References

Bialystok,E. (1984), "Strategies in Interlan-guage Learning and Performance", in *Interlanguage,* Davies et.al. (eds)

Catford, J. C. (1968), Contrastive Analysis and Language Teaching *Alatis*, 1968.

Dickerson, L.(1974), *Internal and External Patterning of Phonological Variability in the Speech of Japanese Learners of English.* Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Universitty of Illinois.

Duskova, L.(1969), "On Sources of Errors in Foreign Language Learning". IRAL, 7, 11- 36.

Firth, J.R. (1957), *Pagers in Linguistics,* 1934 - 1951, London: OUP.

Fries,C. (1945), *Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

George, H.A.(1972), *Common Errors in Language Learning.* Rowley Mass., Newbury House.

Halliday ,M.A.K. , McIntosh, A.& Strevens, P.(1964), *The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching.* London: Longman.

Hamp, E .P. (1968) , What a Contrastive Grammar Is Not, If It Is.*Alatis* 1968.

Jesperson,O. (1904), *How to Teach a Foreign Language* ,trans. Sophia Yhlen Olssen Bertelsen. London: Allen & Unwin.

Lado, R. (1957), *Linguistics Across Cultures.* The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.

Lee, W. R.(1968) ,Thoughts on Contrastive Linguistics in the context of Foreign Languge Teaching. *Alatis.* 1968.

Oller, J.W. & Ziahosseiny, S,M. (1970). "The Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis and Spelling Errors." *Language Learning*, 20 : 183- 189.

Schachter , J. (1974), An Error in Error Analysis. *Language Learning.* 24/2, 205- 213.

Selinker, L. (1986) "CA/EA/IL: The Earliest Experimental Record." *IRAl,* Vol. xxvll/4, Nov. 1989: 267 - 291

Stockwell , R.P. (1968), Contrastive Linguistics and Lapsed Time, *Alatis,* 1968.

Sweet, H. (1899), *The Practical study of Languages,* Dent , reprinted OUP, 1964.

Valdman,A.(1966) Programmed Instruction and Foreign Language Teaching. In *Trends in Language Teaching.* Valdman, A.(ed.). Mc Graw - Hill, New York, 133- 158.

Wardhaugh , R. (1974), The Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis. *In New Frontiers in Second Language Learnng.* Shumann, J.H. & Stenson, N. (eds.). Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Whitman, R.A.& Jackson , K. L.(1972), The Unpredictability of Contrastive Analyais. *Language Learning.* 22 /1, 29- 41.

CA

Area of Study	Area of Concentration	Shortcoming(s)	Types	Remark
Contrastive Analysis	errors resulting from MT interferences	1. Limited to interference errors ... (therefore) 2. Unable to identify other types of errors 3. Some of the predicted errors never materialize 4. Unable to indicate the degrees of similarities between MT & TL 5. Unable to provide an adequate solution to the problem of equivalence	1. Strong version-predictive p o w e r 2. Weak version-explanatory power 3. Moderate - emphasis on the nature of human learning rather than the contrast between two languages	as long as differences between two languages exist... will remain useful

feasible. They claimed that a moderate version that emphasizes the nature of human learning, has more explanatory power. Consequently they defined the moderate version of CA as: "the categorization of abstract and concrete patterns according to their perceived similarities and differences is the basis for learning; therefore, whereas patterns are minimally distinct in form or meaning in one or more systems, confusion may result " (Oller & Ziahosseiny, 1970: 186).

However, the strong, weak and also moderate versions of CA were criticized on the grounds that they fail to account for the learner's errors of competence. Yet this is not to suggest that CA can be entirely written off as being irrelevant to second language acquisition (e.g., Schacter, 1974). Because it has been shown, for instance, by George (1972), that approximately, about one third of all errors made by foreign learners can be traced to mother tongue interference. The pro and con discussions of CA have definitely clarified its possibilities and limitations and even the proponents of alternative approaches have implicitly or explicitly incorporated CA in their research. Therefore, despite all the criticism mentioned above, and others not touched upon, at present some arguments in favor of CA have been forwarded, of which one by Bialystock was referred to above. One of the leading authorities on Interlanguage, Selinker, as recently as 1989 notes

that "the more recent result confirms that CA is the best place to begin language transfer studies since structural congruence... is most probably necessary, though not sufficient, for most types of language transfer to occur" (Selinker, 1989: 278). Consequently it is important to realize that as long as the differences and similarities between two languages is a factor in the success or failur of learning a second language, and as the results of some of the research have verified at least some of the predictions of CA (Duškova, 1969; Schacter, 1974), it will remain one of the contributing components to understanding of second language learning and teaching practices (Stockwell, 1986).

because it was further believed that were they not eliminated they might become a permanent feature of the learner's linguistic repertoire.

CA has been critized mainly on the grounds that native language interference is only one of the sources of error and therefore it would be erroneous to claim that a comparison of the two languags involved and teaching "the sum of the differences established by the CA" (Valdman, 1966: 27) would eliminate chances of error. In addition it would still remain to be decided which problems arise from interference and which ones do not. In other words, CA was criticized on the grounds that it deals only with native and target languages, and therefore does not take into account the Interlanguage hypothesis. That is, CA had been noted as only predicting linguistic behaviors which are related to transfer from the native language. Bialystok (1984) notes that one important way of finding about transfer is comparing a common language two learners with different mother tongues. CA, he adds is a good place to start, provided that the concepts such as similarity of structures, congruence etc are carefully and exactly defined. Similarity of structures, should not be defined in terms of surface level, rather abstract argumentation too, should be taken into consideration.

Furthermore critics of CA have argued

that whereas the results drawn from CA would predict some problematic areas, in reality it has been found that these predicted problems never materialze(Dickerson,1974). Also problems which would not be predicted by CA have been noticed in learner's utterances, specially more so in syntax than in phonology (among others, Lee, 1968; Whitman & Jackson, 1972). Results of studies using CA have faild to note degrees of similarities between the two languages involved, because by their very nature contrasive analysis cannot be quantified.

In order to overcome these shortcomings, specialists such as Wardhuagh (1974) (see also, Catford, 1968; Lee, 1968) believes that CA has two versions:

1. a strong or a priori version which is supposed to have predictive power and presently because of lack of comprehensive theory of CA (Hamp, 1968) is untenable; and

2. a weak or a posteriori version which is only capable of explaining the observed errors, by contrasting the two linguistic systems involved.

Oller and Ziahosseiny (1970), after studying the spelling problems of two groups of students, using the same and different letters of alphabets as the target language, concluded that, because both the strong and the weak forms of CA center just on the contrast between two languages, neither are

proponents of CA claimed, in one form or another, that a detailed comparison of the learner's source language and the target language would reveal areas of dissimilarity between the two languages and therefore would predict potential sources of errors. Thus for instsnce, the results of CA would predict that Persian speakers would produce sentences like:

"Oil which we sell it to..." (Schacter, 1974:211); because their language forms relative clauses by inserting a relative clause marker as well as retaining a nominal copy of the relativized noun in the subordinate clause. Another example from the sound system would make the point clearer. When Persian learners replace the English vioced or voiceless alveolar fricatives of /ð/ and /θ/ by the voiced or voiceless dental stops of /d/ and /t/, they are carrying over their mother tongue habits to the task of learning the target language.

Because CA is based on a description of languages in question, therefore changes in linguistic theories affectted CA in one way or another. That is to say, the delicacy of the linguistic foundation of CA have changed from time to time, reflecting changes in linguistic theories. For example, Chomsky's radical departures from the up to then, prevelant structural grammars, is claimed to add more strength to CA in two ways:

1. It enabled more precise and exact comparisons possible, and

2. It provided apparently more solid theoretical base, by advocating language universals.

In regards to the methodology of CA, prerequisite for any CA is:

a. an accurate description of the structure(s) being studied in two languages under study, and,

b. that the descriptions should be theoretically compatible.

In practice what has happened, is that the selection of data has taken place by means of:

a: polysystemic approach of Firth, (1957) according to which language is a system of a systems, therefore, closed systems such as articles in two languages can be constrasted; or

b: as the followers of the weak version of CA do, explain only the observed errors.

I will have to refer to this relatively new version of CA later. Regarding the pedagogical implications of CA, the predictive power of CA, would help second language educators prevent potential errors by the preparation of suitable text materials and the use of appropriate teaching techniques (Lado, 1957; Haliday , Mcintosh & Strevens , 1964). Consequently it was believed by the educators to be important that errors should be immediately and negatively reinforced,

Contrastive Analysis

Esmail Faghih
Az-Zahra University

چکیده: مقاله حاضر بررسی تحلیل تقابلی را وجهه همت خود قرار میدهد. پس از ارائه تاریخچه مختصری از تحلیل تقابلی و ذکر نمونه هایی از خطاهای زبان آموزان ایرانی در یادگیری انگلیسی، اهمیت تغییرات در نظریه های زبانشناختی در حوزه مورد بررسی، یادآوری می شود. بررسی روش شناسی و پیامدهای تحلیل تقابلی در امر آموزش زبان خارجی، بخشهای بعدی مقاله را تشکیل می دهد. سپس، انتقادات وارده و انواع گوناگون تحلیل تقابلی که برای چاره جویی در مقابل انتقادات، تنظیم و ارائه شده است، مورد بررسی قرار می گیرد. سرانجام با عنایت باین واقعیتکه موارد تشابه و تباین بین زبان مادری و زبان هدف، عاملی مهم در موفقیت یا شکست امر یادگیری زبان بشمار می آید ، نتیجه گیری می شود که علی رغم انتقادات وارده ، تحلیل تقابلی هنوز از اهمیت ویژه ای برخوردار است و توجه اخیر برخی از صاحب نظران به تحلیل تقابلی، مؤید این نکته می باشد.

Experienced teachers of second or foreign languages were aware of the influence of mother tongue in learning a target language and they have admitted this in different places. For example even in the 19th century, Henry Sweet (1899) and Otto Jesperson (1904) make reference to this fact. However, apparently, it was C. Fries (1945) who for the first time incorporated contrasive analysis (CA) into the practices of teaching forei languages. Others followed the suit, not among them was Robert Lado.

At the beginning, it was believed t results of CA alone can account for l speech. "Those elements that are the [learner's] native language, will for him, and those areas that ar will be difficult" (Lado, 1957:2)/