of the semantic equivalences, reformulation, allows for the expression of the same meaning as the anchor but in a different method (rewording). Reformulation can take many different forms, such as the use of synonyms, factual knowledge that includes knowledge of the outside world, a more exact formulation, revision, and many others. In reformulation, language markers like (more) simple, in scientific terminology, in more technical terms, technically, and many other similar markers are frequently used. Here are some examples:

(1) *In addition to things like "task chunking" (i.e., doing like things together - in other words, answering all my e-mail at once or running a bunch of errands in one trip), I look for short cuts to make the most of my writing time.* (H-COCA) (Šinkūnienė, 2019, p.548)

The appositive, which indicates the existence of clarification through reformulation, is an example in that sentence. The anchor receives the value of equivalence in terms of the particular substance thanks to this appositive reformulation. By employing the reformulation marker, the reformulation is given in the form of an explanation. According to Inkinien (2019), the

word in the sample above has an interpretation of explicit meaning.

The use of appositive reformulation emphasizes rewording or restating in a different way while maintaining the same meaning, making it easier for readers to comprehend the intended anchor in a given situation (Feist, 2022). For a better understanding of this reformulation, consider the following example from Lavinson (1983, pp. 329–330), who claims that reformulation is a sort of self-repair using the example of the repairable item:

(2) I need *a new bolt for my oil pan*, *the bolt in the bottom for draining the oil.*
The response to the other-initiation in the following exchange is also a reformulation:
A: I need *a new bolt for my oil pan*.
B: Which?
A: *The big one underneath.*

That sample (2) above is very clear that reformulation is a self-repair by means of a paraphrase of the repairable item, and here is the simple explanation:

The expression *a new bolt for my oil pan* is corrected/repaired by the reformulation *the bolt in the bottom for draining the oil.*

The expression *a new bolt for my oil pan* is corrected/repaired by the reformulation *the big one underneath*

The ability to provide corrective expression (revision) to the anchor as the antecedent reveals that the two appositives of reformulation in (2) above have coreference (Kroll & Rysling, 2019). By connecting the phrase to distinctive characterization, the term can be made more exact (Haverkamp & Hoeltje, 2021). To put it another way, a speaker may be encouraged to reformulate their previous talk or a coparticipant's past turn in response to a coparticipant's express request or a coparticipant's display of non-understanding (Kunitz & Majlesi, 2022).

Inknien (2019) investigated the distribution frequency and purposes of reformulation markers in academic discourse in two languages (English and Lithuanian) and three science domains (humanities, medicine, and technology) in relation to this research issue. The findings indicated that reformulation markers are most frequently used in the humanities by English and Lithuanian scholars.

Florea (2019) is now working on the reformulation markers for the literature reviews sections. The findings showed that advanced academic literature reviews activate a specific sort

of reformulation discourse in which markers exhibit a clarifying function within an authority-based, readership-oriented reformulation discourse type.

In a separate study, Alipour (2019) investigated the use of reformulation markers, a prevalent metadiscourse strategy in applied linguistics research articles written by Iranian native and non-native writers. The findings revealed that the roles played by reformulation markers (RMs) varied between research articles published by native and non-native writers.

The form of reformulation and its coreferentiality should be discussed in relation to the topic of reformulation. The two components of reformulation that are of interest to talk about here are. In order to make the reformulation more understandable, the first thing to look for is any clarifications that are offered by the reformulation as a result of semantic equivalences. The second thing to look for is whether or not the reformulation contains coreferences. In order to make anchors more understandable, reformulation provides many types of explanation. Therefore, this research serves two aims: 1) to elaborate the forms of clarification provided by reformulation as a semantic equivalence that makes anchors more comprehensible, and 2) to explain whether reformulation and its anchor are coreferential in the appositional constructions.

METHOD

Based on the nature of study, the method used in this research is qualitative descriptive research method in which the data used are not judged to be true-false but they are viewed as the true phenomena as they are. Qualitative method aims to describe the real case that occurs in the field (Octaberlina *et al*., 2020), which means that all data in this study are collected. It is in line with Cresswell (2018), saying that the objective of descriptive research is to describe description regarding the facts of the data and phenomenon.

The data collection is conducted by identifying data through reading the selected data sources, marking the potential data, notetaking and tabulating the data into tabular form based on the data classification. The data that have already collected and classified are analysed through employing the method of qualitative research, that is, the method presenting descriptive data, both written and oral data. To analyse such descriptive data, the distributional method of analysis with the two techniques is used, namely, extracting technique, and inserting technique.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The important findings related to reformulation cover the reformulation in the form of: metaphors, factual knowledge (knowledge of the external world), revision, short forms of a word (acronyms), equivalence in other language, emphasis through negative reformulation, and simplified expression. Here are the samples extracted from the selected data sources.

Metaphorical expression

> (3) TV censorship, while still strict, was no longer suffocating – and *Benghazi, the cradle of any Libyan dissent*, was given its team back.

The reformulation above is expressed in the form of metaphor – rewording in the form of metaphorical expression, that is, transferring concept of a cradle symbolizing a place with full of comfort for rebels. The concept of "being comfortable" attached to the cradle is used for the city of Benghazi. It seems to be well-known that the cradle is the most comfortable place for a baby. This implicates that Benghaji is a very nice place for Libyan dissent.

This appositive in (3) above has coreference which can be seen from the capability of the appositive in providing reformulation in terms of metaphor from the definite anchor. The capability to become reformulation is indicated by the reformulation marker (relator) *in other words* between the anchor and the reformulation as the appositive equivalence as seen in (3a). Besides, to indicate that the reformulation in that appositional construction has coreference by inserting relative pronoun – in other words, by changing the construction (3) into relative clause by using the copular verb *be*, as seen in (3b).

> (3a) TV censorship, while still strict, was no longer suffocating – and *Benghazi*, *(in other words) the cradle of any Libyan dissent*, was given its team back.

> (3b) TV censorship, while still strict, was no longer suffocating – and *Benghazi*, *(which is) the cradle of any Libyan dissent,* was given its team back.

The anchor *Benghazi* becomes the reference from the content of reformulation, *i.e.*, *the cradle of any Libyan dissent* so that the two are coreferential in the form of metaphorical expression for a certain place.

Factual knowledge

It is rather different from the sample (4) below. This reformulation is still about the clarification of certain place which is categorized into factual knowledge (city).

> (4) She learned that a large number of female refugees, most of them Muslims, were streaming into *Zenica, an industrial town in central Bosnia,....*

Then reformulation in sample (4) provides clarification on the existence of the Zenica city, and it has coreference. This coreference lies on the capability of the reformulation in providing factual knowledge to the anchor which has already been definite in nature. This capability is indicated by inserting relative pronoun and changing the construction (4) into relative clause by using the copular verb *be*, as seen in (4a). such a coreference will be very obvious if the anchor and the appositive are extracted independently from the context as in (4b).

> (4a) She learned that a large number of female refugees, most of them Muslims, were streaming into *Zenica*, *(which is) an industrial town in central Bosnia,....*

> (4b) Zenica *is* an industrial town in central Bosnia.

The anchor *Zenica* becomes the reference from the content of factual reformulation with respect to a certain place, that is, *an industrial town in central Bosnia* so that the two are coreferential in the form of factual knowledge.

Similar to the sample (4), it is still related to the reformulation regarding a place as in sample (5) below. This sample (5) is still about the clarification of certain place which is categorized into factual knowledge (city). It can be seen from the use of geographical name (state and city).

> (5) Richard Lehner and Captain Daniel Aufdenblatten's trip in April 2010 to *Kathmandu, Nepal,* had been fairly undramatic by their standards.

The appositional construction with the content of certain geographical names moving from part (*i.e.*, name of city) to whole (*i.e.,* name of country) – specific place (capital city) on the anchor, and general place (country) on the appositive.

The anchor and the appositive of reformulation in (5) above are not coreferential as seen in (5a)

which is contrary to the factual knowledge. Besides, to indicate that the reformulation in that appositional construction does not have coreference is through extracting the two elements (anchor and appositive) independently from the context as seen in (5a).

> (5a) Kathmandu *is* Nepal**.** *(not coreferential)*

From the factual side, construction (5a) is not acceptable although it is grammatically correct. Kathmandu is a part of Nepal, and therefore different from Nepal. The geographical relation of the two names of places is part-to-whole relation so that sample (5a) can be revised with a slight change in order to be factually acceptable as expressed in (5b) below.

> (5b) Kathmandu *is [the capital of]* Nepal**.**

Factually, sentence (5b) is clear enough that Kathmandu is a part of Nepal to which the two places refer. The equivalence lies on the part-to-whole relation, not on the same referent. The anchor *Kathmandu* becomes the reference of the reformulation content in the form of factual knowledge, and it is located in a bigger place – in this case the name of the country (Nepal).

Revision

Sample (6) below is the reformulation in the form of revision (correcting expression). This can be seen from the expression which provides corrective clarification dealing with somebody's noticeable characteristic, *his most salient trait.*

> (6) The unified field theory that ties together Jobs' personality and products begins with *his most salient trait, his intensity.*

The appositive of reformulation in (6) has coreference which can be seen from the capability in providing corrective expression (revision) to the anchor which has already been definite in nature. The indicator of its capability can be seen from being able to change into relative clause by using the copular verb *be*, as seen in (6a).

> (6a) The unified field theory that ties together Jobs' personality and products begins with *his most salient trait, (which is) his intensity.*

To prove that the reformulation in (6) has coreference is by extracting the two elements (anchor and the appositive) independently from the

context as in (6b) below.

(6b) His most salient trait *is* his intensity.

The anchor *his most salient trait* becomes the reference of the content of corrective reformulation, that is, *his intensity* so that the two of them can be said to be coreferential in terms of corrective clarification about someone's personality, in this context referring to Steve Jobs.

Acronym
The following sample (7) is very different from the previous ones. This reformulation is in the form of acronym which is clearly seen from the use of the first letters of each word in the phrase *the European Central Bank*.

(7) Whether that national story can once again be rewritten depends in part on Mario Draghi, former head of the Bank Italy, who became the president of *the European Central Bank (ECB)* on Nov. 1.

The coreference in sample of reformulation in (7) can be seen from the capability in providing the formulation of an acronym as one of the short forms. To indicate that there is a coreference in that appositional construction can be done through extracting both the anchor and the appositive independently from the context as shown in (7a) below.

(7a) European Central Bank *is* ECB. (= ECB *is* European Central Bank)

The anchor *European Central Bank* becomes the reference from the content of the reformulation which provides the short form to the anchor. Therefore, both the anchor and the appositive are coreferential referring to a financial institution *European Central Bank*.

Equivalence in other language
Another different sample is in the following sentence (8). It is categorized into the reformulation in the form of equivalence in other language which is tend to be simpler language transfer but keep the same meaning.

(8) The singer, Jorge Gamboa, is the youngest in the group at 50; the leader and *guitarron (a very large guitar) player,* Francisco Carreon, is 85.

The word *guitarron* comes from Spanish meaning *a very big Mexican guitar*. Sample (8)

above has coreference, and this can be seen from being able to express language transfer which is relatively easy for readers to understand instead of the word *guitarron*. To prove the existence of the coreference in appositional construction in which there is a reformulation is by inserting the reformulation marker (relator) *in other words* between the anchor and the reformulation as the appositive equivalence as seen in (8a). Besides, to indicate that the reformulation in that appositional construction has coreference by extracting both the anchor and the appositive independently from the context as shown in (8b) below.

(8a) The singer, Jorge Gamboa, is the youngest in the group at 50; the leader and *guitarron, (in other words) a very large guitar* player, Francisco Carreon, is 85.

(8b) Guitarron *is* a very large guitar.

The anchor *guitarron* becomes the reference from the content of the reformulation which provides the expression of simple language that can makes readers easy to understand what *guitarron* means. Therefore, both the anchor and the appositive are coreferential referring to a kind of guitar.

Negative emphasis
Sentence (9) below is the sample of reformulation in the form of negative emphasis. It is clear from the use of *not* on the appositive *my life*. The word *life* is not the synonym of the word *legs*. The expression of *not my life* indicates that *my life* is more important and valuable than *[my] legs*.

(9) All that I've lost are *legs, not my life.*

The anchor '*legs*', and the reformulation appositive '*not my life*' are not coreferential because they are the two different elements. The word *legs* and the phrase *not my life* cannot be considered to be the same. To indicate that the reformulation in that appositional construction does not have coreference is through extracting the two elements (anchor and appositive) independently from the context as seen in (9a), *legs* are parts of the body which are visible in nature, while *life* has a wide range of meaning and it is an abstract concept.

(9a) *[My] legs* are *not my life.*

The anchor *legs* become the reference of the reformulation content providing emphasis that the

intended point is *not my life* but [my] *legs*. In fact, the lost thing is NOT *my life* but of small and supporting of my life, *i.e.,* [my] *legs*. Despite the fact that the anchor *legs* and the reformulation appositive *not my life* do not have coreference, the appositive is able to give emphasis through negative reformulation that there is something more important and valuable than [my] *legs***,** that is *my life*.

Simplified expression
The last sample of the reformulation is the following sentence (10). This sample (10) contains two appositives of reformulation using the conjunction *and*. The two appositives are in the form of the expression of simplification.

> (10) Three days ago, they administered *a 570-cc pouch of melphalan*, *a high-dose chemotherapy that kills everything in my bone marrow,* and *Zofran, a drug to combat the constant nausea.*

The anchors *a 570-cc pouch of melphalan,* and *Zofran* become the referents of the contents of the appositives in the form of reformulation that explain the anchors in a simpler way, and in such a way that can possibly make it easier (for readers) to understand. Therefore, the two (the anchors and the appositives) have coreference in the form of the simpler formulation of explanation compared with the contents of the anchor *a 570-cc pouch of melphalan,* and *Zofran* as the chemotherapy medicines.

To demonstrate that the reformulation appositives and the anchors have semantic equivalences can be done through inserting a linguistic marker *in simpler words* between the anchors and the appositives as seen in (10a), and through independently-extracting the anchors and the appositive from the contexts as shown in (10b).

> (10a) Three days ago, they administered *a 570-cc pouch of melphalan,* (in simpler words) *a high-dose chemotherapy that kills everything in my bone marrow,* and *Zofran***,** (in simpler words) *a drug to combat the constant nausea.*

> (10b) *A 570-cc pouch of melphalan* is *a high-dose chemotherapy that kills everything in my bone marrow, and Zofran* is *a drug to combat the constant nausea.*

The two anchors in (10a) *a 570-cc pouch of melphalan,* and *Zofran* become the references of the contents of reformulation appositives providing simpler clarifications which are potentially easier to understand.

CONCLUSION
The results of this research indicates that 1) the forms of clarification provided by reformulation as a semantic equivalence cover: a) metaphorical expression, b) factual knowledge, c) expression of revision, d) simplified expression, e) short forms (acronyms), f) emphasis through negative reformulation, and g) equivalence in other language, and 2) not all reformulations have coreferences, and those which have no coreferences are the ones that have part-from-whole relations. On top of that, all of the clarification forms are given to make the anchor more comprehensible.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

REFERENCES
Alipour, M. (2019). A corpus-based study of reformulation markers: The case of native versus non-native research articles. *Ethical Lingua: Journal of Language Teaching and Literature, 6*(2), 129-148.

Alsayed, F. K. (2019). The effects of semantics in the language development of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners. *International Journal of Learning and Development, 9*(4), 138-153.

Al-Sulaimaa, M. M. D., & Khoshaba, L. M. (2018). Context as a basis for understanding pragmatic ambiguity with reference to Arabic. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences (IJELS), 3*(5), 768-775.

Alwasilah, A. W., & Mahdi, S. (2020). Syntactic and semantic analysis on Nadia Murad's nobel lecture. *Linguistik: Jurnal Bahasa & Sastra, 5*(1), 80-88.

Chotimah, Y., Mujiyanto, J., & Hartono, R. (2022). Newmark's translation techniques and degree semantic equivalence of figurative language in *Five Feet Apart* novel. *English Education Journal, 12*(2), 215-224.

Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative & Mixed methods approach*. SAGE publications, Inc.

Fajrah, N. Y. (2018). *Improving students' vocabulary through semantic field of eighth year students of SMP Negeri 9 Parepare* [Unpublished thesis]. IAIN Parepare.

Feist, J. (2022). *Significance in language*. Routledge.

Florea, S. (2019). Reformulation markers in doctoral research. *Bucureşti, 66*(4), 345-361.

Goodwin, C. (2018). *Co-operative action*. Cambridge University Press.

Gunawan, H. (2020). Multiappositives as the Bonus Information for Their Anchor. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology, 17*(10), 3278-3289.

Gunawan, H. (2021). Semantic equivalence in English appositives. *Unika Atma Jaya, 19,* 167-172.

Gunawan, H., & Sari, P. (2019). Sense relations in restrictive appositives. *Universal Journal of Educational Research 7*(4A), 27-34.

Hasanah, U., Hartanto, B. P., Yulianti, M., & Faruqi, S. H. (2020). Synonym measurement through semantic similarity using the SOC-PMI method. *Telematika, 13*(1), 1-10.

Haverkamp, N., & Hoeltje, M. (2021). Semantic theories, linguistic essences, and knowledge of meaning. *Synthese, 199*(2021), 14459–14490

Jiménez, S. S. (2022). Measuring reformulation through eye-tracking: The role of reformulation markers inestablishing reformulation, an experimental approach. *Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación, 91,* 205-218.

Johnson, J. G. (2019). *Reformulation and its markers: A study of classification, semantic relation, and function* [Unpublished Thesis]. The University of Georgia.

Lavinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics.* Cambridge University Press.

Kroll, M., & Rysling, A. (2019). The search for truth: Appositives weigh in. *Proceedings of SALT, 29,* 1-21.

Kunitz, S., & Majlesi, A. R. (2022). Multimodal gestalts in reformulating practices in language cafés. *Social Interaction: Video-Based Studies Of Human Sociality, 5*(1), 1-28

Majlesi, A. R. (2018). Instructed vision: Navigating grammatical rules by using landmarks for linguistic structures in corrective feedback sequences. *The Modern Language Journal, 102*, (Supplement 2018), 11–29.

Meurant, L., Sinte, A., Gabarró-López, S. (2022). A multimodal approach to reformulation: Contrastive study of French and French Belgian sign language through the productions of speakers, signers and interpreters. *Languages in Contrast, 22*(2), 322–360.

Mutiara, R. (2019). Modification of English complex noun phrases: A case study of native and nonnative writers. *English Studies on Translation, Culture, Literature, and Linguistics, 2*(1), 17-29.

Nadal, L. (2020). *Lingüística experimental y contraargumentación: Un estudio sobre el conector "sin embargo" del español.* Peter Lang.

Octaberlina, L. R., Anggarini, I. F., Negeri, I., Malik, M., & Malang, I. (2020). Teaching vocabulary through picture cards in Islamic elementary school a case study in Nida Suksa school, Thailand. *Madrasah: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran Dasar, 13*(1), 26–38.

Sagala, R. W., & Rezeki, T. I. (2018). Code switching in the English department proposal seminar. *Budapest International and Critics in Linguistics and Education (BirLE) Journal, 1*(1),11-14.

Sahyoni. (2018). Corrective feedback and classroom interaction at SMA 1 Payakumbuh Sumatera Barat. *Jurnal Ta'dib, 21*(1), 9-20.

Šinkūnienė, J. (2019). Reformulation markers in academic discourse: A cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary study. *Jezikolovje, 20*(3), 531-553.

Tsedryk, A. (2019). Reformulation in L2: A new assessment and development instrument for lexical competence at an advanced level. In A. Tsedryk & C. Doe (Eds.), *The description, measurement and pedagogy of words* (pp.253-289). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Wongkittiporn, A. (2022). Syntactic structures and semantic classes of appositive noun phrases in fashion texts, English applied linguistics articles, and novels. *VACANA School of Liberal Arts Mae Fah Luang University, 10*(2), 111-131.

Zhang, S., Wang, M-C., & Balog, K. (2022). Analyzing and simulating user utterance reformulation in conversational recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (SIGIR '22) (1-11). Association for Computing Machinery.