Contrastive Analysis Hypotheses (CAH)

Strong version	"The change that has to take place in the language behavior of a foreign language student can be equated to the differences between the structure of the students native language and culture and that of the target language and culture." (Banathy, Trager, Waddle, 1966).
Weak Version	Linguistic difficulties are explained a posteriori instead of being predicted a prior, to understand the sources of error by utilizing and intuitively contrasting a general knowledge of L1 and L2.
Moderate Version	"The categorization of abstract and concrete patterns according to their perceived similarities and differences is the basis for learning; therefore, wherever patterns are minimally distinct in form or meaning in one or more systems, confusion may result." (Oller & Ziahosseiny, 1970).

Procedures of the CAH Strong version:

1. Description;

2. Selection (!!);

3. Contrast;

4. Prediction.
   (According to Randal Whitman, 1970).
   Mentalistic subjectivity within structural behaviorism. No over-all contrastive
system to relate ALL items in the two languages.

Hierarchy of difficulty:

1. Transfer - no difference [general word order, cardinal vowels (!!), some consonants s/z (!!)].

2. Coalescence - one item covering two in L1 [su for his/her].

3. Underdifferentiation - absence [Where *do* you go? A donde vas? Sign *in/out.* Firmase].

4. Reinterpretation - different application of existing item [handsome/hermoso; honor/hombre, hour/ora].

5. Overdifferentiation - new item [tu/vosotros/usted/ustedes. Aqui *se* habla Espanol. Red - rojo/roja. Venga]

6. Split -two items covering one in L1 [If I were you/there. Si yo sera tu/estaria alli. (If) you come - vienes/vengas].

7. According to Clifford Prator (1967).

Weak Version
All language errors are contributed to interference.

Moderate version

Similarity is a source of confusion

Negative transfer: superficial

Positive transfer: in depth

Generalization and overgeneralization (cf. 2 r-s (right/string) in english, spanish (pero/perro), Russian, Armenian).

Markedness and UG

Contrastive analysis
p 54, 59 discuss the graphics
Chomsky's view of la is not a product of habit formation but rather one of rule formation. Humans are thought to possess a certain innate predisposition to induce the rules of a target language from the input to which they are exposed.

Children learning English as a first language make errors similar to that of students' of English as a second language:
*she doesn't wants to go.
*I eated it.
These suggest that they have internalized rules for subject-verb agreement and past tense formation but had not yet mastered the limitations of the rules. Furthermore, such original errors indicate that the children are not simply repeating forms from the input they have encountered.
SL learners commit similar 'developmental; errors apparently not due to L1 interference.
After initial exposure to the target language learners form hypotheses about the nature of certain target language rules. SLAR, p 58

Interlingual vs. Intralingual errors
errors due to overgeneralization, simplification, redundancy reduction, communication-based errors SLAR, p 58

Corder's distinction between mistake and error. SLAR p 59

STRONG VERSUS WEAK VERSIONS OF CAH (CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS HYPOTHESIS)
Strong version involves predicting errors in second language learning based upon an a priori contrastive analysis of the L1 and L2. The predictions are not always borne out.
Weak version starts with learner errors and explains at least a subset of them by pointing to the similarities and differences between the two languages. SLAR, P 57