"Sensorveiledning"
ENG2162 Contrastive and Learner Language Analysis

Generic guidelines
This take-home exam consists of two parts. Pass marks are required on both parts. The first part of the exam paper counts 30%; the second counts 70%. This should be reflected in the time and the number of pages dedicated to each question. The evaluation (and marking) of the candidate's performance on the exam follow the underlying principles regarding analytic skills, judgement and independent thinking, according to the general evaluation criteria specified by "Universitets- og høgskolerådet".

The exam questions reflect the aims and learning outcome of the course by focusing on
- problems faced by Norwegians learning English
- similarities and differences between English and Norwegian
- the use of electronic text corpora in contrastive and learner language analysis

o The language of the examination is English; the candidate should apply the conventions of academic writing and referencing.
o Both the language and the content of the paper count towards the final mark.
o Use of available secondary sources is recommended/required (course reading, course website, grammar books, dictionaries, etc.).
  o This also applies to the short answers in Part I; examples from relevant corpora should be used to demonstrate the phenomenon under discussion in (a). See below for some more specific guidelines for Part I.
o The tasks in Part II are wide in nature and it is to some extent up to the candidate to interpret, delimit and determine how he/she chooses to solve them. This is particularly true of the three tasks (b, c, and d) that require engagement with more or less unspecified primary corpus data in order to carry out an original corpus study on either learner language analysis (b) or contrastive analysis (c), or a combination of the two (d). The examiners will have to accept different interpretations, albeit within a scope relevant to the task. The candidate is expected to engage with literature on the syllabus, and to some extent with other secondary sources relevant to the topic chosen (e.g. dictionaries, grammars, case studies).
o If the candidate draws on secondary sources outside the syllabus for these tasks, this should be rewarded, although it is not a strict requirement.
o Recommendations for Part II, task (a): Analysis of a NICLE text:
  o Take up the most conspicuous points.
  o Categorise observations rather than just giving a list.
  o In taking up different features it is recommended to say something about how pervasive they are.
  o It is recommended to use/refer to a typology of lexical / grammatical errors, e.g. Johansson (2008) and/or Hasselgren (1994).
  o Johansson (2008) further suggests that an analysis should include
    - a description of errors,
    - followed by an explanation,
    - and finally an evaluation of the text.
  o Use syllabus texts to substantiate claims regarding e.g. writer/reader visibility, lexical teddy bears, progressive verb forms, register awareness, etc.

o The paper (particularly Part II) should be written as a coherent text and the candidates are expected to use evidence from relevant corpora in their papers (ENPC, NICLE, LOCNESS).

PART I (30%)
a) Define and elaborate on TWO of the following terms/concepts with reference to relevant course literature on the subject. Illustrate with (your own) corpus examples where relevant (i.e. from the ENPC, NICLE and/or LOCNESS).

    i. Conceptual confusion
    ii. Translation effect
   iii. Mutual Correspondence
   iv. Error analysis vs. Contrastive Analysis

The questions that have been set should be answered with relevant definitions and illustrations. Own examples are rewarded (in comparison to examples drawn from the syllabus texts).

    i. Conceptual confusion (Johansson, 2008. 121ff): Give examples from NICLE.
    ii. Translation effect (Johansson, 2008: §2.8): Give examples from the ENPC.
   iii. Mutual Correspondence (Johansson, 2008: 29, with reference to Altenberg, 1999; explain the formula and give an example from the ENPC)
   iv. Error analysis vs. Contrastive Analysis (Johansson, 2008: 113, Hasselgård 2010: 98): Give examples from NICLE and the ENPC

b) In what ways do the following two sentences reflect the concept of L1 *transfer* in learner language?

    i. Some university teachers mean that literature history is crucial for the understanding of mankind.
    ii. I accepted the job offer in Chicago, but then I got cold feet, because I started to think it wasn't such a good idea after all.

Discuss these sentences in the light of L1 transfer, with reference to e.g. Granger, 1998; Hasselgren 1994; Altenberg & Tapper, 1998, Hasselgård 2010. Could also be discussed with reference to Johansson's (2008) term "interference". Good also if mention can be made of negative and positive transfer (although only mentioned in the seminars, but inferred in the literature).

In (i) there are two clear instances of L1 (negative) transfer, in the form of a transliteration "literature history", which has been equated with "litteraturhistorie". The result is an invalid word in English. The second instance is the use of the verb "mean" instead of

"think" or "believe". Here we have a case of an equivalence error (and colligation error) where Norwegian "mene" is equated with its English cognate "mean". In this context the two words are false friends, as the context with a *that*-clause requires "think"/"believe" instead; the university teachers have an opinion (i.e. *they think/believe*), rather than that they signify something (i.e. *mean, e.g. This means that we can move on.*).

In (ii), the sentence is in agreement with lexical and grammatical rules in both English and Norwegian, including the idiom "cold feet". Thus, it could be claimed that this is a case of (positive) L1 transfer.