

การตีความวากยสัมพันธ์ของนามวลีที่ใช้กับตัวคุณานุประโยค เฉพาะเจาะจง Which และ That ในตำราอาหารภาษาอังกฤษ

อภินิษฐ์ วงศ์กิตติพร

อาจารย์ ดร. ประจำสาขาภาษาอังกฤษ วิทยาลัยศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยรังสิต

E-mail: abhinan.w@rsu.ac.th

วันรับบทความ: 7 ธันวาคม 2565

วันแก้ไขบทความ: 23 มกราคม 2566

วันตอบรับบทความ: 25 มกราคม 2566

บทคัดย่อ

งานวิจัยครั้งนี้ศึกษาการตีความวากยสัมพันธ์ของนามวลีที่ใช้กับตัวคุณานุประโยคเฉพาะเจาะจง *which* และ *that* ในตำราอาหารภาษาอังกฤษ งานวิจัยที่ศึกษาการตีความวากยสัมพันธ์ของนามวลีที่ใช้กับตัวคุณานุประโยคเฉพาะเจาะจง *which* และ *that* ก่อนหน้านี้ให้ความสำคัญกับตัวบทหนังสือพิมพ์ภาษาอังกฤษ บทความวิจัยด้านวิทยาศาสตร์และงานเขียนของนักเรียนผู้เรียนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาต่างประเทศ การตีความวากยสัมพันธ์ของนามวลีที่ใช้กับตัวคุณานุประโยคเฉพาะเจาะจง *which* และ *that* ในงานวิจัยครั้งนี้จึงเลือกตัวบทที่มีความแตกต่างออกไปนั่นคือตำราอาหารที่เขียนเป็นภาษาอังกฤษ ชุดข้อมูลตำราอาหารเก็บรวบรวมมาจาก *Pollen Street: The Cookbook* (Atherton, 2018) *The Ritz London: The Cookbook* (Williams, 2018), *Open Kitchen: Inspired food for Casual Gatherings* (Spungen, 2019) และ *Big Love Cooking* (Campanaro & Gambacorta, 2020), *Middle Eastern Sweets* (Hage, 2021) และ *Gabrial Kreuther: The Spirit of Alsace* (Kreuther & Ruhlman, 2021) ซึ่งเป็นตำราอาหารที่มียอดขายสูง (www.amazon.com) ชุดข้อมูลตำราอาหารจำนวนประมาณ 350,000 คำ ประกอบด้วยจำนวนทั้งสิ้น 22 ตัวอย่าง การวิเคราะห์ข้อมูลทำตามแบบของ Daafia (2021) การวิเคราะห์ข้อมูลในการศึกษานี้แบ่งนามวลีออกเป็นสามประเภทคือวัตถุนาม นามธรรมและนามเฉพาะเจาะจง คำนามทั้งสามประเภทนี้ถูกวิเคราะห์ร่วมกันกับตัวคำเชื่อมคุณานุประโยคเฉพาะเจาะจง *which* และตัวคำเชื่อมคุณานุประโยคเฉพาะเจาะจง *that* ผลการศึกษานี้แสดงให้เห็นว่าคำเชื่อมคุณานุประโยคเฉพาะเจาะจง *which* ในตำราอาหารภาษาอังกฤษปรากฏในจำนวนร้อยละ 13.67 ในขณะที่คำเชื่อมคุณานุประโยคเฉพาะเจาะจง *that* ปรากฏเป็นจำนวนร้อยละ 86.36 นักวิจัยหวังเป็นอย่างยิ่งว่าผลการศึกษานี้จะเป็นประโยชน์ต่อผู้เรียนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาต่างประเทศในการใช้นามวลีที่ใช้กับตัวคุณานุประโยคเฉพาะเจาะจง *which* และ *that* ในตำราอาหารภาษาอังกฤษ

คำสำคัญ: การตีความวากยสัมพันธ์ นามวลี ตัวเชื่อมคุณานุประโยคแบบเฉพาะเจาะจง *which* ตัวเชื่อมคุณานุประโยคเฉพาะเจาะจง *that* ตำราอาหารภาษาอังกฤษ

Syntactic Interpretations of Noun Phrases with Restrictive Relativizers Which and That in English Cookbooks

Abhinan Wongkittiporn

Lecturer, English Language Department, College of Liberal Arts, Rangsit University

E-mail: abhinan.w@rsu.ac.th

Received: December 7, 2022

Revised: January 23, 2023

Accepted: January 25, 2023

Abstract

The study examines the syntactic interpretations of noun phrases (NPs) used with the restrictive relativizers which and that in English Cookbooks. Whilst previous studies focused on the colligations of NPs with the restrictive relativizer which and the restrictive relativizer that in English writing of EFL learners, this study contributed to the view of English cookbooks. Regarding the sources of data, English cookbooks were collected *Pollen Street: The Cookbook* (Atherton, 2018), *The Ritz London: The Cookbook* (Williams, 2018), *Open Kitchen: Inspired Food for Casual Gathering* (Spungen, 2019), *Big Love Cooking*, (Campanaro & Gambacorta, 2019), *Middle Eastern Sweets* (Hage, 2021) and *Gabrial Kreuther: The Spirit of Alsace* (Kreuther & Ruhlman, 2021). Approximately 350,000 words contain 22 tokens. The analytical framework of syntactic interpretation of the head NPs follows Daafia (2021), who categorized noun phrases into three types. These types of NPs were analyzed regarding their colligation with the restrictive relativizer which and the relativizer that. The results show that the restrictive relativizer which occurs at 13.67 percent, whereas the relativizer that occurs at 86.36 percent. Both the relativizer which and the relativizer that in this study frequently occur with concrete nouns, such as oil which and cake that. It is expected that this current study will be useful for learners of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in order to use the relativizers which and that accurately and appropriately.

Keywords: Syntactic interpretations, noun phrase, the relativizer which, the relativizer that, cookbooks

Introduction

To know English is to know the grammar of English (Radford, 2009). Although grammar is not everything in the study of the English language, it is considered an important language branch that is necessary for English language learners to know when they learn the English language. It helps us improve our grammatical competence, referring to the capability to use the English language fluently and correctly (Radford, 2009). In addition, having grammatical competence allows us to have syntactic interpretations of abstract nouns, concrete nouns and proper nouns appropriately.

Concerning English grammar, the relative clause is frequently used in present-day English. It is also viewed as a significant grammatical feature in English language learners' competence. This knowledge allows English users to convey additional information, such as subjectivity or arithmetical numbers, when communicating in English, as in (1).

(1)

(a) Nicolene who is a charming woman won a beauty pageant competition in 2022.

(b) Tony purchased a fully-furnished condominium which contains two bedrooms, two bathrooms and one miniature kitchen.

Example (1) represents the structures of restrictive relative clauses in English. In (1a), who is a charming woman is an example of a restrictive relative clause that has the semantic denotation of subjectivity, referring to one's attitudes, comments or opinions (Nuyts, 2015). Unlike (1a), the restrictive relative clause which contains two bedrooms, two bathrooms and one miniature kitchen, as in (1b), is used for the reason of adding numerical information. Misuse of restrictive relativizer which and that as in *Mary which is studying at Oxford University, is my older sister could result in unprofessional communication. Especially if this situation occurs in standard tests or exam rooms, it could affect the EFL learner's score to be low.

Unlike the previous studies of semantic denotations of restrictive relative clauses, this current study concentrates on the syntactic interpretations



of noun phrases (NPs) of the restrictive relativizer which and the restrictive relativizer that, as in (2).

(2) I planned to visit the Opera House which is an astonishing building in Australia.

Example (2) shows the colligation of the proper noun in the Opera House with the restrictive relativizer which. In this case, a proper noun refers to the specific name of a certain place or person (Swan, 2016). Even though numerous grammar references indicate that the restrictive relativizer which and the restrictive relativizer that can be used interchangeably (Swan, 2016), it is questioned as to when and why one variant is used over the other.

Aside from the controversial perspectives of interchangeable use of the restrictive relativizer which and the restrictive relativizer that, numerous previous studies reported that it is difficult for EFL learners to decide how to use restrictive relativizers, especially which and that. Moreover, the use of restrictive relativizer that is usually overgeneralized. For example, Koçak (2020) reported that English language learners are confused in selecting different relativizers. Whilst numerous EFL learners overgeneralize the use of the relativizer that, other English language learners show a rather serious problem related to the use of the relativizer which with the head to identify people (Koçak, 2020). With this concern, the current study is expected to be a beneficial guideline for EFL learners, such as Thai students, on how to apply the restrictive relativizer which and the restrictive relativizer that in English correctly and appropriately.

In addition to the theory and practicality of relativizers for ESL and EFL learners to study, previous studies concerning the restrictive relativizer which and the restrictive relativizer that used various materials in their studies, such as English newspapers, scientific research journals and EFL learners' writing. Nonetheless, this study contributes to the field by selecting English cookbooks. They are texts that everyone can read. English cookbooks are authentic texts that are appropriate for everyone, that are different genders and different age groups. Especially in the present day, most people tend

to take care of their health by cooking food to eat themselves. As a matter of pedagogy, many writing classes instruct English language learners to write process paragraphs regarding cooking. This study could be one of the useful examples for them to study. This information leads to the following research question and objective of the study.

Research Question

1. What are the frequencies of syntactic interpretations of noun phrases with the restrictive relativizers which and that in English cookbooks?
2. What are syntactic interpretations of noun phrases with the restrictive relativizers which and that in English cookbooks?

The objective of the study

1. To examine the frequencies of syntactic interpretations of noun phrases with the restrictive relativizers which and that in English cookbooks
2. To examine syntactic interpretations of noun phrases with the restrictive relativizers which and that in English cookbooks?

Literature Review

This section provides fundamental information concerning the restrictive relative clauses which and that, EFL learners' grammatical errors in using the restrictive relativizers which and that and previous studies regarding the restrictive relativizer which and that.

Syntactic Interpretations of Noun Phrases

Syntactic interpretations of noun phrases in this study refer to the identifications of noun types, whether concrete nouns, abstract nouns or proper nouns. According to Daafia (2021), concrete noun refers to physical or tangible objects, such as a duck, a printer and a watermelon. The abstract noun refers to intangible objects existing in the world, such as idea, promise and experience. On the other hand, proper noun refers to a particular name



of things, persons and places, such as London, New York and Paris. The noun used in this study is the head of restrictive relative clauses such as oil as in coconut oil which is good for our digestive system is recommended when cooking. Based upon this example, the lexical item oil is syntactically interpreted as a concrete noun, and it is colligated with the restrictive relativizer which.

Restrictive Relative Clauses

Restrictive relative clause, interchangeably known as an adjective clause, is syntactically defined as a postmodifier beginning with wh-question words, such as who, which and where (Tallerman, 2015). Semantically, it conveys additional information (Kearns, 2011). Pragmatically, it can be placed in the middle and at the end of the sentence depending upon the importance of the information, such as (3).

(3)

(a) Tony who studied at Oxford University has many clever friends.

(b) John bought a car which has enough seats for his family.

(c) Peter went to study French in Paris *where different cultures can be studied at the same time*.

In (3a), who is now studying at Oxford University represents a restrictive relative clause. Cutting this information would violate the maxim of quantity, referring to a lack of enough information. The head of the clause is the complementizer phrase (CP) who to modify the determiner phrase DP a nice friend. In (3b), which has enough seats for his family, is an example of the restrictive relative clause. The head of this clause is the relativizer which and it is used to modify an inanimate object, a car. In (3c), where different cultures can be studied at the same time, is a relative clause that is used to modify the place, Paris.

It seems that the relativizers who, which and where are likely to be used specifically. The relativizer who is specifically used to modify people. The relativizer which can be used to modify both physical and

intangible objects (Swan, 2016), such as a duck and sweet. The relativizer where is specifically used to modify places, such as Paris, as in (3c). While the aforementioned relativizers show their specific use with people, objects or places, the relativizer that can be used with people, physical objects and intangible objects (Swan, 2016).

With the explanation above concerning the differences between the restrictive relativizers who, which and where, it can be noticed that there are some similarities between the restrictive relativizer which and the restrictive relativizer that, as in (4).

(4)

(a) I like a house that is decorated in a sumptuous Bohemian style.

(b) I like a house which is decorated in a sumptuous Bohemian style.

In (4), it can be seen paradigmatically that both variants of the restrictive relativizers which and that occur in the same syntactic position, appear to be used interchangeably. As a syntactician, it is intriguing to study when and why one variant of the relativizer which and the relativizer that is preferred over the other.

Restrictive Relative Clauses and EFL Learners

Despite having the rules of restrictive relative clauses available in grammatical references for us to study (Swan, 2016), a number of previous studies still reported errors in the use of restrictive relativizers as produced in EFL learners' writing. One of the EFL learners' common grammatical errors is the colligation of the NP people with CP which, as in (5).

(5) *Helen which lives in Paris is my sister-in-law.

Although the restrictive relative clause is used in (5), the restrictive relativizer which is used ungrammatically. Helen is interpreted as a person; hence, the grammatical choice in this example can be either the relativizer who or the relativizer that (Swan, 2016).



To further support the claim above with additional research evidence, 20 Indonesian EFL learners were instructed to supply the relativizer in the blank, as in (6). Even though the accurate answer is the restrictive relativizer which, only two students or only 10 percent could provide the correct answer (Kusdianty, 2016).

(6) Rock and roll were the name given to the music _____ developed in the early 1950's.

(Kusdianty, 2016: 64)

Filling in the blank in (6), most Indonesia EFL learners chose to use the restrictive relativizer who (Kusdianty, 2016).

In addition to the grammatical errors of the restrictive relativizers which and who among EFL learners', another problem that is consistently found in EFL's production of relative clauses is the overgeneralization of the restrictive relativizer that (Kusdianty, 2016). The restrictive relativizer that is likely to be used to modify people and things. For example, Lee (2020) indicated that the restrictive relativizer could be used with animate and inanimate subjects. Accordingly, this study would help EFL and ESL learners select appropriate restrictive relativizers to be used in the right context.

Previous Studies of the Restrictive Relativizers Which and That

It is believed that different genres seem to have their own preference for grammatical use. For example, the relativizer which seems to be used often in interior design texts, and however, the use of the relativizer that is more productive in English novels. Because of grammatical preferences in different genres, this makes EFL learners get confused about how to use the relativizer which and that in different text varieties (Sulistiani, 2020).

Since EFL learners experience problems in deciding how to use the restrictive relativizers which and that in English, reading different materials of English with different genres would help English language learners to build their grammatical competence in this aspect, with this belief, this

section presents the use of the restrictive relativizer which and the restrictive relativizer that available in different genres from previous studies.

To begin with, Allen's (2009) study is one of the clearest and most distinctive studies of the restrictive relativizers which and that in English newspapers. The study shows that the use of restrictive relativizer that is mostly preferred to be used in the genre.

Along the same lines with the frequent occurrences of the restrictive relativizer that in English newspapers, another study used research journals in the field of scientific and engineering journals, including CELL, JACS and IEEE (Cho & Lee, 2016). The results show that the use of the restrictive relativizer that occurs more frequently at 97.3 percent, 84.3 percent and 71.2 percent, respectively. This indicates that the restrictive relativizer that under the genres of scientific and engineering research articles is preferred over the restrictive relativizer which.

Aside from that, Tse and Hyland (2010) selected the genres of sociological and biological research studies to examine the use of restrictive relative clauses. The results of their study show that the restrictive relative clauses under these genres are frequently used with the semantic denotations of subjectivity or providing personal opinions, comments and viewpoints, such as (7).

(7) Written in language that new readers will find accessible, articles provide insights that seasoned experts will find valuable.

(Tse & Hyland, 2010: 20)

The relative clause that seasoned experts will find valuable, as in (7), is interpreted as subjectivity, referring to the researcher's comment. Accordingly, this study will investigate whether the restrictive relativizer which and the restrictive relativizer that occurred with noun phrases (NPs) can actually be interchangeably used in the English language (i.e., the first question which companies always ask vs. the first question that companies always ask) (Lee, 2020).



Moreover, Wongkittiporn (2022) studied the use of restrictive relative clauses between which and that in English novels. The result in his study shows that the relative clauses which is used more often than the relativizer that. Wongkittiporn (2022) explained this phenomenon that the restrictive relativizer which is usually used as a tangible object in English novels.

English Cookbooks

While previous studies focusing on the study of restrictive relative clauses paid attention to the materials of English newspapers, research studies and writings of EFL learners, this study contributes to the view of English cookbooks. One of the advantages of using English cookbooks is that they are regarded as everyday reading materials that are suitable for everyone, referring to different genders, people of different age groups, people from different cultures and people with different educational backgrounds. Cookbooks also provide cooking processes that the readers can follow to enjoy cooking for themselves. Nowadays, eating healthy food is a trend in society, and people who care about their health are likely to cook for themselves. With cookbooks, people can enjoy reading different recipes that they like, practice cooking different menus and enjoy eating with their family (Hoffman & Kytö, 2017). This information leads to the following methodology.

Methodology

Source of Data

Based upon the advantages of English cookbooks, as mentioned in the previous section, the criteria for selecting the materials of English cookbooks in this study is based upon them being best-selling cookbooks (www.amazon.com), which was provided on the website. Hence, the selection of the English cookbooks in this study is based on a purposive sampling method. The framework of the data collection is that cookbooks selected in this study must be the best sellers during the year of 2019 to 2021, which are regarded as the most up-to-date data collection when this research

was conducted. Since people now seem to take care of their health, the cookbooks selected in this study are healthy cookbooks.

They include Pollen Street: The Cookbook (Atherton, 2018), The Ritz London: The Cookbook (Williams, 2018), Open Kitchen: Inspired food for Casual Gatherings (Spungen, 2019) and Big Love Cooking (Campanaro & Gambacorta, 2020), Middle Eastern Sweets (Hage, 2021) and Gabriel Kreuther: The Spirit of Alsace (Kreuther & Ruhlman, 2021).

Data Collection

Approximately 350,000 words from the sources of data contain 22 tokens. The data collection was collected based on a sentence level which included the main verb. Although the data collection in this study was quite limited, this study intended to conduct mini-scale research based on purposive sampling methods. The advantage of using this method was that it allowed the researcher to gather a small number of data collection that they intended to study. The data collection allowed both quantitative and qualitative methods, which means that the researchers also have qualitative data as empirical evidence to support their analysis.

The data collection of relativizers in this study was based on Radford's (2009) English sentence structures. Each token extracted to be studied was collected based on a unit of a sentence. The keys that were used to collect the data in this study were the restrictive relativizer which and the restrictive relativizer that. These restrictive relativizers are sometimes called relative pronouns (Radford, 2009). As illustrated below, the restrictive relativizers were collected to be studied with their head NPs.

(8) Transfer to the prepared baking sheet and use a pizza cutter to cut the dough into **18 breadsticks that** are about the width of your pointer finger.

(Campanaro & Gambacorta, 2020: 229)



Example (8) presented how data was collected to be studied based on a sentence level. As illustrated, the restrictive relativizer that is the key word that needs to be interpreted concurrently with its head determiner phrase (DP), as in 18 breadsticks. However, their vicinity, or linguistic elements in adjacent areas to the left and to the right, are also important to support the analysis.

Data Analysis

As indicated above, the keys to gathering the data to be analyzed in this study are the restrictive relativizer which and the restrictive relativizer that. Once the data were collected in this way, the heads (NPs) were simultaneously analyzed with the restrictive relativizer which and the restrictive relativizer that. Accordingly, the head noun phrases (NPs) as concrete nouns, abstract nouns or proper nouns were analyzed regarding their colligation with the restrictive relativizer which and the restrictive relativizer that.

To elaborate on the data analysis, concrete noun refers to physical or tangible objects, such as a cat, a house and a hammer (Daafia, 2021). In contrast, abstract noun refers to intangible objects, such as experience. The proper noun refers to specific names of places or things (Daafia, 2021), such as The Statue of Liberty. The example of data analysis is reproduced as follows:

Transfer to the prepared baking sheet and use a pizza cutter to cut the dough into **18 breadsticks that** are about the width of your pointer finger.

(Campanaro & Gambacorta, 2020: 229)

With the example above, the concrete noun breadstick was interpreted to be colligated with the relativizer that. The data analysis is further presented in Table 1 as follows:

Table 1 Data Analysis of the Relativizers Which and That with their NPs
(9)

Types of Nouns	Examples
Concrete noun	(a) John bought <i>a car which has enough seats for his family.</i>
Abstract noun	(b) Mary made <i>a promise that she would not make a mistake again.</i>
Proper noun	(c) I planned to visit <i>the Opera House which is an astonishing building in Australia.</i>

Table 1 demonstrates how data in this study are analyzed. In (9a), a car is syntactically interpreted as a concrete noun, which is colligated with the relativizer which. In (9b), a promise is interpreted as an abstract noun, which is colligated with the relativizer that. In (9c), the Opera House is interpreted as proper noun which is colligated with the relativizer which.

Data Validation

Once the data were analyzed as presented in Table 1, three English native speakers were instructed to validate the data analysis for the sake of accuracy, based upon Table 2. English native speakers helped check the syntactic interpretations of abstract nouns and concrete nouns. This process of checking helps ensure the reliability of the data analysis.

Table 2 Process of Data Validation

Types of Nouns	Examples	Native English Speaker 1		Native English Speaker 2		Native English Speaker 3	
		A	D	A	D	A	D
		Concrete noun	(a) Transfer to the prepared baking sheet and use a pizza cutter to cut the dough into 18 breadsticks that are about the width of your pointer finger.	✓		✓	

	(Campanaro & Gambacorta, 2020, p. 229)			
Abstract noun	(b) The beer reduction, thick like a balsamic reduction, has a lot of <i>bitterness that</i> is nice with the dried fruit (Kreuther & Ruhlman, 2021, p. 224).	✓	✓	✓

Table 2 presents the process of data validation in the current study. Three native English speakers were instructed to read the definition of relativizers as provided in the section of the literature review. After that, they were instructed to carefully read the definitions of concrete, abstract, and proper nouns. The data presented in Table 2 were then given to validate the analysis of noun phrases. While A represents the validator’s agreement, D represents the validator’s disagreement. If either two or three native English speakers placed a tick in column A, the data gained validity. However, if only one or none placed a tick in A, the data were required to be analyzed again based on the validators’ suggestions and comments. This methodology gives the results and discussion in the following section.

Results and Discussion

With the data collection of approximately 350,000 words, there are 22 tokens of relativizers to be studied. This section provides the results and discussion of noun phrases (NPs) as used with the relativizer which and the relativizer that in the selected English cookbooks. The research question concerning the frequencies of the syntactic interpretations of the restrictive relativizers which and that are presented in Table 3.

Table 3 Frequency and Percentages of the Restrictive Relativizers Which and That in English cookbooks

Relativizers	Frequencies
	Percentage (%)
<i>Which</i>	3 (13.64)
<i>That</i>	19 (86.36)
Total	22 (100)

Table 3 presents the total frequency and percentage of the relativizers which and that in English cookbooks. From a total of 100 percent, the percentage of the restrictive relativizer which and the restrictive relativizer that in the selected English cookbooks is 13.64 percent and 86.36 percent, respectively. The results show that the use of restrictive relativizer that is more common than which in English cookbooks.

Syntactic Interpretations of NPs with the Restrictive Relativizer Which in English Cookbooks

The literature review section defines concrete nouns as physical or tangible objects, while abstract nouns are intangible objects (Daafia, 2021). The proper noun refers to specific names of places and things (Daafia, 2021). The frequency and percentage of concrete nouns, abstract nouns and proper nouns as used with the relativizer which are presented in Table 4.

Table 4 Frequency and Percentage of Concrete Nouns, Abstract Nouns and Proper Nouns Colligated with the Relativizer Which

Types of Nouns	Frequency	Percentage
Concrete nouns	3	100
Abstract nouns	0	0
Proper nouns	0	0
Total	3	100

Table 4 reveals the percentage of syntactic interpretations of NPs colligated with the restrictive relativizer which in English cookbooks. The percentage of concrete nouns with the restrictive relativizer which is a total of 100 percent. Examples of a concrete noun, and an abstract noun with the restrictive relativizer which, are presented as follows:

(10)

(a) These are dusted with confectioners' **sugar which** blisters in the oven to make a burnt sugar top.

(Hage, 2021: 71)

(b) The seed popped in my mouth, releasing **oils which** had the most lingering aromatic flavours I had ever known.

(Williams, 2018: 85)

(c) Instead, a lot of the regular guests had a bar – **a box of drinks-which** was filled in advance of their arrival.

(Williams, 2018: 201)

As presented in (10), the relativizer which is found to be colligated with a concrete noun, such as sugar, oil and a box of drink.

Syntactic Interpretations of NPs with the Restrictive Relativizer That in English Cookbooks

This section presents the use of syntactic interpretations of NPs with the relativizer that. In this study, the relativizer that was found to be used with both concrete nouns and abstract nouns. As mentioned in the literature review, concrete noun refers to physical objects (Daafia, 2021), while abstract nouns refer to intangible objects (Daafia, 2021). The frequency and percentage of the relativizer that with concrete nouns, abstract nouns and proper nouns are presented in Table 5.

Table 5 Frequency and Percentage of the Restrictive Relativizer That with Concrete Nouns, Abstract Nouns, and Proper Nouns

Types of Nouns	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Concrete nouns	16	84.21
Abstract nouns	3	15.79
Proper nouns	0	0
Total	19	100

Table 5 shows the percentage of syntactic interpretations of NPs colligated with the restrictive relativizer that in English cookbooks. The percentages of concrete nouns and abstract nouns colligated with the relativizer that are 84.21 percent and 15.79 percent, respectively. Examples of a concrete noun and an abstract noun used with the relativizer that are presented as follows:

(11)

(a) This is **a cake that** every farmer would always have on hand for visitors who might stop by.

(Kreuther & Ruhlman, 2021, p. 94)

(b) The beer reduction, thick like a balsamic reduction, has a lot of **bitterness that** is nice with the dried fruit.

(Kreuther & Ruhlman, 2021, p. 224)

Based upon the examples above, the relativizer that in English cookbooks appears with the concrete noun a cake and the abstract noun bitterness. Some concrete nouns and abstract nouns NPs used with the relativizer that are presented in Table 6.



Table 6 Restrictive Relativizer That Colligated with Concrete Nouns and Abstract Nouns

Concrete Nouns	Abstract Nouns
<i>breadsticks that</i>	<i>bitterness that</i>
<i>butter-style cookie that</i>	<i>flavor that</i>
<i>cake that</i>	<i>flavor that</i>
<i>cookbook that</i>	
<i>leaves that</i>	
<i>pan that</i>	
<i>vessel that</i>	
<i>recipe that</i>	
<i>the commodity drink that</i>	

Differences of the Syntactic Interpretations Between the Restrictive Relativizers in English Cookbooks and Previous Studies

This study shows that the use of the relativizer which in English cookbooks occurs at a lower frequency than the relativizer that. In regard to percentage, the occurrence of the restrictive relativizer which and the restrictive relativizer that in English cookbooks in this study are 13.64 percent and 86.36 percent, respectively. The lower frequency of which in this study could be because which can be used as non-restrictive relative clause, whereas the relativizer that cannot.

One of the clearest reasons to support the lower percentage of the relativizer which is that they have the other option to be use as non-restrictive relative clauses that are used with commas. Hence, omitting this information does not affect the grammaticality of sentences (Radford, 2009). However, non-restrictive relative clauses with commas can only be used with the relativizer that occur with wh-question words, such as who and which, as in (12)

(12)

(a) Typically, madeleines are made with **brown butter**, which lends them a delicious nutty flavor.

(Hage, 2021: 137)

(b) I decorate the tops of the jellies individually with **pomegranate seeds**, which look beautiful and add a texture contrast.

(Hage, 2021: 211)

Moreover, the results of this study are contradictory with Allen (2009), who studied the relativizer which and the relativizer that in English newspapers. Allen's results of the study show that the relativizer that is preferred to be used with the materials of English newspapers.

In addition to that, the results in the current research are similar to Cho and Lee (2016) who used materials from scientific and engineering research journals, including CELL, JACS and IEEE. Their results of study show that the restrictive relativizer that occurs more frequently at 97.3 percent, 84.3 percent and 71.2 percent, respectively.

While Swan (2016) indicated that the restrictive relativizer which and the restrictive relativizer that can be interchangeable, this study found that it can be used interchangeably when its head is concrete noun.

In regard to EFL learners' overgeneralization of the relativizer that, as mentioned in the section of literature review, it is reflected by the empirical data that the restrictive relativizer which rarely occurs for them to study in authentic texts.

Conclusion

This study examines different types of NPs as colligated with the relativizer which and the relativizer that in the material of English cookbooks in order to answer the following research question.

What are syntactic interpretations of noun phrases with the restrictive relativizers which and that in English cookbooks?

The percentage of the restrictive relativizer which and the restrictive relativizer that in English cookbooks are approximately 20 percent and 80 percent, respectively. To answer the question when one variant can be used



over the other, the answer is that the restrictive relativizer that is commonly used with concrete nouns. The restrictive relativizer which occurs with lower frequency, is due to having another type of usage as non-restrictive relative clauses with commas, which is recommended for further studies. The restrictive relativizer that cannot be used in this way. The results of this study are similar to previous studies who selected the genres of English newspapers and scientific research papers (Allen, 2009; Cho & Lee, 2016). The use of the relativizer that is preferred over the use of the relativizer which in those studies. In contrast, this section also concludes that the relativizer which is used over the relativizer that in English cookbooks. On the other hand, the relativizer which and the relativizer that are commonly used with concrete nouns. Accordingly, this study is regarded as distinctive empirical evidence to show that a certain grammatical feature is not always applicable in all writing genres.

Finally, the results of this study only relate to the use of the relativizer which and the relativizer that in English cookbooks. Generalizing the results of this study to other genres, such as English newspapers and English magazines, may not be applicable to the optimal level. For future research studies, it is recommended that using other materials, such as English novels to study the colligations of NPs with the relativizer which and the relativizer that in English would contribute something new to the field.

References

- Allen, D. (2009). A study of the role of relative clauses in the simplification of news texts for Learners of English. *System*, 37(4), 585-599.
- Atherton, J. (2018). *Pollen Street: The Cookbook*: UK: Bloomsbury.
- Campanaro, J. & Gambacorta, T. (2020). *Big Love Cooking*. UK: Chronicle Book.
- Cho, D. W., & Lee, K. (2016). English relative clauses in science and engineering journal papers: A comparative corpus-based study for pedagogical purposes. *Ampersand*, 3, 61-70.

- Daafia, S. (2021). Identifying the use of abstract and concrete noun in Charott's web novel by EB write. **Journal of Research on Applied Linguistics, Language, and Language Teaching**, 4(2), 109-113.
- Gordon, P. C., & Lowder, M. W. (2012). Complex sentence processing: A review of theoretical perspectives on the comprehension of relative clauses. **Language and Linguistic Compass**, 6(7), 403-415.
- Hoffman, A., & Kytö, M. (2017). The linguistic landscapes of Swedish heritage cookbooks in the American midwest. **Studia Neophilologica**, 89(2), 261-286.
- Koçak, A. (2020). Turkish tertiary level EFL learners' recognition of relative clauses. **Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies**, 16(4), 1637-1655.
- Kreuther, G. & Ruhlman, M. (2021). **Gabriel Kreuther: The spirit of Alsace**. New York: Abrams.
- Kusdianty, S. R. (2016). The analysis of students' errors in using relative clause. **Indonesian EFL Journal**, 2(1), 60-70.
- Lee, K. M. (2020). Relative clauses in a modern diachronic corpus of Singapore English. **Asia Pacific Journal of Corpus Research**, 1(1), 31-60.
- Nuyts, J. (2015). Subjectivity: Between discourse and conceptualization. **Journal of Pragmatics**, 86, 106-110.
- Radford, A (2009). **Introduction to English sentence structure**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spungen, S. (2019). **Open Kitchen: Inspired food for Casual Gatherings**. New York: Penguin Random House.
- Sulistiani, A. F. (2020). An analysis of relative clauses in the novel paper towns by John Green. **Journal of Language and Literature**, 6(2), 72-83.
- Swan, M. (2016). **Practical English Usage**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tallerman, M. (2015). **Understanding syntax**. London: Routledge.
- Tse, P. & Hyland, K. L. (2010). Claiming a territory: Relative clauses in journal descriptions. **Journal of Pragmatics**, 42(7), 1880-1990.



Williams, J. (2018). **The Ritz London: The Cookbook**. UK: Octopus.

Wongkittiporn, A. (2022). Syntactic Interpretations of Noun Phrases Used with the Relativizers which and that in English Novels. **Journal of Liberal Arts Ubon Ratchathani University**, 18(2), 181-205.

