



بررسی مقابله‌ای

سری کتاب‌های کمک آموزشی کارشناسی ارشد

مجموعه مترجمی زبان انگلیسی

مولف: امیر طاهری‌آزاد

ویراستار علمی: علی درخشش

سرشناسه	: طاهری آزاد، امیر
عنوان	: بررسی مقابله‌ای
مشخصات نشر	: تهران : مشاوران صعود ماهان، ۱۴۰۲
مشخصات ظاهری	: ۹۵ ص
فروست	: سری کتاب‌های کمک آموزشی کارشناسی ارشد
شابک	: ۹۷۸-۶۰۰-۴۵۸-۸۶۹-۰
وضعیت فهرست نویسی	: فنیای مختصر
یادداشت	: این مدرک در آدرس http://opac.nlai.ir قابل دسترسی است.
ویراستار علمی	: درخشش، علی
شماره کتابشناسی ملی	: ۳۷۶۹۴۵۶



نام کتاب: بررسی مقابله‌ای

مؤلف: امیر طاهری آزاد

مدیر تولید محتوی: سمیه بیگی

ویراستار علمی: علی درخشش

ناشر: مشاوران صعود ماهان

نوبت و تاریخ چاپ: اول / ۱۴۰۲

تیراژ: ۱۰۰۰ نسخه

قیمت: ۲/۳۹۰/۰۰۰ ریال

شابک: ISBN : ۹۷۸-۶۰۰-۴۵۸-۸۶۹-۰

انتشارات مشاوران صعود ماهان: خیابان ولیعصر، بالاتر از تقاطع مطهری،
 رویروی قنادی هتل بزرگ تهران، جنب بانک ملی، پلاک ۲۰۵۰
 تلفن: ۴-۸۸۱۰۰۱۱۳

سخن ناشر

«ن والقلم و ما یسطرون»

کلمه نزد خدا بود و خدا آن را با قلم بر ما نازل کرد.

به پاس تشکر از چنین موهبت الهی، موسسه ماهان درصدد برآمده است تا در راستای انتقال دانش و مفاهیم با کمک اساتید مجرب و مجموعه کتب آموزشی خود برای شما داوطلبان ادامه تحصیل در مقطع کارشناسی ارشد گام موثری بردارد. امید است تلاش‌های خدمتگزاران شما در این موسسه پایه‌گذار گام‌های بلند فردای شما باشد. مجموعه کتاب‌های کمک آموزشی ماهان به‌منظور استفاده داوطلبان کنکور کارشناسی ارشد سراسری و آزاد تالیف شده‌اند. در این کتاب‌ها سعی کرده‌ایم با بهره‌گیری از تجربه اساتید بزرگ و کتب معتبر داوطلبان را از مطالعه کتاب‌های متعدد در هر درس بی‌نیاز کنیم.

دیگر تالیفات ماهان برای سایر دانشجویان به‌صورت ذیل می‌باشد.

● **مجموعه کتاب‌های ۸ آزمون:** شامل ۵ مرحله کنکور کارشناسی ارشد ۵ سال اخیر به همراه ۳ مرحله آزمون تالیفی ماهان همراه با پاسخ تشریحی می‌باشد که برای آشنایی با نمونه سوالات کنکور طراحی شده است. این مجموعه کتاب‌ها با توجه به تحلیل ۳ ساله اخیر کنکور و بودجه‌بندی مباحث در هریک از دروس، اطلاعات مناسبی جهت برنامه‌ریزی درسی در اختیار دانشجو قرار می‌دهد.

● **مجموعه کتاب‌های کوچک:** شامل کلیه نکات کاربردی در گرایش‌های مختلف کنکور کارشناسی ارشد می‌باشد که برای دانشجویان جهت جمع‌بندی مباحث در ۲ ماهه آخر قبل از کنکور مفید می‌باشد. بدین‌وسیله از مجموعه اساتید، مولفان و همکاران محترم خانواده بزرگ ماهان که در تولید و به‌روزرسانی تالیفات ماهان نقش موثری داشته‌اند، صمیمانه تقدیر و تشکر می‌نماییم. دانشجویان عزیز و اساتید محترم می‌توانند هرگونه انتقاد و پیشنهاد درخصوص تالیفات ماهان را از طریق سایت ماهان به آدرس mahan.ac.ir با ما در میان بگذارند.

موسسه آموزش عالی آزاد ماهان

سخن مؤلف

برخلاف کتاب‌های موجود در بازار که تست-محور هستند، رویکرد کتاب حاضر در وهله اول شرح کامل درس است. این توضیحات از روی منابع اصلی این درس و براساس مباحث پرتکرار و اصلی کنکور در ۸ سال اخیر ارائه شده‌اند. در انتهای هر فصل تعدادی سوال تالیفی به‌همراه پاسخ تشریحی با توجه به حجم مطالب قرار داده شده که به داوطلبان کمک می‌کند میزان یادگیری خود را بسنجند. پس از این بخش سوالات دانشگاه سراسری آورده شده تا داوطلبان با نوع سوالات و نکاتی که در این سال‌ها مورد توجه طراحان بوده است بیشتر آشنا شوند.

با وجود اینکه در کنکور از این درس با عنوان بررسی مقابله‌ای (Contrastive analysis) یاد می‌شود اما درواقع این درس از دو بخش بررسی مقابله‌ای و تجزیه و تحلیل خطاها (Error analysis) تشکیل می‌شود. اما کتاب حاضر مشتمل بر سه بخش است که دو بخش اول آن مربوط به بررسی مقابله‌ای و بخش سوم آن مربوط به تجزیه و تحلیل خطاها می‌باشد. مطالب بخش اول یعنی اصول و مبانی تئوریک بررسی مقابله‌ای و همین‌طور مطالب بخش دوم یعنی بررسی مقابله‌ای اجزای زبانی در فارسی و انگلیسی عمدتاً برگرفته از کتاب دکتر ضیا حسینی، و مطالب بخش سوم یعنی تجزیه و تحلیل خطاها عمدتاً برگرفته از کتاب دکتر کشاورز هستند. در تالیف این کتاب سعی شده است تا حد امکان داوطلبان بی‌نیاز از مطالعه منبع اصلی باشند اما در ارتباط با نوع خطاهایی که زبان‌آموزان فارسی زبان مرتکب می‌شوند، با توجه به حجم بالای این خطاها، بخشی از آنها در صفحات ۷۲-۷۰ کتاب آورده شده و بخشی نیز باید از روی رفرنس مطالعه شوند (صفحات ۱۰۰-۱۰۳ از کتاب دکتر ضیا حسینی و صفحات ۹۴ تا ۱۰۶ از کتاب دکتر کشاورز).

Chapter 1: Contrastive analysis	7
COMPARATIVE LINGUISTICS	8
THEORETICAL AND APPLIED CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS	8
THE CONCEPT OF TRANSFER	9
PEDAGOGICAL VALUES OF CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS	10
VERSIONS OF CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS	10
TECHNIQUES AND PROCEDURES OF CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS	12
DEGREES OF DIFFICULTY	14
MARKEDNESS THEORY	16
PRACTICE QUESTIONS & ANSWERS	17
STATE UNIVERSITY QUESTIONS & ANSWERS	22
 Chapter 2: How to compare and what to compare	27
PHONOLOGY	28
SYNTAX	28
LEXICAL ITEMS	33
DISCOURSE	38
CRITICISMS OF CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS	46
PRACTICE QUESTIONS & ANSWERS	48
STATE UNIVERSITY QUESTIONS & ANSWERS	53
 Chapter 3: Error Analysis	57
DIFFERENT NOTIONS OF LEARNER'S LANGUAGE	58
ERROR vs. MISTAKE	62
SIGNIFICANCE OF ERRORS	63
BRANCHES AND USES OF ERROR ANALYSIS	64
TYPES OF ERRORS	65
ERROR TYPES AS REPRESENTING STAGE OF L2 DEVELOPMENT	66
PROCEDURES FOR DOING ERROR ANALYSIS	67
CLASSIFICATION OF ERRORS	68
SOURCES OF ERRORS	72
INTERLANGUAGE ANALYSIS	78
PRACTICE QUESTIONS & ANSWERS	79
STATE UNIVERSITY QUESTIONS & ANSWERS	86
References.....	95

Chapter 1

Contrastive Analysis

- ◆ **COMPARATIVE LINGUISTICS**
- ◆ **THEORETICAL AND APPLIED CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS**
- ◆ **THE CONCEPT OF TRANSFER**
- ◆ **PEDAGOGICAL VALUES OF CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS**
- ◆ **VERSIONS OF CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS**
- ◆ **TECHNIQUES AND PROCEDURES OF CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS**
- ◆ **DEGREES OF DIFFICULTY**
- ◆ **MARKEDNESS THEORY**

Contrastive Analysis

1. COMPARATIVE LINGUISTICS

Comparing languages has always interested linguists, and so comparative studies in linguistics have a long history. Linguists have compared various stages in the development of a single language, for example comparing Old Persian with Modern Persian, to find out about the changes in the language. Sometimes different but related languages have been compared at a certain stage of their development in order to construct a proto-language, e.g. comparing Old Persian with Sanskrit in order to construct the proto Indo-European language. These studies have been known as **Comparative Historical Linguistics**.

Linguists have also been comparing languages as they are used today in order to classify them into certain groups on the basis of the occurrence of some features. Some linguists study the structural similarities between languages, regardless of their history, in order to establish a satisfactory classification, or typology of languages or special structures in languages. This type of study has been termed **Comparative Typological Linguistic**.

In addition to these two types of comparative studies, there is another type in which two or more languages can be compared to determine the differences and similarities between them. This kind of study is referred to as **Contrastive Analysis** or **Contrastive Study**. Like typological study, Contrastive Analysis (CA) is interested in comparing languages synchronically, though it has different aims. Contrastive analysis is concerned with both similarities and differences between languages at a particular level, i.e. phonological, morphological, syntactic, semantic and pragmatic for a particular purpose, especially teaching and translation.

Although comparative typological linguistics and contrastive studies have different aims, they share two main elements: (1) a comparative element (2) synchronous comparison (synchronic comparative linguistics). In other words, in both comparative typological linguistics and contrastive analysis there is a common feature, or *Tertium comparitionis* (TC), based on which the two languages are compared. As for synchronous comparison, the languages are compared and studied at the same stage of development in time rather than diachronically.

2. THEORETICAL AND APPLIED CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS

Many linguists draw a distinction between *theoretical* and *applied* contrastive analysis. It is claimed that **theoretical CA** gives an exhaustive account of the differences and similarities between two or more languages, provides an adequate model for their comparison, and determines

how and which elements of the languages are comparable, while **applied CA** directs the comparison of the languages toward some specific non-linguistic purpose, such as translation, foreign languages teaching, or explanation of interlingual errors. Here the findings of theoretical contrastive studies provide a framework for the comparison of languages for a specific purpose.

3. THE CONCEPT OF TRANSFER

A major task of applied contrastive studies is the identification of probable areas of difficulty in another language where, for example, a given category is not represented in the surface structure of the foreign/second language. As a result, in the process of learning this foreign/second language some *interference* many occur.

Experiments in psycholinguistics indicate that the second language to be learned is always seen through the filter of first language rule system. While learning a second language, the rules of the first language (L1) are matched with those of the second language (L2): they are expanded, additional rules are learned, and some of the rules of the first language are discovered to be invalid in the second language. In this process, the differences between the rule system of the source and the target language cause interferences, which have to be given special consideration in second language teaching.

The systematic analysis and classification of errors that may occur as a result of this interference can be very important in pedagogical programming. In other words, contrastive analysis is based on the assumption that the second or foreign language learners will tend to *transfer* the formal features (forms), meanings, and also the culture of L1 to their L2 utterances, and so it is the main concern of applied contrastive analysis to identify areas of difficulty for second language learners and produce appropriate teaching materials to overcome these difficulties.

The concept of **transfer** which is the psychological cornerstone of the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH) is of two kinds, depending on the similarities and differences between the structures of the learner's native language and target/foreign language. When students come into contact with a foreign language, they will find some features of it quite easy because they are similar to their L1, so this old habit (i.e. the element in the native language) will facilitate the formation of a new habit (i.e. a new element in the target language). Here we say **positive transfer** takes place. However, some elements in the L2 are different from those in the L1, so learning them would be difficult for students because here the old habit impedes the formation of a new habit. Here **negative transfer** is believed to occur and learning becomes difficult; thus, errors may occur. How these errors are treated in CAH depends on the view taken by its proponents.

According to this view, transfer depends on similarities and differences between the two languages (the first language and the target language). Lado believes that those second language elements that are similar to the learner's first are easier to learn. The learners can positively transfer the similar elements to their second/ foreign language production. In contrast, the elements on second language that are different from the learner's first language are more difficult to learn. In this case, negative transfer occurs and makes learning the second language difficult for the learner. Therefore, the behaviorists and structural linguists believe that the key to successful second/ foreign language learning and teaching lies in the study of both similarities and differences between the learner's mother tongue and the target language.

4. PEDAGOGICAL VALUES OF CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS

As mentioned before, the period after world war II was the heyday of contrastive analysis. During this period, contrastive analysis formed the basis of most foreign language teaching in terms of both theory and practice. In this respect, CA was used as main criterion for preparing instructional materials for foreign/ second language teaching.

The criterion was established by Fries. He held that to provide the most effective materials for foreign/second language teaching, a scientific description should be provided on the target language as well as one such description of the learner's mother tongue. The most effective material then is to be based upon a careful comparison of the two descriptions.

Behavioristic and structural views of foreign/ second language learning saw errors as being like sins in that they were signs of deficiencies in learning and teaching. As a result, they held, every attempt should be made to prevent errors. The very negative view of second language learning is also stated by skinner in another way. He argues that punishment can not reduce the probability of error reoccurrence and thus teachers must try to encourage the correct responses. Skinner believed that teachers should effectively reward the correct response rather than punish the errors.

5. VERSIONS OF CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS

There are three versions of Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH) in the literature since it has always been a field of heated controversy and the advocates of this discipline have not shared the same views regarding its main tenets. The different views are discussed under the strong version, the weak version, and the moderate version.

5.1. The Strong Version

The advocates of the principle of transfer in foreign language learning have hypothesized that learning of similar items (sounds, words, structures, and cultural items) in the foreign language is easy and that of different items is difficult, and the degree of difficulty depends upon the degree of differences. The underlying assumptions of the strong version of CAH were outlined by Lee as follows:

1. The main cause, or even the sole cause, of difficulty and error in foreign language learning is interference coming from the Learner's Native Language (NL).
2. The difficulties are chiefly, or wholly, due to the differences between the two languages.
3. The greater these differences are, the more acute the learning difficulties will be.
4. The results of a comparison between the two languages are needed to predict the difficulties and errors which will occur in learning the foreign language.
5. What there is to teach can best be found by comparing the two languages and then putting aside what is common to them, so that what students have to learn equals the sum of the differences established by the CA.

One shortcoming of this hypothesis is that it can only describe *interlingual* errors, that is, errors in the foreign language which are caused by interference from the native language. Experiments, however, have shown that only one-third of the errors committed by learners are of this type. Two third of the learners' errors are caused by other sources.

5.2. The Weak Version

A number of psychologists disagree with the application of the principle of transfer in foreign language learning to predict errors that might occur. They suggest that in the process of foreign language learning, if the learner gets into trouble, he tries to resort to his native language for help. For example, in the case of a Persian learner of English, if the learner is not able to produce the interdental fricatives [θ and ð], he substitutes them with the alveolar fricatives or stops [s, t, z, d], the closest sounds in Persian. This is not because of proactive inhibition; rather the learner has not yet learned how to produce these English sounds, and so he refers to his previous linguistic knowledge, Persian sound system, for help. In other words, the native language does not interfere, rather it helps, and the linguist should only use the best knowledge available to him in order to account for the observed difficulties in second language learning. He starts with the evidence provided by linguistic interference and uses such evidence to explain the similarities and difference between the two systems. Therefore, in contrast with the predictive claim of the strong version, the weak version is a model with diagnostic and explanatory means. However, as it is clear the weak version – though more realistic and practicable than the 'strong' version – is still confined to errors caused by language transfer.

5.3. The Moderate Version

A recent development regarding the interpretation of language learners' errors as well as predicting them is the moderate version of CAH. The advocates of this theory believe that instead of transfer, the principle of *stimulus generalization* is at work in the learning of a native or foreign language.

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. Conversely, where patterns are functionally or perceptually equivalent in a system or systems, correct generalization may occur.

The implication is that, for example, a Persian learner of English will make fewer errors on the English items that are different from Persian than on those which are similar. In fact, since a Persian, while learning English, expects to learn a different system, and thus pays more attention to different items, which is a motivating factor in learning, the different items must be significantly easy to internalize; and this is what experiments have shown to be true: gross differences – because of their saliency – are often more easily perceived and stored in memory, while minimal differences can be overlooked because of overgeneralization.

One great advantage of this learning theory is that it can describe both *interlingual* and *intra-lingual* errors, that is, errors, the sources of which are either in the native language or target language. Hence, a great percentage of linguistic errors, resulting from overgeneralization of rules, either in the native or target language can be interpreted or predicted on the basis of stimulus generalization.

Certainly, there are some other types of errors whose sources are neither the native nor the target language. They may result from a number of non-linguistic factors such as the teacher, the learning strategy, the textbook, methodology, etc. which could be categorized as idiosyncratic errors. They differ for different learners and do not have much methodological value.

6. TECHNIQUES AND PROCEDURES OF CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS

Comparison of any given pair depends on description and the description is provided through applying linguistic theories and methods. Therefore, there is an inevitable relation between CA and linguistic theories. James (1989) defines this framework as consisting of three phases:

1. CA adopts linguistic tactic of dividing up the concept of a language into 3 smaller and more manageable areas of phonology, grammar and lexis.
2. CA uses descriptive categories of linguistic unit, structure, class and system.
3. CA uses the linguistic description under the same model of language.

There are different linguistic theories which maybe used for the purpose of comparison. Traditional, structural and generative transformational models are discussed briefly.

(a) **Traditional approach** describes languages based on two types of analysis: one dealing with the identification of parts of speech (nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, and function words like prepositions and conjunctions), and the other dealing with identification of functions of various parts of speech (subject, predicate, kinds of complements and modifiers). This traditional model is believed to work along the *horizontal* dimensions necessarily involved in comparing an element or a class of elements in L1 with an *equivalent* element in L2 and/or vice versa.

(b) **Structural approach**, expounded by Bloomfield (1933) and elaborated by Harris (1963), focusing on five types of structural signals for identifying parts of speech: function words, word order, inflection, derivational contrast, and suprasegmentals.

(c) **Transformational generative grammar approach**, by which the contrastive analysis has been profoundly influenced from three aspects: (1) the universal base hypothesis, (2) the deep and surface structure distinction, and (3) the rigorous and explicit description of linguistic phenomena¹.

Bloomfield expounded (1993) structural linguistics and Harris (1963) elaborated on it in his article "transfer Grammar". He claimed that this model could be used for comparative purposes. The task of structural and taxonomical CA was therefore to show similarities and differences between languages in terms of form and distribution of comparative units.

Generative transformational grammar criticized the above view of taxonomic contrastive analysis and taxonomic descriptive linguistics on the grounds that they were preoccupied with the surface structure of the language rather than the deep structure. Three aspects of the transformational grammar model that have a profound influence on CA are:

1. Universal base hypothesis
2. Deep/ surface structure distinction
3. Rigorous and exploit description of linguistic phenomena

Krzeszowski (1976-7) proposed another theoretical model for CA under the title of contrastive generative grammar. The difference of this model with structural models was that in structural models, each of the two languages or parts of them were involved in analysis (CA). These were analyzed independently first and then juxtaposed and compared. However, in contrastive generative grammar, the structures of L1 and L2 were generated from a common base and they

1. For details of the linguistic models of discourse analysis, see Keshavarz (2008:18) & Ziahosseiny (1994: 20).

were compared and contrasted during this generation process. This means that contrastive analysis has only one phase (a single-phase CA).

James (1980) asserts that “executing [doing] a contrastive analysis involves two steps: description, and comparison” (p. 63). However, five different steps have been mentioned in the literature for comparing and contrasting two languages, or two subsystems for that matter. These are explained below.

I. Selection

It must be realized that a comprehensive comparison of two languages for pedagogical purposes is neither feasible nor necessary. Therefore, the analyst should select certain features of the target language that may potentially cause difficulty for the learners and then compare and contrast those features with parallel features in the learners’ native language. Selection can be based on the analyst’s teaching experience and bilingual intuition, if he shares the same native language with the learners. It can also be based on a prior analysis of errors committed by the learners.

II. Description

After the selection of certain linguistic items, structures or rules, the linguist or language teacher, should explicitly describe the two languages in question. Scientific description has been the core of contrastive analysis and the proponents of this theory have always put emphasis on parallel description of the two languages. By *parallel description* it is implied that the two languages should be described through the same linguistic model or framework. For example, if the analyst used Generative-Transformational Grammar for describing certain aspects of the grammar of L1 he should use the same model for the description of L2. This principle works in the majority of cases; however, some languages may require the use of alternative models for their description.

III. Comparison

When the description of subsystems of the two languages is complete, the job of the analyst is to compare and contrast the two systems by juxtaposing features of the two languages in order to find similarities and differences between them. At this stage, the analyst has to decide what to compare with what. Linguistic features of the two languages are compared on three levels: form, meaning, and distribution of forms.

IV. Prediction

Having described and compared certain features across languages, the analyst can make predictions about difficulties learners may face in acquiring the second language. The analyst should judge whether similarities and differences found through the comparison of the two languages are problematic for the learners or not. Predictions can be arrived at through the formulation of a hierarchy of difficulty, as discussed below.

V. Verification

The final step in contrastive analysis is verification. In this stage, the analyst needs to find out whether the predictions made about errors and difficulties actually materialize or not. In other words, we need to ask whether second language learners in reality commit the type of errors predicted on the basis of the contrastive analysis of the two languages or sub-systems of those languages.

Prator (1967) captured the essence of the grammatical hierarchy in six categories of difficulty. Prator's hierarchy is applicable to both grammatical and phonological features of language. The six categories devised upon the notion of transfer, in the ascending order of difficulty, are presented by Brown under the title of degrees of difficulty.

7. DEGREES OF DIFFICULTY

Now that a distinction has been drawn between interlingual and intralingual errors, it is time to review the degrees of difficulty that may arise in learning a foreign language and see how the interlingual errors may occur.

Level 0: Transfer

Sounds, lexical items, or structures that are similar in the two languages fall in this category. The assumption is that due to positive transfer, the learner faces no problem learning these elements of the foreign language. A number of phonemes in English and Persian /b, f, s, z, u, i/ are among the examples as well as words such as *door* / در, *the wall* / دیوار, also concepts of negation and interrogation, and structures such as general word order *گل باغ* / گل باغ, *garden flower* / *flower garden*.

Level 1: Coalescence

Two or more items in the native language converge into one item in the target language. The learner has to overlook the distinction he learned in his native language. Examples of lexical coalescence in the case of Persian learners of English are:

book/ دفتر، کتاب	teacher/ آموزگار، دبیر
student/ دانش‌آموز، دانشجو	cousin/ خاله‌زاده، دایی‌زاده، عمه‌زاده

Level 2: Underdifferentiation

The equivalence of an item in the native language is absent in the foreign language. Persian learners of English must forget such items as Persian [x] and [y] or the words *مگر* in sentences like *آقای روحانی چندمین رئیس‌جمهور ایران است؟* or *مگر دانشجو نیستی؟*

Level 3: Reinterpretation

An item exists both in the native and target languages. Sometimes they are equivalents, but other times they are not. So learners of the foreign language would overgeneralize on the basis of the similarity. On the basis of the equivalence of English and Persian present perfect tense in sentences (1) and (2), a Persian learner of English makes errors in sentences (3) and (4).

(1) <i>We have come to this gallery today.</i>	ما امروز به این گالری آمده‌ایم.
(2) <i>We haven't had lunch today.</i>	ما امروز ناهار نخورده‌ایم.
(3) <i>We are fasting today.</i>	ما امروز روزه گرفته‌ایم.
(4) <i>We are sitting in the classroom.</i>	ما در کلاس نشسته‌ایم.

As you see, in the English sentences (3) and (4) the tense of verbs is present progressive, while in the Persian equivalents present perfect tense must be used.