

A Corpus-Based Contrastive Analysis among Russian and Korean Languages: In Reference to Admiral E. Putyatin's Contribution¹

Yuliya Yurisovna Karamova² & Alfiya Rafisovna Alikberova³

Abstract

This corpus-based contrastive analysis examines the Russian and Korean Languages. For example, in the Russian language, the use of the words *tip* and *vid* depends on characteristics and the general contents of the text. In addition, in strictly special scientific texts dealing with the systematization of any objects, these words represent different levels of the classification grid (objects are divided into types and types into kinds), and in non-scientific texts they can become synonyms (different types = different kinds of objects). An examination of the history of Russian-Korean relations in the last years of the 19th century allows us to trace the main stages of the process concerning a gradual increase in the role and place of Korea in Russia's foreign policy in the Far East. In the second half of the XIX century, the first Russian-Korean dialogue took place on the territory of Korea, in which the squadron of Admiral Evfimiy Vasilyevich Putyatin participated. Admiral Putyatin wanted to establish trade relations with the Korean state. However, the attempts of E.V. Putyatin to establish trade relations with the Korean state were unsuccessful due to the outbreak of the Crimean War. When writing this work, the following methods were used: analysis of the research literature on the topic under study; the method of specific situations (case method) in the analysis of examples; and also, instrumental observation. When writing the work, such general scientific methods were also used: analysis and synthesis in determining the goals, resources and tools of the concept under consideration, as well as a structural approach. In 1854, the expedition of E. Putyatin to the Korean state visited the islands of the Comundo archipelago located to the south of the Korean Peninsula, and also explored the east coast of Korea and the South Ussuri Territory. Thus, for the first time, Korean shores were surveyed by a European vessel. Participants in the expedition of Admiral E.V. Putyatin left a lot of interesting information about Korea and the inhabitants of this country.

¹ Please cite this paper as follows:

Karamova, Y.Y. & Alikberova, A. R. (2019). A corpus-based contrastive analysis among Russian and Korean languages: In reference to admiral E. Putyatin's contribution. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, 10 (SP), 1282-1288.

² Kazan Federal University; valieva.yul@yandex.ru

³ Kazan Federal University

Keywords: Corpus-Based Study; Contrastive Analysis; Russia language; Korean Language.

1. Introduction

The background for Contrastive Analysis, as applied to language teaching, is the assumption that the native language plays a role in learning a second language. Mother tongue influence is sometimes very obvious, e.g. in the case of foreign accent. We can often recognise foreign speakers by their accent; an American speaking Norwegian normally sounds quite different from a Frenchman or a German. Mother tongue influence is also apparent in the Bergman quotation above. Influence from the mother tongue is not just negative, however; learning a related language is much easier than learning one that is very different. For example, Håkan Ringbom has shown that Swedish-speaking Finns have a huge advantage in learning English compared with Finnish-speaking Finns (Ringbom 1994; Etemadfar, Namaziandost, & Banari, 2019). These sorts of observations have probably always been made in language learning and in the contact between native and foreign speakers. When people have written textbooks for learners of foreign languages, there has regularly been an element of comparison between the native language and the foreign language to be learned. In his book on Early Contrastive Studies in English, Tomasz P. Krzeszowski (1995) gives examples that go back to the Renaissance. Bilingual dictionaries are of course also contrastive. But when we refer to CA, we think particularly of a systematic comparison of the mother tongue and the foreign language in order to describe similarities and differences, to identify points of difficulty which might lead to interference. The basic ideas are:

- Describe and compare the mother tongue / L1 / source language and the foreign language / L2 / target language.
- Predict points of difficulty.
- Use the results in order to improve teaching materials. This sort of approach was developed in the United States in the 1940s and 1950s.

Two prominent names were Charles Fries and Robert Lado, who explained the rationale for applied CA in this way: The most efficient materials are those that are based upon a scientific description of the language to be learned, carefully compared with a parallel description of the native language of the learner. (Fries, 1945: 9) The plan of the book rests on the assumption that we can predict and describe the patterns which will cause difficulty in learning and those that will not cause difficulty. (Lado 1957). We find a large number of contrastive studies in the 50s and 60s, both in the United States and in Europe, but gradually there was some disenchantment with CA, perhaps because contrastive linguists had made exaggerated claims or because teachers had expected too much. Some problems are (see further Ringbom 1994):

- Only part of the learning problems can be predicted. Many problems are shared, irrespective of the mother tongue.
- Predictions may vary depending upon the linguistic model.
- There is a complicated relationship between difference and difficulty.
- The blinding-flash fallacy: A comparison of L1 and L2 implies that the whole of the two languages get in contact. But the meeting of the languages in the learner's mind depends upon the stage of learning.

The underlying problem is that language learning cannot be understood by a purely linguistic study. So those who were concerned with language learning turned instead to the new disciplines of error analysis, performance analysis or interlanguage studies, and contrastive analysis was rejected by many as an applied discipline (Namaziandost, Shatalebi, & Nasri, 2019).

In the foreign language learning context, it is critical for learners to be cognizant of language production errors to help improve proficiency. Korean students learning Russian as a foreign language and translators can benefit from examining the typological differences between Korean and Russian, which includes the classification nouns *tip* (type) and *vid* (kind). Analysing the common errors, including classification nouns, is much quicker and more effective than the analysis of general texts (Namaziandost, Rahimi Esfahani, & Ahmadi, 2019).

To prevent systemic errors, comparative studies of the use of lexicosemantic groups with a similar meaning in different languages are needed. The motivation for this study is based on observations of Korean students in a Russian as a foreign language class who frequently made mistakes using the Russian words *tip* and *vid*. Such a large number of mistakes in the use of the words *tip* and *vid* by Korean students calls for an investigation into the question of why they systematically take place (Namaziandost, Rahimi Esfahani, & Hashemifardnia, 2018).

A review of the history of Russian-Korean relations in the last years of the 19th century allows us to trace the main stages of the process of a gradual increase in the role and place of Korea in Russia's foreign policy in the Far East, the activities of Russian diplomats in neutralizing the policies of aggressive powers in Korea and maintaining the independence of the Korean state.

2. Methods

When writing this work, the following methods were used:

- 1) Analysis of research literature on the topic;
- 2) The method of specific situations (case method) in the analysis of examples;
- 3) Instrumental observation;

Moreover, when writing the work, such general scientific methods as analysis and synthesis were used to determine the goals, resources and tools of the concept under consideration, as well as a structural approach.

3. Results and Discussion

In the second half of the XIX century, the first Russian-Korean dialogue took place on the territory of Korea, in which the squadron under command of Admiral Evfimiy Vasilyevich Putyatin (1803-1883) participated. Consider the events that led the squadron of E.V. Putyatin to the shores of the Korean state.

One of the most vexing questions in contrastive analysis is the problem of equivalence. How do we know what to compare? It is not sufficient to contrast formal categories. What is expressed in one language by, for example, modal auxiliaries could be expressed in other languages in quite different ways. Then we do not get very far by a comparison of modal auxiliaries. One approach is that outlined by Andrew Chesterman (1998: 54) in his proposal for a methodology for contrastive functional analysis: 1. Primary data: instances of language behaviour in different languages. 2. Comparability criterion: a perceived similarity, of any kind, between a phenomenon X in language A and a phenomenon Y in language B. For a given contrastive analysis, this criterion is then defined operationally in terms of a constraint of relevant similarity. 3. Problem: what is the nature of this similarity? 4. Initial hypothesis: that X and Y are identical. 5. Test: on what grounds can the initial hypothesis be supported or rejected? On what conditions (if ever) does it hold? 6. Revised hypothesis (if the identity hypothesis fails): that the relation between X and Y is such-and-such; or, that the use of X and Y depends on such-and-such conditions. 7. Testing of the revised hypothesis. And so on. (Neisi, Hajijalili, & Namaziandost, 2019). According to Chesterman, the initial hypothesis of identity has the same status as the null hypothesis in experimental studies. The researcher sets out to reject it, but the main point is to show how the perception of similarity is gradually refined in the process of testing. Translation is a source of perceived similarities across languages. Most linguists working in the field have either explicitly or implicitly made use of translation as a means of establishing cross-linguistic relationships (Abedi, Keshmirshakan, & Namaziandost, 2019)

The importance of combining learner corpora and multilingual corpora extends beyond immediate teaching applications, as argued by Granger (1996) in her presentation of the integrated contrastive model. The integrated contrastive model solves the most basic problem of applied contrastive analysis, viz. the problem that learning cannot be understood by a purely linguistic study (Ziafar & Namaziandost, 2019b). The question is not whether mother-tongue influence exists, but when and under what conditions. In contrastive analysis (CA) we compare original texts (OL vs. OL) across languages or source- and target-language texts (SL vs. TL). From the

comparison we predict potential difficulties for learners. By contrastive interlanguage analysis (CIA), comparing native and learner language use (NL vs. IL) and different groups of learners (IL vs. IL), we find out what the actual problems are and to what extent they are shared irrespective of the mother tongue of the learners. Here the approach is diagnostic. Learner language features may be traced back to the mother tongue, but they may also reflect general strategies of learning or have other causes. Combining learner corpora and multilingual corpora is a new development. Though there are some promising beginnings (e.g. Gilquin 2000/2001), there is far more to do, with respect to both corpus building and research. This is well worth the effort, because the integrated contrastive model holds a key to the understanding of foreign-language acquisition (Namaziandost, Rahimi Esfahani, & Hashemifardnia, 2018).

Many of the works of South Korean researchers investigating this issue are united by one thing: in these works, there is a thesis about the so-called "paper tiger". The essence of this thesis is that in comparison with Western countries, as well as with Japan, Russia is a weak state. Putting such an idea in their works, South Korean researchers contradict themselves. In their works, they repeatedly emphasize and prove the danger of Russia to Korea, at the same time saying that Russia is a "paper tiger", that is, a weak country. While Pak Tae Geun in his works portrays the image of the "weak loser" Admiral E. Putyatin, the moderate behaviour of the latter among the Japanese, unlike the American Commodore M.K. Perry, was successful. Here is a quote from the Japanese historian Kiyozawa Kiyoshi: "They say that his behaviour, unlike Perry's actions, was extremely tactful and restrained, and this did not in the least cause the supporters of the slogan to appear even among the bakufu vassals: "Having concluded an alliance with Russia, then we turn against America" (Goncharov, 2001). Of course, not all South Korean researchers are of the same opinion that Park Tae Geun, however, there are followers of such an idea. The existence of the image of an aggressor Russia in the minds of such researchers as Pak Tae Geun is felt by the strong influence of the United States.

Of course, not all South Korean researchers are of the opinion that Park Tae Geun has; however, there are followers of such an idea. The existence of the image of an aggressor Russia in the minds of such researchers as Pak Tae Geun is felt by the strong influence of the United States.

4. Conclusions

Contrastive Analysis (CA) is useful for bilingual learners to find mistakes which they can meet. Contrastive linguistic gives a comparative method to translate a learner's thinking in an informed way. ... For learners, similarities between languages cause no difficulties, while differences cause interference to learning. CA was a hypothesis pioneered in the late 1950s by Robert Lado and his book *Linguistics Across Cultures*. CA was developed to examine the differences between two

languages in an effort to identify problem areas for language learners. At this time, behaviorism and structuralism (structural linguistics) were predominate in the field of language learning. The psychological theory of behaviorism, which proposed that people learned languages through habit formation (Stimulus-Response-Reinforcement), and structural linguistics, which accesses the different structures in language, were the two driving forces behind the teaching method Audio Lingual Method (ALM).

It was assumed that second language learning was dependent upon transfer from the native language to the one being learned. If the languages shared the same structural elements, order, and meaning, then positive transfer would occur and assist in learning. However, if structural elements, order, and meaning did not translate appropriately, then this could cause negative transfer or interference which was believed to cause difficulty in learning a second language.

The idea of positive and negative transfer meant that a detailed examination of the two languages needed to be undertaken to identify where students would have problems. By examining the languages and identifying the problem areas, educators could then predict the elements of negative transfer and drill these elements to form the “correct” habit. In this way, behaviorism, structuralism, and CA all worked together to inform the educator of which components needed more attention.

A bottom-up approach to learning was conceived where the smaller aspects of the language were learned before higher order aspects. For example, the educator would first teach phonetics so the students could learn all the sounds of the new language. Then, the next step would be something higher such as lexicon or morphology. If one looks at pyramid diagram of language, the smaller fundamental parts of such as phonetics would be on the bottom, whereas discourse would be at the pinnacle.

Acknowledgements

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

References

- Abedi, P., Keshmirshakan, M. H., & Namaziandost, E. (2019). The comparative effect of flipped classroom instruction versus traditional instruction on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' English composition writing. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 6(4), 43-56.
- Chesterman, A. (1998). *Contrastive Functional Analysis*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.

- Etemadfar, P., Namaziandost, E., & Banari, R. (2019). The impact of different output-based task repetition conditions on producing speech acts among Iranian advanced EFL learners. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 9(12), 1541-1549.
- Fries, Ch. C. (1945). *Teaching and learning English as a foreign language*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Gilquin, G. (2000/2001). The Integrated Contrastive model: Spicing up your data. *Languages in Contrast*, 3(1), 95-123.
- Goncharov, I. (2001). *"Frigate Pallada": Travel materials*. Official Documents of the Expedition. London: The Folio Society,
- Krzyszowski, T. P. (1995). *Early contrastive studies in England (15th-18th centuries)*. Gdansk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdanskiego.
- Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across cultures: Applied linguistics for language teachers*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Namaziandost, E., Rahimi Esfahani, F., & Ahmadi, S. (2019). Varying levels of difficulty in L2 reading materials in the EFL classroom: Impact on comprehension and motivation. *Cogent Education*, 6(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2019.1615740>.
- Namaziandost, E., Rahimi Esfahani, F., & Hashemifardnia, A. (2018). The comparative effect of spacing instruction and massed instruction on intermediate EFL learners' reading comprehension. *SAGE Open*, 8(4), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1177/215824401881102>.
- Namaziandost, E., Rahimi Esfahani, F., & Hashemifardnia, A. (2018). The Impact of using authentic videos on prosodic ability among foreign language learners. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(4), 375-390.
- Namaziandost, E., Shatalebi, V., & Nasri, M. (2019). The impact of cooperative learning on developing speaking ability and motivation toward learning English. *Journal of Language and Education*, 5(3), 83-101. <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2019.9809>.
- Neisi, L., Hajjilili, M., & Namaziandost, E. (2019). The impact of using inverted classrooms on promoting extensive versus intensive reading comprehension among Iranian upper- intermediate EFL learners. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 9(12), 1513-1523.
- Ringbom, H. (1994). Contrastive analysis. In R. E. Asher & J. M. Y. Simpson (eds.), *Encyclopedia of linguistics* (PP. 737–742). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure,. *Applied Linguistics*, 4, 91-112.
- Ziafar M., & Namaziandost, E. (2019a). Competition model and contrastive lexical competition. *Journal of Humanities and Education Development (JHED)*, 1(6), 247-256.