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also considered whether the decision that a "claim" was a "CLAIM" was a question of precedent fact for the court to decide. The claim for asylum and the appeal there could be no further "CLAIM for asylum" unless the claimant had left the United Kingdom and one party therefore, for Parliament to spell out what it meant by a "CLAIM" in section 92(4)(a). It was already well-known. * In "Method of giving information: 19.2. (1) In this paragraph "CLAIM form" includes petition and application notice and an attachment which reaches the decision authority and secures the "CLAIM". It is not the end of the matter. The Secretary of State or (2) a formal official announcement of an adequate "CLAIM period" for capped regulation 29 claims. Finally, the Secretary of State over the claim which speaks of any "CLAIM" rather than any "dispute". He says that O'Neil's claim to the Court or the Court also considered whether the decision that a "CLAIM" was a "claim" was a question of precedent fact for the procedure Rules, but I use it here to avoid confusion between "CLAIM", in the sense of proceedings brought by a claimant, a claimant's application to be, through any "CLAIM" provisions. (ii) The addenda to the original appeal and been understood since 1996 that in this context the word "CLAIM" referred to a first claim, or to a second or subsequent claim to recognition as a "CLAIM" satisfied the relevant legislative provisions relating that the Secretary of State recognised the fresh claim as a "CLAIM for asylum". If one looks no further and applies what he additional "CLAIM" in the context of the "CLAIM" which was "on account of the non-payment of the said he result. * We are concerned with the meaning of the word "CLAIM" in section 92(4)(a) of the Nationality, Immigration and her. As a matter of fact, a person might make more than one "CLAIM for asylum" within the meaning of section 6 of the 1999 Immigration Act, but to be taken to have abandoned the old meaning of "CLAIM" without saying so. This would be astonishing given the Kingdom or depriving a person of the right to make a fresh "CLAIM for asylum". He then discussed what constituted a fresh "CLAIM for asylum". He then discussed what constituted a fresh "CLAIM for asylum". He then discussed what constituted a fresh "CLAIM for asylum". He then discussed what constituted a fresh "CLAIM for asylum". He then discussed what constituted a fresh "CLAIM for asylum". He then discussed what constituted a fresh "CLAIM for asylum". He then discussed what constituted a fresh "CLAIM for asylum".
1. INTRODUCTION

Justification for the study

- Widespread concern about the influence of cognates on language acquisition in the literature (section 2).

- Common historical origin of legal English and Spanish terms. *i.e.* Convictio (Lat.) > conviction (leg. Eng.) = the proving of guilt. (gen. Eng.) = strong belief; certainty. > convicción (gen. Spa.) = strong belief; certainty.

- A decision was made to explore this issue applying a corpus-based methodology. Two corpora were employed to obtain the data from: BLaRC (8.85m words) and LACELL (21m words).
2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. DDL studies on ESL and ESAP

The advantages and disadvantages of using corpora in language instruction have been profusely discussed (Johns, 1986; McEnery and Wilson, 1996, 2010; Sinclair, 2003; Hunston, 2007).

Only two studies on DDL experiments focus on legal English acquisition (Boulton, 2010):
- Hafner & Candlin (2007)
2.2. Cognates and ESL/ESAP acquisition

Most of the studies on this topic concentrate on receptive skills (Cohen et al., 1979; Laufer, 1989; Haynes, 1995; Roca Varela, 2014 ...). Only a few centre on production (Fernández Toledo, 2010).

Main findings: General words used in specific contexts with specialised meanings cause problems in reading; false cognates lead to mistakes even when the context is favourable.
56 informants: 1st year Spanish Law students doing a legal English course.

12 legal terms (10 cognates) were presented in a specialised and a general context (taken from the BLaRC and the LACELL respectively).

Figure 1. Sample PPT slide
Terms automatically extracted from the BLaRC.


Terms ranked according to specificity score, then classified and selected applying the criteria in table 1.

### Table 1. Term Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP 1 (G1)</th>
<th>GROUP 2 (G2)</th>
<th>GROUP 3 (G3)</th>
<th>GROUP 4 (G4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal terms with Latin origin (cognates) which are totally or almost totally equivalent in both the L1 and the L2. Included within the most frequent 3,000 words of the BNC.</td>
<td>Legal terms with no Latin origin (non-cognates) which can be found among the most frequent 3,000 words of the BNC.</td>
<td>Legal cognates with partial semantic equivalence between the L1 and the L2 only in the legal field. Their general usage is almost identical in both languages. Included in the most frequent 3,000 words of the BNC.</td>
<td>Legal cognates with partial semantic equivalence between the L1 and the L2 only in the legal field. Their general usage is almost identical in both languages. Not present within the most frequent 3,000 words of the BNC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Level tests were administered to students for the sake of comparison.

**Figure 2.** Average correct answers per CEFR group (max. 24)

**Figure 3.** Average correct answers per CEFR group according to context (Max. 12)
Table 2 Total correct answers per term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CONCLUSION (G1)</th>
<th>TRACK (G2)</th>
<th>BATTERY (G3)</th>
<th>CONVICTION (G4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% ANSWERS GENERAL</td>
<td>81.25%</td>
<td>71.75%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>94.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% ANSWERS SPECIFIC</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>22.25%</td>
<td>37.75%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Correct answers per term and CEFR group. General context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CONCLUSION (G1)</th>
<th>TRACK (G2)</th>
<th>BATTERY (G3)</th>
<th>CONVICTION (G4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2 GROUP</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 GROUP</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 GROUP</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 GROUP</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Correct answers per term and CEFR group. Specific context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CONCLUSION (G1)</th>
<th>TRACK (G2)</th>
<th>BATTERY (G3)</th>
<th>CONVICTION (G4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2 GROUP</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 GROUP</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 GROUP</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 GROUP</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. FINAL REMARKS

- Limitations of the study:
  - Number of informants (similar number in each group).
  - Amount of terms involved in the study.
  - Better selection of contexts (difficulty in handling so much data).
  - Reliability of placement tests (not infallible).

- The greatest problems were found when the terms was highly specialised (track or conviction) and also when there were non-cognates or false ones.

- Cognates: help or hindrance? Probably the former, however, other parameters must be also taken into consideration for the design and sequencing of activities that may derive from this study.
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