

بررسی مقابله ای

What are the core assumptions of Contrastive Analysis (CA), and how did these assumptions influence early approaches to ELT? Explain the difference between the a priori and a posteriori approaches to Contrastive Analysis. Which proved more reliable and why? Describe the hierarchy of difficulty proposed by CA. Provide examples of how different types of linguistic differences (e.g., coalescence, underdifferentiation, overdifferentiation) impact learners' L2 and L1 between L1 and L2. What is "positive transfer" in the context of CA, and how can teachers leverage it to facilitate language learning? Give specific examples. Discuss the limitations of CA in predicting and explaining all learner errors. What other factors influence language acquisition that CA overlooks? How did the development of Error Analysis (EA) challenge the dominance of CA in ELT? What advantages did EA offer over CA? In what specific areas of language (e.g., phonology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics) is CA most useful for identifying potential learning challenges? Provide examples. How can teachers effectively integrate insights from CA into their lesson planning and materials design without relying on a purely CA-driven approach? Consider the changing landscape of language learning, with increasing numbers of multilingual learners. How relevant is CA in today's diverse ELT contexts? What are some ethical considerations for teachers when using CA in ELT? How can teachers avoid reinforcing negative stereotypes about learners' L2 proficiency? Provide examples of how teachers can avoid reinforcing negative stereotypes about learners' L2 proficiency.

1) •
 :era AC fo snoitpmussa eroc ehT :rewsna •
 significantly influences their L2 acquisition (L2) :egagnal tsrif s'renrael a tahT :refsnarT :egagnal L2 •
 .(L2 acquisition of a second language (L2) •
 and L2 predictability of Errors: That by systematically comparing the structures of the L1 and L2, one can predict the areas where learners will encounter difficulties and make errors, L2 from the L1 "are primarily due to "interference L2 ni srorre tahT :ecnerefnal sa rorrE •
 .L2 habits being applied inappropriately to the L1 the L1 –
 desucof ylivaeh TLE ni sehcaorppa ylae ot del snoitpmussa esehT :TLE no ecneulfnal •
 Teaching materials and methods were L2 and L1 on identifying differences between L1 and L2. Drills and exercises were designed to directly address these predicted areas of difficulty. Course design often L2 interference and establish correct L1 used to override L1. began with a systematic comparison of the two languages

a priori and a posteriori approaches to Contrastive Analysis. Explain the difference between the two. Which proved more reliable and why?

:rewsna •
 neve renrael eht erofeb seitluciffid gnitciderp devlovni hcaorppa sihT :AC iroirp A •
 identify differences, L2 and L1 encountered the language. Linguists would analyze the L1 and predict which differences would cause errors •
 dah yeht retfa srorre renrael lautca gnizylana devlovni hcaorppa sihT :AC iroiretsop A •
 and occurred. Researchers would collect samples of learner language, identify errors, and L1 to determine if those errors could be attributed to L2 and L1 then analyze the L1 interference •
 predicted -revo netfo AC iroirp A .elbailer erom devorp AC iroiretsop A :ytilibailer •
 that learners' errors; many predicted errors never materialized, and it missed errors actually made but were not predicted by the linguistic comparison. The a posteriori

the hierarchy of difficulty proposed by CA. Provide examples of how different types of linguistic differences (e.g., coalescence, underdifferentiation, overdifferentiation) impact learners and L¹ between L¹ and L².

in the context of CA, and how can teachers leverage it to "What is "positive transfer . . . facilitate language learning? Give specific examples

Explaining all learner errors. What other factors influence language acquisition that CA overlooks? Discuss the limitations of CA in predicting and explaining learner errors.

- :noitatimil tnacifingis sah AC :rewsna
- .prediction: It predicts errors that don't always occur-revO
- .errors that learners actually make prediction: It fails to predict many-rednU
- interference but to other 'L ot eud ton era srorre ynaM :srorre IIA rof tnuocCA t'nseoD
- .factors
- :noitisiuqCA egaugnaL gnicneulfnI srotcaF rehtO

• ("I goed to the store" ,rules too broadly (e.g. ʔL gniylppA :noitazilarenegrevO
 rules to make them easier to process (e.g., using only ʔL gniyfilpmiS :noitacifilpmiS
 • (the base form of verbs
 tsrif rieht gninrael nerdlihc yb edam esoht ot ralimis srorrE :srorrE latnempoleved
 • (lar past tense forms incorrectly language (e.g., using irregu
 • seigetarts dna selyts gninrael laudividnl :seigetartS gninrael
 • and its culture ʔL eht sdrawot sedutitta 'srenrael :edutittA dna noitavitoM
 • ʔL eht ot erusopxe fo ytilauq dna tnuoma ehT :tupnl dna erusopxE
 • txetnoc laicos dna ,ecnedifnoc ,yteixnA :srotcaF lacigolohcysP dna laicoS

How did the development of Error Analysis (EA) challenge the dominance of CA in ʔ
 ?ELT? What advantages did EA offer over CA

• ect challenge to CA. Instead of predicting rid a sa degreme (AE) sisylanA rorrE :rewsnA
 • errors, EA focused on describing and explaining errors that learners actually made
 :AC revo AE fo segatnavdA
 • dna etarucca erom ti gnikam ,atad renrael laer no desab saw AE :sisaB laciripmE
 • A's theoretical predictions reliable than C
 gnidulcni ,secruos rorre fo egnar rediw a deredisnoc AE :epocS redaorB
 • interference ʔ developmental errors, overgeneralization, and simplification, not just L
 ers' interlanguage)the nrael otni sthgisni elbaulav dedivorp AE :eulaV citsongaiD
 • helping teachers to identify , (ʔ developing system of rules they create as they learn the L
 • specific learning needs and provide targeted feedback
 eht fo trap yrassecen dna larutan a sa srorre deweiv AE :srorrE fo weiV evitisoP
 • interference ʔ learning process, rather than simply as signs of L

In what specific areas of language (e.g., phonology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics) ʔ
 has CA proven most useful for identifying potential learning challenges? Provide
 examples

• :CA has proven most useful in :rewsnA
 • dnuos eht ni secnereffid ot eud seitluciffid noitaicnunorp gniyfitnedl :ygonohP
 Example: Japanese speakers often struggle to pronounce the ʔ and L ʔ systems of the L
 y one sound that approximates /l/ and /r/ sounds in English because Japanese has onl/
 • both
 :elpmaxE .redro drow dna erutcurts ecnetnes htiw seitluciffid gniyfitnedl :xatnyS
 • object (VSO) word order, which can cause difficulties for -subject-Arabic has a verb
 • Arabic speakers learning English, which uses SVO
 • sgnidne lanoitcelfni dna noitamrof drow htiw seitluciffid gniyfitnedl :ygonohproM
 Example: Languages with rich inflectional systems (e.g., Spanish, Russian) may cause
 • learners to struggle with the simpler inflectional system of English

teachers effectively integrate insights from CA into their lesson planning and How can ʔ
 ?driven approach-materials design without relying on a purely CA

• :driven approach by-AC ylerup a tuohtiw sthgisni AC etargetni nac srehaeT :rewsnA
 • tial Challenges: Use CA to anticipate potential difficulties based netoP fo erawA gnieB
 • backgrounds, but don't assume that all learners will make the same ʔ on learners' L
 • errors
 • ot krow tneduts fo sisylana rorre gniogno tcudnoC :moorssalC eht ni sisylanA rorrE
 • interference or ʔ ecurring errors and determine whether they are related to L identify r
 • other factors
 • sserdda ot seitivitca ecitcarp dna noitcurtsni detegrat edivorP :noitcurtsnl detegraT
 • interference is likely to occur ʔ specific areas where L
 • ot srenrael egaruocne taht seitivitca ngiseD :seitivitca ssenerawA evitsartnoC
 • and English, raising their awareness of ʔ compare and contrast features of their L
 • potential differences and similarities

ive competence and fluency over tacinummoC noitacinummoC no sucoF •
 .free performance. Don't overcorrect minor errors that don't impede communication-error
 esrevid eht sserdda ot noitcurtsni detaitnereffid edivorP :noitcurtsni detaitnereffid •
 .dsbackgroun \needs of learners from different L

Consider the changing landscape of language learning, with increasing numbers of .
 ?multilingual learners. How relevant is CA in today's diverse ELT contexts

:decnaun erom si AC fo ecnaveler eht ,stxetnoc TLE esrevid s'yadot nl :rewsna •
 s and \L elpitlum neewteb noitcaretni eht ,srenrael laugnilitlum htiW :ytixelpmoC •
 English becomes complex, making it difficult to predict the source of errors based solely
 .on CA
 ing potential dnatsrednu rof tniop gnitrats lufesu a eb llits nac AC :lufesu llitS •
 .\challenges, especially when working with learners who share a common L
 sdeen renrael laudividni no sucof ot deen srehaeT :sdeen laudividni no sisahpmE •
 .dbackgroun \and learning styles, rather than making broad generalizations based on L
 ot ytiliba dna ssenerawa egaugnal 'srenrael gnipoleveD :sllikS elbarefsnarT no sucoF •
 .transfer skills from one language to another becomes increasingly important

What are some ethical considerations for teachers when using CA in ELT? How can .\ •
 or creating feelings of \eachers avoid reinforcing negative stereotypes about learners' Lt
 ?inadequacy

:edulcni snoitaredisnoc lacihtE :rewsna •
 \L rieht no desab srenrael tuoba snoitazilareneg gnikaM diovA :sepytoeretS gnidiovA •
 that individual learners will vary in their strengths and background. Recognize
 .weaknesses
 s as valuable resources and cultural \s: Acknowledge and value learners' L\L gniulaV •
 .\assets. Avoid implying that English is superior or that learners should abandon their L
 romoting Positive Attitudes: Create a supportive and encouraging learning P •
 .environment where learners feel comfortable taking risks and making mistakes
 interference as a problem or a deficit. \L gnimarF diovA :ledoM ticifeD gnidiovA •
 .s a natural part of the learning processInstead, view it a
 dna shtgnerts 'srenrael no sucoF :shtgnertS no sucoF •