Abstract

Studies on repetition in ELF interactions have been carried out in several domains, but medical academic discourse still remains under-researched. This paper explores same-speaker repetition in a 31,153-word corpus of lectures included in the 100,135-word medical section of the 1 million-word ELFA (English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings) corpus. More specifically, the corpus was searched for the most frequent same-speaker content key word repetition and corresponding functions, with both immediate and delayed repetition being scrutinized. The results confirmed the initial hypothesis according to which same-speaker repetition was expected to be pervasive in the data, not only as a result of the pedagogical nature of the encounters but also as a possible consequence of the ELF linguistic context. To this purpose, the data in the ELFA medical corpus were compared to those explored in a corpus of medical lectures from the NS (Native Speaker) BASE (British Academic Corpus of Spoken English) corpus. Most frequent same-speaker content key word repetition occurred in the ELFA data twice and a half as much as in the BASE data on average considering relative frequencies. No differences were found as for repetition use, which mostly displayed explicating and emphasizing functions in both corpora.

Occurrence of extra repetition in the ELFA data as compared to the BASE data shows the need for high levels of clarity in communicative contexts where interactions take place between speakers of different linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

1. Introduction

It is widely acknowledged that nowadays English is the lingua franca of international communication in both general and professional interaction, and that the number of non-native English speakers has outnumbered that of native speakers (Crystal 2003).

The dominant position of English as the most used language worldwide is particularly evident in academia, «one of the domains which have most eagerly adopted English as their common language in international
communication» (Mauranen 2006a: 146). Graddol (1997: 45) explains the phenomenon of the growing number of courses in universities where English is the language used:

The need to teach some subjects in English, rather than the national language, is well understood: in the sciences, for example, up-to-date text books and research articles are obtainable much more easily in one of the world languages and most readily of all in English.

Serving universities the dual function of teaching and researching institutions, «a powerful impact is exerted by the language of academic publication» (Coleman 2006: 5). From the increasing use of English as the medium of instruction in international higher education stems the largest project on ELF (English as a Lingua Franca) usage in academic contexts, that is the 1 million-word ELFA (English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings) corpus of transcribed spoken academic ELF interactions in several disciplinary domains. ELFA, led by Mauranen at the University of Helsinki, was created with the goal of understanding «how academic discourses work at time when so much of teaching and research is carried out in different countries using English as a lingua franca» (Mauranen 2006a: 147). Several publications were generated based on the ELFA corpus from 2001 to 2014. To mention only some of the latest ones, studies were carried out on organizing formulaic chunks in spoken and written academic ELF (Carey 2013), narrative elements in conference presentations (Mauranen 2013), aspects of lingua franca discourse in academic contexts (Mauranen 2014), the negotiation of acceptability and correctness in lingua franca interaction (Hynninen 2013), and verb-syntactic features in English as a lingua franca (Ranta 2013).

Of the most relevant features in spoken ELF communication, repetition has been shown to play an important role in serving a wide range of functions, including enhancing clarity and making discourse more effective (Kaur 2009; 2012), and contributing to social cohesion (Mauranen 2010).

A still neglected field of investigation within ELF studies on repetition is medical discourse, despite the proliferation of medical research output in the English language and the growing number of EMP (English for Medical Purposes) literacy programs.

This paper explores – from both a quantitative and qualitative perspective – the use of repetition of the most frequent same-speaker content key word as found in a medical subcorpus of speech events made up of lectures and included in the medical section of the ELFA corpus. Central to the study is that previous research on repetition has highlighted that differences between NS (Native Speaker) and NNS (Non-Native Speaker) exchange do not basically seem to consist of the type of repetition identified but of the fundamental role it plays in enhancing understanding and negotiating knowledge in a lingua franca context, as well as of a higher pervasiveness in
ELF speakers’ interactions compared to those in NS speech. In this respect Kaur (2009: 72) states:

While repetition performs a range of functions in non-native speaker discourse, not unlike those in native speaker conversation, of particular interest is its role in ‘facilitating and enhancing intersubjective intercultural understanding’ (Neil 1996: 124). That repetition has been found ‘to be most noticeable in situations in which speakers are least likely to share a linguistic variety’ (Johnstone, 1987: 205), suggests that it has a crucial role to play in the negotiation of meaning and understanding in a lingua franca context.

Thus, the starting hypothesis here is that, given the pedagogical nature of the medical subcorpus investigated and its ELF encounters, not only repetition is expected to be pervasive in the data for didactic purposes, but extra repetition is likely to be located too as the NNS subcorpus is compared to a medical academic corpus of NS encounters.

The choice for ELF spoken academic medical discourse as a ground where investigating key word repetition basically stems from three main interrelated factors. First, the close relationship between the language of science and English, with medical English being a highly influential field of discourse (Gotti & Salager-Meyer 2006: 10-11); second, the deep impact of the language of academia in that «it is international, mobile and thoroughly dependent on cooperation across national borders and internationally negotiated standards, especially in science, where cutting edge research teams operate in several countries and recruit from anywhere in the world» (Mauranen 2010: 7); third, the status of English as a global lingua franca of international communication. In this regard, lingua franca English is the «English most widely used for scientific and scholarly pursuits, and as it comprises the spoken mode, it is where the language can be expected to undergo particularly fast change» (Mauranen 2010: 7).

1.1. Previous research on repetition in NS and NNS discourse

Much of the research previously carried out on repetition focused on the various functions it serves in NS everyday conversation. Johnstone (1994: 6) provides a wide range of functions served by repetition:

Repetition functions didactically, playfully, emotionally, expressively, ritualistically: repetition can be used for emphasis or iteration, clarification, confirmation; it can incorporate foreign words into a language, in couplets, serving as a resource for enriching the language […] repetition can be bridging device in conversation, a way of dealing with an interruption, or a way of validating what another speaker has said. Repetition is a persuasive device. It is one of the primary forms of play.

Tannen (2007: 64), who states that «it would be hubris (and hopeless) to attempt to illustrate every form and function of repetition», classifies
the purposes «simultaneously» served by repetition under four main
categories, namely production, comprehension, connection, and interaction
(Tannen 2007: 58). As a production tool, repetition is a more efficient and
energy-saving communication strategy. It allows a speaker to obtain a
frame for new information so that s/he is not obliged to newly formulate it.
As for comprehension, the main function of repetition is a consequence of
that served for production, that is a better comprehension of the information
on the recipient’s part as a result of a semantically less dense discourse. As
far as connection is concerned, Tannen (2007: 60) draws on Halliday and
Hasan (1976) taxonomy of cohesive devices including repetition as serving
a referential and tying function. Finally, on the interactional level,
repetition serves several functions, including keeping the floor, stalling,
persuasion, linking one speaker’s ideas to another’s, ratifying another’s
contributions, providing back-channelling, and including in an interaction a
person who did not hear a previous utterance.

All the above-mentioned functions make repetition play a fundamental role
in oral communication because «it not only ties parts of discourse to other
parts, but it bonds participants to the discourse and to each other, linking
individual speakers in a conversation and in relationships» (Tannen 2007: 61).
Most importantly, Tannen investigation highlights the ultimate function of
repetition as a result of the congruence of production, comprehension,
connection and interaction, that is the accomplishment of interpersonal
involvement. Repeating words, sentences and phrases may serve several
functions, such as showing acceptance of others’ utterances, giving evidence of
one’s own participation, showing one’s response to another’s utterance, etc.
repetition and other-speaker repetition (or allo-repetition). The latter plays an
equally important role as same speaker’s in the negotiation of knowledge and
mutual understanding, and «act as a device to signal agreement, rapport and
even surprise or disbelief».

Studies have also been carried out on repetition in NS institutional
discourse. Barton (1999), for example, investigates the multiple functions
of the repeated use of slogans and sayings in the discourse of a support
examine the repetitions in the discourse of a learner of Portuguese in three
different institutional settings and found out that the functions of repetition
observed differed across settings both quantitatively and qualitatively.

As far as studies on ELF interactions are concerned, an extensive analysis
of repetition is given by Kaur (2009), who distinguishes several functions as
for both same-speaker and other-speaker repetition. Her repertoire includes all
functions aimed at preventing misunderstandings and establishing or re-
establishing shared understanding. In another work by Kaur (2012), the scholar
focuses on self-repetition in ELF talk (in an academic setting) as for its
function in enhancing clarity. The analysis shows that ELF speakers use
several strategies, for example parallel phrasing, combined repetition and repaired repetition, in order to increase recipient understanding. Lichtkoppler (2007) identifies three types of repetition with reference to the scale of fixity: exact repetition, repetition with variation, and paraphrasing. Cogo (2009) analyses other-repetition in ELF exchange and identifies several functions, two of which are maintaining rhythmic synchrony and showing alignment with the speaker of the original utterance. Björkman (2010) distinguishes three subcategories of repetition, namely, repetition for emphasis, repetition caused by disfluencies (which is not considered a strategy), and repetition of others’ utterances.

Mauranen (2012: 220) arises the question whether repetition is a phenomenon of spoken interaction in general, or whether it is a communicative strategy used to enhance understanding between different lingua cultural speakers. She maintains that much self repetition and paraphrasing is occasioned by normal contingencies of spoken interaction, in which ELF is no different from any other kind of speaking […]. But in addition to making themselves clear and their points comprehensible to their interlocutors, speakers also actively engage with each other and use repetition as a resource for achieving this.

1.2. Self-repetition in ELF interaction

Repetition can be classified using different functional and formal criteria (cf. Tannen 2007). Relevant to the study of same-speaker most frequent key word repetition in ELF communication is its classification according to who performs the practice, i.e. the same speaker or the other speaker / recipient (Kaur 2009).

In an ELF setting, same-speaker repetition provides the recipient with another opportunity to hear and understand the prior utterance while other-speaker repetition is designed to elicit confirmation of the recipient’s understanding of the prior utterance or further clarification to facilitate understanding (Kaur 2009: 74).

As Kaur (2009: 74-75) observes, in same-speaker repetition it is the current speaker who «recycles» all or part of the ongoing turn or some preceding turn. In an ELF setting, repeats by the same speaker are generally performed to ensure the effectiveness of communication. Thus the speaker repeats all or part of a turn «to both enhance and secure recipient understanding after the display of a (possible) problem of understanding on the part of the recipient».

In Kaur (2012) work on the role of repetition in enhancing clarity in English as a lingua franca talk, four types of same-speaker repetition displayed to accomplish the lingua-cultural diversity are identified in an international academic setting, namely parallel phrasing, key word(s)
repetition, combined repetition, and repaired repetition. These practices revealed to be fundamental in the negotiation of meaning and in mutual understanding in an ELF context.

Finally, in both NS and NNS previous studies, repetition has also been classified according to the dichotomy intentionality / unintentionality. Unintentional repetition, which Mauranen (2006b) refers to as «involuntary repetition», typically includes repeats of a single item (e.g. the the the), and self-repairs (e.g. that occurs when), while intentional repetition, also referred to by Biber et al. (1999) as «deliberate repetition», includes lexical repetition and rhetorical repetition. The former, in particular, is considered a very important feature in pedagogical encounters as it may influence the way students perceive lectures (Kim et al. 2001). Intentional repetition is used as a «cohesive device speakers use to help listeners with the clarity of their message, as well as a rhetorical device to emphasize, intensify, and stress parallelisms and correlations. Listeners use repetition as a support for memory and comprehensions» (Suviinitti 2012: 155-156). Moreover, repetition can also be immediate or delayed according to the intervening material that separates the occurrences of the repeated items. In immediate repetition an item is repeated close to its occurrence, while delayed repetition is displayed when some intervening material separates the repeated items.

1.3. Same-speaker key word repetition

Kaur (2012: 602) describes same-speaker key word repetition as a common practice, in ELF talk, that «involves the recycling of a lexical item(s) oriented to by the speaker as crucial for purposes of understanding the message or idea being put across». She suggests that key word repetition allows the speaker to foreground and give relevance to those items considered central in the understanding process. In an ELF interaction context, where speakers do not share a linguistic variety, key word recycling plays an important role as «it works effectively to narrow down the range of items to those considered crucial in attaining the communicative goal» (Kaur 2012: 603).

2. Description of the corpus and methodology

The corpus used for the investigation of the most frequent same-speaker content keyword repetition in spoken academic medical discourse is represented by the 31,153-word subcorpus of academic medical lectures drawn from the 100,135-word medical section of the 1 million-word ELFA corpus. The ELFA medical section is made up of 17 speech events, both monologic and polylogic. Of the monologic events, lectures are in all five.
The corpus was searched for occurrences of the most frequent key word repetition in each lecture, and quantitative data were given, accompanied by some extracts illustrating how the repetition is used. Moreover, in order to understand if extra repetition occurred in the subcorpus as a possible result of the ELF context where the encounters took place, medical data in the ELFA corpus were compared with those included in a 44,155-word subcorpus of 5 randomly selected lectures from the NS academic medical speech from the BASE (British Academic Corpus of Spoken English) corpus. To the purpose of this study, it was considered appropriate to select the same number of speech events for the NS BASE subcorpus as those in the ELFA medical subcorpus\(^1\). The computation of most frequent key word repetition took into account lexical items in both their singular and plural forms. Moreover, search for key word repetition distinguished immediate repetition and delayed repetition in each lecture. Following Suvininnty (2012) model, as three to four topics were mostly discussed in the lectures, criteria for defining the frame for immediate and delayed repetition considered one to five intervening words between the repeated items for immediate repetition, and a limit of twenty intervening items for delayed repetition.

Intensive reading of the texts of both corpora was carried out, supported by a quantitative analysis performed by means of WordSmith (5.0) concordancing software.

3. Results

3.1. Quantitative analysis

The results of the search for same-speaker most frequent key word repetition in ELFA medical section corpus of lectures are illustrated in Table 1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Most frequent Keyword</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
<th>Key word repetitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ULEC23A</td>
<td>Cell biology</td>
<td>membrane</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Immediate: (A)=7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delayed: (B)=8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULEC23B</td>
<td>Cell biology</td>
<td>twinfilin/s</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Immediate: (A)=10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delayed: (B)=15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULEC150</td>
<td>Neurology</td>
<td>cell/s</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>Immediate: (A)=18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delayed: (B)=76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULEC130</td>
<td>Genetics</td>
<td>hearing</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Immediate: (A)=7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delayed: (B)=19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULEC180</td>
<td>Neurology</td>
<td>oscillation/s</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Immediate: (A)=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delayed: (B)=7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>482</td>
<td>Immediate: (A)=45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delayed: (B)=125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: (A)+(B)=170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Henceforth the terms subcorpus/subcorpora will be replaced by corpus/corpora for convenience.
As can be seen in Table 1, repetition of most frequent key word in the five ELFA lectures occurred once every two hundred words on average in texts, and was mostly displayed in the delayed repetition type, accounting for 73.5% of total repetitions, while immediate repetition accounted for 26.5%. Moreover, the delayed repetition type occurred 2.7 times on average every immediate repetition.

In order to understand if key word repetition could be considered pervasive in the ELFA corpus, the same analysis was carried out for the BASE lecture corpus. The results are shown in Table 2 below:

Table 2 – Occurrences of most frequent same-speaker key word repetitions in BASE 44,155-word lecture data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Most frequent Keyword</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
<th>Immediate (A)</th>
<th>Delayed (B)</th>
<th>Key word repetitions (A)+(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0018</td>
<td>Cell biology</td>
<td>endemicity</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0028</td>
<td>Nephrology</td>
<td>stone/s</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0037</td>
<td>Infectivology</td>
<td>virus</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0032</td>
<td>Nephrology</td>
<td>diabetes</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>Infectivology</td>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>340</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Repetition of most frequent key word in the BASE lectures occurred once every five hundred words on average in the five texts investigated, and was mostly displayed in the delayed repetition type, accounting for 79.8% of total repetitions, while immediate repetition accounted for 20.2%. The delayed repetition type occurred 3.9 times on average every immediate repetition.

The comparison between the two corpora considering relative frequencies resulted in overall key word repetition occurring in the ELFA data twice and a half as much as in the data on average (0.5% / 0.2%). As for types, immediate repetition and delayed repetition occurred in ELFA, respectively, twice as much (0.1%/0.05%), and 2.7 times (0.4%/0.15%) as much as in the BASE data on average.

Results evidenced a higher level of pervasiveness of most frequent key word repetition in the ELFA data than that in the BASE data.

3.2. Qualitative analysis

As far as qualitative analysis is concerned, there were no differences in the manner of lexical repetition use between the two corpora. Extracts below, drawn respectively from the ELFA corpus (ULEC 23B and ULEC 130) and
the BASE corpus (0018 and 0028) lectures, illustrate how lexical repetition is used in corresponding data:

(1)
1 L: [...] the actin erm tail just grow in every direction and form these weird shapes but then when you add twinfilin it is
2 actually the tails start to look normal and the beads start to move again so twinfilin can replace the capper in this in this
3 minimum medium and here’s to show that er most twinfilin does this but yeast and drosophila twinfilin don’t rescue this
4 movement, so we have found the function of twinfilin which needs these both both of these domains [...]
(ULEC 23 B) (cell biology lecture about twinfilin, a binding protein conserved from yeast to mammals)

(2)
1 L: [...] there are also syndromic forms and many other genes are responsible for that i will not go into that er but for the
2 non-syndromic forms so the pure hearing impairment er we know many different genes and these er genes lead to a very
3 similar phenotype so the hearing impairment in in many cases is very similar or even indistinguishable the different genes
4 can er can cause it and hearing impairment is one of the erm, i think most extreme examples of what we call genetic
5 heterogeneity [...]
(ULEC 130) (genetics lecture about hearing-related injuries)

As can be seen, the term twinfilin in extract 1 is used several times in the passage, precisely 4 times, and since it refers to the main topic of the speech, it is repeated as many as 53 times in the lecture (2 of which in plural form). The repetition of twinfilin and its explicitation over and over helps students memorize the term in question and focus attention on the crucial topic at hand.

The same can be said for extract 2, where the repetition of hearing, in the key word list occurring 100 times in the lecture, emphasizes the main issue of the speech. Moreover, the repetition of the term in line 4 brings back the referential precision and clarity that the use of anaphoric it two tokens before had temporarily obscured. Furthermore, what is of particular interest in extract 2 is the association of hearing with impairment; the latter represents the main collocate for hearing, occurring 45 times with it in the lecture. The occurrence of hearing + impairment, besides highlighting the key topic of the lecture, also helps acquire the exact, precise expression used in medicine when referring to «a reduction in the ability to perceive sound ranging from slight inability to complete deafness» (Farlex Medical Dictionary 2012).

The functions identified in the ELFA data can also be found in the manner of lexical repetition use in the BASE data:
(3)
1 L: [...] you’re going to potentially have different epidemiological scenarios high or low endemicity in the same country
2 yeah if if this is right there is no reason why we shouldn’t have high endemicity in the U-K yeah the only reason we don’t
3 have high endemicity is because we don’t have high endemicity [...] (0018) (cell biology lecture about hepatitis B)

Here, too, repetition of the most frequent key word, occurring 48 times in the lecture, serves the function of orientating the recipient’s attention to what is crucial in the message being put across, in the specific case the juxtapose between low endemicity and high endemicity. The second repetition of high endemicity in line 3, in particular, is used emphatically to intensify the concept that hepatitis B does not show high levels of endemic characteristics in the UK, and is also used to highlight one of the aspects of the disease in question from an epidemiological point of view, that is just its being or not restricted to a particular area or region.

Finally, extract 4 below illustrates how repetition helps the speaker make focus on the crucial concept to be conveyed in the speech. The lecturer (L) has just showed an x-ray and asked the students to describe what the image shows; one of them (S) has replied the image shows kidney stones:

(4)
1 L: [...] what makes you say they’re kidney stones
2 S: they’re calcified
3 L: okay so they’re calcified in fact most kidney stones are calcified how many kidney stones are calcified guess calculate a guess if you don’t know [...] (0028) (nephrology lecture about kidney stones)

In extract 4, stone is the most crucial item of the speech, as evidenced by its many occurrences (117) in the lecture. The repetition of stone in association with calcified, which is repeated twice by the lecturer in line 3, serves the function of explicating and clarifying calcification as a characteristic of stones, thus orientating students to immediately identify stones through the association stones / calcification. Similarly, later on in the same lecture:

1 L: what percentage of stones are urate stones
2 S: two per cent
3 L: about seven per cent [...] (0028) (nephrology lecture about kidney stones)

The repetition of stones in line 1 allows the lecturer to introduce and highlight another characteristic of kidney stones, i.e. that a specific percentage of them exists being urate, thus focusing on the classification of kidney stones into different types according to their chemical composition.

As can be seen from extracts 1 to 4, the use of key word repetition basically displays explicating and emphasizing functions in both corpora, resulting in orientating the recipient’s attention to what is considered crucial in the message being put across.
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4. Conclusions

The investigation of key word repetition in the ELFA medical corpus of lectures confirmed the initial hypothesis according to which repetition was expected to be pervasive in a context of pedagogical encounters, and that extra repetition was likely to occur as a possible result of the ELF linguistic context. From the comparison of medical data in the ELFA corpus used as a target corpus and those in the BASE corpus used as a reference corpus, pervasiveness of most frequent key word repetition was higher in the former. However, it is quite challenging to define whether the higher level of pervasiveness of the phenomenon found in the ELFA data be due to its ELF setting. Quantitative results may suggest that occurrence of extra repetition in the ELFA data be probably motivated by the need for more clarity than that required in an NS context such as BASE. From a qualitative perspective, functions served by key word repetition use were basically identical, first and foremost that of explicating and emphasizing the specific topic at hand.

It is worth underlining that most of the repeated words included in the corpus investigated are monoreferential. Medical terms – as well as specialised terms in other discourse fields – usually have a precise unique meaning, universally accepted by the scientific community, and cannot be substituted by a synonym without causing a change in meaning too. Likewise, expressions cannot be altered in their constituents. The term “impairment”, for example, found in the noun phrase hearing impairment in the ELFA data, cannot be substituted with damage, inability, deficiency, or injury (unless these terms are used to provide a definition), as ambiguity would be generated in the immediate identification of its exact meaning when found in association with hearing. The same can be said for high and low, in high endemicity and low endemicity in the BASE data, where only high and low are the exact precise terms when referring to the level of diffusion of a pathological condition, as well as endemicity itself cannot be replaced by a synonym without necessarily generating a change in the referent too. Therefore, if on the one hand, in a pedagogical medical academic setting, word lexical repetition is a deliberate strategy to draw the recipient’s attention to a specific issue, on the other hand it is also the consequence of compliance with medical discourse-related conventions adopted by specialists to avoid phenomena of referential ambiguity, which may result in lack of successful communication, whatever the linguistic context.

2. For the concept of monoreferentiality in specialised discourse, see Gotti 1991, p. 17. For phenomena of violation of rules in the word-formation process of specialised terminology, with particular reference to synonymy in medical language, see Gotti 1991, pp. 36-37.
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