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2 Introduction

In light of the increasing importance and establishment of global communication, the study of language acquisition grows ever more relevant. A substantial subcomponent of the study of language acquisition is the study of transfer, which in itself is not a new field at all, having traversed the path from controversy to recognition over the course of more than a century (Odlin 1989: chapter 2; Jarvis & Pavlenko 2008: 8-13). However, little of the research on this topic has been explanatory in nature, as the majority of transfer studies have been descriptive in focus (Jarvis & Pavlenko 2008: preface). Insight into the causes and principles underlying transfer would nonetheless have many applications, not least in language education.

As transfer constitutes a speaker’s projection of features of one language onto another, research on the topic necessarily involves the study of structural differences between specific languages. Nevertheless, another field of study that has received quite some attention over the last decades is that of linguistic universals, features that are supposed to be inherent to all languages (e.g. Greenberg 1973). A specific approach to the topic of linguistic universals consists of the use of semantic maps, spatial representations of a supposedly language-independent alignment of grammatical functions showing how these functions may be expressed and how their manners of expression may evolve (Haspelmath 2003: 215-218 & 233-237). Yet, another value of the semantic-map method may be its potential usefulness in explaining how and why transfer between languages occurs.

This paper presents the investigation of the applicability of semantic maps to the description, explanation, and ultimately the prediction of transfer and the ways in which it occurs. More precisely, it deals with the phenomenon of transfer in relation to the use of indefinite pronouns in English by native speakers of Spanish. Key resources in this investigation will be the work Indefinite Pronouns (1997) by Martin Haspelmath, which provides ample information regarding the application of semantic maps to indefinite pronouns, and the Written Corpus of Learner English (2010), a corpus assembled by Paul Rollinson as part of a project supervised by Amaya Mendikoetxea. Comparison of the ways in which the functional scopes of indefinite pronouns in Spanish and English respectively encompass the functions on the semantic map of this word type should show the functional associations native speakers of Spanish might establish between Spanish and English indefinite pronouns. This should in turn produce a hypothetical model of transfer from Spanish to English with respect to indefinite pronouns, which could then be tested by analysing the uses of indefinite pronouns in the corpus. The results of these tests should ultimately provide an indication of the applicability of semantic maps to the study of transfer.
The literature on which this investigation was based will be reviewed in chapter 3, while chapter 4 will outline the resources and methods employed in the research process and the different steps it comprised. The results and their implications will be discussed in chapter 5. Finally, the conclusions that can be drawn from this investigation will be presented in chapter 6.
3 Literature study

In this chapter, various notions that are essential to the investigation will be defined. First of all, it is specified what exactly is understood by the concept of transfer. In addition, an overview of semantic-map theory and some of its applications will be provided. Furthermore, a definition of indefinite pronouns will be given, with particular attention to their specific forms in English and Spanish. The decision to discuss these last two concepts in this order is motivated by the fact that both the semantic-map method and the employed definition of indefinite pronouns were based on those presented by Martin Haspelmath, who used the aforementioned method to acquire this definition.

3.1 Transfer

3.1.1 Principal observations

To investigate the phenomenon of transfer in any way, it must logically be specified what exactly is understood by this concept. In Crosslinguistic Influence in Language and Cognition (2008), Scott Jarvis and Aneta Pavlenko emphasize the many stages which the research, and, accordingly, the definitions of transfer or cross-linguistic influence have traversed, ranging from high degrees of scepticism regarding the concept to its general recognition (2008: 4-13). Naturally, the term cross-linguistic influence is self-explanatory, but it provides little specification of its features or the ways in which it occurs. However, Jarvis and Pavlenko highlight certain discoveries that revealed some of the most important aspects of transfer (2008: 11-13), which can be summarized as follows:

1) transfer, cross-linguistic influence or CLI may both lead to erroneous and correct outcomes in the language being influenced, also known as the recipient language;

2) transfer may influence not only the speed and success with which a language learner may acquire their target language, but also the way in which they do so. Native speakers of different languages acquiring the same second language, or L2, may acquire the same L2 structure in different ways due to influence from their respective mother tongues;

3) differences between one’s first language, or L1, and the L2 they are trying to learn do not always hinder their learning process, and may in fact aid it, as such differences are sometimes obvious enough to alert language learners to their existence and may prevent confusion of similar L1 and L2 constructions;

---

1 Different sources present different spellings of the term cross-linguistic. When used freely, the spelling featuring a hyphen is preferred throughout this paper.
4) the amount of cross-linguistic influence a language learner experiences is not inversely proportional to their level of proficiency in the target language, as specific forms of transfer may be linked to specific stages of language acquisition;

5) it is not only a language learner’s L1 that exerts influence over their L2. Language learners who speak several languages may transfer features from any of their previously acquired languages into their target language and even vice versa, which is called reverse transfer;

6) the probability that specific forms of transfer occur is determined by various factors, such as the language learner’s age, the perceived typological distance or similarity between the languages the language learner knows and the one they are trying to acquire, the perceived extent to which the language learner considers the affected language structures to be specific to the recipient language, and the connections between language transfer and general principles of development and learning;

7) transfer affects not only language forms, but also meanings, functions, and language use;

8) Different individuals may realize transfer in different ways, even if they are native speakers of the same language, due to various personal factors such as aptitude and sentiments.

An additional observation of considerable importance is that ‘[l]inguistic transfer in most cases arises from interlingual associations between structures (e.g. words) in two or more languages’ (Jarvis & Pavlenko 2008: 82). These associations may either be established at the level of word forms, the lexical lemma, or the conceptual level (82). This observation is easily connected to the previously introduced notion that speakers of different languages acquiring the same target language may do so in different ways.

3.1.2 Classifications

Another author who has made important contributions to the study of transfer is Terence Odlin, who underlines several important notions concerning the phenomenon in *Language Transfer: Cross-Linguistic Influence in Language Learning* (1989) and has influenced Jarvis and Pavlenko considerably.

An important remark in Odlin’s work is that a linguistic structure can only be regarded as such if it consists of a particular form connected to a specific function, the two of which together constitute a so-called tagmeme (1989: 31). This is in correspondence to the idea that both language forms and their functions are subject to transfer. Another crucial point Odlin addresses is the difficulty of predicting the way in which transfer will occur, which he attempts to diminish by means of a classification of the possible outcomes processes of transfer may produce (35-41), summarized here:

1) Positive transfer, or transfer producing correct structures in the affected language

---

2) **Negative transfer**, or transfer producing errors in the affected language, which can be classified in various ways:
   a) **Underproduction**, which is a relatively low frequency of use of a particular recipient language structure by language learners due to a lower frequency of occurrence of the analogous structure in their native language;
   b) **Overproduction**, which is a relatively high frequency of use of a particular recipient language structure by language learners due to a higher frequency of occurrence of the analogous structure in their native language, or may be a consequence of underproduction, as the limited employment of the linguistic resources affected by underproduction create a functional vacuum subsequently filled up by overproduction;
   c) **Production errors**, which may take the forms of substitutions, or simply the direct use of source language structures in the recipient language, calques, which are errors in the recipient language that very closely resemble source language structures, and alterations of structures, which often consist of failed attempts to avoid native-language influences in the recipient language;
   d) **Misinterpretation** of recipient language structures due to source language influence;

3) **Differing lengths of acquisition** of a target language determined by various factors, such as the net sum of all instances of negative transfer a certain language learner experiences, the typological distance between previously acquired languages and the target language, and possibly the number of languages the language learner has already acquired.

In turn, Jarvis and Pavlenko further elaborate on the different types of transfer that can be distinguished, focusing on their linguistic properties in addition to their outcomes, as shown in table 3.1. The aspects of transfer they recognize complement some of those distinguished by Odlin. First of all, Jarvis and Pavlenko’s model clarifies that ‘language structures’ affected by transfer may belong to all areas of language knowledge. Moreover, they provide a more fine-grained terminology for types of transfer that differ with regard to the order in which the languages involved were acquired and the roles these languages play in the process of transfer. Their definition of **forward transfer** covers any instance of transfer in which a previously acquired language influences a subsequently acquired or not yet fully mastered language, regardless of whether the source language is the speaker’s native language or not. Conversely, **reverse transfer** refers to influence from any language on a previously acquired language. **Lateral transfer**, then, specifically denotes transfer between post-L1 languages regardless of their inherent order of acquisition, and **bidirectional transfer** means reciprocal influence between languages (Jarvis & Pavlenko 2008: 21-22).
A further important distinction is the one between lexical and semantic transfer. Whereas lexical transfer is purely based on word forms in the recipient language and the source language, semantic transfer is based on the meanings of lexical items (Jarvis & Pavlenko 2008: 21). Recognition of the fact that transfer may occur at either the linguistic or conceptual cognitive level (Jarvis & Pavlenko 2008: 22-23) is easily connected to Odlin’s notion that language forms and functions combine into unities (1989: 31). Additionally, the observation that transfer may either be productive or receptive (Jarvis & Pavlenko 2008: 24) conforms to Odlin’s distinction between kinds of transfer that affect language production and those that affect language interpretation. More importantly, Odlin represents receptive transfer as a subtype of negative transfer, whereas Jarvis and Pavlenko do not, thereby implicitly recognizing the existence of positive receptive transfer, or correct interpretations of recipient language structures thanks to knowledge of source language structures. Jarvis and Pavlenko’s distinction of transfer through either aural or visual channels (2008: 24) and in either verbal or nonverbal form (25) can of course be linked to their classification of transfer by area of language knowledge and use (21). Finally, their acknowledgment of the possible difference between overt and covert transfer should be noted, as it separates transfer based on perceived relations between the source language and the recipient language from transfer based on discrepancies between the source language and the recipient language. Nonetheless, they do not actively employ this distinction, as it has not been empirically researched (25).

3 Throughout this paper, the term target language is used to refer to languages speakers are trying to acquire in general, while the term recipient language specifically denotes languages whose usage is influenced by transfer.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of language knowledge/ use</th>
<th>Phonological</th>
<th>Orthographic</th>
<th>Lexical</th>
<th>Semantic</th>
<th>Morphological</th>
<th>Syntactic</th>
<th>Discursive</th>
<th>Pragmatic</th>
<th>Sociolinguistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directionality</td>
<td>Forward</td>
<td>Reverse</td>
<td>Lateral</td>
<td>Bi- or multi-directional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive level</td>
<td>Linguistic</td>
<td>Conceptual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of knowledge</td>
<td>Implicit</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionality</td>
<td>Intentional</td>
<td>Unintentional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>Productive</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel</td>
<td>Aural</td>
<td>Visual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Nonverbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manifestation</td>
<td>Overt</td>
<td>Covert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1. The classifications of transfer. Adapted from Jarvis & Pavlenko 2008: 20, table 1.2.

### 3.2 The semantic-map method

#### 3.2.1 Theoretical background

Before the possibility of applying the semantic-map method to the phenomenon of transfer is tested, the specifics of the method itself must be established. In “The Geometry of Grammatical
Meaning: Semantic Maps and Cross-Linguistics Comparison”, Martin Haspelmath states that the model of semantic maps, also known as implicational maps, mainly seeks to solve theoretical problems surrounding the idea of multifunctionality of grammatical morphemes or grams (2003: 211). More specifically, Haspelmath claims that the model resolves the oppositions between three different theoretical viewpoints in relation to the functions of grammatical morphemes, namely the “monosemist” position which is based on the proposition that each gram has a single meaning that is specified by context of use, the “polysemist” position which is centred around the idea that a single gram has multiple, interrelated meanings that manifest as different uses, and the “homonymist” position which also recognizes that a grammatical morpheme may have multiple uses, but views the corresponding meanings as completely unrelated and as such effectively considers each particular use of a gram as a different lexeme (2003: 212). By focusing on the exact functions of morphemes rather than their lexical meanings, Haspelmath attempts to transcend these theoretical differences. In *Indefinite Pronouns* (1997), he elaborates that ‘every grammatical category can have several uses. Whenever two roughly comparable categories in two languages turn out to differ in one type of environment or meaning, this is sufficient for setting up a separate use’ (1997: 61). These uses, then, are also referred to as functions, and are represented visually in the form of a diagram in which each function has a certain position relative to that of the other functions that can be expressed by means of grammatical morphemes. The spatial relations between different functions represent their internal relations in the sense that spatial proximity corresponds to semantic proximity and spatial distance equals semantic distance. Specific grams are visualized as areas on the map and literally cover particular functions, and as such the extents of their meanings, or functional scopes, are shown. Haspelmath motivates this method of representation in greater detail:

The leading idea of the semantic-map method is that multifunctionality of a gram occurs only when the various functions of the gram are similar. (This presupposes, of course, that accidental homonymy, where formally identical elements have unrelated meanings, can be distinguished from polysemy in some way.) Similarity is expressed topologically by closeness of nodes in representational space, which metaphorically can be thought of as mapping the possibilities of meaning, or “semantic/conceptual space”. For the sake of clarity, closeness is formally shown not only by spatial adjacency, but also by a straight connecting line.

(2003: 215-216)

This description generates the depiction shown in figure 3.1, in which the topmost map differs from the bottom one with respect to the degree of similarity between their respective functions. Whereas the former represents functions 1, 2 and 3 as equally related and function 4 as being more closely related to function 3 than to functions 1 and 2, the latter displays equal similarity between
functions 1, 3 and 4 while function 2 is shown to be more similar to function 3 than to the other functions.

Figure 3.1. Two semantic maps. Adapted from Haspelmath 2003: 216, Fig. 8.3.

### 3.2.2 Creation and uses

As the semantic-map method presupposes that grammatical morphemes fulfil specific functions that can be arranged into a specific alignment, it requires a mode of distinguishing these. For this purpose, cross-linguistic research is employed. Each function that, after comparison of a large number of languages, is found to be represented differently in at least two of these languages is included on the map. By looking for an arrangement of functions that allows each multifunctional grammatical morpheme to occupy an undisrupted area on the map while covering all of its functions, the correct spatial representation of grammatical functions can be found (2003: 217). Logically, the larger the number of compared languages is, the more specifically different functions can be mapped out, as a larger sample of languages will likely provide more contrasts between the lexico-morphological representation of particular functions and will consequently decrease the number of possible arrangements that allow multifunctional grams from every examined language to be represented by contiguous areas covering sets of multiple functions. Therefore, the semantic-map method will overtime yield an arrangement of functions that would theoretically approximate a universal model, and which could accordingly be used to predict the way in which any given language will express certain functions. Haspelmath remarks that ‘[e]xperience shows that it generally sufficient to look at a dozen genealogically diverse languages to arrive at a stable map that does not undergo significant change as more languages are considered’ (217), and a semantic map supported by sufficient data will thus provide implicational universals. For instance, if the map in figure 3.2 has been found to be the only one that allows its functions to be covered by contiguous areas representing grammatical morphemes from every language involved in their arrangement, that order must logically be correct, and consequently have implications such as “if a particular gram in a particular language is found to have functions 1 and 4, it must necessarily also have functions 2 and 3”.
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3.2.3 Implicational directionality

In “the Geometry of Grammatical Meaning”, Haspelmath highlights not only the potential usefulness of semantic maps to the description of synchronic grammatical relations, but also indicates that they may even serve as a model for diachronic change (2003: 233-237). This use of semantic maps is strongly related to the notion that grammatical morphemes must always cover a contiguous area on the map, as this also implies that extension of the functional scope of a particular gram must follow the order of the functions in representational space (233). Haspelmath moreover expresses a strong suspicion that processes of functional extension may only occur in one direction on the implicational map, citing the universal directionality of processes of grammaticalization from concrete to abstract meanings among other examples (232). The idea that language change would in principle follow such a route, also known as a slope (234), is in harmony with the implicational nature of semantic maps. Although diachronic language change is of little importance in the current context, the observation that changes in the functional scope of grammatical morphemes are unidirectional may be relevant to the investigation of transfer, as will be explained in greater detail in chapter 4.

The term “implicational directionality” should not be confused with the notion of directionality shown in table 3.1, which indicates which of the languages that a particular speaker knows or is acquiring will respectively act as the source language and the recipient language in the process of transfer (Jarvis & Pavlenko 2008: 21-22).

3.3 Indefinite pronouns

3.3.1 Defining criteria

A proper definition of the lexico-grammatical category of indefinite pronouns is a logical requisite for the investigation of the phenomenon of transfer with respect to this word type. Haspelmath defines indefinite pronouns by means of two criteria: on the one hand, their formal aspects are considered, and on the other, attention is given to their functional properties (1997: 10-13). He states that ‘typological work presupposes cross-linguistically applicable concepts, so a definition of ‘indefinite pronoun’ that is independent of language-particular properties is provided’ (1997: 1), which means that the definitions given, like the model that generated them, are assumed to suffice universally. Regarding the form of indefinite pronouns, Haspelmath concedes that formally speaking, pronouns are not easily recognizable as such in every language. However, he views their ability to replace other lexical items as a universal feature of pronouns, and as such also includes lexical items that can be used as substitutes for adjectives, adverbs and verbs in this category. Additionally, indefinite determiners are included, even though determiners do not normally serve to replace other
items. Haspelmath motivates this choice with the statement that it is a common practice in traditional grammar and, more importantly, remarks that determiners and pronouns have similar functional aspects (1997:11), which will be discussed shortly. In other words, pronouns are viewed here as elements replacing referents rather than nouns per se.

With regard to function, Haspelmath discusses the notion of indefiniteness and specifies this, quite simply, as the property of having indefinite reference. Consequently, he deviates from traditional grammar by eliminating certain linguistic items that are normally included in the category of indefinite pronouns. These are discussed below with addition of examples from Spanish to the original English ones:

1) **Mid-scalar quantifiers**, such as *few, several and many* in English (1997: 11) and *poco, varios and mucho* in Spanish. The choice to disregard words of this type is motivated by the fact that many of them may be combined with definite articles, thereby cancelling their indefinite reference. For instance, in English one could imagine a construction such as *the many +* (plural noun) (Haspelmath 1997: 11-12), just as Spanish might present constructions such as *los muchos +* (plural noun);

2) **Generic pronouns**, such as English *one*. Haspelmath recognizes that words of this type meet both the predetermined formal and functional criteria, but excludes them because of their very specific properties and functions, which differ from those normally found among indefinite pronouns, and which in many languages are expressed by different means (1997: 12);

3) **Universal quantifiers** like *all and every* in English, as *all* easily combines with the definite article in constructions such as *all the +* (plural noun) and universal quantifiers, due to their universal reference, are inherently definite (1997: 12). This also holds true for Spanish as well, in which *cada and todo* have universal reference, and the latter can combine with the definite article;

4) **Identity pronouns and determiners** such as *other and same*, since these refer to identity or the lack thereof rather than indefiniteness (1997: 11-12). Again, the same discrimination can be applied to analogous items in Spanish such as *otro and mismo*.

Although several objections could be raised to the exclusion of these word types, Haspelmath’s method of investigation must be followed meticulously, since it is his semantic map concerning indefinite pronouns that is being used to research possible instances of transfer regarding this category. The current emphasis lies on possible connections between the semantic-map model and the phenomenon of transfer, which means that adoption of Haspelmath’s exact definition of the indefinite pronouns will generate the most informative results, as it allows the investigation of transfer within the functional scope outlined for this word type in *Indefinite Pronouns*. A definition of
indefinite pronouns that was generated by a semantic map to begin with is judged to be of the greatest value here, since such a definition enables the perception of transfer based on the functions of these grammatical morphemes rather, than the formal word types to which they belong in particular languages.

### 3.3.2 Functions

Having highlighted the set of functions covered by indefinite pronouns as one of their defining criteria, Haspelmath goes on to apply the semantic-map method to define indefinite pronouns within the context of their grammatical functions. Based on a sample of 40 languages, he provides the schematic overview of the typical functional-semantic scope of indefinite pronouns shown in table 3.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Known to speaker</th>
<th>Unknown to speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-specific</td>
<td>Irrealis context</td>
<td>Conditionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard of comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Free choice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2. The primary functional distinctions of indefinite pronouns (based on Haspelmath 1997: 52, Fig. 3.3).

The notion of ‘negative polarity’ introduced in table 3.2 requires some illumination. Haspelmath explains that, besides the overt expression of non-existence, indefinite pronouns may have functions that ‘are compatible with the truth of the corresponding negative clause […] [and] may also occur in quite a few non-negative contexts that only carry a negative implication of some kind’ (1997: 34). He also provides examples of each kind of negative polarity item. A conditional sentence such as ‘If you tell anybody, we’ll punish you’ (1997: 34) might be rephrased as ‘Do no tell anybody, or we will punish you’, just as a question such as ‘Have you heard anything new about the ozone hole?’ (1997: 34) favours the expectation of a negative response. Indeed, one might just as easily ask ‘Have you heard nothing new about the ozone hole?’ or ‘Haven’t you heard anything new about the ozone hole?’, including a formal aspect of negation in the construction. An expression of a standard of comparison of inequality, such as ‘The boy can run faster than anyone in his class’ (Haspelmath 1997: 35 (51 (b))) also elicits a negative interpretation, which might be formally represented in the paraphrase ‘No one in the boy’s class can run as fast as he’. A similar interpretation might even be evoked by an expression of a standard of comparison of equality, such as ‘The boy can run as fast as anyone in his class’ (Haspelmath 1997: 35 (52)), albeit more indirectly.
Another important distinction to be specified is that between ‘direct negation’ and ‘indirect negation’. Haspelmath treats indefinites in contexts of implicitly negative expressions as well as those in contexts of superordinate negation as instances of indirect negation (1997: 33 & 1997: 80). Conversely, contexts in which ‘the indefinite pronoun is an argument of the negated clause’ (Haspelmath 1997: 32) are regarded as instances of direct negation.

Apart from distinguishing the different functions indefinite pronouns may have, Haspelmath’s research also reveals their relative positions and relations on an implicational map, as is shown in figure 3.3.

![Figure 3.3. The functions of indefinite pronoun series on an implicational map (based on Haspelmath 1997: 64, Fig. 4.4).](image)

### 3.3.3 Indefinite pronoun series

When used productively, the functional division shown in figure 3.3 reveals specific lexical items in any language whose indefinite pronouns one might seek to identify. Haspelmath states that in many languages, indefinite pronouns are organized into various series in correspondence to the ontological categories they reflect, such as person, thing, property, place, time, and manner. Furthermore, they are often found to consist of a stem representing this ontological category and a common formal item that shows their membership to the word class of indefinite pronouns or a certain subclass thereof (1997: 21-22). Based on the previously determined functional range and their formal elements, three classes of indefinite pronouns can accordingly be distinguished in English, as represented in table 3.3.
Haspelmath tentatively notes that a fourth series consisting of the stem *ever* and its derivatives, such as *whatever*, might be recognized, as well as a fifth series encompassing the stem *no matter* and its derivatives, such as *no matter what*. However, he does not provide specific details about the uses of these series, and describes them as “marginal” (1997: 65). Due to their doubtful nature and the lack of specific information about their uses, these series will currently be excluded, as their functional scopes must be precisely known in order to assess their behaviour under cross-linguistic influence.

Formal divisions of indefinite pronouns as shown in table 3.3 are of course completely language-specific, and the current purpose of such a division is merely the organisation of English indefinite pronouns into series that allow swift reference during the investigation and enable a clear delineation of their functional ranges. Moreover, it should be noted that the general rule regarding the formal features of indefinite pronouns are not without exception. For instance, Catalan presents various forms whose relation to other lexical items is no longer transparent, such as *ningú* (‘anybody’) and *res* (‘anything’) (Haspelmath 1997: 25). This observation is of particular importance to the identification of indefinite pronouns in Spanish, as will subsequently be discussed in greater detail.

### 3.3.4 An implicational map of English indefinite pronoun series

Haspelmath finally superimposes the main formal pronoun series shown in table 3.3 on the implicational map presented in figure 3.3 (1997: 65), which results in the complete semantic map shown in figure 3.4.
Logically, this map does not account for the differences between reference to persons, things, places and such, but outlines the kinds of indefinite reference expressed by the general series of indefinite pronouns shown in table 3.3.

3.3.5 Distinctions between functions

In spite of its potential usefulness, the kind of model shown in figure 3.4 does not always show the intended function of every instance of every indefinite pronoun. Haspelmath particularly indicates that the distinction between specific and non-specific meanings is not always clear in English (1997: 37). However, he sums up certain tests that may reveal the specificity of an indefinite pronoun: if a noun phrase can be referred to anaphorically, can be paraphrased with an existential sentence, or can be disambiguated by specific determiners, its reference must necessarily be specific, while an instance of an indefinite pronoun that does not meet any of these criteria has indefinite reference (38). Haspelmath adds that ‘in affirmative and declarative sentences in the perfective past or in the ongoing present […] indefinites of the non-specific series are simply unacceptable’ (1997: 39). Specific indefinites, however, are unacceptable in imperatives and questions, since the hearer would not be able to respond appropriately if the speaker knowingly omitted the identity of the referent, which, as Haspelmath remarks, would violate Grice’s cooperative principle (42).

Haspelmath furthermore provides means for the recognition of irrealis contexts: future sentences and indicators of non-indicative modality elicit the irrealis non-specific function, as do affirmative and declarative sentences in the past and present that contain indications of epistemic modality, such as adverbs expressing doubt (1997: 40).

Haspelmath also addresses the use of indefinite pronouns of the some-series in negative sentences (1997: 44). Although the map in figure 3.4 indicates that such constructions are incorrect, the following phrase is acceptable in certain contexts:
‘John did not see something.’

(Adapted from Haspelmath 1997: 44 (93)).

The explanation is that the semantic scope of negation does not include the indefinite pronoun in this sentence. This can also be demonstrated by a paraphrase, which moreover shows that the reference of *something* is specific here (44):

‘There was something John did not see.’

(Adapted from Haspelmath 1997: 44 (94)).

Finally, Haspelmath sheds some light on the matter of the knowledge of the speakers, which distinguishes the specific-known function from the specific-unknown function. He remarks that this matter ‘has received very little attention in the theoretical literature’ (1997: 46). However, he notes that while English has fewer means to express this difference than many other languages, the indefinite determiner *some* always demonstrates inability to identify the referent on the part of the speaker when combined with a singular count noun (47).

### 3.3.6 Spanish indefinite pronouns

Regarding Spanish indefinite pronouns, a distinction quite similar to the one found in English can be made. In *Gramática española 3.2. El pronombre*, José Polo characterizes indefinite pronouns by means of their expressive functions and singles out indefinite reference as their defining feature (1987: 298). He furthermore recognizes two main series of indefinite pronouns based on the semantic values of their members, namely an affirmative and a negative series (Polo 1987: 297-300). Moreover, Polo observes that the form *cualquier(a)* derives its reference from singular nouns that represent the entire class of entities to which their referent belongs, can accordingly act in generalizing expressions, and may be used to refer to things as well as persons (1987: 340-341). As such, *cualquier(a)* communicates indifference towards the selection of any particular member of a class of entities, and the sum of all its forms may therefore be seen as an indefinite pronoun series of its own in the current context. In the interest of easy reference, this series will henceforth be called the indifference series. The application of the ontological categories specified in table 3.3 to the different series leads to the division schematized in table 3.4. Although the distinction between these series is primarily based on semantics, the members of the affirmative and indifference series respectively also present formal relations, as all affirmative indefinite pronouns share the syllable *al-*, and all members of the series of pronouns communicating indifference contain the element *cualquier(a)*. A certain formal similarity between the members of the negative series might also be recognized. However, the Spanish indefinite pronoun paradigm is less specific in its distinction between different ontological categories than its English counterpart. For indefinite reference to place, time or manner, a construction consisting of an indefinite determiner and a noun representing one of these ontological categories, rather than a fully
grammaticalized morpheme, is employed. A similar situation can still be found in English regarding
the negative indefinite pronoun denoting manner, no way, which, unlike its fellow pronouns, is not
spelled as a single word.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Affirmative series</th>
<th>Negative series</th>
<th>Indifference series</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thing:</td>
<td>Algo</td>
<td>Nada</td>
<td>Cualquier(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person:</td>
<td>Alguien</td>
<td>Nadie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time:</td>
<td>Alguno/a(s) (+ noun)</td>
<td>Ninguno/a(s) ( + noun)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manner:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determiner:</td>
<td>Alguno/a(s)</td>
<td>Ninguno/a(s)</td>
<td>Cualquier/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4. The two main series of indefinite pronouns in Spanish (based on Polo 1987: 297-300 and Haspelmath 1997: 21).

3.3.7 An implicational map of Spanish indefinite pronouns series

Apart from the functional aspects derivable from table 3.4, the uses of different Spanish
indefinite pronouns can be established by means of both their description in grammatical compendia
such as Gramática española 3.2 and the translation of the examples of constructions expressing
different functions provided by Haspelmath in Indefinite pronouns. Polo indicates that the members of
the affirmative series leave their referents unspecified or conceptualize them as hypothetical. He also
directly states that they may be used to refer to entities that are at least partially unknown (1987: 300-
301). These uses can easily be described in the Haspelmath’s terminology as the specific known,
specific unknown and irrealis non-specific functions. It should be noted that grammatical morphemes
realizing the specific-known function do not always communicate the identity of the referent to the
hearer, but are used when the speaker is aware of its identity, wants to indicate that its identity can be
asserted, or when the context demands that the referent should be identifiable (Haspelmath 1997: 37-
41).

Regarding the negative series, Polo remarks that, when placed after the verb, its members
evoke the use of the particle no before that same verb (1987: 305-306). Although it might sometimes
seem as if the causal relation is actually the opposite, meaning that the use of no before the verb would
evoke the use of a negative indefinite pronoun after it, the current relevance of Polo’s observation
remains the same, namely that the negative series of Spanish indefinite pronouns covers the direct
negation function on the implicational map and is the only gram that does so. Implicit indirect
negation elicits the use of negative indefinite pronouns in Spanish as well, while negative indefinites
compete with members of the affirmative series in contexts of superordinate negation. This difference
between the two realizations of indirect negation can be demonstrated by translation of the examples
of either Haspelmath provides:
a) (implicit) ‘Without any warning’

Sin ningún aviso

’Sin algún aviso

b) (superordinate) ‘It is not necessary that anybody comes.’

No es necesario que nadie venga.

No es necesario que alguien venga.

(Adapted from Haspelmath 1997: 80 (147)).

Polo even mentions that after the negative preposition sin and after verbs denoting the presence or existence of entities, ninguno competes with the standard form alguno (1987: 329), which once more proves that the negative and affirmative series overlap in the indirect negation function. Paired with the implicational character of the semantic map, the enclosure of the indirect-negation function within the representational space of the affirmative series implies that either questions or conditionals and comparatives should also be included in its function set. Moreover, the co-occurrence of negative indefinite pronouns with a negative particle reveals that questions are not included in the function set of the negative series, as a question including a negative indefinite would automatically include a negative particle as well, overtly polarizing the question negatively and therefore making negation, rather than the posing of a question, its main function in such a context. The same reasoning applies to conditionals, which could only include negative indefinite pronouns in combination with negative particles which would cause the negation function to dominate the conditional function, thereby excluding the latter function from the scope of negative indefinite pronouns in Spanish. As such, both questions and conditionals are likely to be part of the representational space of the affirmative series, although this assumption is yet to be substantiated linguistically. For the sake of clarity, a semantic map of the functions that have so far been linked to specific grams with certainty is provided in figure 3.5.
With respect to the expression of questions and conditionals in Spanish, the notion of negative polarity introduced earlier is of considerable importance. Translation of the examples of positively and negatively polarized questions and conditionals provided by Haspelmath illuminates their specific differences:

a) (Positive polarity)  ‘Has someone come to see me?’
¿Ha venido alguien a verme?

b) (Negative polarity)  ‘Has anyone come to see me?’
¿Ha venido alguien a verme?
¿Ha venido cualquier(a) (persona) a verme?

(Adapted from Haspelmath 1997: 83, (155)).

a) (Positive polarity)  ‘If Daniel wants something, he will tell us.’
Si Daniel quiere algo, nos lo dirá.

b) (Negative polarity)  ‘If Daniel wants anything, he will tell us.’
Si Daniel quiere cualquier cosa, nos lo dirá.

(Adapted from Haspelmath 1997: 84 (157)).

a) (Positive polarity)  ‘If you say something, you will get a prize.’
Si dices algo, ganarás un premio.
b) (Negative polarity) ‘If you say anything, you’ll be punished.’

\[ Si \ dices \ algo, \ se \ te \ castigar\acute{a}. \]
\[ Si \ dices \ cualquier \ cosa, \ se \ te \ castigar\acute{a}. \]

(Adapted from Haspelmath 1997: 84 (158)).

It is clear that the function set of the affirmative series includes both the question and conditional functions, but overlaps with the indifference series in these specific positions on the map. This is in correspondence with Polo’s description of the employment of the form \textit{cualquier(a)} (1987: 340-341), as its use in generalizing expressions and its ability to convert a member of a certain class of entities into a representation of that entire class make it the most natural gram for the expression of negative-polarity questions and conditionals. The inherent element of indifference in the meaning of \textit{cualquier(a)} also makes it the most logical candidate for the expression of free choice. The overtly negative character of negative indefinite pronouns in Spanish eliminate the possibility that these grams also include free choice in their function set, and Polo’s observations that members of the affirmative series do not directly specify their referents or present them as hypothetical (1987: 300-301) demonstrate that they are poorly suited for the expression of free choice, as free choice entails the idea of selection of non-specified members of a specific series, and Spanish affirmative pronouns do not specifically cover the notion of such a series. Conversely, this also means that the uses of \textit{cualquier(a)} and its derivatives do not include the specific known, specific unknown and irrealis non-specific functions. Translation of Haspelmath’s example sentences for the free choice function provides further evidence:

‘You can take any apple.’

\[ Puedes \ tomar \ cualquier \ manzana. \]
\[ ?Puedes \ tomar \ alguna \ manzana. \]

(Adapted from Haspelmath 1997: 48 (104)).

A: ‘Bring me a chair.’
B: ‘Which one?’
A: ‘Any one.’
A: \textit{Tráeme una silla}.
B: ¿Cuál?
A: \textit{Cualquiera}.
A:*\textit{Alguna}.

(Adapted from Haspelmath 1997: 50 (110)).
‘Any amount is adequate/sufficient.’

*Cualquier cantidad basta.

*Alguna cantidad basta.

(Adapted from Haspelmath 1997:51 (117)).

a) (Free choice)

‘(Go) ask anyone.’

Pregúntale a cualquiera

Pregúntale a alguien.

b) (Specific-unknown, irrealis non-specific)

‘(Go) ask someone.’

Pregúntale a alguien.

Pregúntale a cualquiera.

(Adapted from Haspelmath 1997: 50 (112)).

Thus, the only function whose expression remains to be determined is the comparative function. As was pointed out earlier, comparatives may either express standards of inequality or standards of equality, which is an important factor in the selection of a particular indefinite pronoun in Spanish in comparative contexts. Polo’s work does not directly address the use of indefinite pronouns for purposes of comparison, but briefly presents the use of negative indefinite pronouns in such contexts as a given in Spanish grammar by means of an example: ‘más periódicos que ninguna noche’ (1987: 327), which literally translates into English as ‘more newspapers than (on) no night’ but translated into grammatical English gives ‘more newspapers than (on) any (other) night’. Again, translation of Haspelmath’s examples provides further evidence:

a) (Comparison of inequality)

‘The boy can run faster than anyone.’

El chico corre más rápidamente que nadie.

El chico corre más rápidamente que cualquiera.

*El chico corre más rápidamente que alguien.

(Adapted from Haspelmath 1997: 35 (51(b))).
b) (Comparison of equality)

‘The boy can run as fast as anyone.’

*El chico corre tan rápidamente que cualquiera.

*El chico corre tan rápidamente que nadie.

*El chico corre tan rápidamente que alguien.

(Adapted from Haspelmath 1977: 35 (52)).

As can be assessed, both negative indefinite pronouns and the indifference series may be used in Spanish to draw comparisons of inequality, while the indifference series alone may be used for the expression of comparisons of equality.

Now that the functional division of indefinite pronouns in Spanish has been fully determined, a complete semantic map showing the representational spaces of each type of pronoun can be rendered, the result of which is shown in figure 3.6. The applicability of the semantic maps of indefinite pronouns in English in Spanish to the phenomenon of transfer can consequently be determined.

![Figure 3.6](image)

Figure 3.6. A semantic map of indefinite pronouns in Spanish.
4  Hypothesis and research methodology

This chapter will present the various hypothetical possibilities regarding the applicability of semantic maps to cross-linguistic influence, which will be specifically addressed in section 4.1. Section 4.2 will in turn show the research methodology used to test these possibilities, as well as some obstacles and contingencies that were encountered during the investigation and retroactively demanded some changes in the employed methods of data collection. To illustrate these, some results will already be presented in this chapter, while the overall results of the investigation will be dealt with in the next.

4.1  Hypothesis

4.1.1 Principal hypothesis

The main idea of this investigation is that grammatical cross-linguistic influence depends on the differences and similarities between the functional scopes of grammatical morphemes in the source and recipient languages that share one or more functions. After all, the categorization of grams by their functions employed in the semantic-map method, which was introduced in section 3.2.1, conforms to Odlin’s definition of linguistic structures as unities of form and function, or tagmemes, seen in section 3.1.2. Jarvis and Pavlenko’s corresponding observation that transfer may occur at the linguistic as well as the conceptual level of cognition, which was presented in section 3.1.1, consequently incites the idea that the functional scope of particular grams in one language may influence the way in which grams in other languages are used, and that semantic maps as such might serve not only to schematize the expression of grammatical functions in separate languages and create a model of implicational universals, but also as a model for the description, and possibly the prediction of the ways in transfer may occur. More precisely, this would mean that speakers will establish an interlingual identification between source language grams and recipient language grams that share at least one function on the implicational map. Positive transfer would typically be expected to occur with regard to the functions in which grams from the source language and the recipient language overlap. Conversely, discrepancies between the representational spaces of grams in different languages superimposed on the same framework of functions would typically indicate areas susceptible to negative transfer, as negative transfer often constitutes the projection of the use of lexical items in one’s source language on the recipient language. This means that speakers of a particular source language would be likely to erroneously extend the use of a recipient language gram that shares certain functions with a source language gram to one or more of the functions that are part of the functional scope of this source language gram, but not of that of the recipient language gram. Conversely, it would mean that speakers would fail to use the affected gram to express the functions included in its functional scope that are not also part of the functional scope of the source language gram. As such, cross-linguistic influence between specific languages pertaining to specific grams could be described and even
predicted by comparing the semantic maps of the affected recipient language grams and the semantic maps of the source language grams. Nevertheless, the results of such a comparison, an example of which is given in figure 4.1, could be interpreted in several ways, and could accordingly bring about several distinct models of transfer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function 1</th>
<th>Function 2</th>
<th>Function 3</th>
<th>Function 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gram A (language 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function 1</td>
<td>Function 2</td>
<td>Function 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gram B (language 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.1. A discrepancy between the functional scopes of grammatical morphemes in two languages.

### 4.1.2 Theoretical possibilities

If the specific ways in which grammatical transfer occurs are indeed related to the functional differences and similarities between source language grams and recipient language grams, then there are multiple possibilities regarding the nature of this relation. After all, the representational spaces of grams in a single language may overlap in certain functions, as was shown in figures 3.4 and 3.6. Therefore, multiple grams in the source and recipient languages may share one or more of the same functions, and interlingual identifications based on shared functions might in some cases be established between several different grams. This elicits multiple theoretical possibilities:

1) transfer will occur with regard to a source language gram, or any of the multiple source language grams, and a recipient language gram, or any of the multiple recipient language grams that share one or more functions. The multitude of possibilities means that the selection of one or more particular source language grams and one or more recipient language grams in the process of transfer necessarily depends on other factors than merely the sharing of one or more functions by the involved grams, or that all associated source language grams will exert influence with regard to those functions that they do share with the affected recipient language gram, but not with other source language grams;

2) transfer will occur with regard to the source language gram that, out of all the source language grams that might be associated with the affected recipient language gram, shares the highest number of functions with it, or, in other words, overlaps most with it. For instance, if source language gram A shares one function with recipient language gram C and source language gram B shares two functions with gram C, transfer will occur between grams B and C, since they share a higher number of functions than gram A and
C, and therefore, the interlingual identification between grams B and C will be strongest. An example of such a situation is shown in figure 4.2.

An additional possible factor that needs to be considered is implicational directionality. Since language change typically follows one particular direction on the implicational map, it could be possible that this rule also applies to transfer. Again, this evokes two theoretical possibilities:

1) transfer will occur with regard to any function included in the functional scope of a source language gram that shares one or more functions with the affected recipient language gram, regardless of the position of the source language gram’s functions relative to the representational area of the affected recipient language gram. For instance, this would mean that transfer affecting gram B as shown in figure 4.2 could consist of the erroneous inclusion of either function 1, function 4, or both in the functional scope of gram B;

Figure 4.2. Transfer regardless of implicational directionality.
transfer will occur with regard to functions that are included in the functional scope of a
source language gram that shares one or more functions with the affected recipient language
gram, but will follow the typical direction of functional extension introduced in section 3.2.3.
As such, transfer affecting gram B as shown in figure 4.3 could consist of the erroneous
inclusion of function 4, but not function 1, in its functional scope.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{Function 1} & \text{Function 2} & \text{Function 3} & \text{Function 4} \\
\text{Gram A (source language)}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Function 1} & \text{Function 2} & \text{Function 3} \\
\text{Function 4} & \\
\text{Gram B (recipient language)}
\end{array}
\]

Figure 4.3. Transfer that follows implicational directionality.

Intuitively, the first possibility seems more logical than the second one, since pure negative
transfer would consist of identical treatment of the associated source language and recipient language
grams. The relevance of the second possibility is that it gives rise to the question whether
implicational directionality plays any role in the assumptions of language learners about the functional
range of recipient language structures. Additionally, it should be noted that positive transfer is not
addressed in any of the descriptions of the different possibilities because this type of transfer would
consist of a correct interlingual identification in all cases. Naturally, the latter two theoretical
possibilities can be combined with the former two, as will be shown in the next section.

It should be noted that not all possibilities regarding the exact relation between semantic maps
and transfer are specified here. After all, it was indicated in section 3.1 that transfer is a multi-faceted
phenomenon, which means that the ways in which it occurs could be influenced by a large variety of
factors, many of which can only be specified after concrete data has been analysed. As such, the
possibility that transfer occurs in a different way from those predicted here must be taken into account.

4.1.3 Theoretical delimitations

Of course, there are quite a few limitations regarding the types of transfer that might be
represented and explained by means of semantic maps, and still more regarding the types of transfer
that will be considered in this investigation. First of all, it was shown section 3.1.2 that cross-linguistic
influence may occur in any area of language use, ranging from the level of phonology to the level of
sociolinguistics. Nevertheless, semantic maps are designed to represent the uses of grammatical
morphemes, and may therefore only be applicable to transfer at the semantic and perhaps the
morphological and syntactic levels of language use. It could be hypothesized that the discursive aspects of language could sometimes be represented by means of semantic maps as well, but these will currently not be considered due to their intermediate position between grammar and pragmatics and their limited relevance to the subject of indefinite pronouns. Moreover, the current focus will be limited to transfer at the level of semantics, as the selection of particular lexical items based on their perceived semantic values is being investigated. Striking morphological and syntactic changes to the canonical features of English indefinite pronouns will be noted during the investigation, but are of secondary importance.

Regarding the directionality of transfer, every type distinguished in section 3.1.2 might be schematized by means of semantic maps, but presently, only forward transfer will be taken into consideration, more precisely transfer from L1 Spanish into L2 English. The types of knowledge that will be addressed are both the explicit and the implicit type. According to Jarvis and Pavlenko, implicit knowledge is more susceptible to cross-linguistic influence than explicit knowledge (2008: 23), which is logical, as the language user will have superior control over the manifestation of linguistic knowledge they consciously possess. Accordingly, both intentional and unintentional transfer will be taken into consideration, as language users can actively reflect on perceived differences and similarities between the source and recipient languages, and may even then produce errors, which would be the most easily identifiable manifestations of transfer. As will be discussed in greater detail in section 4.2, the investigation will address the productive mode of transfer and disregard the receptive mode, just as it will focus on the visual channel of transfer rather than the aural one. Since the phenomenon of transfer is analysed with respect to indefinite pronouns, the only form of transfer that will be studied is the verbal one.

Particular attention should be given to the kind of outcome of transfer that will be examined. While the connection between negative transfer and discrepancies between the representational spaces of grams in the source and recipient languages can be directly verified, the connection between positive transfer and overlap of the representational spaces of these grams cannot. However, contrasting both types of transfer should provide greater certainty regarding their relation with semantic maps. After all, the discovery that negative transfer occurs only with respect to those functions the investigated source language and recipient language grams do not share would reinforce the likelihood that the further correct use of the recipient language grams is indeed at least partly a consequence of positive transfer, even if this positive transfer is nothing but a prevention of negative transfer based on interlingual similarities. Therefore, only negative transfer will be actively investigated, while the absence of negative transfer regarding functions that the investigated grams in the source and recipient languages share will be regarded as possible positive transfer. Naturally, both overt and covert manifestations of transfer are included in the ways in which positive and negative transfer may occur, so either type will be considered, although the distinction between overt and covert
transfer will not be prioritized due to its doubtful nature (Jarvis & Pavlenko 2008: 25) and its limited additional value to the investigation. An overview of the types of transfer that will be addressed in the current investigation is provided in table 4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of language knowledge/ use</th>
<th>Semantic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directionality</td>
<td>Forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive level</td>
<td>Linguistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of knowledge</td>
<td>Implicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionality</td>
<td>Intentional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unintentional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>Productive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel</td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manifestation</td>
<td>Overt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Covert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1. An overview of the types of transfer addressed in the current investigation. Adapted from Jarvis & Pavlenko 2008: 20, table 1.2.

4.1.4 Application to indefinite pronouns

The various theoretical possibilities introduced in section 4.1.2 produce different models of transfer when applied to the semantic maps of indefinite pronouns in English and Spanish, introduced in sections 3.3.3 and 3.3.5 respectively. Each of these possibilities could be considered as a hypothesis of its own and is explained here with specific reference to each of the English-language grams that might be affected by cross-linguistic influence exerted by the Spanish grams. The first hypothesis, henceforth referred to as hypothesis 1a, is that any Spanish indefinite pronoun sharing one or more functions with a particular English indefinite pronoun will exert cross-linguistic influence over this pronoun, while the second hypothesis, henceforth referred to as hypothesis 2a, supposes that cross-linguistic influence will only be exerted by the Spanish indefinite pronoun that shares the highest number of functions with the affected English indefinite pronoun. Additionally, each of these hypotheses can be expanded either with the supposition that transfer will occur regardless of implicational directionality, or with the supposition that it will only occur according to the implicational alignment of functions, producing hypotheses 1b and 2b respectively. The predictions following from each of these hypotheses are shown for each individual English indefinite pronoun series in tables 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, and 4.5.
From the suppositions of hypotheses 1a and 1b, it follows that interlingual associations will respectively be established between the affirmative series and the *some*-series, the indifference series and the *some*-series, the affirmative series and the *any*-series, the indifference series and the *any*-series, the negative series and the *any*-series, and the negative series and the *no*-series. Hypotheses 2a and 2b, for their part, suppose that interlingual identifications will respectively be established between the affirmative series and the *some*-series, the indifference series and the *any*-series, and the negative series and the *no*-series. Of course, the negative series shares a higher number of functions with the *any*-series than it does with the *no*-series, since it overlaps in the comparative, indirect-negation and direct-negation function with the former, and only in the direct-negation function with the latter. However, the negative series is the only Spanish series whose functional scope includes direct negation, which is the only function of which the functional scope of the *no*-series consists. Therefore, if an interlingual identification is established between the *no*-series and a Spanish indefinite pronoun series, this only Spanish series that can be selected according to any of the four hypotheses is the negative series.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Any</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific known</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific unknown</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrealis non-specific</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect negation</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct negation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free choice</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2. Hypothesis 1a. The results of cross-linguistic influence if it is exerted by any source language grams that share functions with the recipient language affected grams, regardless of implicational directionality.
### Table 4.3. Hypothesis 1b. The results of cross-linguistic influence if it is exerted by any source language grams that share functions with the affected recipient language grams and follows implicational directionality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Any</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific known</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific unknown</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrealis non-specific</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect negation</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct negation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free choice</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.4. Hypothesis 2a. The results of cross-linguistic influence if it is exerted by the source language grams that overlap the most with the affected recipient language grams, regardless of implicational directionality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Any</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific known</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific unknown</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrealis non-specific</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect negation</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative: underproduction</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct negation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Negative: underproduction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free choice</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific known</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific unknown</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrealis non-specific</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect negation</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative: underproduction</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct negation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Negative: underproduction</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free choice</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5. Hypothesis 2b. The results of cross-linguistic influence if it is exerted by the source language grams that overlap the most with the affected recipient language grams and follows implicational directionality.

4.1.5 Examples

In the previous section, various ways in which transfer from Spanish to English might affect the use of indefinite pronouns were postulated. Since positive transfer by definition results in the production of correct structures in the recipient language, it requires but an adequate knowledge of the rules of English grammar concerning indefinite pronouns to foresee what shapes this type of transfer will take for each of the investigated functions and pronouns. However, the various predictions with respect to negative transfer require some exemplification, since it should be clear what kinds of structures will be deemed incorrect. The theoretically possible mistakes for each separate indefinite pronoun are given here.

The use of *some* to express indirect negation, then, would lead to constructions such as the following:

a) ‘*I finished my homework without some help.’
b) ‘*It is not necessary that someone comes.’

(Adapted from Haspelmath 1997: 80 (147(b))).

If used to express the comparative function, *some* would be encountered in constructions like these:

a) ‘*John is as strong as someone.’
b) ‘*John is stronger than someone.’
Naturally, these sentences might be acceptable in specific contexts that allow different readings from those featuring the comparative functions. The importance of the context in which particular constructions are encountered is also underlined by the following example of the use of some:

‘You can take some candy you like.’

Certain readings would render this sentence grammatical, but there is no acceptable interpretation featuring the free-choice function. Conversely, the use of the any-series to express the specific-known function would lead to an error as well:

‘John is looking for any colleague. *We met him last week.’

Expression of the specific-unknown function by means of the any-series would produce similar constructions:

‘John is looking for any colleague. *He would like to introduce us.’

The final hypothesized mistake involving the any-series consists of its use to express the irrealis non-specific function:

‘If we wait long enough, *we might have any luck.’

The erroneous expression of indirect negation by means of the no-series, in turn, could take the following forms:

a) ‘*I finished my homework without no help.’

b) ‘*It is not necessary that nobody comes.’

(Adapted from Haspelmath 1997: 80 (147(b)).

The last hypothesized error consists of the use of the no-series to represent the comparative function:

‘*John is stronger than nobody else.’

Now that the kinds of mistakes predicted by the hypotheses have been described, the way in which they were sought out and interpreted can be addressed.

4.2. Research methodology

4.2.1 Resources

To test the hypotheses described in section 4.1, 740 English-language argumentative essays were analysed. The essays were part of the Written Corpus of Learner English, also known as
WriCLE, which was collected by Paul Rollinson as part of the WOSLAC Project directed by Amaya Mendikoetxea. A copy of the corpus was kindly provided in digital form by Professor Rollinson and Professor Michael O’Donnell at Universidad Autónoma de Madrid. As specified on the web page Written Corpus of Learner English (n.d.) of Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, all essays were written by university students of English whose native language was Spanish and whose proficiency levels in English ranged from A2 to C2, as assessed by the Oxford Quick Placement Test, which all students took around the time of writing the essays they submitted. Each student filled out a form for each submitted essay indicating what resources had been used during its creation, and also filled out a form by means of which they supplied information about their language background, indicating their native language, their parents’ native languages, their level of knowledge of other languages than Spanish or English, the number of years they had been studying English, and so forth (Universidad Autónoma de Madrid). An example of either form can be found in the appendix along with a specific description of the data collection process, as well as some examples of the analysed essays.

4.2.2 Data collection

As all WriCLE texts were provided in the form of plain text files, their contents could be easily investigated by means of digital tools. In this case, all instances of the indefinite grams some, any and no as well as their derivatives and uses as determiners were sought, which could simply be accomplished by means of the Search tool available in most word processors. Though this search method introduced the chance that some indefinite pronouns would escape notice due to spelling errors, it was assumed that the number of misspelled indefinite pronouns would not be so high that it would alter the results substantially. For each separate essay, the number of times each gram was encountered and the number of times it was used to express each particular function was noted in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. Consequently, an overview was created of the total number of instances of each gram and the total number of times each gram was used to express each particular function. This data could then be compared to the expectations that followed from the different hypotheses specified in section 4.1.4. Negative transfer resulting in production errors could be discovered directly in the form of erroneous uses of grams to express functions they did not have. Negative transfer resulting in underproduction of the use of particular grams for functions they did have and positive transfer could be discovered simultaneously. More precisely, a relatively low number of uses of a particular English gram to express correct functions that it did not share with Spanish grams with which it might have been associated could be seen as an indication of both types of transfer. On the other hand, if certain English indefinite pronouns were relatively frequently found to be used correctly for both functions they shared with Spanish indefinite pronouns with which they might have been associated and for functions they did not share with such Spanish indefinite pronouns, this would not suffice as proof that
positive transfer had occurred. Likewise, if overt mistakes were relatively frequently found with regard to the use of English indefinite pronouns to express both those functions that were predicted to be susceptible to negative transfer and those that were not, the results would not provide sufficient evidence that cross-linguistic influence had been exerted, or at least as hypothesised.

No particular notice was taken of the proficiency level of each individual subject, as the hypotheses only concerned the way in which transfer would occur if it occurred, and did not specify a particular supposed correlation between the levels of proficiency of subjects and the kinds of transfer they will produce. This does not mean that there is no imaginable logical correlation between a speaker’s level of proficiency in a recipient language and the amount and types of cross-linguistic influence they will experience, but rather that there was no theoretical background on which suppositions about the exact relation between language knowledge on the one hand and the manifestation of transfer based on similarity between the functional scopes of source language and recipient language grams on the other could be based.

The number of times each function was expressed was also noted regardless of which grams were used to express it, as long as it was expressed by means of one of the investigated pronouns. As such, a reference frame for the numerical results for each particular pronoun was created, as no data concerning the relative frequency of each separate function in English was available beforehand, and moreover, the reference frame should reflect the reality of the analysed corpus rather than that of an ideal model of English language use.

4.2.3 Ignored data
Some attention should be given to the kind of structures that were not taken into account during the data collection. Incorrect or unidiomatic language use sometimes rendered the correct interpretation of the intended function of indefinite pronouns difficult or impossible, as will subsequently be shown by means of some examples. These examples have been taken from the corpus without alteration, since their unintelligibility is the very focus of this section.

In summary, the phenomenon of immigration is more difficult than could seem the population. Any politician finds one effective solution and, while, the Spanish population has to learn to coexist with the immigrants.

(Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010: A4-2)

A number of apparent mistakes make the interpretation of this sentence very difficult. The author could either erroneously have used the determiner any to express direct negation, which would have been logical in the context of the essay. Nevertheless, another possibility might be that the author

---

4 Since the corpus consisted of separate files, each of which comprised a single essay, the file names of sources are indicated rather than page numbers when the corpus is cited.
meant to write: ‘any politician can find one effective solution’. The lack of the agreement between the subject and the verb to find reinforces this idea. The following sentence is another example of data that was difficult to process:

The most of this persons are sickness and no have food for raise their defenses in the body, in addition, they can't buy medicines because there are very expensive, so all the days dies a lot of people.

(Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010: A178-1).

In this case, it is unclear how the author meant to use the word no. As a correctly used negative particle, which, when placed before a noun, would be interpreted as a determiner in the current context, it would have produced the construction ‘[most of these people are sick] and have no food’. Accordingly, the author might have made a syntactic mistake, correctly using the negative particle no. On the other hand, the author might not have mastered the use of the auxiliary do to express negation in English, and instead have used no, possibly analogously to verbal negation in Spanish, which consists of the placement of the negative particle no before the main verb. This would not be an indication of transfer affecting the use of indefinite pronouns, but rather show incomplete mastery of verbal negation in English.

The last example of ... does not concern incomplete mastery of English so much as poor writing on the part of the author:

In some many cases, [...].

(Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010: A75-1).

The author probably meant to write either ‘in some cases’ or ‘in many cases’ but, due to inattention or a similar cause, wrote down both possibilities rather than one of them. The interpretation of the kind of data exemplified here heavily depended on personal judgement, and as such, unintelligible or highly ambiguous constructions were ignored.

4.2.4 Difficulties in distinguishing functions

A problem during the data collection that deserves some attention was the distinction between the uses of the gram some to express the specific-known, specific-unknown and irrealis non-specific functions respectively. In most cases, the means described in section 3.3.5 were employed to distinguish between these functions. However, some contexts still allowed various readings, especially if they also featured unidiomatic language use. For instance, the noun phrase ‘some people’ was used quite frequently throughout the corpus, and could often refer to either a known or an unknown group of people:
On the other hand, some people would argue that the legalization of marijuana is completely negative [...].

(Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010: A6-2).

The modal auxiliary would shows that no people have actually argued that the legalization of marijuana is completely negative, but it is unclear whether the author had the means to distinguish the people who would do so. Due to the use of this modal auxiliary, there is even a possibility that the determiner some expresses the irrealis non-specific function here, since the modal auxiliary would indicates an irrealis context that may or may not include the identity of the referents of the noun phrase. After all, two paraphrases are possible:

a) (Specific)
   ‘There are some people who would argue that the legalization of marijuana is completely negative.’

b) (Irrealis non-specific)
   ‘There would be some people who would argue that the legalization of marijuana is completely negative.’

In such cases, the function of the indefinite pronoun was determined based on the context in which it was encountered. For instance, the essay from which the aforementioned example was taken mostly featured uses of the noun phrase ‘some people’ in indicative, affirmative sentences:

Some people argue that marijuana should be legalized.

(Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010: A6-2).

Some people point out that marijuana should be legalized only for those individuals who require it for medicinal purposes [...].

(Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010: A6-2).

The noun phrase in question was therefore considered to express specific reference. Furthermore, the context quite easily allowed the use of adjectives producing a specific reading, such as certain, as well as anaphoric reference:

‘Certain people would argue that the legalization of marijuana is completely negative. They do not see any advantages to it.’

(Adapted from Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010: A6-2).
As such, all criteria for a specific reading were met, which was therefore selected. The only remaining problem was the identification of either the specific-known or the specific-unknown function, which, as pointed out in section 3.3.5, is often insolubly ambiguous in English, as it was in this case. Again, the specific-known and specific-unknown functions respectively were attributed to each indefinite pronoun that might express them based on the context in which these pronouns were encountered throughout the investigation. The following citation demonstrates this:

This essay will argue about [sic] the different points of view that some institutions have related to abortion.

(Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010: A249-2).

In this sentence, the noun phrase ‘some institutions’ is most likely to have the specific-known function, as the author indicates that their essay will address the views of particular institutions, which would be very strange if they did not know which institutions they will discuss.

The main point is that the attribution of certain functions to the member of the some-series may vary somewhat according to the criteria used. The numbers of times these grams were found to express each of these functions should therefore be seen as an indication of the relative frequencies with which they did so rather than fixed absolute values. Nevertheless, this uncertainty was not of too much consequence, since the specific-known, specific-unknown and irrealis non-specific functions are also expressed by a single indefinite pronoun series in Spanish, the affirmative series. Correlations between the use of the some-series and that of the Spanish affirmative series could therefore still be distinguished from correlations between the use of the some-series and the uses of the other Spanish indefinite pronoun series.

4.2.5 Difficulties in categorizing the results

During the data collection, it became clear that the number of possible structures containing indefinite pronouns was slightly greater than expected, given that many of the functions of indefinite pronouns can be expressed by means of multiple constructions. This was already apparent from the discussion of the two ways in which indirect negation may be expressed in section 3.3.6. Nonetheless, it was not the correct uses of English indefinite pronouns that mattered most, as each instance of a correctly expressed function could simply be tagged as such, whereas specific mistakes could reveal some information about the acquisition of the affected grams. More precisely, the necessity to distinguish two kinds of expressions of direct negation by the any-series and the no-series arose. While both series include direct negation within their functional scope, they could still be wrongly used to express this function:
1) [T]he law is going to improve society's health and is not against nobody's rights […].

(Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010: A101-1).

2) Finally, most people states [sic] that anybody is not safe at all […].

(Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010: A155-2).

The first example shows the use of nobody to express direct negation, which is correct in itself, but is not adequate here because it is part of the scope of another negative particle, not, which in correct English would elicit the use of a member of the any-series. The author seems to have known that the no-series could be used to express direct negation, but does not seem to have fully understood under what conditions. As will be explained in chapter 5, this imperfect competence regarding direct negation may be due to influence exerted by the Spanish indefinite pronoun paradigm.

The second example, in turn, shows what may be considered as the opposite of the error in the first. The author apparently knew that members of the any-series may be used in contexts of negation, but seems not to have grasped that they may only express direct negation when they are part of the scope of a negative particle or when they are indirectly negated.

Instances such as these evoked the need to expand the number of categorizations of functions grams could be found to express. Consequently, a separate category consisting of the “incorrect direct-negation” function was recognized for the any-series and the no-series to serve current purposes, denoting an attribution of a correct function to these grams, but in the wrong context. Of course, the distinction did not apply to the some-series, since this series can never be used to express direct negation. In the analysis of the results, occurrences of “incorrect direct negation” were interpreted as correct uses of the members of the no-series and the any-series, since the current focus lies on the selection of functions instead of their context. However, the “incorrect direct-negation” function was distinguished because of its implications concerning other factors than interlingual functional similarity influencing transfer, which will be discussed in detail in section 5.3.

Now that the proceedings of the investigation have been outlined, the results to which they eventually amounted will be presented in the next chapter.
5 Results and discussion

In this chapter, the results of the investigation and their implications are discussed. Section 5.1 shows the sheer numerical results, while section 5.2 examines the implications of these findings for the models of transfer in section 4.1.4. Particular findings that contradict these models are analysed in section 5.3. Finally, additional possible explanations for and implications of the data are considered in section 5.4.

5.1 Results

The investigation process described in chapter 4 lead to the results shown in tables 5.1, 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4. Tables 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 show the results per investigated indefinite pronoun series, as well as the relative amount of uses of the series in question to express each particular function relative to the total amount of uses of that series. Table 5.4 shows how often each function occurred and by means of which indefinite pronouns it was expressed, as well as the amount of realizations of each particular function by each particular gram relative to the total amount of realizations of that function. Correct uses are indicated as instances of positive transfer and incorrect uses as instances of negative transfer. However, these indications only show the possible implications of the results, which are yet to be discussed in detail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>Specific known</td>
<td>3211 (70.62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specific unknown</td>
<td>341 (7.50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irrealis non-specific</td>
<td>794 (17.46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>10 (0.22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>122 (2.68%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>Indirect negation</td>
<td>27 (0.59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct negation</td>
<td>38 (0.84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>1 (0.02%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free choice</td>
<td>3 (0.07%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4547 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1. The results for the some-series.
### Any

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>Specific known</td>
<td>2 (0.18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specific unknown</td>
<td>8 (0.71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irrealis non-specific</td>
<td>14 (1.24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>5 (0.44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>28 (2.47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect negation</td>
<td>147 (12.97%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct negation (right</td>
<td>10 (0.88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>function, wrong context)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct negation</td>
<td>373 (32.92%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>43 (3.80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free choice</td>
<td>503 (44.40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1133 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2. The results for the *any*-series.

### No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>Specific known</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specific unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irrealis non-specific</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect negation</td>
<td>3 (0.31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free choice</td>
<td>3 (0.31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>Direct negation (right</td>
<td>23 (2.39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>function, wrong context)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct negation</td>
<td>936 (97.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>965 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3. The results for the *no*-series.
Table 5.4. The results per function. Percentages are rounded to two decimals.

In the next section, the implications of these results will be discussed.

5.2 Theoretical implications

In this section, the relevance of the results for each of the hypotheses formulated in chapter 4 will be addressed separately.

5.2.1 Compatibility with hypothesis 1a

Hypothesis 1a supposed that cross-linguistic influence would be exerted by any source language gram that shared at least one function with the affected recipient language gram, and would moreover not be affected by the implicational directionality in the alignment of functions. The patterns of possible positive transfer that have emerged from the results correspond quite well to these predictions. The specific-known, specific-unknown, irrealis non-specific, question and conditional functions have all been found to be correctly expressed by the some-series relatively frequently, and the question and conditional functions have also been found to be correctly expressed by the any-series relatively frequently. The relevance of these findings is supported by the fact that the no-series was never found to express any of these five functions. Moreover, direct negation was almost never expressed by means of the some-series, while 33.80% of all instances of members the any-series were used to express this function, which in turn was represented by this series in 27.75% of all cases in which it was expressed. Moreover, the no-series was almost exclusively used to express the direct-negation function.
The problem, however, lies in the matter of negative transfer. While the indirect-negation function was expressed by some member of the *some*-series in roughly 15% of all its instances, which could be considered as an indication that transfer may have occurred, none of the other predicted results of negative transfer were observed with striking frequency. Hypothesis 1a predicted that erroneous expression of the indirect-negation function by means of members of the *no*-series would be notably frequent, but this was not the case, as only 0.31% of the encountered members of the *no*-series expressed this function, and only 1.69% of the instances of the indirect-negation function were expressed by members of the *no*-series. Similarly, the comparative function was expected to be erroneously expressed by pronouns belonging to the *some*-series and the *no*-series, but only 0.02% of all uses of the *some*-series represented this function, which corresponds to 2.27% of all instances of the comparative function. No instances of the *no*-series were found to express the comparative function. Finally, the predicted incorrect use of the *some*-series to realise the free-choice function was barely encountered.

It is also notable that no indications of the predicted underproduction of the expression of the indirect-negation and direct-negation functions by members of the *any*-series were found, as both functions were expressed by pronouns belonging to this series rather often.

In summary, the results corresponded to hypothesis 1a with respect to the correct uses of English indefinite pronouns, but did not satisfy its predictions of the types of error that would occur.

**5.2.2 Compatibility with hypothesis 1b**

Like hypothesis 1a, hypothesis 1b postulated that any Spanish gram sharing one or more functions with a particular English gram would affect it, but unlike hypothesis 1a, it also accounted for the role of implicational directionality. As was the case with the test results for hypothesis 1a, all correct expressions of functions that occurred frequently enough to possibly indicate positive transfer correspond to the model following from hypothesis 1b. Moreover, no substantial indications of negative transfer resulting in the expression of the specific-known, specific-unknown and irrealis non-specific functions by means of the *any*-series were found, which contradicted hypothesis 1a, but is in accordance with hypothesis 1b.

However, some of the other encountered mistakes once again pose a problem. While the frequency with which members of the *some*-series were used to express indirect negation could be considered high enough to indicate the possibility of negative transfer, the low frequencies of expressions of the comparative function and the free-choice function by means of members of the *some*-function do not fit into the model of transfer of hypothesis 1b. In short, a model of cross-linguistic influence such as that proposed by hypothesis 1b seems to be more accurate than the kind produced by hypothesis 1a, but it does still not provide a flawless explanation of the facts.
5.2.3 Compatibility with hypothesis 2a

Hypothesis 2a presented the idea that interlingual identifications that might result in transfer would only be established between source language grams and recipient language grams that shared a maximal number of functions, and that the resulting transfer would not be affected by implicational directionality. All possible indications of positive transfer encountered in the corpus are in accordance with this idea, as are the reasonably numerous expressions of the indirect-negation function by pronouns belonging to the *some*-series. Hypothesis 2a also did not predict that the comparative and free-choice functions would frequently be incorrectly expressed by means of the *some*-series, while hypotheses 1a and 1b counted this prediction among their respective weaknesses. On the other hand, the absence of a considerable quantity of erroneous expressions of the indirect-negation and comparative functions by means of members of the *no*-series, which could be an indication of negative transfer, does not conform to the predictions of hypothesis 2a. Additionally, the absence of indicators of underproduction of the expression of the indirect-negation and direct-negation functions by members of the *any*-series clashes with hypothesis 2a.

To conclude, the facts correspond to a higher degree to hypothesis 1b than they do to hypothesis 2a, since more of the findings contradict the latter. The question that remains, then, is whether hypothesis 2b can provide a better explanation of the data than hypothesis 1b.

5.2.4 Compatibility with hypothesis 2b

Hypothesis 2b was identical to hypothesis 2a, save for its supposition that transfer would follow implicational directionality. Regarding the correct uses of indefinite pronouns, the data fully corresponds to this hypothesis. Hypothesis 2b also correctly predicted that no striking amount of mistakes consisting of the expression of the indirect-negation function and the comparative function by means of pronouns belonging to the *no*-series would be found, while hypotheses 1a and 2a supposed the contrary. It also predicted no particularly large quantities of mistakes consisting of the representation of the comparative and free choice functions by members of the *some*-series, while such erroneous predictions did follow from hypotheses 1a and 1b. The only weakness in hypothesis 2b, then, is its prediction of underproduction of the expression of the indirect-negation and direct-negation functions by pronouns belonging to the *any*-series, which it shares with hypothesis 2a.

Ultimately, the predictions of hypothesis 2b seem to be equally accurate as those following from hypothesis 1b, since this hypothesis 1b accounted for the correct expressions of the indirect-negation and direct-negation functions by members of the *any*-series, but incorrectly presupposed the ungrammatical expression of the comparative and free-choice functions by means of members of the *some*-series. Nevertheless, hypotheses 1b and 2b cannot be simultaneously correct, as each partly contradicts the other, and therefore, they will be compared more precisely in the next section.
5.2.5. Towards a new model of transfer

Both hypothesis 1b and hypothesis 2b supposed that transfer would follow implicational directionality, but their apparent irreconcilability arises from the fact that the former predicted that interlingual identifications would be established between any source language grams and any recipient languages grams that shared one or more functions, while the latter predicted that such identifications would only be established between the source language and recipient language grams that shared a maximal number of functions. However, if both hypotheses were partly correct, this would not only resolve their discrepancy, but also provide an explanation for the findings that contradicted each hypothesis on its own. More precisely, the reconciliation of both hypotheses would be that cross-linguistic influence over a recipient language gram is exerted by any source language gram that overlaps with it, but most strongly by the source language gram that overlaps the most with it. This would explain the limited amount of mistakes consisting of the expression of the comparative and free-choice functions by the some-series, since the Spanish indifference series, which was predicted by hypothesis 1b to exert influence resulting in such mistakes, overlaps in more functions with the any-series than it does with the some-series. It would also explain why no notable underproduction of the expression of the indirect-negation and direct-negation functions by means of the any-series was encountered, but there was still a notable quantity of mistakes consisting of the expression of the indirect-negation function by means of the some-series. After all, while the indifference series shares the highest number of functions with the any-series out of all Spanish indefinite pronoun series and the facts seem to indicate that Spanish speakers do indeed associate these two series, an additional identification between the negative series and the any-series to express the two negation functions. On the other hand, the very strong overlap between the affirmative series and the some-series would produce the erroneous expression of indirect negation by means of members of the latter. The aforementioned combination of hypotheses 1b and 2b does not only provide these solutions, but also contradicts none of the other general findings.

This model of transfer would also seem logical in relation to learning strategies. The tendency to associate recipient language grams with the source language grams with which they overlap the most would allow speakers to express a maximal number of functions correctly in the recipient language. Nonetheless, underproduction of the expression of particular functions by means of a recipient language gram due to a discrepancy between its representational space and that of the associated source language gram in these functions would create a functional vacuum, since speakers would be left with the need to express these functions and no apparent means to do so. Recourse to other source language grams that share one or more functions with the recipient language gram as a basis for the apprehension of its functional scope would allow speakers to fill up this functional vacuum, albeit incorrectly at times.
In spite of the compatibility of the general results with the previously described combination of hypotheses 1b and 2b, however, there were also some sparse findings that did not correspond to this model of cross-linguistic influence, which will be discussed in detail in the following sections. For the sake of swift reference, the precise combination of hypotheses 1b and 2b that has been established will henceforth be referred to as hypothesis 3.

5.3 **Counterevidence**

In this section, examples from the corpus that did not correspond to hypothesis 3 will be analysed so as to assess their implications for its accuracy. The literature reviewed in section 3.3.1 already indicated that various factors may determine the specific manifestation of transfer, so it was predictable that at least some of the results would not correspond to the investigated models of transfer. However, the aim of this section will be to offer explanations for such results and estimate the extent to which they repudiate these models. Because the tested models of transfer presupposed specific results for each particular grammatical function, the findings for each of these functions will be examined separately. Some of the orthographic, grammatical or lexical features of citations have been adapted to improve their clarity, but uses of indefinite pronouns are represented verbatim so as to leave their relevance undistorted.

5.3.1 **Specific known**

The following instances of the use of members of the *any*-series to express the specific-known function were encountered in the corpus:

The way as we found it in any manual is this: marihuana is a psicotropic [*sic*] plant that in little doses can produce sedation, […].

(Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010: A24-2).

Next, there are other countries that have a law that approves the [*sic*] abortion only in any cases.

(Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010: A317-2).

These findings contradict the supposition that transfer is subject to implicational directionality, since the specific-known function holds a position on the implicational map relative to the representational space of the *any*-series that is not susceptible to meaning extension. As the two instances of this specific mistake shown here are the only two in the entire corpus, their implications for hypothesis 3 are limited, but they are a clear indication that the correspondence of transfer patterns to implicational directionality may not be without exception. This idea is further strengthened by the handful of mistakes consisting of the use of the *any*-series to express the specific-unknown function.
5.3.2 Specific unknown

Some of the unpredicted expressions of the specific-unknown function were the following:

To finish we have to remember that [everybody] has immigrate[d] in any way from one place to another […].

(Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010: A48-2).

A recent study says that 30% of secondary [school] teachers have rec[ei]ved any threaten [sic] or al[g]ression.

(Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010: A95-2).

Many women […] are being [sic] victims of any kind of discrimination […].

(Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010: C72-1).

Just like the few occurrences of indefinite pronouns belonging to the any-series being used to express the specific-known function, these findings are not so numerous that they completely refute the hypothesis that transfer will follow implicational directionality, but they do show that this supposed rule is not always valid.

5.3.3 Irrealis non-specific

The results showing the use of indefinite pronouns from the any-series to express the irrealis non-specific function lead to the same conclusions as the mistakes discussed in the previous two sections. Some examples are the following:

I personally believe that […] a student […] should make a good use of [their] time doing any kind of work.

(Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010: A164-3).

There are people who defend this conduct by saying that they maybe were under the [influence] of [alcohol] or any kind of drugs […].

(Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010: C76-1).

Nevertheless, it is striking that the irrealis non-specific function was expressed by means of the any-series more often than the specific-unknown series, which in turn was expressed more often by means of members of the any-series than the specific-known function. It seems that, although transfer may occur opposite to implicational directionality, its occurrence becomes less frequent as the involved functions are farther removed from the representational space of the affected recipient language gram, which could still be the result of a minor influence of implicational directionality.
Moreover, such a correlation between the relative distance between functions and their susceptibility to transfer would be logical from a speaker’s point of view, since the inclusion of functions within the functional scope of a gram from which they are relatively far away would constitute a more doubtful guess about the functions of that gram than the inclusion of functions that are relatively close to it. However, it is the very scarcity of mistakes of this type that makes it hard to currently draw definite conclusions about this possibility. Moreover, their indication of the limitations of semantic maps as a model of transfer is reinforced in the next few sections.

5.3.4 Indirect negation

From the supposition that cross-linguistic influence exerted by source language grams over recipient language grams, it followed that indefinite pronouns belonging to the no-series would not be wrongly used by native speakers of Spanish to express the indirect-negation function. Nonetheless, three instances of such mistakes were found, the first of which is the following:

Another point of view that we have seen is that although the world is not safer as [a] result of that war, [the] U.S.A and the [E]uropean countries mus[t]n't leave that area without doing nothing[,] but they have to develop the economy and democracy that allow themselves [sic] [to] resolve that problem.

(Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010: A160-2).

The construction ‘without doing nothing’ is reminiscent of indirect negation in Spanish, since Spanish negative particles require that pronouns in the clauses they negate should be negative as well, as was pointed out in section 3.3.7. The Spanish counterpart of this particular construction would be sin hacer nada. It thus seems very likely that the author has indeed projected features of Spanish grammar onto English grammar. However, if transfer is subject to implicational directionality, an interlingual association between the Spanish negative series and the English no-series should not produce any errors of this kind, as the indirect-negation function comes before the direct-negation function on the map, and the two series overlap only in the latter function, the representational space of the no-series excluding indirect negation. Still, if this mistake was the result of negative transfer, the only interlingual association that could have evoked it is one between the negative series and the no-series, which would mean that cross-linguistic influence has been exerted opposite to implicational directionality. The other two instances of the same type of mistake lead to the same conclusion:

Going by car is faster and you go alone, without nobody who can disturb you.

(Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010: A282-2).

They are [of] the opinion that everyone should be free to travel around the world and to choose a place to live without giving explanations to no-one [sic] […].
As such, the role of implicational directionality in transfer cannot be absolute.

5.3.5 Direct negation

The expression of direct negation by means of the some-series was not predicted by any of the models of transfer described in section 4.1.5, yet 38 instances of this type of mistake were found, some examples of which are the following:

[T]hey argue that it is not m[a]n's duty to deprive someone from [sic] his/her [sic] own life, but God's.

(Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010: A243-2).

You cannot put a price to [sic] anybody's thoughts, and that is the reason why price cannot be put to [sic] somebody's creation of music.

(Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010: C46-1).

However, the rest could maintain that this isn't something new[,] as heterosexual marriage has been declining for a long time with these high numbers of divorce[s] throughout the world.

(Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010: C76-2).

If mistakes such as these are the result of negative transfer, they would indicate the association of the English some-series with the Spanish negative series. This would be against all expectations, since the representational spaces of these series do not overlap in any function. Mistakes of this type therefore demonstrate that not every single instance of negative transfer can be explained by interlingual associations based on the intersection of the functional scopes of source language and recipient language grams, unless each of them could be proven to have a different cause than cross-linguistic influence.

5.3.6 Comparative

The use of the some-series to express the comparative function does not actually disprove hypothesis 1b or hypothesis 3, since both postulate that all source language grams sharing at least one function with a recipient language gram affected by transfer may influence its use. However, only a single expression of the comparative function by means of an indefinite pronoun belonging to the some-series was found, while the other 43 instances of the comparative function were represented by the any-series. Therefore, it may be useful to assess whether this singular mistake may have been caused by transfer or something else:
[There are] people who do not like [f]ast [f]ood but who eat it because of many reasons[,] which seem to be more important than someone's health.

(Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010: C6-3).

As was shown in section 3.3.7, both the indifference series and the negative series may be used to draw comparisons of inequality in Spanish. Since the functional scopes of the negative series and the some-series do not overlap, an explanation of this mistake based on cross-linguistic influence would be the most logical if it involved an interlingual association between the indifference series and the some-series. However, a Spanish version of this sentence featuring a member of the indifference series sounds rather strange:

*Hay gente a que no le gusta la comida rápida, pero que la come por varias razones que parecen ser más importantes que la sanidad de cualquiera.*

‘There are people who do not like fast food, but who eat it because of various reasons which seem to be more important than anyone’s health.’

The peculiarity of this sentence arises from the fact that people who eat fast food are represented as a subgroup of people in general, but that reference is made to the health of any given individual, even though people who eat fast food only endanger their own health. Of course, the some-series could be used in a comparative construction if a particular entity were the standard of comparison, but such a reading is not possible here, unless reference is made to the ‘people who do not like fast food’ introduced at the beginning of the sentence. However, such a sentence would be ungrammatical, since the noun people denotes multiple individuals, while someone is a singular noun, and because the disclosure of the identity of the referent would render the use of this indefinite pronoun incorrect to begin with. Instead, the use of possessive pronouns such as su in Spanish and their in English would be logical choices in either language:

*Hay gente a que no le gusta la comida rápida, pero que la come por varias razones que parecen ser más importantes que su sanidad.*

‘There are people who do not like fast food, but who eat it for various reasons which seem to be more important than their health.’

The source language structure that would underlie the mistake analysed here if it were a consequence of negative structure would thus be incorrect to begin with. Logically, then, the erroneous expression of the comparative function by means of the indefinite pronoun someone is unlikely to be a consequence of cross-linguistic influence exerted over the English some-series by the Spanish indifference series. Instead, the error may be due to some type of transfer unrelated to indefinite pronouns or by a phenomenon unrelated to transfer.
5.3.7 Free choice

Since it was established in the previous section that no instances of the expression of the comparative function by means of the some-series were found, the expression of the free-choice function by means of this series should be examined so as to determine whether the examples of this type of mistake do correspond to the assumption that cross-linguistic influence over a recipient language gram may be exerted by any source language gram that shares one or more function with it. An example of a mistake consisting of the use of a member of the some-series to express the free-choice function is the following:

Nowadays, terrorism is almost an [sic] usual shadow in our lives, a shadow that every day plays with the life of someone […].

(Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010: A158-2).

This mistake could well be the result of an association between the indifference series and the some-series, which overlap in the question and conditional functions. However, the one encountered instance of a member of the no-series expressing the free-choice function does not fit as easily into the hypothesized models of transfer:

The situation is much more alarming in developing countries where hardly no information is given.

(Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010: C68-2).

There is no Spanish series of indefinite pronoun that both includes the free-choice function within its functional scope and overlaps with the no-series. Therefore, if this particular error were the result of transfer, it would both go against the idea that grammatical transfer is based on the overlap of grams and the idea that such transfer follows implicational directionality. However, the English word hardly translates most accurately into Spanish apenas, and just as hardly could easily be rephrased as ‘almost no’, apenas can often be replaced by the analogous construction casi no. As such, the mistake in question could also be the result of lexical confusion regarding the word hardly. Replacement of ‘hardly’ by almost, for instance, would change the reading featuring the free-choice function into one featuring the direct-negation function:

‘The situation is much more alarming in developing countries where almost no information is given.’

(Adapted from Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010: C68-2).

Such lexical confusion seems to be a logical mistake, especially since no other apparent uses of the no-series to express free choice were found. However, the possibility that the error was a
consequence of negative transfer after all cannot be ruled out, and as such, it cannot be ruled out either that transfer may sometimes occur regardless of the overlap of grams and opposite to implicational directionality.

The topic of lexical transfer and transfer based on interlingual formal similarities in general will be discussed in detail in section 5.4.1.

5.3.8 Incorrect direct negation

It was established in section 4.2.5 that an “incorrect direct-negation” function had to be distinguished to enable the categorization of mistakes comprising the expression of direct negation by grams that could normally be used to do so, but not in the syntactic context in which they were encountered. Although this type of mistake does not disprove hypothesis 3, it does show some of the limitations of its explanatory value. The following is an example:

[O]nly God has the right of taking the life of the people [sic]. […] I agree completely with this […], because I believe that anybody has the right to take away the life of anybody [sic].

(Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010: C14-3).

This error could easily be the consequence of the identification of the any-series with the negative series, since these series overlap in the comparative, indirect-negation and direct-negation functions. It therefore does not refute hypothesis 3. The same phenomenon could explain the next example:

I'm in favour of the idea [of only downloading] foreign movies that have few or any possibilities of being licensed for its [sic] distribution in cinema or DVD-stores.

(Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010: C87-1).

However, the mistake in this example could also be the consequence of insufficient mastery of the English idiom few, if any, which would be unrelated to transfer or the author’s knowledge of the use of indefinite pronouns. It can therefore neither be considered evidence for nor against hypothesis 3.

In my opinion, any act of violence is never justified […] no human being on earth deserves it [in] anyway [sic].

(Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010: C119-1).

The peculiarity in this particular example is that it features both the correct and the incorrect expression of indirect negation. After all, a correct rephrasing of ‘any act of violence is never justified’
would read: ‘no act of violence is ever justified’, but *any* is used to express direct negation in a perfectly grammatical way in the final clause of the example. The error in the first use of *any*, or at least its ungrammatical combination with *never*, may have been caused by negative transfer resulting from an association of the *any*-series with the negative series, since the use of a pronoun such as *ninguno* in Spanish elicits the negation of the subsequent verb:

\[ \text{Ningün acto de violencia nunca se puede justificar.} \]

(lit. ‘No act of violence never itself can justify.’)

‘No act of violence can ever be justified’.

However, if the correct uses of *no* and *any* in the final clause are results of positive transfer, this would mean that the author has undergone negative and positive transfer regarding the same word type and the same function simultaneously, which would be most unlikely. Another possibility would be that either the error or the correct construction is the result of some process of transfer, but this would still be unlikely, given the similarity of the two constructions. A third possibility is that the author was in the process of acquiring the correct means of expressing direct negation in English at the time of writing, and has consciously chosen to use both modes of expression out of doubt. However, this explanation is conjecture at best. In short, this example of “incorrect direct negation” affirms that not all correct and incorrect uses of indefinite pronouns in the corpus can doubtlessly be attributed to transfer, let alone to the models of transfer examined here.

5.4 Further considerations

While the previous section focused on evidence against hypothesis 3, this section will address various findings that may indicate different phenomena underlying the encountered uses of indefinite pronouns, and will accordingly put forth a number of alternative explanations for the results.

5.4.1 Formal similarities between languages

It was clear from the literature reviewed in section 3.1 that transfer is a multi-faceted process. Since cross-linguistic influence may affect all levels of language use and occur at both the linguistic and conceptual levels of cognition, notice must be taken of the possibility that interlingual identifications are established between different lexical items based on their formal characteristics rather than between different grammatical morphemes based on their functions. The use of the term ‘lexical items’ here is no coincidence, since interlingual associations based on formal similarities may naturally be established between items in different languages that do not fulfil comparable grammatical functions. The concept of pairs of lexical items that easily elicit such associations is of course not a new one, being commonly known as *false friends*, associations between which may in the current context be regarded as instances of negative transfer. In the terminology introduced in
section 3.1.2, recipient language structures that evoke such associations could also be referred to as *calques*.

Although the degree of similarity between lexical items may to some extent be in the eye of the beholder, there is little discernable resemblance between the grams *some* and *any* and their derivatives on the one hand and the grams from the affirmative series and the indifference series on the other. However, the virtual identicalness of Spanish *no* and English *no*, phonetic differences notwithstanding, may very well serve as a basis for the establishment of interlingual associations between the two lexical items. These could in turn lead speakers of one language to attribute functions of the source language item to the recipient language item, which in this case would often result in positive transfer. As such, the *no*-series, and especially its principle function of expressing direct negation, might be easier to intuitively comprehend for native speakers of Spanish than the other English indefinite pronoun series. This could well be an alternative explanation for the fact that the total of all uses of the *no*-series across the corpus featured the lowest relative quantity of mistakes. Then again, the fact that the results for the other two English indefinite pronoun series corresponded to the model of hypothesis 3 too shows that formal similarities cannot explain all findings.

An indication of the influence of the overlap between the functional scopes of Spanish and English indefinite pronouns can actually be deduced from the results for the *no*-series too when they are compared with the results for the other two series. More precisely, if native speakers of Spanish were to associate the English negative series with the Spanish negative series based not on the overlap of their functional scopes, but on the formal similarity between the morphological stem of the *no*-series and the Spanish negative particle *no*, this would likely lead them to produce both indirect and direct negation in erroneous ways. After all, it was observed in section 3.3.6 that negative indefinite pronouns are used within the syntactic scope of both direct and indirect negation. However, only 3 instances of the incorrect use of members of the *no*-series to express indirect negation were found, against 23 instances of incorrect direct negation and 936 instances of correctly expressed direct negation. The subjects thus seem to have generally had a good understanding of the use of the *no*-series, whose functional scope only overlaps with that of the negative series in the direct-negation function. The *some*-series, on the other hand, overlaps with the affirmative series in all but the indirect-negation function, which, relative to the functions included in the functional scope of the *some*-series, is situated on the side of the semantic map susceptible to meaning extension according to implicational directionality. The expression of indirect negation by means of members of the *some*-series was also the mistake that occurred with the highest relative frequency throughout the corpus. All further instances of indirect negation were correctly expressed by means of indefinite pronouns belonging to the *any*-series, which overlaps with the negative series in the comparative, indirect-negation and direct-negation functions. The results for the indirect-negation series thus correspond to the idea that implicational directionality and the degree of overlap between source language grams and
recipient language grams govern processes of transfer, while simultaneously showing that the role of formal similarities in the establishment of interlingual identifications must have been limited in the investigated corpus.

The notion of transfer based on formal similarities instead of functional ones may actually also strengthen the idea that transfer is guided by implicational directionality, as it shows that examples such as those analysed in sections 5.3.7 may not have been instances of cross-linguistic influence being exerted opposite to implicational directionality after all, since they may have had nothing to do with the functional scopes of the involved grams. It might even be possible that some of the uses of the any-series analysed in sections 5.3.1, 5.3.2 and 5.3.3 were actually consequences of interlingual associations based on the slight formal similarity between members of the affirmative series, such as algo, and indefinite pronouns containing the morpheme any, though this is doubtful.

In any case, the fact that interlingual associations may be based on formal similarities between lexical items still means that transfer will only follow implicational directionality if it occurs as a result of associations between source language grams and recipient language grams based on the similarity of their functional scopes. Transfer can thus largely be explained by means of comparison of semantic maps, but cannot be flawlessly predicted by it. Exact comparison of the use of English indefinite pronouns by native speakers of Spanish and the use of their supposed formal counterparts in Spanish would therefore be needed to measure the relative influences of formal and functional similarities in processes of transfer.

The notion that speakers may exhibit transfer based on other perceived interlingual connections than functional similarities is also closely related to the matter of intentionality, which will be explored in the next section.

**5.4.2 Intentionality**

It was established in section 3.1.2 that speakers may both intentionally and unintentionally allow transfer to occur. A factor that therefore must be taken into account is the role intentionality may play in the assumptions speaker make about the use of recipient language structures. Naturally, speakers would have limited control over unconsciously established interlingual associations, and their effects on recipient language structures would most likely be governed by principles such as those supposed by hypothesis 3 rather than being random. On the other hand, the results of conscious reflection on the expression of meanings and the use of items in the target language would be less predictable, since different individuals could draw different conclusions about the same recipient language structures. This does not mean that the overlap of grams in the source and recipient language may not affect the conscious reasoning speakers will apply to their use of recipient language structures, but it does mean that the outcomes of such reasoning may vary in ways that comparison of the semantic maps of the supposed source and recipient languages cannot directly predict. The
example from section 5.3.8 in which both a correct and an incorrect expression of direct negation by means of members of the no-series were featured is likely an instance of the results of conscious reasoning applied to the use of recipient language structures. A similar example would be the following:

They basically do not accept anyone different [...]..

(Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010: C72-3).

[N]obody belongs to nowhere.

(Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010: C72-3).

Both citations were taken from the same essay, yet the first one features the correct expression of direct negation by a member of the any-series, while the second one features the incorrect reduplication of direct negation. There are various explanations imaginable, one of which will be considered in the next section, but the main point is that the possibility that intentional transfer on the part of the author resulted in the production of one of the constructions, if not both, must be taken into consideration.

These examples show that even a single individual may produce different structures regarding the same function at different times. As such, their limited capability to predict the ways in which intentional transfer will occur is one of the shortcomings of semantic maps as a means of schematizing cross-linguistic influence.

**5.4.3 Gradual change of transfer patterns**

The examples from the previous section emphasize more than just the importance of the role intentionality possibly plays in transfer processes. To be precise, the fact that single individuals may alternate between the use of different means to express the same grammatical meaning shows that if transfer occurs, it does not necessarily consequently do so in one single way. However, hypothesis 3 as well as the hypotheses that preceded it supposed that cross-linguistic influence would follow particular patterns based on the compatibility of source language grams and recipient language grams. The conceptualization of transfer as a learning strategy hinted at in section 5.2.5 furthermore implies a certain redundancy of multiple types of transfer occurring with regard to the same function, since the establishment of an interlingual identification resulting in positive transfer would render previously established identifications resulting in negative transfer obsolete. Nevertheless, the redundancy of multiple cross-linguistic associations regarding the same function does not mean that there are no situations in which several of such associations can actually coexist, as the alternation between different structures expressing the same functions on the part of a single individual shows. Such alternation could be a logical part of a process of trial-and-error directed at eventual language mastery.
Gradual replacement of patterns of negative transfer by patterns of positive transfer and patterns of correct recipient language usage not based on transfer would moreover be in harmony with the findings. For instance, the *some*-series presented a relatively large amount of mistakes consisting of the use of its members to express the indirect-negation function. Incidentally, the *some*-series and the affirmative series, the latter of which includes indirect negation in its functional scope, overlap to a higher degree than any other two series. In contrast, the indifference series, which counts the comparative function among its uses, overlaps with the *some*-series in only two functions, and hardly any instances of mistakes consisting of the expression of comparison by means of the *some*-series were found. As was pointed out in section 5.2.5, these results correspond to the idea that interlingual identifications may be established between any source language gram that shares functions with the affected recipient language gram, but that the degree of influence exerted by such source language grams is proportional to their degree of overlap with the affected recipient language grams. A tendency towards gradual replacement of patterns of negative transfer by patterns of correct target language usage could thus be one of the reasons behind this relation between the overlap of grams and the relative strength of cross-linguistic influence. This notion also bolsters the idea that cross-linguistically contrasted semantic maps may serve as models of transfer, although it also highlights their inability to predict the exact proportions between correct and incorrect uses of recipient language grams.

Another factor that may influence the relative quantities of correct and incorrect uses of grams may be the medium of language production, which will be contemplated in the next section.

5.4.4 Media of language production

Besides the fact that transfer may both either be intentional or unintentional, section 3.1.2 introduced the notion that cross-linguistic influence may be exerted through various media of language production, as either spoken or written language use may be affected by it. Semantic maps are supposed to represent the expression of grammatical meaning in general, which means that their supposed correlations with transfer are assumed to be valid regardless of the form in which linguistic structures are produced. However, a crucial difference between authors of written text and speakers producing spoken language is their level of spontaneity, given that the former will generally have more time to consider formulations, have the ability to reread and alter text, and may in certain cases consult sources such as dictionaries, grammar books, or other individuals. Media of language production and the intentionality of transfer, which was discussed in the previous section, are therefore also strongly related. Since the corpus used for this investigation consisted entirely of written texts, it is very likely that at least some of the authors have consulted external sources when writing their essays. The discovered relative quantities of incorrect and correct uses of the investigated grams may therefore in part have been determined by the nature of the corpus, and the relative quantities of mistakes might not have been so small as those indicated in section 5.1 if the corpus had comprised
spoken text. Reiteration of this investigation with such a corpus would therefore provide an interesting standard of comparison. In spite of these uncertainties, however, consulting external sources will rarely result in the alteration of correct constructions, and the subjects who contributed their essays to the corpus will not have attentively considered the use of every indefinite pronoun, nor will they have consulted external sources for every one of them. Consequently, the findings still provide an indication of the general patterns of transfer affecting the use of English indefinite pronouns by native speakers of Spanish.

5.4.5 Language knowledge

A final necessary observation is that the idea of a relation between the overlap of grammatical morphemes in particular functions on the one hand and patterns of cross-linguistic influence on the other presupposes that language learners have some intuitive notion of different word types. Given that the theory underlying the semantic-map method defines word types based on their functions, transfer based on the alignment of functions postulated by this theory would likely result in the exertion of cross-linguistic influence by grammatical morphemes in the source language over comparable types of grammatical morphemes in the recipient language. However, to establish interlingual identifications resulting in such transfer, speakers should at least have a basic idea of the general area recipient language grams cover on the functional framework. This would mean that a speaker’s knowledge of the recipient language would greatly influence their manifestations of transfer. Naturally, this was already clear in relation to the distinction between positive and negative transfer, since a speaker who has fully mastered a language will, by definition, experience only a negligible amount of negative transfer. Nonetheless, it could also be presumed that if a speaker does not yet have sufficient knowledge of a language to understand the basic division of its types of grammatical morphemes on the functional framework, they would be unable to establish functional identifications between particular source language grams and their recipient language counterparts. As such, cross-linguistic influence manifested by such speakers would be more likely to be based on formal resemblance and other perceived similarities between source language items and recipient language items than on functional correspondences. The results presented in section 5.1 might therefore not have conformed as much to the model of transfer of hypothesis 3 if the corpus had not consisted of texts written by people who have received formal education about the English language.

Now that these final considerations have been addressed, the overall conclusion to which this investigation has led will be summarized in the next chapter.
6 Conclusion

The goal of this investigation has been to test whether semantic maps can be used to describe, explain, and predict the way in which processes of transfer or cross-linguistic influence occur. More precisely, attention has been paid to the role the overlap of grammatical morphemes from different languages on the framework of functions on which semantic maps are based plays in the manifestation of transfer. The role the directionality of language change might play in the manifestation of transfer has also been examined. These matters have been investigated by means of a case study focused on the use of English indefinite pronouns by native speakers of Spanish in a corpus of English-language argumentative essays. This will present the results this investigation has produced.

Generally speaking, the results confirm that an accurate model of cross-linguistic influence exerted by Spanish indefinite pronouns over their English counterparts has been created by means of comparison of the respective semantic maps of this word type in Spanish and English. On the one hand, functions that particular Spanish and English indefinite pronouns shared were expressed correctly most frequently by means of these English indefinite pronouns, while the most common mistakes consisted of the expression of functions by means of English indefinite pronouns that did not share these functions with the Spanish indefinite pronouns with which they partly overlapped. The overlap of the functional scope of source language morphemes and recipient language morphemes as such seems to play a significant role in the assumptions language learners make about their target languages.

This investigation also sought to answer the question which grammatical morphemes would exert cross-linguistic influence if more than one of them overlapped with the affected recipient language gram. The encountered patterns of correct and incorrect use of English indefinite pronouns suggest that all source language grams that share functions with a particular recipient language gram may influence its use, but that the degree of influence is proportional to their degree of overlap. Moreover, the contrast between the patterns of correct and incorrect uses of English indefinite pronouns indicate that transfer is largely susceptible to the same implicational directionality that governs the change of the meanings of grammatical morphemes. This means that the functions that are likely to be added to the functional scopes of grammatical morphemes should their meaning be extended are also most likely to be erroneously included within the functional scopes of recipient language grams, on the condition that they are part of the functional scope of the source language gram with which the affected recipient language gram has been associated.

These principles do not apply without exception, however. Some of the findings, such as the sparse expressions of the specific-known, specific-unknown and irrealis non-specific functions by means of English indefinite pronouns containing the base morpheme any, suggest that the erroneous
attribution of functions to a particular recipient language gram may oppose implicational directionality. Furthermore, the use of semantic maps to schematize and predict the occurrence of transfer presupposes that all transfer is based on associations between grammatical morphemes based on their functional aspects. However, it is clear that in practice, cross-linguistic influence may be exerted as a consequence of various kinds of associations between source language items and recipient language items. For instance, some of the results concerning the use of negative indefinite pronouns in English could be explained by interlingual identifications established by native speakers of Spanish based on the formal similarity between the Spanish negative particle *no* and the English morpheme *no* rather than the functional similarities between negative indefinite pronouns in these two languages. Other factors that may influence the manifestation of transfer are the intentionality of the speaker in exerting cross-linguistic influence, the medium of language production, and the speaker’s knowledge of the recipient language and its types of grammatical morphemes. Finally, of course, not all incorrect and correct uses of grammatical morphemes by language learners are the result of transfer.

In short, semantic maps seem to be a reasonably good basis for the creation of models for the description and prediction of transfer based on functional similarities between morphemes in different languages. Due to the large variety of factors that may influence transfer, they do feature a certain margin of error, but the results of this study indicate that the comparison of the semantic maps of particular grammatical morphemes in two languages will reveal the patterns of use of these grammatical morphemes speakers of one of these language are most likely to exhibit in the other. As such, this method of analysing cross-linguistic influence may have several uses, such as the prevention of specific mistakes in language education. To assess their precise benefits and shortcomings, however, additional investigations of the applicability of semantic maps to the phenomenon of transfer are needed.

This paper is thus concluded with some suggestions for further research. First of all, reiterations of this investigation focusing on different morphemes and languages could confirm or refute its results, thereby indicating the degree of validity of the apparent principles it has revealed. Moreover, repetition of this investigation with a corpus consisting of spoken language rather than written language would specify the influence of different media of language production on the manifestation of transfer. Finally, comparison of the kinds and patterns of cross-linguistic influence exerted by speakers who have received formal instruction in a particular recipient language and those exerted by speakers who have not, as well as comparison of the use of particular morphemes in a particular language by non-native speakers compared to that of native speakers, would provide greater insight into the accuracy of semantic maps as a model of transfer. Hopefully, this paper will serve to inspire such research in the future.
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8 Appendix

This chapter presents specific information about the nature of the corpus used in the investigation. Section 8.1 specifies what information contributors to the Written Corpus of Learner English were asked to provide by its original creators in section 8.1. Furthermore, some examples of the texts from this corpus that were analysed in this investigation are provided in section 8.2.

8.1 Information on contributions to the corpus

The following information about the collection of data for the corpus is available at the web page Written Corpus of Learner English:

The corpus consists of essays written by native Spanish students who are learning English within the Department of English at the Universidad Autonoma de Madrid. In particular, students within the first and third year of the degree take Academic Writing courses, and these students were asked if the essays they submitted for marking could be included in the corpus.

Collection of essays and metadata: Students submitted their essays, either by email or on disk. Additionally, they passed to the teacher two information sheets:

Release forms/Essay Profile: For each essay submitted, the student provided an "essay profile" form, detailing the resources they used to write the essay. The form also includes a section where the student grants permission for the essay to [b]e used for research purposes […].

Learner Profile: Each student filled in a "learner profile" form, which solicits information regarding age, gender, language background, English language proficiency, etc. […].

Oxford Quick Placement Test: Each student took the Oxford Quick Placement Test at a time close to the writing of the essays. The first year students took the test within a month of writing the essays, while the third year students took the test within the same semester.

Data Entry: The learner and essay profile forms were entered into an Excel spreadsheet by Ivan Teomiro.

Text Normalisation: Paul Rollinson normalised each submitted text in accordance with the process used in the ICLE corpus. All personal data, titles, footnotes, endnotes,
graphics, maps and bibliographies were stripped out, and quotations and references were replaced with <Q> and <R> respectively.

(Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, n.d.).
Figure A.1. The form contributors to the Written Corpus of Learner English were asked to fill out regarding their linguistic background. Universidad Autónoma de Madrid: n.d. *Written Corpus of Learner English*. 
Figure A.2. The form contributors to the corpus were asked to fill out regarding the details of the material they submitted. Universidad Autónoma de Madrid: n.d. *Written Corpus of Learner English.*


8.2 Example texts from the corpus

In this section, various texts that were analysed during the investigation are shown so as to provide a general idea of their nature. All texts were taken from the Written Corpus of Learner English (Rollinson & Mendikoetxea 2010). The file name of each corpus is indicated in its title. Underscores indicating indefinite pronouns that were taken into account during the research were not featured in the original corpus, and typographic features have been changed to suit those of the rest of this paper. All other textual features, including misspellings and grammatical mistakes, have been left unaltered.

8.2.1 A170-1

Actually there are some kinds of problems that worry the population. Problems like immigration, racism or domestic violence are increasing in our society getting worse in Europe and North America. In this essay I'm going to expose my point of view about these problems and the solutions that I think would be appropriate for them.

The first problem is immigration. I think that people can go to every place they want besides their nationality or the colour of their skin if they want to have a better life, salary or education because in their countries there are weaknesses in these aspects. Of course they must have their passports regulated. However it's true that some of them are illegal immigrants and criminals who come there for commit robbery and murders. But they are only few persons that don't represent the immigrants. My solution for this problem is the better regulation of the immigrants that enter in our country by putting more police in the frontiers and repatriating the illegal immigrants that have arrive here in boat crossing the sea. Other way is regulate the immigrants that have been working here since one or two years and give more working licenses for avoid the massive entrance in the country.

The second problem is related to the first problem. My personal opinion is that nobody can hate a person for the colour of his skin, his nationality or his status because nobody is better than anybody and everybody has the right to go wherever they want without be hated. Lots of people hate immigrants and foreigners because they think that these people steal the jobs that a person of the country can do, but for me this is not true because if the foreigners obtain these jobs is because they are better prepared or it is a job that nobody wants. My personal solution is increase the education of this people in especial classes living together with foreigners or working together to learn that the foreigners are not bad or different people. Other way is by television. With the publicity and the programs we can see black or Asiatic people interacting with natives and finally people will see foreigners like something closer and normal.

The last problem is the domestic violence, which is a problem that is increasing in developed counties. I strongly believe that the person that hurts his o her partner must be in prison because you can't mistreat the person whom you have promised eternal love. You can't pay with him or her your
own frustrations because if you do that you're nothing but a criminal. Some of these criminals say that they have killed their partners because they love them. I think that it's stupid because if they had love their partners they wouldn't have killed them. The solution that I propose is to harden the justice to maintain these criminals in jail a big quantity of years for punish them. The police also can increase their actuation is case of violence or denunciation. Finally the criminals can be educated to integrate themselves in the society and maintain their marriages.

In conclusion, we have seen the four problems that I think are the most worrying these days. Other people have different opinions from me and all the opinions are valid. But I believe that in the future these problems will be solved. This is duty of the government that must give solutions like better regulation of the immigrants, increase the education for avoid the racism and harden the justice for the criminals. These are my solutions but there could be much more. I hope that in the future we can talk that these problems have been solved. For solving these problems everybody has to involve in this and people must not live thinking that anything affects them. It's a social issue and it concerns everybody.

8.2.2 A196-1

Child abuse, drugs abuse and sexual transmitted diseases are the most worrying issues these days. Fist of all, child abuse is a serious issue in the society. It can include: physical, emotional or sexual abuse and neglect. Second, the use of drugs can lead to behavior that causes difficulties at home and in their own job. Sexual transmitted diseases is also another important problem in our society; not having protected sex with someone is one of the main reason of this. In this essay I am going to explain all this points.

When a child is sexually abused, there are some symptoms to make it out. The child's behavior will change a lot. He / she will rather be alone and reject some activities in which they participate. Child abuse is a serious issue in the society. It can include: physical, emotional or sexual abuse and neglect. In the drug's matter the personality changes, less interest in family activities, increase of arguments, needing more money for them. Drugs use can also lead to big changes in your life. Ignorance the rest of the world, living in a world with no real friends. Unprotected sex with someone is one the main reasons of this. Furthermore, the use of drugs is related to the occurrence of unsafe sexual behaviour that brings to the adolescent to pregnancies or contracting sexually transmitted diseases such as VIH/ AIDS. About Sexual transmitted diseases we could see that although there are a lot of information around this, there are still a lot of disinformation too. At school students are probably the best informed about it and yet they still need more education, but adult people need to know more about this and take care about it. There a lot of campaigns that help to know a lot about good sex without fright for these diseases.
In conclusion, we have seen how the child's behavior changes because of the abuse, the drugs' effect and how a person can change his lifestyle to a worse one and disinformation about sex could be stupid for our lifes getting them in serious danger.

On the other hand, some people say that it is not an easy phenomenon to define the child abuse because childhood behaviour varies in harmony of cultural, family and social tolerance (example in the India) but we must see that a child is just a child that is going to grow and have his own decision when he/she is older. The solution will be a major parent's control or teacher's control, if they see anything wrong about the behavior's child, but this is too difficult and sometimes not possible because we don't know which, when where or who could be the cause of the abuse. As regards drugs, there are funny ones and we can find better friends and sex, we also see for example if much better doing sex without worrying anything, so we have all together we could spend the weekend in a better funnier way. But we must be aware of it, we try to show people that this is not real and when it finishes, there is nothing that will be possible solution.

8.2.3 A224-1

Religion is one of the subjects of the obligatory education in Spain. In the lasts months there have been a hot debate about if should be a optional subject for those students who don't want to do religion in the secondary education. The current education law establishes study activities or an optional subject about the history of religions as an alternative for religion. However, the secular groups are fighting to erase religion from the hours of lesson because they want to break the agreement of the government with the Holy see to turn Spain to a true secular State. In my view there should be a religion or a history of religions subjects in the hours of lessons, as I will try to show in this essay.

In the first place, I think religion is one of the pillar of the our occidental culture. A good knowledge of religion is very useful for the humanistic preparation of any student. First, the majority of arts; as could be painting, architecture or sculpture; have strong religious influences. For example, a student who stands in front of the striking altarpiece of the Old Salamanca Cathedral, and who has not been properly prepared in religion, won't be able to understand the meaning of this piece of art. He will only see a great Romanic altarpiece, but he will know nothing about the characters or the stories that represent the marvellous paintings of the 15th century, which are in this old cathedral. As a result, this student would have deficiencies in his educational formation. Second, literature or philosophy subjects do continuous religious references, if a student doesn't know the basic stories and principles of religion he would be lost in many aspects of this subjects. Also our language has incorporated some religious words and terms, which nowadays are common, as could be repent or sin, and any student would be able to understand its connotations.
On the other hand, the president of the Ceapa ("Confederación Laica de Padres") suggests that religion shouldn't be a school subject and the government should break the agreement with the Holy see so Spain will be a secular State, once and for all as is said in the Constitucion. This could mean that students who doesn't want to do religion could go home and they won't need to do any optional subjects, as history or religion or other study activities. Also this confederation agrees with a new proposal that suggests that religion can be chosen like an optional subject as could be computing, or the second foreign language, out of the hours of lesson. Even this confederation maintains that there should be other religions to chose, as could be Muslim. Nevertheless, my own view of this is that most of the students will prefer to go home instead of doing religion or any optional subject. As a result, they will have more time to play or maybe to study other important subjects as could be mathematics or physic. However, speaking personally, I feel students will lose an important part of their humanistic formation like the student of the cathedral's example.

In addiction, I could argue that the main problem is the way that religion is taught. Some people feel that religion class is only the study of the missal, the repetition of some common prayers like Our father, the live after death's belief and the study of the moral Christian values. But from my point of view the religion class consists in the study of the history of the Christian religion; because is the main occidental religion; or even the study of some relevant passages of the Bible. What's more I feel that the Bible has important keys to understand our modern society, our art and our culture. Consequently, students could discover in the Holy Bible the deepest roots of our occidental culture as well as the source of the Christian faith.

In conclusion, this paper has focused on why class religion should be a school subject with respect to the religion's cultural values instead of the ethical or moral Christian value. Two main arguments again religion class have been covered: Spain is a Secular State therefore religion should be out the hours of lesson and the belief that religion is only a kind of excuse to teach Christian beliefs and the moral Christian values. However, I have argued that religion is very useful for the education of any students with respect to three main fields: art, language, and philosophy or literature. Also I have argued that the study of the Bible could be a source of useful knowledge, because a student could understand the roots of or society, our art and our culture. One possible solution might be to change the method that traditional education has followed to teach religion: the study of the missal and the Christian moral instead of the study of the history of religion and the study of the Bible from a social and cultural point of view. In general I think that students will have important deficiencies in their knowledge of the world if religion is out of hours of lesson.
Nowadays the practise of legal abortion is only allowed in 54 countries in the world, which is about 61 percent of the world population. 97 countries, about 39 percent of the population, have abortion laws that make it illegal according to the pro-abortion Centre for Reproductive Law and Policy in New York. In Spain, the abortion is only legal when either the mother's life or the mother's physical and mental health is in danger. Some people believe that the abortion should be a basic women's right to choose about their own wills; but others disagree with that opinion because it's considered a murder. In this essay, I am going to show the different people's opinions about the abortion concerning the Spanish legislation and the moral background.

Some people argue that the parents of an unborn baby should take the decision about either interrupting the pregnancy or not. It's also argued that no reason needs to be given. Those ones who agree about legalizing the abortion think that there are several reasons to make it a women's right. First, because the life of the mother could be saved. Second, to preserve the physical health and the mental health of the mother. Third, it's also supported in cases of rape and incest. These arguments supported by some people can be felt really convincing but others find them unfair because it's not considered the life of the new human being, who can have a good healthy long life even though the mother can die when giving a birth.

It has been pointed out that the approval of the legalization of the abortion would make decrease the amount of clandestine unhealthy abortions taken place all over the World, in places that are not ready to do these types of surgeries. According to this fact, it would be more ethical and safer that the international legislations took care of this issue when millions of mothers can be about to die at these illegal places. This argument is strong enough for those people who back the cause, but it doesn't seem a good argument for those ones who are against of making abortion legal because from their point of view nobody would be about to die at any place if some mothers didn't want to interfere with their own pregnancy.

One of the main arguments supported by doctors and scientists, in favour of the abortion, is that some mothers could prevent the suffering of their unborn children in cases of medical problems and birth defects. This argument can be apparently true because in that way we could avoid the pain of thousands of children who are been born with some kind of disability that makes their lives hard and distressing. In this way, families and people related to these children would not suffer seeing how one of their relatives has a bad time trying to survive and trying to have a normal life because there is no expectation that the handicapped child recovers.
On the other hand, mostly from a conservative point of view, some people are against the abortion because it's considered as a murder under any circumstance. Only 4 countries in the World feel it this way. These countries are the Vatican, Malta, Chile and El Salvador. In these countries with a high Catholic population it's thought that it does not exist any cause in order to avoid the birth of the future offspring that has a soul as anyone else and which would break the sixth commandment: 'Not to kill'. Furthermore, it can be argued that the abortion is a type of murder since every one has the right to live.

Finally, from the point of view of those who are in favour of the abortion, it could be claimed that the legalization of it could solve the complicated situation of those parents who do not want a future baby because they can't afford to support a child. This seems a strong argument even though it appears to be some other solutions before practicing abortion such as giving the child into adoption so that the baby could be supported by a family with such a good income besides the child would be raised in a happy environment where their foster parents could enthusiastically take care of them.

There are always several opinions about this important issue; some people agree that legalization of abortion could be a good idea if governments completely control the situation and make sure that laws and rules are followed and there is no corruption within doctors and patients. However, there always will be the religious view, which considers abortion as a murder and stays tough to not practice it by any cause.

So then, there are many arguments concerning the topic of abortion. The main arguments in favour are those that try to protect the life and the health of the mother. Other arguments seem to try to protect the mothers' social and/or economic reason and her dignity, in case of rape and/or incest. On the other hand, it's considered that abortion should not be allowed by any reason. Moreover, many people who are against the abortion think that it should be illegal because the legalization of it would make increase the amount of pregnancy interruptions because women would not want to deal with their own responsibilities during their sexual relationships and the practical of abortion would be as simple as getting a haircut and any daily act. This is a hard issue to solve since everybody disagrees because of that women should plan ideas to convince the rest of the society to be either in favour or against the abortion.

8.2.5 A275-1

Nowadays the practise of legal abortion is only allowed in 54 countries in the world, which is about 61 percent of the world population. 97 countries, about 39 percent of the population, have abortion laws that make it illegal according to the pro-abortion Centre for Reproductive Law and Policy in New York. In Spain, the abortion is only legal when either the mother's life or the mother's physical and mental health is in danger. Some people believe that the abortion should be a basic women's right to choose about their own wills; but others disagree with that opinion because it's
considered a murder. In this essay, I am going to show the different people's opinions about the abortion concerning the Spanish legislation and the moral background.

Some people argue that the parents of an unborn baby should take the decision about either interrupting the pregnancy or not. It's also argued that no reason needs to be given. Those ones who agree about legalizing the abortion think that there are several reasons to make it a women's right. First, because the life of the mother could be saved. Second, to preserve the physical health and the mental health of the mother. Third, it's also supported in cases of rape and incest. These arguments supported by some people can be felt really convincing but others find them unfair because it's not considered the life of the new human being, who can have a good healthy long life even though the mother can die when giving a birth.

It has been pointed out that the approval of the legalization of the abortion would make decrease the amount of clandestine unhealthy abortions taken place all over the World, in places that are not ready to do these types of surgeries. According to this fact, it would be more ethical and safer that the international legislations took care of this issue when millions of mothers can be about to die at these illegal places. This argument is strong enough for those people who back the cause, but it doesn't seem a good argument for those ones who are against of making abortion legal because from their point of view nobody would be about to die at any place if some mothers didn't want to interfere with their own pregnancy.

One of the main arguments supported by doctors and scientists, in favour of the abortion, is that some mothers could prevent the suffering of their unborn children in cases of medical problems and birth defects. This argument can be apparently true because in that way we could avoid the pain of thousands of children who are been born with some kind of disability that makes their lives hard and distressing. In this way, families and people related to these children would not suffer seeing how one of their relatives has a bad time trying to survive and trying to have a normal life because there is no expectation that the handicapped child recovers.

On the other hand, mostly from a conservative point of view, some people are against the abortion because it's considered as a murder under any circumstance. Only 4 countries in the World feel it this way. These countries are the Vatican, Malta, Chile and El Salvador. In these countries with a high Catholic population it's thought that it does not exist any cause in order to avoid the birth of the future offspring that has a soul as anyone else and which would break the sixth commandment: 'Not to kill'. Furthermore, it can be argued that the abortion is a type of murder since every one has the right to live.

Finally, from the point of view of those who are in favour of the abortion, it could be claimed that the legalization of it could solve the complicated situation of those parents who do not want a
future baby because they can't afford to support a child. This seems a strong argument even though it appears to be some other solutions before practicing abortion such as giving the child into adoption so that the baby could be supported by a family with such a good income besides the child would be raised in a happy environment where their foster parents could enthusiastically take care of them.

There are always several opinions about this important issue; some people agree that legalization of abortion could be a good idea if governments completely control the situation and make sure that laws and rules are followed and there is no corruption within doctors and patients. However, there always will be the religious view, which considers abortion as a murder and stays tough to not practice it by any cause.

So then, there are many arguments concerning the topic of abortion. The main arguments in favour are those that try to protect the life and the health of the mother. Other arguments seem to try to protect the mothers' social and/or economic reason and her dignity, in case of rape and/or incest. On the other hand, it's considered that abortion should not be allowed by any reason. Moreover, many people who are against the abortion think that it should be illegal because the legalization of it would make increase the amount of pregnancy interruptions because women would not want to deal with their own responsibilities during their sexual relationships and the practical of abortion would be as simple as getting a haircut and any daily act. This is a hard issue to solve since everybody disagrees because of that women should plan ideas to convince the rest of the society to be either in favour or against the abortion.

8.2.6 C10-3

In our present society the subject about human cloning is considered such as controversial issue among all positions and countries. Instead of being three different types of cloning, the basic word 'cloning' is used as a term to describe the process of create an identical copy of an original. Before start talking about the viewpoints of this topic is important to know the terms properly: firstly, is the well known 'embryo cloning' which consists basically on produce monozygotic (identical) twins or triplets with an identical DNA; secondly, 'adult DNA cloning' which is based on duplicate an existing animal and thirdly 'therapeutic cloning' which is used to create new and healthy organs with the person original's DNA. It could be considered by some people that human cloning is both acceptable and necessary in our society in order to have a healthier life than years ago had. But it should also be considered that, instead of being an advance that could cure a lot of serious illness, there are some communities such as religious ones which think that these processes are totally immoral and attempt to decay the human beings. Nowadays these procedures are forbidden in humans and they only can be made in animals. Therapeutic cloning is currently legal for research purposes in Britain and a law permits human cloning for the purpose of developing provided that the clone is aborted and used for medical research in New Jersey. There is also a mid point in which are those who
are in favour of all types of human cloning only beyond the limits and in extreme circumstances. In this essay I am going to point out some of the main viewpoints including mine concerning human cloning.

One of the main arguments often given to defend the human cloning is that this process is going to consent the medicine to create parts of the body free of illness for those people who are in need of them. Some people argue that, people who are convalescents and claim any organ to be alive more time have the right to go to aid of this form of cloning calls 'therapeutic cloning'. The liberal position said that: <Q> <R>. That is why to clone organs is considered as a satisfactory action since it makes the possibility of study much sickness without rejects directly into the patient's system. However, on the other hand, some conservative Christians think that, not only this cloning but also all kinds are a murder against human person considering a new life starts in a conventional conception process. Personally speaking, I strongly believe that therapeutic cloning is the most relevant and important one inside the world of human/animal cloning. According to Dr. Boisselier: <Q> <R>. I think this method allows to create a healthy copy of a sick person's organ ready to be transplanted without neither any problems nor rejections from the patient's body, so seeing this, I disagree with these Christian organizations which say this is a crime whereas despite of be inadequate for health, is a technique which, from my point of view is going to save many lives in the future.

Another important argument that can be pointed out by those in favour of human cloning is that people have the right to be free to choose whether create a new life or not. Those who are old, unable parents or homosexual could be happier if they could have children with their same genes. Randolfe Wicker, the founder of 'Clone Rights united Front' said: <Q> <R>. Contrary to this, it could be said that because of this, people will abandon sexual reproduction in favour of cloning and it will create new forms of family such as: joint custody of children after divorce, single motherhood and/or fatherhood, single-parent adoption, interracial adoption, homosexual parenting...From my point of view, these arguments given for be against cloning are nonsense because all of us should have the right to be parents. If we are not able, old enough or homosexual...why can we not be parents as well? These people who have risks can be as good parents as the rest and they are not choosing cloning as an easier way to breed but make their dreams come true.

One of the most common arguments given by those who are against cloning is the feeling of 'Playing God'. Christians say that: <Q> <R>. For them, scientists create superior beings like in Frankenstein, but it is a wrong idea since Frankenstein created life from inanimate things and cloning creates life from life, is just an extension of in vitro procedures: <Q> <R>. Members of some religious groups, such as 'Evangelical Christianity' and 'Roman Catholicism' said that a soul enters in a person at the same time of conception and in that moment has already become in a human full of rights. Because of this, when a 'baby' is divided in more parts some clone zygotes die, that means for them a loos
considered as serious as the death of a new born baby. Pope John Paul II commented to the
'International Congress on Transplants' in 2000 that: <Q> <R>. It seems to me that we can not leave
all in God's hands because if we do this, we could never develop according to time. We must try, from
my point of view, to advance and not to leave matters to nature. I think this cloning is not different
from other reproductive technologies so is not harmful for anyone. Talking to superior beings, I think
no one is going to use cloning to create 'something' for destroy the world. Cloning is not cheap and
there are other methods (nuclear bombs, virus...) which provide of superior power to their creators.

People argue that there is a word that appears in all the people's mind when we talk against this
topic: risk. It is said that two important risks should make us to go against human cloning. They are:
risks of health and emotional risks. A subsequent Time/CNN poll in 2001 found that: 90% of people
felt cloning humans was a bad idea and 69% believe that human cloning is against God's will <R>. It
seems that for these people, there are many disfigured and abnormal clones that have been either
aborted or destroyed by the scientists worried about what they were creating. Contrary to this, people
say that human cloning is not going to be working until all is right. Scientists are working hard
nowadays in order to make this process more and more secure. The medicine is not exploiting people
but is providing another chance for them instead of illness, despair, sadness...<Q> <R>.

Referring to emotional risks people argue that clones will have a huge emotional pressure
because of their feelings about their own identity and their knowledge of have been the replacement of
another. <Q> <R>. Nevertheless it could be said that, in cases in which there are bad treatment in the
familiar environment, orphaned children or a child who lives with any kind of abuse, exists more
emotional disorders than in cloned children. Their supposed replacement is the same as if a couple
decides to have another baby because of their child's death. Dr. Boisselier pointed out that: <Q> <R>.

Personally speaking, these risks are in our daily life and in all kind of birth. There is always a
factor of risk in a pregnancy and because of this I think yet there is not any resource to prove that is
more tricky than another method of reproductive process. I also believe that medicine in general
should study more about human cloning before starting to work on people. But this procedure occurs
always in all the subjects during these centuries, since is necessary for the mankind to go on develop
and on try to find some solutions to our problems of health. This topic is like all in life: neither no one
borns knowing nor all the knowledge is known by anyone. And finally, talking about the emotional
risks, I strongly believe that, being a cloned child is not a handicap for being happy and is not going to
create problems for them. They only should have love in all around them as any child should have.

Like in all topics there are also opinions less radical than the two ones explained before. It could
be said that some people are not extremely against human cloning but are nearer of it. For them this
technique is well seen if it is used with responsibility and has the purpose to make a good action in something or someone. That means that, if an animal cloning suppose this animal is going to live 10 years and is going to feed up five children of an undeveloped country, these people say 'yes' to the method. The same if it is for an organ which is for a person who is in need of it. On the other hand, those who are extremely in favour say that cloning always is for a good act, never is going to caused a harmful feeling. It seems to me that, this viewpoint concerning human cloning is the most reasonable seeing that there are many atrocious people anxious of power who is able to abuse of it and the only thing that are going to make is play with innocent people's feelings.

To sum up, we have seen that there are different arguments concerning human cloning. On the one hand we have seen that those in favour of human cloning group all their arguments and emphasize the two most important for them: the therapeutic function which allows to improve a person's health and the other one which is connected with the fact that not all the people can hold the parents' role because of any problem such as age, homosexuality, infertility.... On the other hand those who consider that human cloning is totally an act of an evil and goes against God's will. Finally, we find a middle point of view in where the only argument given by these people is that they want this technique to be used with responsibility and in a good way. Apart from all these subjective viewpoints, we have also seen my personal opinion and how I feel above all the arguments given. This topic seems not to have an easy solution in which all the viewpoints agree with, because instead of the majority of them want to use it as something good, there are those who think that all this kind of medicine is against nature.

8.2.6 C119-1

Nowadays society is dealing with a problem revealed throughout the XXth century, although it seems to have been present for as long as human conscience and couple foundations: domestic violence. Domestic violence is defined by the Children and Family Court Advisory and Support Service in the United Kingdom as <Q>. In this essay I intend to express my opinion against domestic violence and the disagreement with many of the prevention and solution politics that have been spread by the government and the institutions responsible for this area.

From my point of view, nobody, men or women, should be object of any kind of violence. My argument is that in a civilized society all persons deserve to be respected and have the obligation to be respectful to others. There isn't any kind of justification for the abusing of another person. Whatever his social, religious or ethnic condition may be, and even less a person you love and with whom you are supposed to form up a family. It seems to me rather unreasonable that considering something that may hurt not only physically but also the integrity of a person can ever be justified and even more recommendable. Nevertheless statistics show that domestic violence accounts for 16% of all violent crime, has more repeat victims than any other crime (on average there will have been 35 assaults before a victim calls the police), and it is the largest cause of morbidity worldwide in women aged 19-
44, greater than war, cancer or motor vehicle accidents and will affect 1 in 4 women and 1 in 6 men in their lifetime.

Domestic violence is in most cases never reported, and many of the reported ones are usually removed. The majority of the victims are afraid of what the repercussions can be. There is a wide range of repercussions: new aggressions, social isolation, as some examples, and the worse of all them: death. Adn journal <R> publishes an inform in which is thrown out that although between April and June of this year aggression notifications have increased in an 8% (31789 cases) the 10,15% of the victims rejected to go on with the procedure. I personally believe that this is related to the fact that once reported the aggressions the aggressor in the better case will be retained for a couple of days, or something as simple as an arrest warrant, and after that he or she can act take vengeance. In my opinion it is hard to recognize and believe that someone who loves you has hurt you, accuse him, and after that bear with the continuous fear of what the consequences after it will be, and as I feel it, when you decide to give the first step there are not enough measures taken which support you the protection and security you need in that tough moment.

Domestic violence is often supported and approved. As an example, a great majority of the developing countries (most of them involving Islamic religions) believe that women are inferior to men, and beating them is one more of men rights. Most people also have in mind a new some years ago about a policeman who wrote a book about how to batter a woman without leaving any signal. And furthermore, some people believe that slapping is justified, that if mistreated victims are beaten because they provoke and deserve it anyway. Social beliefs are, as I feel it, born out of education, and this may be the main problem in society, receiving an education where it is being registered a dramatically increase of violence without almost anyone concerning about it. And another point to be stand out is that domestic violence violates the Universal Declaration of Human Rights concerning many articles about equality, security and dignity, for example, Article 5: <Q>

Punishment, even when it is of a higher degree, seems not to be effective anyway. Although no crime should be left free of punishment, the effectiveness of this measure is put in question. Penal Law Profesor Miren Ortubay from the Universidad del País Vasco states that: <Q>.

Spanish law has changed from the 70s to the present in reference to domestic violence. What was first punished with a mere arrest now is supposed to be punished with an imprisonment from six months to three years, but in a great number of the cases this punishment is not effected just because aggressors don't possess previous antecedents. Furthermore, what the law promotes is the punishment for the action, when the abuse has occurred and the harm is done, instead of preventing the crime. The consequence of this, as I see it, besides the non-eradication of the problem, is creating even more insecurity in the victim.
Men are also object of domestic violence. Women are the main aim of law and antidomestic violence politics, because they are mainly the ones who suffer it, but cases occurred to men are also reported. Besides there are many myths about it. Some of them we can read from web: most people believes that domestic violence does never happens to men, men who experience abuse are weak or not 'real' men, the law only protects women who experience domestic violence but does nothing to help men. Nevertheless male victims suffer added psychological effects, as information provided by BBC reports: they feel they are the only ones and it is hard for them admitting it is happening. BBC research also throws out that the 2001/02 British Crime Survey (BCS) found 19 per cent of domestic violence incidents were reported to be male victims, with just under half of these having a female abuser. I feel this is rather unjust: for me society is prejudiced and that only can cause more problems to men who suffer domestic abuse.

The welfare of the children is argued to be the most important reason for not carrying out parental separation. It is argued that either divorce or separation can cause psychological problems in the offspring. It is true that any kind of breaking in the familiar nucleus will affect a children in some way or other, but on the other hand, maintaining a relationship in which there is an scenery of habitual violence to one of the parents, and in which the child lives with the fear of and to what may happen with his parents, and with himself, the fear of being also beaten, which sooner or later will occur, is not, in my opinion, the appropriate environment for childhood development. Joseph S. Volpe in his work Effects of Domestic Violence on Children and Adolescents: an Overview tells: <Q>

As research shows, bearing domestic violence not only affects the actual state of the children, but also has long-term consequences. Personally speaking there isn't any better reason for finishing with what will cause so many bad effects in children who are unaware to understand what is happening inside home.

To conclude this essay I present here a brief summary of the exposed opinions I have given: that there is too much silence among the victims; punishment is not enough; violence support is a horrible thing which only causes more harm; that society is wrong about what concerns to male victims and that children shouldn't be used to justify the fact of putting up with this abuse. There are actually many things to be improved about this social cancer, all starting, of course, from the education. As some examples it can be organising more sensitizing courses, insisting on the equal treatment and finishing with all those prejudices about differences between men and women as human being and favouring the equal treatment in all areas. Protection measures should be also reinforced as what is related with post-accusation because hardly ever a simple removal order doesn't guarantee anything. Some kind of sensitization is also to be taking about male domestic abuse to concern people that this problem also exists and it is as important as female one, as important is providing help for
children who suffer this problem at home and more effective solutions to mothers with children. But I'm afraid this is a hard work to do.

8.2.6 C121-1

Sexual offences are those crimes which almost every person would agree to be of the worst kind of crime. We can go beyond, and say that those committed against children are far more worse. First of all, we have to establish what does sexual offence mean and what types of it can exist. Sexual offence can be defined as <Q> <R>. Following the Sexual Offences Act of 2003 there are 18 types of sexual offences, some of them are: 1. Rape, in which a person <Q>; 2. Assault, which can be: by penetration (a person <Q> without consent) and sexual assault (a person <Q>); 3. Causing sexual activity without consent; 4. Rape and other offences against children under 13; 5. Child sex offences, which include for example: <Q>; 6. Offences against persons with a mental disorder impeding choice; 7. Indecent photographs of children; 8. Others such as: Exposure (a person <Q>), Voyeurism ("<Q> and without the other person's consent), Intercourse with an animal, Sexual penetration of a corpse, Sexual activity in a public lavatory,...and many more (Sexual Offences Act 2003, 2007). In this essay, I will expose different points of view about the possible punishments and/or remedies that can be applied to sexual offenders and remedies to avoid possible assaults.

Depending on the country, sexual offences punishments vary in many ways. In U.S.A. for example, there are some web pages in which are published photos of sexual offenders. One of them is called "Family watchdog" in which you can introduce your personal direction and see whether the police have a file on sexual offenders in your area. In this web page, you can also tell your experiences concerning this issue, if you have been raped for example. This is what a raped girl says there about this web page: <Q> <R>. In a Detroit News homepage's article by Kim Kozlowski we can find this <Q> <R>. This article also says that this online sex offender registry is <Q> <R>, because everybody with access to internet would be aware of a large group of people considered threatening to society. Well, this can be seen from two sides, one is the side of victims, almost every victim would agree with this idea of publishing sexual offender's photos in a place (internet, in this case) because if they have criminal records and are not arrested yet, to know their faces is really a way of being aware of these individuals. But if we think about the people posted, it is probably that a number of them were innocent, or not so threatening to society, or furthermore, mentally unbalanced. This article adds: <Q> <R>. It is true that to show a true sexual offender's face in the internet is in a way a possible punishment, in the sense that it is a deterrent measure to the offender because he or she would be recognized as one for a long period. But if the person has already expired his sentence or he is serving his sentence, this would be an extra punishment for him/her.

What psychiatrists suggest about the possible punishments or -better named- remedies for these people can be: to take part into programs of sexual education and rehabilitation inside prisons.
The Association of Argentinian Psychiatrists suggests that: <Q> <R>. This association also suggests the creation of comunitary support groups and use of pharmacis if it is necessary. It seems that since these treatments must be done in prison, we are letting these kind of individuals to the responsibility of the prison system, and we have to trust in this system. Other people would argue that the sexual offenders must be put in jail for life, and be isolated from the rest of prisoners, because, in the case of pederasts for example, they are very vulnerable to been raped by other prisoners and this would not help them, this only would cause more anger in them.

Another remedy for sexual offenders is called "chemical castration". Castration is defined in Wikipedia right this: "<Q> <R>. Many people consider this way to be the perfect punishment for sexual offenders. Some of these aggressors in fact, have the possibility of choosing this option, after having been thinking for a long time. But it can be argued in the sense that, well, if a person who commits a crime with his sexual organs, a person who kills someone with his hands, do we have to cut his/her hands? Well, it is true that if the aggressor does not have sexual impulses, he will not commit again a sexual offence. In the other hand , The American Civil Liberties Union <Q> <R>; it seems reasonable to argue that this is a rather medieval technique, a very strong measure, you can not impose someone to lose his possibility of reproduction, because it would be an antinatural law, a law that goes against some basic principles of life. But it is important to take into account the fact that some of them can choose this option and it will not be imposed if the prisoner does not agree, as it is said in an article called "Chemical castration for paedophiles approved" : <Q> <R>. Of course, this is the law approved in California, but the laws concerning to that issue varies from one country to another. So it appears to be, that it is a very hard punishment if it is imposed -as this extract says, for repeat offenders-, but if it is a choice, it seems to be more reasonable.

It is very common that the victims do not report the assaults, above all in cases of rape or sexual abuse. As we can find in Editorial Guidelines In Full of BBC <Q> <R>. Although, many victims find themselves unable to go to the police with fear of being followed or witnessed by their aggressors, or in case the aggressor is arrested and not found guilty and he was free again. In a report of a Toronto's web page, we can find these two other reasons: <Q> <R>. It appears to be very reasonable that a woman or a raped man -because although it is strange, it happens to men also- does not go to the police at the first moment, first of all they want to find help in their relatives or friends, and at the very end of the assault they are in a shock, which in the majority of the cases almost does not allow them to say nothing, or nothing coherent, and it lasts at least for some days, or even months. But it necessary to go to the police and report the aggression, if not the victim, at least a relative, a friend or a witness. This would be the first step to catch the offenders.

It is important also to talk about the remedies or measures that should be taken in order to avoid some of these types of sexual offences I have mentioned in the introduction of this essay. For example,
as in a webpage of Toronto we can read: in the case of assault by a stranger: \(<Q> <R>\); in the case of acquaintance/date rape: \(<Q> <R>\). This web page also suggests men and women to take classes of personal defense, or \(<Q> <R>\). Well, all these suggestions seem to be very useful if you are young, have enough free time..., but for example in the case of taking personal defense classes, there may be many people with no free time or money enough to take these classes. In the case of avoid to trust in certain kind of men, it is really difficult to know if a man you have already known is a prototype of a sexual offender, and many times it appears to be someone who knows the victim who makes the offence. Moreover, it appears to be true that you can not go always prejudging the people you meet because you may make a mistake.

To sum up, we have seen that a sexual offence can be of many types, and depending on each type, the punishment for the offenders must be in a way or in another, some of the punishments are for example to register for some period of time their names and faces in a webpage, which also can give a sense of security for citizens, but at the same time have bad consequences for rehabilitated offenders; another possible punishment or remedy for the aggressors is to take part in rehabilitation programs of sexual education and so on, or another choice they can have is to be chemically castrated. In the side of the victims we have seen that in order to avoid a possible attack of them, people have to use common sense and be cautious in some special situations, and also if it is possible, report an attack or an intent as soon as possible in order to catch the offender, but it seems to be very difficult if you have already suffered such an attack.