



پښتونستان د علومو او مطالعاتو فریښی
پرتال جامع علومو انسانی

- George, H.V., 1972. **Common errors in language learning**. NewburyHouse Publishers Company: 137-183.
- James, C., 1972. **Some crucial problems in the theory of contrastive linguistics**. In R. Filipovic (ed.), YSCECP, (studies, vol.5). Zagreb.
- Koieraogo, P., 1987. **Curriculum in different circumstances**. ELT Journal, 41(3): 171-177.
- Lado, Robert., 1971. **Linguistics across cultures**. The University of Michigan Press.
- Lee, W. R., 1974. **The contribution of contrastive linguistics to the preparation of language teaching materials**. In G. Nicked (ed.) **Applied Contrastive linguistics**. Germany: Julius Groos Verlag, Heidelberg Publishing Company.
- Phillips, M. K., 1981. **Toward a theory of LPS methodology**. In R. Mackey & J. D. Palmer (eds.), **Languages for specific purposes: program design and evaluation**: 92-105. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Robinson, P., 1980. **ESP (English for specific purposes)**. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Rivers, W. M., 1975. **Contrastive linguistics in textbook and classroom**. English Teaching Forum, vols. 1-2: 16-19.
- Stockwell, Bown., 1970. **The grammatical structures of English and Spanish**. The University of Chicago: 265-281.

each language is a clear illustration of the culture and the customs of that language. Such differences are, in large part, parallel to those which exist between fashions of dress, of food, of architecture, of social behavior, of literature, of politics, and so on; and the distinction between these differences along with their applications for teaching cannot be determined by word frequency counts alone. To give the students the control of a lexical item, the teacher has to be aware of not only the word frequency counts of his discipline but the lexical differences between two languages as well.

In conclusion, I would like to emphasize that the analyses presented here are very general in character and do not pretend to cover the entire pedagogical problems conneted with the transfer of Persian in learning English as a foreign language in Iran. Other more detailed analyses will probably be better produced in the framework of contrastive linguistics along the contrastive approach presented here. As it is my conviction that this will be an extremely useful undertaking, let us hope that we will not have to wait for it too long.

References

- Bowers, R, 1988. **English in world: aims and objectives in English language teaching**. TESOL Quarter, 20(3),
- Christions, Mary A., 1986. **Student perceptions of academic language study**. TESOL Quarterly, 20(1): 61-79.
- Cown, Jr., 1974. **Lexical and syntactic research for the design of EFL 'reading materials**, TESOL Quarterly 8(4).

windshield of a car, containing indicator dials and control instruments. The Persian language borrowed this word but restricted it mostly to the glove compartment which is a space built into the dashboard of an automobile, for miscellaneous articles.

We can refer to another example of deceptive cognates. The word **telegraph**, an apparatus or system for communication or the action of communication by this system, came into Persian and extended its meaning to denote **telegram**, meaning a message sent by **telegraph**. As a result of this expansion, a Persian speaker learning English might say he received a **telegraph** meaning that he received a **telegram**.

The words of this category whether cognates or deceptive cognates are usually distributed throughout the technical and sub-technical disciplines and the native speakers of the Persian language recognize them easily. These words constitute the lowest difficulty group of lexicons and, therefore, are labeled easy in this study.

Summary

To sum up, I wish to maintain that major process of decoding the meaning and identifying the structure of lexical components in EFL/ESP curriculum cannot be isolated by oversimplified vocabulary counts alone. There is every reason to believe that the same kind of distortion that we can observe in the sound of the speech of a non-native speaker, also occurs in the structure and meaning of the lexicons that he/she is trying to grasp or convey. In both cases he/she is substituting the units and patterns of his/her native language and culture. In other words, the logic of lexical items in

the corresponding lexical items do not correspond in all details. Thus, in comparing the verb systems of the two languages, the English two-word verbs are left over without Persian correspondents; and therefore, it is obviously inaccurate to list the English two-word verbs such as: **take after; get through; put out; and fall off** as the perfect correspondents to **shabih budaan; tamaam kardan; khaamoosh kardan; and kaahesh yaaftan** respectively. The perfect correspondents of these Persian verbs are **resemble; finish; extinguish; and decrease**.

2.5. Cognitive Relationship (Words That Are Similar in Form and in Meaning)

The Persian language has borrowed thousands of technical and sub-technical words from French or English that are reasonably similar in form and in meaning and occur with or without a slight change in pronunciation. Examples are: **radio, television, penicillin, aspirin, radiator, and motor**

These cognates can be classified into a relatively small number of sub-groups according to the source of their correspondence. For example, the words mentioned above can be classified as follows:

<u>Medical Science</u>	<u>Electronics</u>	<u>Mechanics</u>
Penicillin	radio	radiator
aspirin	television	motor

There is a sub-division of this category that are called "**Deceptive Cognates**". This group includes words that are similar in form but partly or totally different in meaning.

For example, in English the word **dashboard** refers to a panel under the

Chart 5

English Two-Word Verbs (Intransitive) Vs. Persian Simple or Compound Verbs	
English: fall through (fail) <u>Examples:</u> 1. The plan fell through. 2. The plan failed	Persian:..... (shekast khordan) <u>Examples:</u> 1. 2.aan tarh shekast khord.

Other examples of this groupe are: (1) **show up** (= appear: zaaher shodan); (2) **fall off** (= decrease: caاهش yaافتان); (3) **stand by** (= wait: montazer shodan); and (4) **come about** (= happen: ettefaagh oftaadan).

The examples given in the subgroups 2.4.1; 2.4.2; and 2.4.3 delineate the fact that not only the structural mechanism of verb formation in the two languages is different, there is not a perfect semantic correspondence between the Persian verb system and the English two-word verbs. The reason is that, "two systems usually correspond perfectly when there is word-by-word translation equivalence between them" (Stockwell, et al; 1965), whereas in Persian, the combination of a verb and preposition never forms a semantic meaning which would differ form the sum of the meaning of its individual parts. However, we may admit that there is an imperfect correspondence between the Persian verb system and the English simple verbs. We call this an imperfect correspondence, because the operations of

Chart 4

<p>English Two-Word Verbs (Transitive + Inseparable)</p> <p>Vs.</p> <p>Persian simple or Compound Verbs</p>	
<p>English: go over (review)</p> <p><u>Examples:</u></p> <p>1. I went over my lessons.</p> <p>2. I went over them.</p> <p>3. I reviewed my lessons.</p>	<p>Persian:.....</p> <p>(moroor kardan)</p> <p><u>Examples:</u></p> <p>1.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>3. dars-haayam-ra moroor kardam.</p>

Following are further examples of this type: (1) **take after** (= resemble: shabih buddan); (2) **look into** (= investigate: bar-resi kardan); (3) **look for** (= seek: jostejoo kardan); and (4) **get over** (= recover: behbood yaaftan).

2.4.3. English Two-Word Verbs (Intransitive) Vs. Persian Simple or Compound Verbs: The verbs characterized in this category are intransitive since they do not take a direct object. The contrastive patterns of these verbs are illustrated in the following chart:

Chart 3

English Two-Word Verbs (Transitive + Separable)	
Vs.	
Persian simple or Compound Verbs	
English: call up (to telephone)	Persian:..... (telephone kardan)
<u>Examples:</u> 1. He called up his sister. 2. He called his sister up . 3. He called her up . 4. He telephoned his sister	<u>Examples:</u> 1. 2. 3. 4. oo be khaaharash telephone kard.

Other example are: (1) **put on** (=wear: pooshidan); (2) **cross out** (=omit: hazf kardan); (3) **pick out** (=select: entekhaab kardan); and (4) **call off** (=cancel: faskh kardan).

2.4.2.English Two-Word Verbs (Transitive + Inseparable) Vs. Persian Simple or Compound Verbs: This subclass of transitive verbs, called **inseparable**, cannot undergo the optional transformational rule and the preposition involved cannot be separated from the verbs. Chart number 4 is an example of the contrastive features of this group in the two languages:

kasi khaahesh kardan \Rightarrow to ask ***from** someone; (3) to order someone: be "to" kasi dastoor daadan \Rightarrow to order ***to** someone; (4) to enjoy something: az "from" cheezi lezzat bordan \Rightarrow to enjoy ***from** something; (5) to fight somebody: baa "with" kasi davaa kardan \Rightarrow to fight ***with** somebody; and (6) to hate something: az "from" cheezi motenaffer budan \Rightarrow to hate ***from** something.

The English **two-word verbs** are still another example of this category which constitute a special group, very high on the scale of difficulty. In order to make an interlingual analysis, it is necessary to contrast the English two-word verbs with their correspondents or translation equivalents in Persian. To do this, we may initially divide the English verbs into transitive, each with particular syntactic and transformational characteristics:

2.4.1. English Two-Word Verbs (Transitive + Separable) Vs. Persian Simple or Compound Verbs: This subclass of transitive verbs can undergo an optional transformational rule that separates the preposition from its verb and moves it after the object noun phrase. Chart number 3 is an indication of this group in the two languages:

2.4. Zero Representation Relationship (one of The Two Languages Having no Lexical Item Corresponding to An Item That Exists in the Other language)

To understand this kind of relationship, the following example will illustrate the problem:

Chart 2

Ex. 1. English:

Bahram	faced	difficulties.
NP ₁	Tr.V	NP ₂ (DO)

Persian:

Bahram	baa	moshkelat	rooberoo shod.
	Prep.	Obj.	
NP ₁	NP ₂ (IDO)		Tr.V

Interlingual Transfer: "Bahram faced *with difficulties."

This example indicates that the sub-class of monotransitive patterns of English constitutes a number of direct objects (objects with zero preposition) which correspond to the prepositional objects in Persian. Such incomplete overlapping results in the mother-tongue interference of the kind mentioned above.

Other examples of this group are: (1) to marry someone: **baa** "with" *kasi ezdevaaj kardan* ⇒ to marry *with someone; (2) to ask someone: *az* "from"

- a. My friend owns a piece of *earth in Tehran.
- b. The *land revolves around the sun.
- c. The *ground is a planet inhabited by man.
- d. The electric circuit is connected to the *globe.

2.3. Convergent Relationship (Several Lexical Item in Persian standing for only One corresponding Item in English)

In this category several lexical items in Persian may correspond to only one lexical item in English. For example, the Persian words: (1) **bahar** (spring: the season between winter and summer); (2) **cheshmeh** (spring: a natural issuing of water from the ground); (3) **phanar** (spring: an elastic device, as a coil of wire, that regains its original shape after being compressed or extended), and (4) **jast-o-khiz** (spring: the act of jumping up or forward), all stand for only one English corresponding word: **spring**. since the convergent relations leads the Iranian students to obligatory choices; therefore, no significant error is predicted, at least in terms of the application of vocabulary in this category. However, a native speaker of English who learns the Persian language may provide examples of frequent mother-tongue transfers with this class of words. The reason is that the distribution of the lexical item in Persian will lead him to optional choices and consequently he will have possibility of confusing one word with the other.

and thus a complete sameness is not to be expected in language behavior concerned with this category of lexicons.

2.2. Divergent Relationship (Several Lexical Item in English standing for only one Lexical Item in Persian)

This kind of relationship is a mechanism of direct mother-tongue interference in the acquisition process of lexicons. In this mechanism, a Persian speaker is encountered with different English lexical items to which he finds only one corresponding counterpart in Persian, For instance, the English words: **land**, **earth**, **globe**, and **ground** all stand for only one Persian word: **zamin**.

Let us consider the following examples:

a. My friend owns a piece of **land** in Tehran.

doostam dar Tehran yek gatch **zamin** daarad.

b. The **earth** revolves around the sun.

zamin dore khorshid migardad.

c. The **globe** is a planet inhabited by man.

zamin sayyaareh ist ke be sekoonate bashar dar aamadeh ast.

d. The electric circuit is connected to the **ground**.

madaareh electriki be **zamin** vasl shodeh ast.

A Persian-speaker assuming that his native language has a word-to-word correspondence to English, tends to make the following errors without being aware of the fact that each of those lexical items in English has a certain application in a given context.

Chart 1

Ex. 1. English:

I	apologized	to	him
		prep.	obj
NP ₁	Tr.V	NP ₂	

Persian:

man	az "from"	oo	mazerat khaastam.
	Prep.	Obj.	
NP ₁	NP ₂		Tr.V

Interlingual transfer: I apologized *from him.

Other examples of this group are: (1) to plead **with** somebody: be "to" kasi eltemaas kardan ⇒ to plead *to somebody; (2) to complain **of** (or **about**) somebody: az "from" kasi shekaayat kardan ⇒ to complain *from somebody; (3) to insist on (or **upon**) somebody: be "to" kasi esraar kardan ⇒ to insist *to somebody.

What we learn from the aforementioned examples is that although the denotative and connotative values of certain words in English are sometimes translatable into the same values in Persian, there are many lexicons in this group of words that are not the same in all their structure

hing-- dwelling, with different connotation. In Persian, too, **Khaane** "house", and **manzel** "home" both denote the same thing-- **maskan** "dwelling", with exactly the same connotations. It means that the word house and **khaane** both usually mean a building which serves as living quarters. In the same manner the words **home** and **manzel** mean a family's Place of residence as a social unit. The consequence of this observation is that: a Persian speaker, finding these two English words sharing the same dennotative and connotative values in Persian, realizes very close similarities between them and, therefore, develops insights into these two new words without any difficulty. The learning burden in this case is chiefly that of learning a new form, **house** or **home**, for a meaning already habitually grasped in the native language.

However, the pedagogical problem with this category is that the Persian students most often assume that the words of their native language should always represent the natural labels for the corresponding words in English. They can hardly realize that the modes of expression differ in both English and Persian as a function of linguistic structure combined with differences in culture making, thus, impossible to work within the semantic structure of their native language in learning English lexicons.

To indicate the mother-tongue transfer concerned with such a presupposition, let us consider the group of "**Prepositional Objects in English Vs. Dissimilar Prepositional Objects in Persian.**"

The following examples will delineate the problem:

frequency count based on a content analysis, the second one has to determine, through the application of contrastive linguistics, the influential features of the native language transfer in learning English lexical items.

The outcome of the contrastive study, then, should be checked against the product of the frequency count and the result be applied to the design of EFL/ESP curriculum in Iran.

In spite of the fact that for some years a limited number of contrastive studies has been made, unfortunately, very seldom attention has been given to contrastive inquiry of the lexicons of the two languages.

The task of the present paper is, therefore, to produce a model analysis of contrastive study of the English/Persian lexicons in order to delineate the pedagogical implications of contrastive linguistics in lexical research and then to provide a basis for more sophisticated and effective lexical investigation to be utilized as guidelines in developing EFL/ESP course outlines in Iran.

2. Contrastive Lexical Model:

In order to provide a model analysis, we may find five kinds of relationship between the lexical components of the two languages as follows:

2.1. One-to-One Representation Relationship (One Lexical Item in English Standing for One Corresponding Item in Persian)

To understand this kind of relationship let us consider the English words: **house** and **home**. In English these two words both denote the same

counts, a list of lexicon to be used for EFL/ESP curriculum. The logic behind this criterion has been the question of which English words occur most frequently in order to be taught first to native speakers of Persian.

Although the statistical analysis leading to register study is crucial in that it aims at defining and identifying the linguistic features of lexicon which are regularly used in recurrent situations, a frequency count alone suffers from a deficiency and cannot be exclusively tailored to fit the objectives of the EFL/ESP students in Iran. The rationale for this claim arises from the fact that due to the limited exposure of Iranian students to English, the native language Persian, exerts significant influence on and potential interference with learning English as a foreign language in this country.

Because of this transfer, the Iranian students often bring to English the aesthetic views about their lexical items derived from their mother-tongue practice. They assume that vocabulary is the primary difference between the two languages and that to learn the English language they ought to learn a new set of words consisting the translation equivalents of those in Persian.

Since they are aware of the lexical system of their mother-tongue, they attempt to impose that system upon the English pattern and filter the lexical structure of English through the manner and mode of their native language in the process of reception.

It seems, therefore, crucial that to improve the task of teaching lexical component of English to EFL/ESP students, we have generally to take two avenues of approach. While the first avenue leads to a statistical study of

Application of Contrastive Linguistics in EFL/ESP Curriculum Development in Iran

Dr.Mohammad M.Fallahi*

Abstract

Due to the limited exposure of EFL students to English language it is believed that Iranian students, will impose the lexical system of their mother tongue upon the English. This is to say that, they will pattern the lexical structure of English on the manner and mode used in their native language, especially in the process of reception which in turn will result in pitfalls originating from the language transfer. The aim of the present paper is to try to delineate the lexical patterns in English language, determine the corresponding patterns in Persian and introduce the patterns of pitfalls and errors which result from transfer. In Addition, guidelines for developing English courses for Persian learners of English in Iran are suggested which will hopefully be useful if utilized properly.

Introduction

The last few decades have seen a remarkable growth in lexical research for the design of EFL/ESP reading materials. The main core of this research has been to develop, through statistical analysis and frequency

*- Professor of Iran University of Science & Technology, Tehran, Iran.