

# The Influence of Contexts and Orientations on Interlocutors' Choices of Concept Reiterations

**SAYAMOL PANSEETA\***

*School of Liberal Arts, King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi, Thailand*

**RICHARD WATSON TODD**

*School of Liberal Arts, King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi, Thailand*

**Corresponding author email: s.panseeta@gmail.com**

Article information	Abstract
<b>Article history:</b> Received: 3 Aug 2023 Revised: 27 Sep 2023 Accepted: 5 Oct 2023	<p><i>This research investigates whether there are relationships between the choices of concept reiterations and interlocutors' orientations, between the choices of concept reiterations and contexts of communication, and between affective connotations of paraphrase, interlocutors' orientations and contexts of communication. The data were collected from four different contexts, namely, the Hotel, Forum, Court, and Debate corpora. The results suggested no clear relationship between interlocutors' orientations and the choices of concept reiterations but the contexts of communication were likely to influence choices of reiterations, especially in the use of repetitions and the purposeful shift of paraphrase connotations to achieve the professional goals of communication in the Hotel and Court corpora which are the contexts where interlocutors are bound by their social roles.</i></p>
<b>Keywords:</b> Concept reiterations Repetition Paraphrase Orientations Contexts Affective connotations	

## INTRODUCTION

In dialogic discourse where two or more interlocutors discuss certain topics, reiterations of the concepts relating to such topics throughout the thread can be expected. In reiterating a concept, interlocutors may choose to repeat the term used by the previous interlocutors which can be exactly the same form or inflectional morphemes or with derivational suffixes of that term, or they may opt for paraphrase including the synonyms, antonyms and forms with derivational prefixes of the said concept. The factors influencing the interlocutors' decision to repeat or paraphrase the concept under discussion is worth exploring. The broad goals of this article are investigating contextual factors which might underlie interlocutors' choices of reiteration and investigating the affective connotations when paraphrases are used.

For the first goal, three contextual factors will be studied. The first is interlocutors' orientations whether they are in agreement or disagreement. We came across this factor in Halliday and Hasan (1976, p. 292) where, in a footnote, they cite an unpublished paper by Sinclair which argues that speakers tend to repeat the others' words or phrases to express their concordant perspectives on the same concept but paraphrase it when they disagree on the representation of that concept. The second factor is medium of communication. Basically, we investigate

whether written and spoken form of the texts with the potential difference in time constraints affect interlocutors' choice of reiteration. The last is interlocutors' roles. In other words, we examine whether interlocutors are free or constrained in how they express themselves and whether there are any significant impacts on their choices of reiterations.

In addition to the contextual factors, we also scrutinize the use of paraphrases. Since paraphrases include the changes of lexical items that may lead to changes of connotative meanings of those items, we examine whether there are any patterns of directionality of shift in affective connotations from positive to negative sentiment or vice versa to see whether there is a relationship between affective connotations of paraphrase, interlocutors' orientations and contexts of communication.

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

As the aim of our research is to investigate whether there are relationships between the choice of concept reiterations, interlocutors' orientations, and contexts of communication as well as the shifts of paraphrase connotations, this section will discuss the previous studies addressing the key variables we investigate in this research which are concepts, reiterations, orientations, contextual factors including medium of communication, interlocutors' roles and directionality of texts, and connotations of paraphrase.

### 1. Concepts

To operationalize concepts, we refer to the broad definitions suggested by multiple researchers. These include Cruse (1986) who explains that a concept is a semantic constituent comprising a minimum of one word, which coincides with Murphy (2010) who suggests that concepts tend to be expressed in words. However, Sinclair (2004) argues that most concepts are represented in phrasal forms while Watson Todd (2016) proposes that concepts can be in the form of nouns or noun phrases. To allow all possibilities in the findings, we decide to treat concepts as the semantic constituents, or the linguistic units that carry the meaning, as suggested by Cruse (1986) without any limitations on the linguistic forms through which a concept is expressed.

To ensure that the constituents we identify as concepts are accurate, we apply the pro-form substitution test to verify our identification. In other words, after a linguistic unit has been selected as a possible concept, we try substituting that unit with a pro-form, such as pronouns, to check whether the sentence structure is still grammatical. For instance, the original sentence is:

(a) There were disgusting bugs in the kitchen.

If we start by looking at single words which are the smallest unit of meaning and try replacing these words with pro-forms, the result could be:

- (b) There were disgusting bugs in the kitchen.  
(c) There were disgusting them in the it.\*

It can be seen from (c) that the sentence is grammatically incorrect, meaning we should expand the identified units from words to phrases to obtain the constituents of concepts, which are:

- (d) There were disgusting bugs in the kitchen.  
(e) There were them in it.

Based on (d) and (e) above, we can conclude that the concepts in this sample sentence are “disgusting bugs” and “the kitchen”.

As stated earlier, however, concepts in this study are not restricted to only words or phrases. Therefore, we are open to broader structures, such as clauses, if they fit the requirements of meaningful units and substitutability by pro-forms.

## 2. Reiterations of concepts

As we aim to investigate the use of concept reiterations between interlocutors, after identifying concept constituents, the concepts that are reiterated between the Initiating Message (IM) and the Responding Message (RM) will be matched and categorized into two main groups of reiterations which are repetitions and paraphrases. The following is previous research on repetitions and paraphrases which can provide the grounds for our analysis.

### 2.1 Repetitions

There has been a fair amount of research on repetitions in written and spoken discourses. In text linguistics, repetitions have been studied as a device to create textual continuity in written texts (e.g., Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Hoey, 1992; Myers, 1991; Mahlberg, 2006; Flowerdew & Mahlberg, 2009). In spoken discourse, repetitions have been used to maintain continuity of the conversation under particular topics (Gómez González, 2010, 2011). Nonetheless, these studies mainly focus on the functions of repetitions in texts as cohesive devices without investigating the interactive reiteration between multiple interlocutors, and possible factors influencing the choices of repetitions are not addressed.

In addition to a textual device, the roles of repetitions in social interaction have also been explored. A considerable amount of research has been conducted in classroom environments where repetitions are applied by teachers to encourage learners’ participation and by learners to interact among themselves, which contributes to improvements of their vocabulary and communicative skills (e.g., Duff, 2000; Rydland & Aukrust, 2005). In the field of conversation analysis, repetitions have been commonly discussed as a self-repair method employed by a single speaker and as a strategy used by two or more speakers to carry on their interactions. For multiple speakers, Kim (2002, p. 51) describes the functions of “second-turn” repetitions which include initiating repair, seeking confirmation or clarification, displaying speaker’s stance or attitudes, providing confirmation, showing agreement with the previous speaker, and

expanding current speaker's turn for providing additional information. Although those studies have been carried out in the field of social interaction, which is similar to the context of our research, they only focus on functions of repetitions in interaction rather than the factors influencing the interlocutors' choices of repetitions.

However, there is some research addressing associations between the use of repetitions and interlocutors' orientations. For example, Brown (1999) mentions that when a speaker wants to express doubts about the information given by the previous speaker, repetitions tend to be used, which leads to clarification or argumentation afterwards. Wong (2000) indicates that an interlocutor may repeat words or phrases used by another interlocutor to signal rejection, imply correction, and express disalignment. Furthermore, Perrin et al. (2003) argue that repetitions give different effects depending on the types of reply in which repetitions appear. More precisely, repetitions signal agreement when used in a positive reply and express disagreement in a negative reply. These three studies similarly suggest that repetitions can be used to express disagreement, which contrasts with Sinclair's claim that interlocutors tend to use repetitions for agreement and paraphrase for disagreement. With these completing claims, we found it worth investigating this point. Moreover, although the above studies imply the possible relationship between interlocutors' orientations and choices of repetitions, other possible factors such as contexts that could also influence those choices are still left unexplored, hence the need for further investigation in this research.

## 2.2 Paraphrase

In addition to repetitions, we will investigate paraphrases which include the substitution of the initial term with another having a slight or complete change in form but related semantically. In his study on lexical cohesion, Hoey (1992) introduces two main types of lexical paraphrase. First, simple lexical paraphrase "occurs whenever a lexical item may substitute for another in context without loss or gain in specificity and with no discernible change in meaning." (p. 62), which is equivalent to synonymy in general. Second, complex lexical paraphrase refers to the case of two lexical items being "definable such that one of the items includes the other, although they share no lexical morpheme" (p. 64), which tends to include superordinates and shell nouns.

Lexical cohesion has been widely applied in other subfields of linguistics. A prominent example is computational linguistics which utilizes lexical cohesion as the model to develop algorithms to train artificial intelligence (AI) to generate automated texts by using synonym substitutions. More precisely, the research has explored how AI would recognize synonymous lexical items and know which constituents are replaceable by alternative ones without changing the propositional meaning of the texts (e.g., Edmonds & Hirst, 2002; Inkpen & Hirst, 2002; Reiter & Sripada, 2002; Bhagat & Hovy, 2013). Although these studies shed light on application of paraphrases for linguistic purposes, only written texts have been studied and the factors influencing the choices of paraphrases are not the focus of these studies.

In spoken discourse, some research on courtroom discourse addresses the interactive functions of paraphrases, suggesting that the parties in court trials could paraphrase each other's terms

for the purpose of controlling or shaping the narratives in their own favor. For example, in a domestic violence case, the defense lawyer describes the plaintiff's action against his client as "smashing", but the plaintiff refers to the same action as just "hitting" to make it less aggressive and a self-defense (Cotterill, 2004). In a research study on courtroom semantics, the prosecutor uses the word "baby" to refer to the aborted subject with the aim to highlighting that a human was killed by a doctor is accused of manslaughter. However, the defendant calls it "fetus" to imply that the aborted subject was not a human in full form to lessen the doctor's guilt (Danet, 1980). Although these studies imply that the parties' disagreement on the concepts being discussed could result in their use of paraphrases to re-negotiate the meaning of those concepts, we still cannot conclude that there is a relationship between the use of paraphrases and discordant orientations based on those studies for three reasons. First, since the above studies do not investigate paraphrases in direct examination, we could not identify whether paraphrases are only specific to discordant orientations or generally used throughout the examination process. Second, the above studies do not indicate the frequency of paraphrases found in their data, so we cannot statistically identify how significant the relationship between paraphrases and discordant orientations is. Lastly, repetition is not explored anywhere in the same research, which means we cannot set aside the possibility that a certain number of repetitions may also be employed in those contexts. To fill this research gap, we find it appropriate to collect the data that contains the texts produced by interlocutors having concordant and discordant orientations and investigate repetitions in comparison with paraphrases.

In the broader field of social interaction, some research on critical discourse highlights the use of paraphrases with strong positive or negative connotations to reflect the attitudes of the users. Talking about a group of people acting against the national regime, referring to this group as "terrorists" implies highly negative attitudes; calling them "freedom fighters" shows positive perspectives (Ganor, 2002, p. 287). Similar paraphrases have been studied based on the theory of political framing or positioning through the government or media outlets in order to shape the public views (e.g., Montiel and Shah, 2008; Osisanwo and Iyoha, 2020). Although critical discourse analysis normally explores interlocutors' orientations towards a concept (i.e., one calls a person a terrorist while another calls the same person a freedom fighter due to individual views) and the effects of paraphrase on people's perception of the concepts, the analyzed texts are not taken from dialogic discourse. Therefore, we found it worth conducting research on contexts where multiple interlocutors having the same and different attitudes interactively refer to the same concept.

### **3. Orientations**

One of the variables of our study is interlocutors' orientations which can be divided into two types, namely, concordant and discordant orientations. In this research, we use the terms "concordant orientations" or "concordance" to refer to the situation where interlocutors share the same attitudes or views on the concepts, whereas the terms "discordant orientations" or "discordance" is used when they have different opinions or perspectives on the concepts being discussed. Other similar terms are "agreement and disagreement" and "alignment and disalignment". Walkinshaw (2015) argues that when interlocutors have a concurring stance on something, it signifies their agreement. On the other hand, they are considered to be

discordant or in disagreement when they have opposing stances towards the referent. Simaki et al. (2017, p. 18) define agreement and disagreement as “alignment versus disalignment with the addressee at the functional level” represented by discourse markers and linguistic features used in the texts. In this research, we use “concordant and discordant orientations” to highlight that the terms refer to the beliefs, evaluations and attitudes of the interlocutors.

#### 4. Contextual factors

In Panseeta and Watson Todd (2022), we compared the use of repetition and paraphrase by interlocutors with concordant and discordant orientations within a single context. In response to this article, Clark (personal communication) pointed out that there are several other possible factors which may affect interlocutors’ choices of concept reiterations. The current article addresses this by considering three contextual factors that could influence interlocutors’ choices of repetitions.

Hymes (1972) suggests speakers’ word choices could be affected by several factors within contexts, among which are Norms (social rules governing the event), Instrumentalities (mode or medium of communication) and Ends (communicative goals). Herring (2007) proposes similar factors that could influence how interlocutors express themselves and how they want their messages to be perceived in computer-mediated discourse, which include norms of social appropriateness, code or language variety used and purpose of communication. In this section, we will discuss three key contextual factors that could influence the choices of reiterations, namely, the medium of communication, the social roles of the interlocutors, and the directionality of texts.

##### 4.1 *Medium of communication*

Medium communication, comprising spoken and written forms, could influence the interlocutors’ choice of reiterations due to the differences in language production processes. Redeker (1984) suggests that interlocutors in the spoken and written discourse tend to face different time constraints, affecting variety of word selections. Burns et al. (1996) argue that spoken and written language are different in terms of grammatical intricacy and lexical density. More precisely, spoken language tends to be more grammatically intricate than written language as people are likely to talk more in chunks rather than in grammatical sentences. When looking into lexical density, it was found that written texts contain more content words than spoken texts probably because writers have more time to carefully select words and create logical sentences to convey their meanings while speakers have less time for polishing the messages or using a variety of words. This coincides with Akinnaso (1982) who suggests that, in terms of lexical items, written language contains longer words, more attributive adjectives, and more varied word choices than spoken language. However, he points out that the above findings are obtained without consideration of other relevant factors, including contexts, purposes of communication and participants’ background, which will be investigated in our research. Furthermore, the syntactic structures of the spoken and written language are also different as a result of the differences in the modes of acquisition, methods of production, transmission, reception, and organization or planning (p. 111). He also argues that people acquire spoken

language naturally and mostly informally through socialization, whereas written language requires formal instruction. This contributes to most writers paying attention to their word choices to ensure grammaticality and proper organization while speakers tend to be less conscious about these things when uttering. Based on the above notions, we find it worth investigating whether the medium of communication, namely written and spoken, affects interlocutors' choices of repetitions and paraphrases. Therefore, our data will be collected from both spoken and written discourse for comparison of the use of reiterations.

#### *4.2 Social roles of interlocutors*

Social roles and expectations attached to professions or social status could limit the freedom of choice in people's communication. The first factor is politeness which affects how interlocutors deal with their disagreement. Brown and Levinson (1987) argue that in contexts of social interaction, polite utterances may not convey the true feeling or attitudes of the speakers towards the issues or the hearers. Some professionals, such as those in hospitality industry, are expected by their professional practices to remain polite to customers and careful about their word choices. In the event of discordant orientations, such as when the hotel receives complaints, the complaining customers are free to say or write their comments without restrictions. For the hotel personnel, however, their word choices to respond to those comments are limited by their institutional expectations, resulting in unequal roles of language users. Therefore, in professional contexts language use could be at least partially determined by social roles in addition to interlocutors' personal emotions or attitudes.

#### *4.3 Directionality of texts*

Another possible factor that influences the lexical choices is directionality of texts. By the term "directionality", we focus on "negative", "neutral" and "positive" shift of the sentiment of the concepts reiterated. While interlocutors in general argumentative discourse can make arguments in any way that benefits them the most, some contexts may have clear directionality of the language. In the case of hotel reviews, for instance, it is proposed that the reviews should be responded to in a positive professional manner. Replies to positive reviews should reflect appreciation and promise to maintain quality. Negative reviews should be responded to with gratitude, explanation of facts or improvements (Litvin & Hoffman, 2012; Nguyen & Coudounaris, 2015). Min et al. (2014, p. 223) additionally suggests that the responses by the hotel management should include "empathy or paraphrasing statements". In other words, the hotel responses should contain positive and polite tones no matter what the comments say for the benefit of maintaining and boosting their corporate image. Based on this, we may expect the use of paraphrases with affective connotations that shift to more positive polarity in the contexts of hotel reviews and responses in both concordant and discordant orientations; whereas, the discourse in other contexts may result in either positive or negative shifts of the reiterated concepts, depending on the purposes of the interlocutors' arguments.

### **5. Connotations of paraphrase**

One way to shift directionality of the messages is to use paraphrases that carry different



connotations. To investigate the role of connotations in this case, we only analyze the connotations of paraphrases but exclude repetitions. This is because repetitions, even when they involve a change in part of speech, still carry the same connotations, hence not affecting directionality of the text. On the other hand, paraphrases are the substitutions of the new semantic constituents which may contain different connotative meaning from the original ones, leading to the shift directionality of the messages. To illustrate, if considering the paraphrased concepts in the IM and the RM below:

**Example 1: Repetition**

(IM) Staff are very polite.

(RM) We appreciate your compliment on our politeness.

It could be seen that “very polite” and “our politeness” in Example 1 are an example of repetition. In spite of the different part of speech, the meaning of both phrases, as well as the directionality of the text, remain the same.

However, if considering Example 2 below:

**Example 2: Paraphrase**

(IM) Service was terrible.

(RM) We are sorry to hear that our service was unimpressive for you.

We can see that both interlocutors refer to the same concept of the service quality using different terms. The first interlocutor expresses a very negative view on the concept, claiming the service was “terrible”. However, the second interlocutor tries to lessen the negativity of the concept by replacing “terrible” with “unimpressive” to shift the sentiment of the IM to a less negative direction in the RM.

The impact of paraphrase connotation in Example 2 piques our interest in exploring further whether there are similarities or differences in the use of paraphrase connotations to shift directionality of the texts in the contexts of interlocutors’ concordant and discordant orientations. However, we might not be able to assume that all connotations are related to interlocutors’ orientations. Brown et al. (2014) suggest that there are six types of paraphrase connotations as follows:

1. *Collocative connotations* include the words which are often used together. For example, “pretty” connotes female looks and typically collocates with female properties.
2. *Reflected connotations* are associated with slangs or taboos. For example, the word “cock” literally means an adult male chicken and connotes a slang of male sexual organ.



3. *Individual or Restricted connotations* apply only to particular communities. For example, the word “pride”, despite its general meaning, has a specific connotation associated with the LGBT community.
4. *Coded connotations* represent the symbolic meanings which vary across countries and cultures. For example, “blue” generally symbolizes dignity and peace but also means sadness and depression (e.g., feeling blue) in some cultures.
5. *Social connotations* involves levels of formalities and politeness of words. For instance, “cop” is an informal word for “police officer”.
6. *Affective connotations* relate to speakers’ attitudes and feelings towards a referent. For example, when people refers to a place where they live in as a “house” or a “home”, different senses of the place are communicated, depending on whether they view it as a structure of building for residence or a place they have emotional attachment to.

Since we intend to compare the use of paraphrase connotations in the contexts of interlocutors’ concordance and discordance, we will focus on affective connotations as these relate to interlocutors’ attitudes and feelings toward the concept, whereas other types are derived from different social or cultural factors which may have nothing to do with interlocutors’ orientations.

In conclusion, our study aims to answer the following questions:

1. Is there a relationship between the choices of concept reiterations and interlocutors’ orientations?
2. Is there a relationship between the choices of concept reiterations and contexts of communication?
3. Is there a relationship between affective connotations of paraphrase, interlocutors’ orientations and contexts of communication?

## METHODOLOGY

This section discusses the criteria for selection of the discourse contexts to form corpora, interlocutors’ orientations in each corpus, characteristics of concept reiterations, classification of directionality of paraphrase connotation, and intercoder reliability measure in our analysis.

### 1. Criteria for selection of the discourse contexts

As our aim is to explore the extent to which interlocutors’ choices of concept reiterations are influenced by interlocutors’ orientations and contextual factors, the criteria for our data selection include the following:

1. The discourse must be interactive with two or more interlocutors.
2. The discourse must contain instances of concordance and discordance with the preceding discourse.
3. These instances of concordance and discordance must be identifiable.

4. There should be a variety of contexts to ensure that patterns found are not context-specific.
5. The contexts should vary based on potentially influential contextual factors.

In this research, two factors are identified, which are medium (i.e., spoken vs. written) and presence or absence of institutional roles of at least one of the interlocutors which may constrain their discourse. Based on the above criteria, we decided to collect texts from four sources as summarized in Table 1 below.

**Table 1**  
**Characteristics of each corpus**

Institutional constraints	Medium	
	Written	Spoken
Presence	Hotel	Court
Absence	Forum	Debate

We collected hotel reviews and responses (Hotel) which are written texts and witness examinations in court trial (Court) which are spoken texts to represent discourses produced by people with clear professional roles, hence the presence of institutional constraints in discourses. To compare with those two sources, we collected the other two discourses where interlocutors tend to interactively exchange their views without institutional restrictions or expectations, which are online discussion forum (Forum) from the written source and formal debates (Debate) from the spoken source. In these two sources, we assume that their lexical choices are guided by their views on the concepts being discussed and not by institutional expectations. Table 2 below shows the quantitative details of our corpora.

**Table 2**  
**Quantitative details of the corpora**

Corpus	Total word counts	Number of interlocutors in each text	Number of texts	Number of turns
Hotel	30018	2	100	200
Court	15915	2	2	412
Forum	7877	2-5	39	115
Debate	35633	2-4	10	720

The Hotel corpus consists of 100 texts, 50 from positive reviews and responses representing the context of concordant orientations and 50 from negative reviews and responses representing the context of discordant orientations. Each text is initiated by a reviewer and responded to by a hotel representative, meaning there are two interlocutors interacting in each text. The Court corpus comprises one text from direct examination, representing the context of concordant orientations, and one text from cross-examination, representing discordant orientations, of a witness in the case. There are two parties involving in the examination that are the lawyer and the witness in both direct and cross-examination. The Forum corpus is made up of 39 texts, each of which is contributed to by two to five writers responding to each other to express their agreement or disagreement. The Debate corpus is obtained from 10 topics of debates. Each debate team consists of two members, making each text be participated by two (each from

the same or different team) to four (both member from the same or different team). More details of each corpus will be discussed in the next section.

## 2. Interlocutors' orientations in texts

Our four corpora contain the interaction between two or more interlocutors identified as having concordant and discordant orientations towards the concepts being discussed. The corresponding threads between each pair of interlocutors are collected to form a corpus, comprised of the Initial Message (IM) and the Responding Message (RM). The IM represents the text generated by the interlocutor who takes the first turn in the text, and the RM is the text(s) generated in response to IM.

The Hotel corpus is obtained from *TripAdvisor*. We select hotel reviews over other reviews because hotel reviews tend to be dealt with more seriously than reviews of other facilities because of their potential effects on customer purchase (Litvin & Hoffman, 2012). The reason why we choose this source is because this website allows the reviews to be responded to by the management of the hotels being commented on. With this, we can expect two types of orientations between the reviewers and the hotel representatives. For the concordant orientations, as the positive reviews enhance the hotels' good image and reputation, the hotel representatives would not argue against such compliments; instead, they are likely to emphasize them for their benefits. On the other hand, the negative reviews would affect the decision of the travelers who consult *TripAdvisor* when looking for accommodation, the hotel representatives would try to protect their image by arguing with the reviewers and possibly contradicting some negative comments, hence reflecting their discordance orientations with the reviewers. Upon writing comments, reviewers are required to rate the hotels from 5 to 1, representing the excellent to the terrible quality. Since reviewers are asked to rate the hotels from 5 to 1, according to the highest to the lowest level of their satisfaction, to ensure that we obtain the texts from interlocutors who have clear concordant and discordant orientations, we exclude the reviews rated 2 to 4, which may contain the texts written by reviewers with neutral attitudes towards the hotels. Rather, we decided to collect 50 reviews and responses from the 5-rated hotels which represent the contexts of concordant orientations and 50 reviews and responses from the 1-rated hotels which represent discordant orientations.

The Court corpus is selected because it fulfills the requirement of containing interactions between interlocutors having two competing viewpoints. In other words, the corpus comprises direct examination where the witnesses are asked by their attorney and cross-examination where the witnesses are asked by the attorney of the other party. The aim of direct examination is to solicit the statements in favor of the petitioner or the respondent's side, as the case may be, hence representing the contexts of concordant orientations. Cross-examination, on the other hand, occurs when the attorney asks the witness of the opposite party, so they have discordant orientations. Our Court corpus is obtained from direct and cross-examination of the witness in the *Terri Schiavo Case*, which involves the right-to-die controversy of a woman who has been in a persistent vegetative state and kept alive by feeding tube. In this trial, the woman's husband is the petitioner who requests for removal of the tube claiming that it is his wife's intention to be freed from this state. The respondents are the woman's parents who

insist that their daughter has the right to live and removal of the feeding tube is not her desire. The full version of witness examination transcript is available at <http://www.lydiamcgrew.com/SchiavoTrialTranscript.htm>.

Online discussion forum is a common platform where people exchange opinions which can be both agreement and disagreement, especially political forums where people are likely to have stronger views based on their political stance. A potential problem with general political forums is that participants may have multiple viewpoints. Therefore, we need a political forum where there are two sides to a political issue and that we can clearly identify the two opposing viewpoints, namely concordance and discordance. With all these requirements, we obtain the data from Jimarkon and Watson Todd (2013). The texts in this data have already been categorized into four different groups, namely “the Red”, “the Yellow”, “Neutral”, and “Unclear” to analyze the use of language of writers based upon their political beliefs towards the ouster of Thaksin Shinawatra, Thailand’s ex-Prime Minister, in September 2006 coup, so it is convenient and reliable for further analysis. The Red are mostly Thaksin’s supporters while the Yellow represent the anti- Thaksin group, so contributors classified into these two groups have opposing viewpoints. The messages collected consist of several threads of opinions about Thai political news written by initiators who are either the Red or the Yellow and followed by one or more responses from writers who have either the same or different political stance. With this, we obtain the texts representing concordant orientations from the threads initiated and responded to by writers with same political positions (the Red vs. the Red or the Yellow vs. the Yellow) and the texts representing discordant orientations from the threads initiated and responded to by writers showing opposing political views (the Red vs. the Yellow or the Yellow vs. the Red). The “Neutral” and “Unclear” categories are excluded since they do not show clear agreement or disagreement towards the issue, so their exact orientations are unidentifiable.

In the Debate corpus, the concerned parties include debaters who are divided into the “for the motion” and “against the motion” side of two members. We select this data because it fulfills the requirements of containing the texts produced by interlocutors having both concordant and discordant orientations. In other words, members of the same team, namely the For and the Against, are supposed to have the same perspective while members of the different teams have the competing viewpoints toward the motion. To obtain the utterances representing concordant and concordant orientations, we collect the utterances of the debaters in the For and Against teams whereby the members of each team responding to each other represent concordant orientations as they basically support the same arguments. On the other hand, the members of each team responding to those of the other team represent discordant orientations since they normally expressed different opinions on the motion. Utterances of the moderator and the audience are excluded from the analysis. Debates are randomly selected and transcribed from the podcasts available on the website of *Intelligence Squared* U.S. (<https://www.intelligencesquaredus.org/>), which is a non-profit organization hosting panels debates on several topics mainly addressing national and international issues related to the United States of America and other countries.

Interlocutors’ orientations in each corpus are summarized in Table 3 below.

**Table 3**  
**Texts containing interlocutors' orientations**

Corpus	Orientations	
	Concordance	Discordance
Hotel	Positive reviews and responses	Negative reviews and responses
Court	Direct examination	Cross-examination
Forum	Red responding to Red	Red responding to Yellow
	Yellow responding to Yellow	Yellow responding to Red
Debate	For responding to For	For responding to Against
	Against responding to Against	Against responding to For

As seen in Table 3, there are two sides of interlocutors in each corpus. In the Court corpus, if the thread starts with the lawyer's question followed by the witness answer, it will be deemed that the lawyer generates the IM and the witness generates the RM. On the other hand, the witness may give a statement and the lawyer asks a question to confirm or elicit more details based on that question, it will be considered that the IM is generated by the witness and the RM by the lawyer. The Debate and Forum corpora have the similar nature in that interlocutors are allowed to exchange their ideas and make arguments in several turns. Therefore, they have opportunities to start the message or produce the IM and can take turns to respond to the preceding message or giving the RM. However, the Hotel corpus has a different nature of threads. To be exact, it is a one-way communication which always starts from the reviewers followed by the responses from the hotel representatives. Therefore, the IM in this corpus will be generated by the reviewers and the RM by the hotel representatives only.

### 3. Concept reiterations

#### 3.1 Matching reiterations

After identifying conceptual constituents by pro-form substitution as described in 2.1, the next step is to match the concepts introduced in the IM and reiterated in the RM. As we focus on concept reiterations, any concepts that are used in the IM but not restated in the RM and found in the RM but have not mentioned before in the RM will be excluded. Example 3 demonstrates this matching.

#### Example 3: Matching of concept reiterations

IM: Protesters<sup>1</sup> should stop before they all will be killed<sup>2</sup> or beaten up<sup>2</sup> by military dictator<sup>3</sup>.

RM: I believe that if the military<sup>3</sup> comes out to subdue<sup>2</sup> the mob<sup>1</sup>, it will be in order to keep the order.

(Forum – Discordance)

Three concepts are reiterated in the above example. "Protestors" and "the mob" refer to the same group of persons in this thread of conversation. The words "killed" and "beaten up" are replaced by "subdue" yet all imply the same action taken by the military in the situation being

discussed. “Military dictator” and “the military” refer to the same troops who deal with the protesters. Other concepts are individually identified in the IM and the RM but not reiterated between interlocutors, hence not included in the further stage of categorizing reiterations.

### 3.2 Categorizing reiterations

Reiterations were categorized based on the types of semantic relations between each pair of the concepts reiterated. Previous research (e.g., Croft & Cruse, 2004; Cruse, 1986; Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Hoey, 1992; Károly, 2002; Marco, 1999; Wang, 2005) suggested a variety of semantic relations types, most of which fall under the umbrella of repetition (e.g., simple or exact repetition, complex or derived repetition, etc.) and paraphrase (e.g., synonym, hyponym, antonym, etc.). Following are the characteristics of repetitions and paraphrase applied in our study:

#### Repetition

1. Reiteration of identical forms
2. Reiteration of inflected and derived words/phrases which belong to the same word family, excluding prefixed forms
3. Reiteration of full proper names and abbreviated or short proper names
4. Reiteration of noun phrases with different articles, demonstratives, and possessive adjectives
5. Reiteration of noun phrases with different pre- and post-modifiers

#### Paraphrase

1. Synonym
2. Hyponym
3. Meronym
4. Antonym
5. General nouns

Basically, reiterations counted as repetition in this study must have the same root words with identical or slightly derived forms such as different suffixes or modifiers. However, the core meaning of the reiterations must not be changed. For instance, “friendly” and “friendliness” are counted as repetition as both refer to the same characteristic of a person. On the other hand, “friendly” and “unfriendly” are regarded as antonym because the prefix “un-” alter the meaning of the initial word, hence being categorized as paraphrase.

As our focus is on reiterations of concepts in the form of repetition and paraphrase, we base the analysis on content words and phrases which represent concepts. The function words which show grammatical relationships in the sentences but do not signal lexical meanings and are not part of the phrasal concept are excluded from this analysis. However, an exception is made for the following negative forms:

1. “without + noun” e.g. *You judge these people without evidence.*
2. “no + noun” e.g. *She had no close friend in the neighborhood.*

3. “not/never + verb” e.g. *They do not care about their customers.*
4. “not + adjective” e.g. *The project was not successful.*

Each of the above underlined negative phrases will be considered as a concept. The reason is that these negative prepositions and adverbs make the words they precede opposite in meanings to those without them, so they can create paraphrase.

#### 4. Polarity of paraphrase

While all repetitions in this study contain derivatives of root words without the change in meaning, making the polarity static, paraphrase sentiment may shift depending on the connotative meaning attached to the paraphrased pair. Nonetheless, not all types of connotations originate from interlocutors’ orientations. Considering the six types proposed by Brown et al. (2014) in the previous section, only Affective connotation could be counted as it relates to interlocutors’ attitudes toward the concept, whereas other types are derived from social or cultural factors. As we focus on Affective connotation, to simplify our categorization, paraphrase containing Affective connotation will be labelled as “Affective” while those containing the other five types of connotations will be collectively labelled as “Other”. Examples 4 and 5 illustrate the paraphrase containing Affective connotation that shifts to more positive and more negative sentiment, respectively.

##### Example 4: Affective connotation of paraphrase shifting to the more positive sentiment

IM: Refused to refund us despite cancelling our stay due to the Bangkok riots.

RM: May I first point out that there are no riots in Bangkok but street protests.  
(Hotel – Discordant Orientations)

It can be seen from the above example that the hotel management in the RM is trying to refuse the negative claim made by the reviewer in the IM by replacing “the Bangkok riots” with a more positive term. In spite of such denial, the hotel management should bear in mind that they cannot just use any words to defend themselves. Instead, they are expected to keep the message positive while clearly rejecting the alleged issues. Two replacements with such function are used in the above example, which are the direct negation “no riots in Bangkok” and the synonym “street protests” with less negative sense and straightforwardly contradict the original term. Therefore, the paraphrase polarity in this RM is categorized as more positive than the initial term in the IM.

##### Example 5: Affective connotation of paraphrase shifting to the more negative sentiment

IM: He wants to come back to Thailand free man, so he sent this people to pressure the now Government out.

RM: The situation in Thailand is simply a power struggle between the old corrupt regime and the new corrupt regime.

(Forum – Discordant Orientations)



In Example 5 above the phrase “the now Government” having the neutral connotation is used in the IM by the person who is anti-Thaksin to express that the protest is manipulated by Thaksin who wanted to take down the then-current government to facilitate his return. The person in the RM replaces that phrase with “the new corrupt regime” that has the negative connotation to emphasize that the situation is a result of political power plays and the then-current administration is no better than the previous one. This paraphrase connotation will, therefore, be categorized as shifting to more negative sentiment.

However, paraphrases categorized as “Other” are not related to interlocutors’ different attitudes toward the concept, as in Example 6.

**Example 6:** Other type of connotation of paraphrase

IM: Is it true that your brother needs a device or mechanism to help him drive?

RM: He has a spinner knob.

(Court – Concordant Orientations)

From the above example, “a device or mechanism” is paraphrased to “a spinner knob” to give more specific information. Both terms do not reflect the interlocutors’ negative or positive attitudes or feelings toward this concept; thus, this type of paraphrases will be labelled as “Other”.

## 5. Intercoder reliability

To reduce researchers’ subjectivity, a native speaker of English was asked to independently code 20 percent of the data to identify repetitions and paraphrases, identify types of paraphrase connotations, and identify polarity of affective connotations of paraphrases. Then, intercoder reliability was tested using the kappa statistic to determine consistency among raters, and Landis and Koch’s (1977) interpretation was applied. The results for identification of repetitions and paraphrases and identification of polarity of affective connotations of paraphrase showed substantial strength of agreement (0.70 and 0.76, respectively), and the agreement for identification of types of paraphrase connotations and identification of functions of concept reiterations were moderate (0.53 and 0.65, respectively). This suggests that the methods we use are reliable enough for further analysis.

## RESULTS

The texts analyzed in this study were obtained from four sources, namely Court, Debate, Hotel, and Forum, which contained various lengths of interactive threads. As our focus is on reiterations of concepts between interlocutors, we firstly identified all concepts found in each IM and RM of the relevant threads in both contexts of concordant and discordant orientations. Then, the reiterated concepts were matched for further categorization and analysis. The non-reiterated concepts were left out. Table 4 summarizes the number of concepts in the IM and the RM and reiterations of the concepts.

**Table 4**  
**Number of concepts in IM and RM and reiterations**

Corpus	No. of threads	Concepts							
		Concordance				Discordance			
		IM	RM	Reiterated concepts	% of reiterated concepts	IM	RM	Reiterated concepts	% of reiterated concepts
Court	31	984	843	173	20.52%	1055	738	114	15.45%
Debate	10	2564	1365	274	20.07%	2338	1726	314	18.19%
Hotel	100	1328	917	231	25.19%	1792	1740	308	18.07%
Forum	39	254	176	33	18.75%	859	532	98	18.42%
<b>Total</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>5130</b>	<b>3301</b>	<b>711</b>	<b>21.53%</b>	<b>6044</b>	<b>4736</b>	<b>834</b>	<b>17.61%</b>

As seen from Table 4 above, the thread counts within each corpus exhibit variations. The Hotel corpus, for instance, comprises brief threads encompassing reviews and corresponding responses, amounting to a collection of 100 threads. Meanwhile, the Forum corpus was derived from the data originally gathered and analyzed by Jimarkon and Watson Todd (2013). In this case, threads that did not contain the interlocutors' shared ("Neutral") or unclear orientations were excluded, leaving a total of 39 threads that encompassed the two mentioned orientations. The Debate corpus, on the other hand, consists of extensive discussions between two debate teams on various motions. To represent this, transcripts of 10 debate topics were collected, resulting in 10 threads. Finally, the Court corpus was sourced from the direct and cross-examinations of three witnesses involved in a legal case, yielding a total of 31 threads accessible online.

In terms of conceptual content, it is noteworthy that IM consistently features a greater number of concepts than RM across all corpora. Nevertheless, the proportion of reiterated concepts remains remarkably consistent at approximately 20% of the overall concepts within both concordant and discordant orientations across the corpora. This consistent proportion suggests that exploring concept reiterations is a promising avenue of investigation.

After reiterations were identified, they were categorized as "Repetition" and "Paraphrase". However, some concepts were reiterated more than once in the same thread, some of which were repetitions and other were paraphrases. Those concepts were, therefore, labeled as "Repetition & Paraphrase" as shown in Table 5 below.

**Table 5**  
**Number of reiterated concepts**

Corpus	Number of reiterated concepts							
	Concordance				Discordance			
	Repetition	Paraphrase	Repetition & Paraphrase	Total	Repetition	Paraphrase	Repetition & Paraphrase	Total
Court	91	75	3	169	61	49	2	112
Debate	90	111	73	274	104	119	91	314
Hotel	59	150	22	231	125	170	13	308
Forum	11	19	3	33	38	40	20	98
<b>Total</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>707</b>	<b>328</b>	<b>378</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>832</b>

It can be seen that, in the Debate, Hotel, and Forum corpora, the number of paraphrases was greater than repetitions. Only in the Court corpus was the number of repetition greater than paraphrase in both contexts of concordant and discordant orientations. As the focus of this research is to figure out whether there is a relationship between the contexts, orientations and reiterations of concepts, a chi-square test was performed to see whether there is a statistically significant difference between the reiterations used by interlocutors having concordant and discordant orientations in the four corpora. To avoid confusion in further analysis, we decided to exclude the reiterations that were not clear-cut, that is falling into the “Repetition & Paraphrase” category. Finally, only the reiterations in “Repetition” category and “Paraphrase” category of the Hotel, Forum, Debate, and Court corpora would be analyzed. Table 6 below shows the results of chi-square value of repetition and paraphrase against concordant and discordant orientations in each corpus.

**Table 6**  
**Chi-square value of reiterations against orientations**

Corpus	Chi-square value	df	Sample size	p-value	Effect size ( $\phi$ )
Court	0.01	1	276	.92	.01
Debate	0.15	1	424	.70	.02
Hotel	11.04	1	504	.0009	.15
Forum	1.27	1	108	.26	.11
<b>All</b>	<b>3.57</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1318</b>	<b>.06</b>	<b>.05</b>

When performing chi-square by comparing the numbers of repetitions and paraphrases in concordance and discordance texts and calculating the effect size, the results suggest that the association between reiterations and orientations in three corpora, which are Court, Debate and Forum, is not significant. In other words, there is no difference between the types of reiteration used in the responses of concordant orientations and those in discordant orientations. Only in the Hotel corpus is the relationship between orientations and types of concept reiterations significant ( $X^2 = 11.04$ ,  $p = .0009$ ) with a small effect size. Considering that the number of repetitions in discordant texts of the Hotel corpus was relatively higher than concordance, it can be concluded that interlocutors in the Hotel corpus tend to use repetitions more frequently in the situation where they had discordance than when they were in concordance. From the above results, we may conclude that the relationship between interlocutors’ orientations and reiterations exist in certain contexts such as the Hotel corpus where the hotel representatives try to address each problematic issue in the responses to negative reviews straightforwardly to clear themselves. Example 7 below illustrates this attempt.

#### **Example 7:** Repetitions in a hotel negative review

IM: The hotel staff refused to refund<sup>1</sup> and instead offered<sup>2</sup> an extension<sup>3</sup>.

RM: It is our practice to first offer<sup>2</sup> an extension<sup>3</sup> of the deposit to be valid through 2014. And if this is not acceptable, we will provide a refund<sup>1</sup>.

(Hotel – Discordant Orientations)

The major issues in the above example are about the hotel's refusal to give a "refund" but instead they "offer" an "extension" of stay. Therefore, the hotel representative repeats those concepts to explain the cause of their decision. Moreover, the guest implies that either the extension or refund is the possible option, and the hotel offers the extension only, whereas the hotel is saying that both are alternatives provided in sequence. To make this point clear, the hotel representative needs to repeat the same terms and add more information to clarify the hotel's policy.

Looking at the effect size of each corpus, in addition to the Hotel corpus having a small effect size ( $\phi = .15$ ), it can be seen that the Forum corpus, where both repetitions and paraphrases in the context of discordant orientation outnumber those in the context of concordant orientation, also reports the small effect size ( $\phi = .11$ ). As both Hotel and Forum corpora are written corpora, this result tends to imply that the association between the concept reiterations and interlocutors' orientations could be slightly stronger in written texts and in spoken texts. In other words, the medium of communication may influence how interlocutors select their terms.

In addition to the frequency of reiterations, we identified the types of paraphrase connotations for further analysis of how paraphrase containing affective connotations shifted from the IM to the RM. As our emphasis is on affective connotation, we decided to classify all non-affective connotations as "Other" group. The results are shown in Table 7 below.

**Table 7**  
**Number of paraphrases with affective connotations**

Corpus	Paraphrase connotations					
	Concordance			Discordance		
	Affective	Other	Total	Affective	Other	Total
Court	23	52	75	11	38	49
Debate	7	177	184	33	165	198
Hotel	15	157	172	64	139	203
Forum	9	13	22	23	37	60
<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>399</b>	<b>453</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>379</b>	<b>510</b>

The above table shows that paraphrases with affective connotations are used less than those with other types of connotations in both concordant and discordant orientations. However, it is apparent that the total number of affective connotations used in discordant orientation is higher than concordant orientations. To confirm whether there is a significant relationship between the affective connotations and orientations in each corpus, chi-square and effect size are tested as shown in Table 8 below.

**Table 8**  
**Statistics of types of paraphrase connotations**

Corpus	Chi-square value	df	Sample size	p-value	Effect size ( $\phi$ )
Court	1.01	1	124	.31	.09
Debate	16.83	1	382	< .0001	.21
Hotel	29.12	1	375	< .0001	.28
Forum	0.04	1	82	.84	.02
<b>All</b>	<b>29.29</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>966</b>	<b>&lt; .0001</b>	<b>.17</b>

The results suggest that there is a significant relationship between affective connotations and discordant orientations with a small effect size in the Debate and Hotel corpora ( $p < .0001$ ), implying a relationship between affective connotations and interlocutors' orientations. More precisely, interlocutors in the Debate and Hotel corpora tend to use paraphrases to express their attitudes and feelings more frequently when they are in discordance which can be seen from Examples 8 and 9 below.

**Example 8:** Paraphrases in the context of discordant orientations of the Debate corpus

IM: The highest value a state can have is survival.

RM: That's the lowest value.

(Debate – Discordant Orientations)

**Example 9:** Paraphrases in the context of discordant orientations of the Hotel corpus

IM: Club lounge administrator<sup>1</sup> was very disrespectful<sup>2</sup>.

RM: Our Club Lounge team<sup>1</sup> is known for the excellent service<sup>2</sup>, and I would like to apologize if this was not evident during your stay.

(Hotel – Discordant Orientations)

Both examples illustrate the arguments made by interlocutors who are in discordance in the Debate and Hotel corpora. In Example 8, the debater in the RM substitutes the negative term “the lowest value” for the positive one in the IM, illustrating the polarity shift to more negative sentiment. On the other hand, in Example 9, the adjective “very disrespectful” in the IM that carries a negative connotation is replaced by the positive phrase “known for the excellent service” in the RM, showing the shift of connotation to more positive polarity. However, both examples signify that the hotel strongly refutes such claim made by the reviewer in the IM, that is, the interlocutors use paraphrase with polarity shift to express their discordant orientations.

Then, paraphrases with affective connotations in both concordance and discordance were also classified into one of the following groups: paraphrase connotations in the RM are more positive than those in the IM (More +), paraphrase connotations in the RM are the same as those in the IM (=) and paraphrase connotations in the RM are more negative than those in the IM (More -). Table 9 shows the results of this analysis.

**Table 9**  
**Paraphrase polarity**

Corpus	Paraphrase polarity								
	More +			=			More -		
	Concord	Discord	Total	Concord	Discord	Total	Concord	Discord	Total
Court	5	2	7	1	2	3	17	7	24
Debate	4	20	24	0	2	2	3	11	14
Hotel	15	39	54	0	0	0	0	25	25
Forum	4	11	15	1	0	1	4	12	16
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>79</b>

From Table 9 above, most affective connotations in all corpora shift their polarity. As discussed in the previous section that in some discourse such as the Hotel corpus, interlocutors may have professional requirements that direct the tone of their messages to always be positive regardless of the interlocutors' attitudes or feelings in order to boost or at least maintain their corporate image. The results in Table 9 above confirms this notion as the Hotel is the only corpus where almost all affective connotations shift to more positive polarity in the concordant contexts. an interesting finding here is that most of the affective connotations of the Court corpus, especially in the concordant orientations, shift to more negative polarity. This characteristic is mostly found in the thread where the lawyer asks the question (IM) and the witness gives the answer (RM). Examples 11 demonstrates this case.

**Example 10:** Affective connotation of paraphrase shifting to more negative sentiment

IM: Does Terri, does Terri emit any noises? Does her face move? Her head?

RM: Terri will moan, but it's not to anything.

(Court – Concordant Orientations)

As seen in Example 10 above, this type of question and answer appears often in the corpora where the lawyer is supposed to use the neutral words when asking to avoid leading questions and the witness tend to reply in more specific, and sometimes more negative terms, resulting in the shift of paraphrase connotation to the more negative polarity.

## DISCUSSION

This research investigates whether there is a relationship between the choices of concept reiterations and interlocutors' orientations, whether there is a relationship between the choices of concept reiterations and contexts of communication, and whether there is a relationship between affective connotations of paraphrase, interlocutors' orientations and contexts of communication. To answer these questions, we analyze the instances where interlocutors have two opposing viewpoints, which are concordant and discordant orientations, from four corpora: Hotel, Forum, Debate, and Court. The key findings can be summarized as follows:

- The number of concepts in initiating messages (IM) is greater than in responding messages (RM) in all corpora.
- The proportion of reiterated concepts in both concordant and discordant orientations is consistent across corpora at approximately 20 percent.
- From the chi-square test, the relationship between the types of reiterations and orientations is significant only in the Hotel corpus with a small effect size. In this context, repetition is more preferred when interlocutors are in discordance than in concordance.
- There are no significant relationships between the types of reiterations and orientations in the Forum, Debate and Court corpora.

- Based on effect size, there is a small slightly positive association between concept reiterations and interlocutors' orientations in both corpora representing written discourse. More precisely, paraphrases outnumber repetitions in both contexts of concordant and discordant orientations in the Hotel and Forum corpora which are the written texts. On the other hand, for spoken discourse, only in the Debate corpus are paraphrases used more frequently in both contexts of concordant and discordant orientations.
- There are no associations between concept reiterations and interlocutors' orientations in the Court and Debate corpora.
- Regarding the affective connotations, there is a significant relationship between affective connotations and discordant orientations with a small effect size in the Hotel and Debate corpora, but there is no relationship in the Forum and Court corpora.
- Polarity of most affective connotations of paraphrase change in all corpora.
- Affective connotations in the Forum and Debate corpora shift to either a more positive or a more negative polarity in RM.
- All affective connotations in the Hotel corpus move to a more positive polarity in concordant orientations, whereas most of the affective connotations of Court corpus, especially in the concordant orientations, shift to a more negative polarity.

Regarding the first research question, our findings stand in contrast with Sinclair's claim since the relationship between orientations and reiterations is not statistically significant in most contexts. There is no significant relationship between the types of reiteration and orientations in the Court, Debate, and Forum corpora; whereas the relationship in the Hotel corpus is significant with a small effect size where repetition is more preferred when interlocutors are in discordance than in concordance.

For the second research question, the findings suggest the influence of interlocutors' roles and medium of communication on the choices of concept reiterations. In terms of the interlocutors' roles, in the Hotel corpus where the hotel management are likely to repeat the concepts when they are in discordance with the reviewers. The probable reason is that, as a service provider, the hotel must fulfill customers' needs while protecting their reputation. For this reason, every problematic issue in the negative reviews must be straightforwardly addressed, resulting in a common use of repetition in discordant orientations, to resolve misunderstandings or to state corrective actions to be taken if the complaints are true to regain customer trust and create the image of customer-oriented hotel. Regarding the influence of medium of communication, the results of the phi coefficient analysis show that concept reiterations and interlocutors' orientations are slightly associated in the written discourse, whereas there is no such a relationship in the spoken discourse. This implies that the medium of communication may play a minor role in interlocutors' choice of reiterations. Written texts are generally structured with writers have more time to think about the terms they deem fit to convey their messages and serve their communicative purposes. Thus, writers have more time to think of paraphrases to replace the original terms than speakers. On the other hand, spoken texts, despite the possibility of being pre-planned, are likely to be prompted by the direction of conversation (Akinnsaso, 1982; Redeker, 1984; Burns, 1996), hence having limited time to come up with alternative terms.



In terms of the third research question, there is a relationship between affective connotations of paraphrase, interlocutors' orientations and contexts of communication in two corpora, the Hotel and Court corpora. The Hotel corpus is unidirectional towards the positive end as seen from the positive polarity shift. The hotel representative has clear directionality to maintain and promote their image, so they will try to make any points, whether originally negative, neutral, or positive, even more positive in their favor. Some studies on hospitality and marketing suggest that the hotel should not ignore online reviews and respond to them appropriately (e.g., Park & Allen, 2012; Proserpio & Zervas, 2017). *TripAdvisor* also provides a manual of how to deal with comments on their platform whereby the hotel management is recommended to always express gratitude for the reviewer's comments. For positive reviews, the hotel management should "reinforce hotel strengths and invite the guest to return" and in negative reviews, their response should start by apologizing for the cause of problems followed by suggested corrective action. In the case of Court corpus, the lawyers' professional role is to shape the narrative in favor of their clients while keeping their questions neutral. In some cases, the lawyers might expect negative responses, but they cannot obviously lead the witnesses to repeat the negative terms initiated in their questions. Instead, they tend to ask the questions using neutral or broad terms and expect the witness to confirm those phrases with more specific and probably more negative replacements, resulting the shift of affective connotation of paraphrase to the more negative side.

This research has been developed from our previous research where we focused on only one corpus which is the Hotel corpus, and the relationship between the two variables, namely concept reiterations and interlocutors' orientations (Panseeta & Watson Todd, 2022). The findings of that study suggest that it could be worth investigating other factors, such as contexts, which may influence the interlocutors' choice of concept reiterations. Therefore, we analyzed the other three corpora representing different contexts, including medium of communication and interlocutors' roles, to examine whether such contexts play any role in the interlocutors' choice. The findings obtained shed light on the possibility that the interlocutors' choice of concept reiteration is context-dependent. However, this study is subject to certain limitations. Firstly, the research investigated the reiteration of words and phrases as surface forms. No attention was paid to intonation in the spoken data or formatting in the written data. There may be cases where a surface form is reiterated with different paralinguistic characteristics which could mean that the reiteration should be treated as a paraphrase rather than a repetition. Secondly, the data from the spoken discourse (Court and Debate) were taken from the transcriptions publicly available on the websites. Without access to the speakers at the time of their discourse production, we could not make sure whether the transcribers omitted any details of the utterances which may affect the form of reiterations and may be worth analyzing. Therefore, it is recommended that the further research be conducted by taking account of other linguistic features such as vocalics and stylistics to see whether any interesting findings would be obtained. Spoken discourse should also be collected directly from the speakers or the audio recording should be available for the researcher to verify those linguistic features which may be worth being included in the analysis.

## CONCLUSION

This research aims to investigate whether there is a relationship between the choices of concept reiterations and interlocutors' orientations, between the choices of concept reiterations and contexts of communication, and between affective connotations of paraphrase, interlocutors' orientations and contexts of communication. From the analysis of two written and two spoken discourses, the results came out differently in each corpus, implying that the relationship between choices of concept reiterations and interlocutors' orientations is not definite but that the contexts of communication matter. Some striking findings that have not been addressed by previous studies include the preference of repetition in discordant orientations in the Hotel corpus and the extensive use of repetition in the Court corpus. The shift of most paraphrase connotations to more positive sentiment in the Hotel corpus to maximize the positive corporate image and the shift of most paraphrase connotations in the Court corpus to more negative sentiment as a result of the expected question-answer pattern in courtroom could reflect the influence of contexts on choices of reiterations. To obtain new perspectives on lexical choices in communication, we suggest that a variety of communication contexts should be taken into account in future studies, such as the contexts of spoken language of which the actual audio records are accessible to allow researchers to verify the transcripts and analyze paralinguistic characteristics which may yield prominent outcomes.

## THE AUTHORS

**Sayamol Panseeta** is a PhD student at School of Liberal Arts, King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi, Thailand. Her research interests include discourse analysis, psycholinguistics and second language acquisition.  
[s.panseeta@gmail.com](mailto:s.panseeta@gmail.com)

**Richard Watson Todd** is an Associate Professor at School of Liberal Arts, King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi, Thailand. He has a PhD from the University of Liverpool and is the author of numerous articles and several books, most recently, *Discourse Topics* (John Benjamins, 2016). His research focuses on text linguistics, corpus linguistics and educational policy.  
[irictodd@kmutt.ac.th](mailto:irictodd@kmutt.ac.th)

## REFERENCES

- Akinnaso, F. N. (1982). On the differences between spoken and written language. *Language and Speech*, 25(2), 97–125. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002383098202500201>
- Bhagat, R., & Hovy, E. (2013). What is a paraphrase? *Computational Linguistics*, 39(3), 463–472. [https://doi.org/10.1162/coli\\_a\\_00166](https://doi.org/10.1162/coli_a_00166)
- Brown, P. (1999). Repetition. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 9(1-2), 223–226. <https://doi.org/10.1525/jlin.1999.9.1-2.223>
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, S., Attardo, S., & Vigliotti, C. (2014). *Understanding language structure, interaction, and variation: An introduction to applied linguistics and sociolinguistics for nonspecialists*. University of Michigan Press.

- Burns, A., Joyce, H., & Gollin, S. (1996). *'I see what you mean': Using spoken discourse in the classroom: A handbook for teachers*. National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research.
- Cotterill, J. (2004). Collocation, connotation, and courtroom semantics: Lawyers' control of witness testimony through lexical negotiation. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(4), 513–537. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/25.4.513>
- Croft, W., & Cruse, D. A. (2012). *Cognitive linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cruse, D. A. (1986). *Lexical semantics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Danet, B. (1980). 'Baby' or 'fetus'? Language and the construction of reality in a manslaughter trial. *Semiotica*, 32(3-4), 187–220. <https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.1980.32.3-4.187>
- Duff, P. (2000). Repetition in foreign language classroom interaction. *Second and Foreign Language Learning Through Classroom Interaction*, 121–150. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410605498-13>
- Edmonds, P., & Hirst, G. (2002). Near-synonymy and lexical choice. *Computational Linguistics*, 28(2), 105–144. <https://doi.org/10.1162/089120102760173625>
- Flowerdew, J., & Mahlberg, M. (2009). *Lexical cohesion and corpus linguistics*. John Benjamins.
- Ganor, B. (2002). Defining terrorism: Is one man's terrorist another man's freedom fighter? *Police Practice and Research*, 3(4), 287–304. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1561426022000032060>
- Gómez González, M. de los Á. (2010). Evaluating lexical cohesion in telephone conversations. *Discourse Studies*, 12(5), 599–623. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445610371052>
- Gómez González, M. de los Á. (2011). Lexical cohesion in multiparty conversations. *Language Sciences*, 33(1), 167–179. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2010.07.005>
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. *English Language Series*. Longman.
- Herring, S. C. (2007). A faceted classification scheme for computer-mediated discourse. *Language@Internet*. <http://www.languageatinternet.org/articles/2007/761>
- Hoey, M. (1991). *Patterns of lexis in text*. Oxford University Press.
- Hymes, D. (1972). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 35–71). Holts Rinehart & Winston.
- Inkpen, D. Z., & Hirst, G. (2002). Acquiring collocations for lexical choice between near-synonyms. *Proceedings of the ACL-02 Workshop on Unsupervised Lexical Acquisition*. <https://doi.org/10.3115/1118627.1118636>
- Jimarkon, P., & Watson Todd, R. (2013). Red or yellow, peace or war. *Discourse and Crisis*, 301–322. <https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.52.10jim>
- Kim, H. (2002). The form and function of next-turn repetition in English conversation. *Language Research*, 38(1), 51–81.
- Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, 33(1), 159. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2529310>
- Litvin, S. W., & Hoffman, L. M. (2012). Responses to consumer-generated media in the hospitality marketplace. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 18(2), 135–145. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356766712443467>
- Mahlberg, M. (2006). Lexical cohesion. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 363–383. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.11.3.08mah>
- Marco, M. J. L. (1999). Procedural vocabulary: Lexical signalling of conceptual relations in discourse. *Applied Linguistics*, 20(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/20.1.1>
- Min, H., Lim, Y., & Magnini, V. P. (2014). Factors affecting customer satisfaction in responses to negative online hotel reviews. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 56(2), 223–231. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1938965514560014>
- Montiel, C. J., & Shah, A. A. (2008). Effects of political framing and perceiver's social position on trait attributions of a terrorist/freedom fighter. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 27(3), 266–275. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927x08317951>
- Murphy, M. L. (2010). *Lexical meaning*. Cambridge University Press.

- Myers, G. (1991). Lexical cohesion and specialized knowledge in science and popular science texts. *Discourse Processes*, 14(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01638539109544772>
- Nguyen, K. A., & Coudounaris, D. N. (2015). The mechanism of online review management: A qualitative study. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 16, 163–175. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2015.08.002>
- Osisanwo, A., & Iyoha, O. (2020). ‘We are not terrorist, we are freedom fighters’: Discourse representation of the pro-biafra protest in selected Nigerian newspapers. *Discourse & Society*, 31(6), 631–647. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926520939687>
- Panseeta, S., & Watson Todd, R. (2022). Repetition and paraphrase in contexts of concordant and discordant orientations. *Pragmatics and Society*, 13(2), 250–271. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ps.19069.pan>
- Park, S. Y., & Allen, J. P. (2012). Responding to online reviews. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 54(1), 64–73. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1938965512463118>
- Perrin, L., Deshaies, D., & Paradis, C. (2003). Pragmatic functions of local diaphonic repetitions in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35(12), 1843–1860. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0378-2166\(03\)00117-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0378-2166(03)00117-6)
- Proserpio, D., & Zervas, G. (2017). Online reputation management: Estimating the impact of management responses on consumer reviews. *Marketing Science*, 36(5), 645–665. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mksc.2017.1043>
- Redeker, G. (1984). On differences between spoken and written language. *Discourse Processes*, 7(1), 43–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01638538409544580>
- Reiter, E., & Sripada, S. (2002). Human variation and lexical choice. *Computational Linguistics*, 28(4), 545–553. <https://doi.org/10.1162/089120102762671981>
- Rydland, V., & Aukrust, V. G. (2005). Lexical repetition in Second language learners’ peer play interaction. *Language Learning*, 55(2), 229–274. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0023-8333.2005.00304.x>
- Simaki, V., Paradis, C., Skeppstedt, M., Sahlgren, M., Kucher, K., & Kerren, A. (2017). Annotating speaker stance in discourse: The Brexit blog corpus. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cllt-2016-0060>
- Sinclair, J. M. H. (2004). *Trust the text: Language, corpus and discourse*. Routledge.
- Walkinshaw, I. (2015). Agreement and disagreement. *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction*, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118611463.wbielsi039>
- Wang, S. (2005). Corpus-based approaches and discourse analysis in relation to reduplication and repetition. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37(4), 505–540. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2004.08.002>
- Watson Todd, R. (2016). *Discourse topics*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Wong, J. (2000). Repetition in conversation: A look at “First and second sayings”. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 33(4), 407–424. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327973rlsi3304\\_03](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327973rlsi3304_03)