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And what, Socrates, is the food of the soul?
Surely, I said, knowledge is the food of the soul.
Plato, Protagoras

Abstract
This article shows how the approach of Contrastive Analysis can be combined with that of Contrastive Interlanguage Analysis in what has been called the Integrated Contrastive Model (Granger 1996a). Through the illustration of English and French causative constructions, it is demonstrated that corpus contrastive data can help explain some of the characteristics of learners’ interlanguage and thus throw new light on the key notion of transfer, which emerges as a more complex phenomenon than was traditionally assumed.

1. Foretaste
Not all mixtures are equally tasty. Some flavours match better than others and these, when combined, can reveal hitherto unsuspected aromas. This is true of cookery, but also of linguistics. Not all combinations of linguistic approaches are felicitous. But when they are, they can bring out fascinating facts that have hitherto been unnoticed. Two approaches that go particularly well together are Contrastive Analysis (CA) and Contrastive Interlanguage Analysis (CIA). While the former compares two languages in order to come to a description of their differences and similarities, the latter tries to discover the features of nativeness and non-nativeness of learner language by
comparing it with native language. The recipe of the so-called Integrated Contrastive Model (Granger 1996a) is simple, yet potent: take a bilingual and a learner corpus – quality products only –, analyse following instructions, mix the results and gently stir until well combined. Sprinkle with authentic examples and significant figures. Before serving, make sure all your claims are substantiated by the data.

To start with, the two main ingredients of the mixture, CA and CIA, will be presented, with particular emphasis on the role that computerised corpora have played in their development. Then, after highlighting the complementarity of CA and CIA and the usefulness of actually combining them, the Integrated Contrastive Model will be illustrated through the case of English and French causative constructions with *make* and *faire/rendre*. It will be shown to what extent the constructions resemble each other (or not) and how this can be linked to the way English causative constructions are used by French-speaking learners. This analysis will lead us to see the traditional notion of transfer in a new light.

2. *Contrastive analysis: Best after 1980*

The origins of Contrastive Analysis (CA) go back to the 1950s, when it was mainly viewed as an applied discipline in the service of foreign language teaching. Its claim was that one could predict the problems encountered by learners of a foreign language (L2) by comparing this language with the learners’ mother tongue (L1). Where there were differences, learners were prone to make errors. As pointed out by Benson (2002: 68),

> [t]his belief was rooted in a behaviourist theory of language learning whereby learning was equated with ‘habit forming’: the habits of the L1 were believed to be ‘transferred’, and regarded as ‘interfering with’ the newly-acquired habits of the L2.

This hypothesis (the ‘strong’ CA hypothesis) won many followers and led to the success of the discipline and its rapid development in the 1960s. However, it soon turned out that the predictive power of CA and its practical applications for language teaching were much more limited than was initially thought. Moreover, the contrastive descriptions were usually intuition-based, so that their conclusions were to be taken with a pinch of salt (Filipović 1984). Consequently, it was not long before
the grapes turned sour and CA came to be considered with some scepticism, especially in the United States (see Sajavaara 1996 for an outline of the history of CA and some of its deficiencies), although, paradoxically, it remained a fruitful area of research in Europe, as witnessed by the establishment of major contrastive projects in the 1970s (see Filipović 1984).

The strong CA hypothesis gave way to another, weaker version, in the form of Error Analysis (EA), which flourished in the 1970s. The approach was no longer predictive, but diagnostic. Unlike the contrastivist, who sought to predict the learner’s behaviour on the basis of the linguistic distance between L1 and L2, the error analyst observed the errors committed by the learner and tried to explain them by referring to the learner’s mother tongue. Though less ambitious, and despite the fact that it was usually based on (admittedly very small) corpora of learner writing, this approach ran into problems too (cf. Dagneaux et al. 1998: 164-165). Among its weaknesses were the heterogeneity of the data, the use of fuzzy and ill-defined error categories and the decontextualization of errors. As a result, many of the studies carried out then are “difficult to interpret and almost impossible to replicate” (Ellis 1994: 49) and of limited use to foreign language teachers.

Recently, however, there has been a revival of interest in CA, both in its strong and weak versions. One of the reasons put forward by Altenberg and Granger (2002b: 7) to explain this re-emergence is “the computer revolution and the possibility of analysing natural language on the basis of large text corpora.” By feeding on naturally-occurring data, the “new-look CA” (Granger 1996a: 49) has acquired the empirical solidity that its predecessor was sorely lacking, thus gaining in reliability and respectability. Similarly, EA has developed into a new discipline, computer-aided error analysis (CEA), more rigorous methodologically and therefore more apt to result in ‘learner-aware’ and efficient pedagogical tools (see Granger and Monfort 1994; Dagneaux et al. 1998).

Among the bilingual – or multilingual – corpora that are available for CA, a distinction can be made between ‘translation corpora’ and ‘comparable corpora’.\(^1\) The former consists of original texts and their translations, whereas the latter contains original texts in two or more languages which share content and text type features. The crème de la crème is if these two types of corpora can complement each other, thus combining their respective strengths (on the advantages and disadvantages of translation and comparable corpora, see Johansson 1998: 5-6). Thus, while
translations provide a good basis for comparing how the same meaning is conveyed in different languages, comparable texts represent authentic data that are not distorted by what has been called ‘translationese’, i.e. the transfer of features from the source to the target language (cf. Gellerstam 1986, 1996). The English-French PLECI corpus (Poitiers-Louvain Echange de Corpus Informatisés), a bidirectional corpus consisting of translated novels and newspaper articles, and the English-Norwegian Parallel Corpus (see Johansson and Hofland 1994, Johansson et al. 1996) are just two examples of corpora that incorporate the two sorts of data. As such, they allow for a four-way comparison (Figure 1), as described e.g. in Johansson (1998: 7-9), viz.

(1) Oa vs. Ob, i.e. comparison of original texts in language a and language b;
(2) Sa vs. Tb / Sb vs. Ta, i.e. comparison of original texts in language a (source language) and their translations in language b, and vice versa;
(3) Oa vs. Ta / Ob vs. Tb, i.e. comparison of original and translated texts in the same language (a or b);
(4) Ta vs. Tb, i.e. comparison of translations in language a and b.

(Figure 1 here)

These comparisons not only provide contrastive descriptions of the two languages involved (1 and 2), but they also give information about the nature of translated language (3 and 4), as well as new insights into the languages compared (1, 2 and 3) – insights “that are likely to be unnoticed in studies of monolingual corpora” (Aijmer and Altenberg 1996: 12).

3. **Contrastive Interlanguage Analysis: A newcomer to the market**

Interestingly, the methods and goals of CA can also be applied to cases where the two systems to be compared are, not two different languages, but two varieties of the same language, for example original language vs. translated language (see above), child language vs. adult language or native language (NL) vs. learner language (Interlanguage, or IL). The focus here will be on this last type of comparison, which, following Granger (1996a), will be referred to as CIA – Contrastive Interlanguage Analysis. Here again, the advent of computer technologies and the expansion of corpus linguistics have been two important components in the development of such an
approach. Yet, due to some (practical and theoretical) ‘incompatibility’ between the
educational sphere and the field of corpus linguistics (see Leech 1998: xvi-xvii), CIA
was actually slow to come to fruition, with the first book on the subject being
published as late as 1998 (Granger 1998a).

Computerised learner corpora contain authentic data produced by language
learners in more or less natural conditions. As such, they give access to learners’
terlanguage and enable us to approach it from a negative point of view – what did
the learner get wrong? – but also from a positive point of view – what did the learner
get right? (Leech 1998: xvii). Because “the results are only as good as the corpus”
(Sinclair 1991: 9), and to avoid the pitfalls of early EA, learner corpora should be
carefully compiled. Indeed, learner language is such a heterogeneous variety that it is
essential to have clear design criteria in order not to mix data coming from different
types of learners and different learning situations. Thus, variables such as learner’s
mother tongue, knowledge of other foreign languages or proficiency level should be
recorded along with the performance data proper. Moreover, a number of linguistic
features should also be taken into consideration, e.g. the distinction between speech
and writing or between various genres, so as to allow for a maximum of comparability
across the data (see Granger 1998b: 7-12 on the principles of learner corpus
compilation, with an illustration of how such principles were applied to ICLE, the
International Corpus of Learner English).

Nowadays, a number of well-designed corpora exist which gather data
produced by learners with different native languages – such as ICLE (see Granger
1993, 1996b) or the 10-million-word Longman Learners’ Corpus – or learners with
the same linguistic background, as in the HKUST project, collecting data from
Chinese-speaking learners only (Milton 1998). By comparing such corpora with a
control corpus of the target language, it is possible to pinpoint the features of non-
nativeness of the interlanguage, i.e. not only errors (cf. EA), but also over- and
underuses, which represent a (positive or negative) deviation from a certain statistical
norm that characterises native performance (Krzeszowski 1990: 206). Furthermore,
one can undertake the comparison of different interlanguages with the aim of
determining the influence of the learner’s mother tongue and/or gaining new insights
into the nature of interlanguage in general (on these two types of comparisons, IL vs.
NL and IL vs. IL, see Granger 1998b: 12-14).
4. **Integrated Contrastive Model: A spicy mixture**

As suggested by Granger (1996a), the two disciplines presented above, CA and CIA, should be seen as closely interrelated and can actually be combined in what she calls the ‘Integrated Contrastive Model’ (see Figure 2). As noted by its author, this model “involves constant to-ing and fro-ing between CA and CIA” (*ibid.* 46).

(Figure 2 here)

Starting from the comparison of two languages (either as original languages or as source language and translated language), one can formulate predictions about the learner’s interlanguage on the basis of the notion of transfer, which states that “individuals tend to transfer the forms and meanings and the distribution of forms and meanings of their native language and culture to the foreign language and culture” (Lado 1957: 2). This predictive movement corresponds to the ‘strong CA hypothesis’, with the difference that here the CA analysis, being based on authentic data, is more reliable, and that the claims made on its behalf are more modest. Indeed, the predictive power of CA is purely hypothetical (hence the broken line). L1:L2 mismatches do not always lead to errors, just as L1:L2 identity does not necessarily imply error-free use by learners.

In the opposite direction, from CIA to CA, the approach is diagnostic (cf. the weak version of CA), aiming as it does to explain the origin of errors against the CA data. Here again, the diagnosis is a mere hypothesis, and the errors observed can have other sources than L1 interference, as indicated by the diverging arrows in Figure 2, such as intralingual origin, transfer of training, strategies of L2 learning or L2 communication (James 1980: 146). In fact, it seems that “between a third and half of learner errors may be caused by the L1:L2 misfit” (*ibid.*). For the remaining cases, another explanation will have to be found.

From what precedes, we can conclude along with Granger (1998b: 14) that “if we wish to be able to make firm pronouncements about transfer-related phenomena, it is essential to combine CA and CIA approaches.” This presupposes a constant movement between the two disciplines, but also and above all the availability of reliable CA and CIA data in the form of well-designed and representative bilingual and learner corpora.
5.  Causative constructions: An illustration

5.1  Causative constructions in English and Swedish

While corpus-based contrastive studies and learner language analyses are quite common now (e.g. Viberg 1996, Schmied 1998 and De Cock 2000, Aijmer 2002), the Integrated Contrastive Model, probably due to its relative novelty, has only yet given rise to a very small number of practical applications. It has been applied successfully by Altenberg (2002a, 2002b), who compares the use of (adjectival and verbal) analytical causative constructions in English and Swedish in order to account for Swedish learners’ overuse of such constructions with make (see Altenberg and Granger 2001). His study shows that this overuse cannot be explained by the frequency of causative constructions in the learners’ mother tongue, since adjectival constructions are hardly more frequent in Swedish than in English (36.8 and 31.4 per 100,000 words in source texts, respectively), while Swedish verbal constructions are actually much less common than their English counterparts in source texts (16.7 and 31.6 per 100,000 words, respectively). But a closer look at the CA data reveals that they are often used as translations of each other and can be regarded as ‘unmarked’ in both languages. Since learners tend to transfer unmarked categories, as well as categories they perceive as similar in L1 and L2, it comes as no surprise that Swedish IL exhibits an unusually high proportion of causative constructions with make.

5.2  Causative constructions in English and French

Since the proof of the pudding is in the eating and in order to illustrate the various concepts and methods outlined above, this section will apply the Integrated Contrastive Model to the study of verbal and adjectival causative constructions in English and French, combining CA data from the two languages with data showing the use of such constructions by French-speaking learners of English. The approach to verbal patterns (E. make + NP + non-finite verb; F. faire + infinitive + NP) will primarily be predictive, starting from the CA data and then moving to CIA, whereas the starting point for adjectival patterns (E. make + NP + adjective; F. rendre + NP and adjective) will be the CIA data, and the approach, basically diagnostic.

5.2.1  Material. The CA data come from the PLECI corpus and include texts and their translations in both fiction and non-fiction (newspaper articles), as shown in Table 1.
The data will be analysed from source to target language, but also in the reverse direction (‘back-translation’ as defined by Ivir 1983, 1987), for this, as observed by Johansson (1998: 6), is one of the ways in which translation effects can be controlled for. The software used is Multiconcord (Wools 1998), a multilingual parallel concordancer which enables the user to retrieve a word (or expression) in its context together with the corresponding aligned sentence or paragraph in the other language.\(^4\) The disambiguation between the causative and the other uses of make, faire and rendre was carried out manually.

(Table 1 here)

The CIA corpus is a sample of ICLE made up of c. 170,000 words of essay writing by advanced French-speaking learners of English and used by Altenberg and Granger (2001) in their analysis of the grammatical and lexical patterning of make in native and non-native student writing. Two control corpora of comparable native performance were used,\(^5\) viz. a 170,000-word sample from the Louvain Corpus of Native English Essays (LOCNESS), a corpus of argumentative essays written by American students, and a 95,000-word corpus made up of essays written by French-speaking students, the Corpus de Dissertations Françaises (CODIF). While the former makes it possible to compare the use of causative constructions by learners and native speakers, the latter can be used to check whether learners’ behaviour can be explained by transfer. The concordancer of WordSmith Tools (Scott 1996) was used to extract all the occurrences of make, faire and rendre and the irrelevant, i.e. non-causative, sentences were discarded manually.

5.2.2 Verbal causative constructions with “make” and “faire”: Predictive approach.

As a causative, make can be followed by three types of non-finite verbs, viz. a plain infinitive (e.g. He makes me laugh), a to-infinitive when used in the passive voice (e.g. We were made to leave) and, in a restricted number of cases, a past participle (e.g. She can make herself understood). By contrast, French faire can only be followed by an infinitive, as in Ils ont fait entrer l’étudiant ‘they made come in the student’.\(^6\) The different participants and elements of the construction will be referred to as follows: I [causer] made [causative (verb)] him [causee] prepare [non-finite

As appears from Table 2, verbal causative constructions with faire are much more frequent than those with make, both in source texts and translations ($X^2 = 55.26$ and 42.35 respectively, highly significant at the 0.001 level). This, in itself, is not surprising, given the fact that French has only one periphrastic causative verb, which can be combined with virtually any verb, whereas English has several, including make, get, have and cause, the use of which is subject to a number of (syntactic, semantic and stylistic) constraints (see Cottier 1991a).

In view of this asymmetry and on the basis of a simple, rough and ready notion of transfer, one would obviously expect French-speaking learners of English to overuse causative make, since it is usually presented as the prototypical equivalent of faire. This, curiously enough, is not borne out by the data, for Altenberg and Granger (2001: 181) have shown that French-speaking learners do not significantly over- or underuse this kind of construction, with $X^2 = 1.21$ (see Table 3).

These unexpected results can be explained by sifting through the CA data, provided we accept a more subtle notion of transfer. The method applied here is that of Altenberg (2002a, 2002b) and consists in examining a word or expression and its different equivalents in the other language in a ‘forward’ and ‘backward’ movement. First, source texts are taken as a starting-point and compared with the corresponding translations, thus showing how causative make is translated into French and how causative faire is translated into English. This, as noted by Altenberg, gives an indication of the main equivalents that can be used to translate the items under investigation and the relative importance of these equivalents. Second, in a complementary approach, translations are taken as a starting-point and compared with the corresponding source texts, so as to reveal the English source structures that have ended up as causative faire-constructions, as well as the French source structures that
have ended up as causative make-constructions. This ‘backward’ movement gives an indication of the various structures that have served as a point of departure for the causative constructions in the translated texts. Moreover, combining the two approaches makes it possible to determine the ‘mutual translatability’, or ‘mutual correspondence’, of causative constructions in the two languages, i.e. the frequency with which they are translated into one another (see Altenberg 1999). This value will range from 0% (if the two constructions are never translated into each other) to 100% (if the two constructions are always translated into each other).

(Table 4 here)

Table 4 shows that by far the most frequent equivalent of verbal causative constructions with faire is the use of a synthetic causative verb, that is, a transitive verb that combines the idea of causation expressed by faire and the meaning of the infinitive following it, as in faire passer un message ‘make pass a message’ = convey a message or faire grimper les exportations ‘make climb exports’ = increase exports. Included in this category are phrasal verbs, such as faire venir des travailleurs étrangers ‘make come foreign workers’ = bring in foreign workers, and, by extension, cases where the infinitive is translated by a complete prepositional phrase, cf. faire travailler nos enfants ‘make work our children’ = send our children out to work. This transposition from causative construction to single transitive verb is made all the easier by two characteristics of causative faire. First, as has been noted by several grammarians (e.g. Girault-Duvivier 1886: 1149, Jespersen 1971: 222, Le Goffic 1994: 167), faire and the infinitive form a single syntactic unit, which is reflected by their formal contiguity and by the fact that clitics belonging to the infinitive are placed before faire, and not before the infinitive itself as would be expected if the infinitive functioned autonomously (cf. Je l’ai fait venir, *J’ai fait le venir ‘I made him come’). Second, in a number of cases (27.5% in the original texts and 24.1% in the translations), the causee is left unexpressed, so that the valency of the construction is actually no different from a simple transitive verb. Compare:

(1) Comme le fait remarquer Jean-Louis Dufour, ...
   As it makes notice Jean-Louis Dufour
   “As Jean-Louis Dufour observes, ...”
Des efforts ont été accomplis pour faire connaître cette catastrophe.
Some efforts have been accomplished to make know this catastrophe
“There have been efforts to publicise the catastrophe.”

Besides synthetic causative verbs, a common equivalent of causative faire is the use of a verbal causative construction with a verb other than make (second most frequent category in translations and third most frequent one in source texts). These verbs include get (faire payer la facture par l’Europe = get Europe to foot the bill), have (faire vérifier ses papiers = have his papers checked) and keep (nous faire attendre = keep us waiting). Congruent constructions with make, on the other hand, only come third among the different alternatives, with a small proportion of 8.7% (e.g. Hemingway m’a fait promettre de ne jamais le vendre = Hemingway made me promise never to sell it). Another possibility is for the infinitive to take the form of an NP, preceded by a causative verb and possibly followed by a prepositional phrase, e.g. faire rêver ‘make dream’ = inspire enthusiasm or faire reculer l’excision ‘make withdraw excision’ = put a stop to excision. Also, the verbal causative construction can correspond to an adjectival causative construction (faire savoir ‘make know’ = make it clear) or a nominal one (faire accéder leur pays au rang de puissance atomique ‘make reach their country the rank of nuclear power’ = make their country a nuclear power). Finally, a number of other various structures are possible, such as the use of an existential construction (Aucun bruit ne se faisait entendre ‘No sound made itself heard’ = There was no sound) or the sheer disappearance of the idea of causation, i.e. cases of ‘zero correspondence’ (Johansson 1998: 14), e.g. Cela fit sourire Tissot ‘That made smile Tissot’ = Tissot smiled.

This overview of the various English equivalents of causative faire, incidentally, points to the inadequacy of traditional, non-corpus-based, contrastive descriptions. Thus, Guitard (1972: 228-230) only considers periphrastic causative verbs – starting with make – as possible translations of faire + infinitive (make, have, get, cause, set, keep and order), not even explaining the differences between the proposed alternatives. In a similar vein, Guierre (1959: 126-128) suggests the verbs make and have as equivalents of causative faire, the former, according to him, expressing the idea of constraint and the latter referring to a non-coercive situation, and merely mentions a couple of other alternatives in a different section under the headings of “expressions comprenant Faire + l’infinitif” (faire appeler quelqu’un =
call for somebody, faire venir = send for) and “idiotismes contenant Faire” (faire savoir qch à qn = let sb know). Not unexpectedly, Chuquet and Paillard’s (1987) corpus-based study comes closer to reality, stating that the use of a synthetic verb represents “une fraction non négligeable de l’ensemble des cas” [‘a significant part of all cases’] (p. 170) and noting elsewhere (p. 23) that “[d]e nombreux cas de transposition sont en particulier liés à la construction faire + infinitif” [‘many cases of transposition, in particular, are linked to the faire + infinitive construction’], e.g. s’il veut se faire servir = if you want service, Voulez-vous que je vous fasse visiter? = Would you like me to show you round?

(Table 5 here)

Disregarding the miscellaneous category, the most frequent equivalent of verbal causative constructions with make in the corpus is the use of a congruent faire-construction, with a total of almost 30% (Table 5). Although this proportion is larger than in the opposite direction (French to English, cf. Table 4), it should be emphasised that it is still relatively small, especially in translations (22.2%). Moreover, as is the case for the English equivalents of causative faire, there exists a large variety of competing equivalents. First, the meaning of make and the infinitive can be conflated into one single verb, as in make democracy work = pratiquer la démocratie ‘practise democracy’ or make someone feel small = rabaisser quelqu’un ‘belittle someone’. Second, the infinitive of the English construction can take the form of an NP, while the causee becomes a prepositional phrase, either as a dative (e.g. made me want to cry = me donnait envie de pleurer ‘to me gave desire to cry’) or as a genitive (e.g. make electrons collide = provoquer la collision d’électrons ‘provoke the collision of electrons’). A number of alternative periphrastic causative verbs, all of them more specific in meaning than faire, are also possible (obliger, pousser, amener), as well as the use of an adjectival causative construction (e.g. made me feel uneasy = me rendait mal à l’aise ‘me rendered uneasy’) or a nominal causative construction (made the Cuban authorities sound like some sort of pimp = faisait du régime cubain une sorte de souteneur ‘made of the Cuban regime a sort of pimp’). Finally, constructions with make can correspond to various other structures, such as What made you invite Anne?
Pourquoi as-tu invité Anne? ‘Why have you invited Anne?’ or What we said made her laugh = Elle riait de ce que nous disions ‘She laughed at what we said’.

Using Altenberg’s concept of mutual correspondence and on the basis of the preceding analysis, we can say that verbal causative constructions with *make* and *faire* very rarely correspond to each other, as they exhibit a surprisingly low mutual translatability of 14%. In other words, they are not perceived as obvious counterparts of each other – which might be partly explained by the different word order they exhibit – and translators often prefer to choose an alternative way of conveying the meaning they express.

How can these findings be related to the CIA data? We saw above that a simplistic notion of transfer would not do, since a high frequency of causative constructions in French does not lead to an equally high frequency (and hence overuse) of causative constructions in the English IL. Yet, the behaviour of French-speaking learners becomes clearer if we refine the notion of transfer by introducing the concept of ‘language distance’, i.e. “the degree of similarity between two languages” (Odlin 1989: 32), and by stating that little similarity results in little transfer. As noted by Ellis (1994: 327), “[t]here is substantial evidence to indicate that the actual distance between the native and the target languages acts as a constraint on transfer.” This distance can be established through careful contrastive analyses of similar words (‘cognates’) or structures. In the present case, the lack of ‘interlingual identification’ – to use a term from Haugen (1956: 67) – between verbal causative constructions with *make* and *faire* helps explain why transfer does not seem to occur and the frequency of *make*-constructions in the IL of French-speaking learners does not diverge significantly from that in native English. Besides the real, objective distance between two words or structures, however, it is important to take another dimension into consideration, namely that of ‘perceived distance’ (see Kellerman 1977, 1979), that is, “the subjective estimation of distance by learners,” which, in some cases, “can override an objective measure” (Odlin 1989: 142). Odlin (1989: 37) points out that “[i]f learners sense that particular structures in the target language are very different from counterparts in the native language, they may try to avoid using those structures.” Learners’ judgement of language distance is difficult to investigate, except by questioning learners themselves about their perceptions, but the results of this study seem to suggest that a (more or less direct) link might be established between mutual translatability (objective distance) and perceived (subjective)
distance. Thus, the lack of objective correspondence between two items would lead learners to (consciously or unconsciously) perceive them as different and consequently avoid using the L2 item. Conversely, objective similarity would result in perceived closeness and, ultimately, transfer in IL. This, naturally, is a mere hypothesis, but one which would be worth exploring in future research.

As appears from the above, the analysis of the CA data proves enlightening to understand the notion of transfer and explain learners’ use of a specific construction. Nevertheless, it would be wrong to assume that such an overall approach gives a complete picture of the transfer phenomenon. In particular, it might be the case that transfer operates at a much more subtle level than simply the over- or underuse of a word or structure. Therefore, the general approach should be supplemented by a more detailed analysis of the factors conditioning the use of the word or structure, as will be briefly illustrated below.\(^{15}\)

(Table 6 here)

Table 6 shows some of the features of verbal causative constructions as they are used in native English (LOCNESS), non-native English (ICLE) and native French (CODIF). As already demonstrated by Altenberg and Granger (2001: 183), French-speaking learners tend to underuse non-finite complements of the relational type, that is sentences such as:

(3) *To accept Spencer's belief that social reform inhibits social progress makes society's future seem bleak and hopeless.* (LOCNESS)

(4) *The wrong clothes can often make a person feel uncomfortable and self-conscious.* (LOCNESS)

(chi-square value equal to 13.43, highly significant at the 0.001 level). A comparison with French, however, takes the issue one step further and makes it possible to conclude that this misuse is very probably the result of transfer, since French causative *faire* very rarely occurs with a relational complement (18%, as opposed to 26% with a mental complement and 56% with a material complement). Actually, a literal translation of some of the English sentences containing a relational complement would result in awkward structures in French. Compare:
(5) By quoting Judge Ito, they make it appear that the judge is on their side. (LOCNESS)

(5’)? En citant le Juge Ito, ils font paraître que le juge est de leur côté. (instead of the more natural ‘ils donnent l’impression que...’)

(6) This was done to make the people become desensitized to what they were doing. (LOCNESS)

(6’)? Cela a été fait pour faire devenir les gens désensibilisés à ce qu’ils faisaient. (instead of the more natural ‘pour désensibiliser les gens’)

Similarly, we can observe a tendency among learners to overuse dynamic verbs as opposed to stative verbs in English causative constructions ($X^2 = 11.16, p < 0.001$), e.g.

(7) There are only two subjects on earth that have the power to pervert people and to make them do anything crazy, those two subjects are love and money. (ICLE)

vs.

(8) It makes me think that the prison system is not adequate. (ICLE)

Again, it looks as if interlingual influence might be at work here, since French constructions predominantly occur with dynamic complements ($X^2 = 15.15, p < 0.001$).

Transfer, however, is by no means an all-pervading phenomenon. On the one hand, certain characteristics of the misuse of causative constructions by French-speaking learners cannot be explained by interference. To take but one example, learners tend to overuse animate causees ($X^2 = 6.34, p < 0.05$), e.g. It was so easy to make people believe that it was God’s will, whereas French actually uses more inanimate causees than English ($X^2 = 4.35, p < 0.05$), e.g. La baisse du prix des produits fera augmenter la demande, ‘The drop in the price of the products will make increase the demand’. This discrepancy, however, can perhaps be explained by the presence of causeless constructions in French, where the implicit causee is normally animate (cf. note 10). French-speaking learners, as it appears, often use general animate causees like ‘people’ (27 %), ‘us’ (14 %) or ‘you’ (3 %), which in a number of cases would most naturally be left unmentioned in French, e.g.
So, the little screen is also there to entertain, to inform, and even to make you dream. (ICLE)

“Donc, le petit écran est aussi là pour amuser, informer, et même faire rêver.”

On the other hand, there exist a number of significant differences between French and English that are not paralleled in learners’ interlanguage. Thus, whilst French resorts more often to subclause passivisation than English (cf. se faire entendre / make oneself heard), with $X^2 = 11.74$ (highly significant at the 0.001 level), learners’ use of such structures does not depart significantly from native speakers’ ($X^2 = 0.56$).

Three important ideas emerge from the analysis of verbal causative constructions. First, high frequency in the mother tongue does not necessarily lead to overuse in IL. Rather, this study suggests that it is the degree of correspondence between the words or structures in L1 and L2 – and possibly its perception by learners – that determines the extent to which transfer can be expected. A high degree of correspondence is likely to result in transfer, while a low degree of correspondence will probably not lead to transfer. Second, there is more to transfer than just the overall frequency. Whether a causative construction sounds English or not also depends on a whole range of parameters such as the animate/inanimate nature of the causee or the type of non-finite complement used. At this level too, transfer can occur, when learners reproduce the features of the L1 construction into the L2 construction. Finally, transfer is far from applying systematically – not all differences between L1 and L2 lead to errors and not all errors are due to differences between L1 and L2. The notion of transfer, therefore, should be handled with care.

5.2.3 Adjectival causative constructions with “make” and “rendre”: Diagnostic approach. Besides a non-finite verbal form, causative make can also be followed by an adjective, as in make someone happy or make it clear. Altenberg and Granger (2001: 181) have observed that advanced French-speaking learners of English tend to underuse this type of structure (see Table 3), with 98 instances in their ICLE sample, as opposed to 130 in their corpus of native-speaker American essay writing ($X^2 = 4.65$, significant at the 0.05 level). Given the fact that Swedish learners, by contrast, overuse adjectival causative constructions with make (ibid.), it can be assumed that the forces at work here are predominantly interlingual, rather than intralingual.
Therefore, CA data should provide an adequate explanation for the problematic behaviour of French-speaking learners.

Unlike verbal causative constructions, adjectival causative constructions in French are not normally constructed with *faire* (*faire possible*). Instead, one should use the verb *rendre*, as in *rendre possible*. This, in itself, could be a first explanation for the CIA data. If transfer does occur, it could be hypothesised that French learners will use an adjectival construction with *render* rather than *make*. That this is not so appears from the scarcity of the verb *render* in the ICLE sample – only 4 occurrences, two of which are followed by an adjective. So, the difference in verbs does not seem to pose a problem to learners.

(The Table 7 here)

The CA data reveal that the adjectival causative construction with *rendre* is less common than its English equivalent (Table 7), though this difference is significant in translations only, not in source texts ($X^2 = 10.9$, $p < 0.001$ and $X^2 = 1.53$, respectively). Given a simplistic notion of transfer, it could therefore simply be argued that the low frequency of *rendre*-constructions results in the underuse of *make*-constructions in IL. However, we saw in the preceding section that this conception of transfer should be given up for a more refined one, which defines transfer, not in terms of frequency alone, but also in terms of correspondence or lack of correspondence between the two items or structures under investigation. With this new definition in mind, we can now look for an explanation of learners’ underuse of the *make* + adjective construction by examining its degree of equivalence with the *rendre* + adjective construction.

(The Table 8 here)

The different alternatives corresponding to an adjectival causative construction with *make* are given in Table 8. As appears from these figures, the most common alternative is the use of a synthetic verb that combines the meaning of *make* and the adjective, e.g. *make easier = faciliter* ‘facilitate’, *make plain = montrer* ‘show’, *make available = libérer* ‘free’. This tendency is even more striking in French source texts, where the proportion of synthetic verbs is as high as 41.9%. Congruent constructions
with rendre come second, with a total of 25.4% (e.g. What made the threat so disturbing was that it remained vague = Ce qui rendait la menace si angoissante, c'est qu'elle restait vague). Other possibilities are structures involving the nominalisation of the adjective (make more competitive = renforcer la compétitivité ‘strengthen the competitiveness’, make popular = assurer la popularité ‘ensure the popularity’), verbal or nominal causative constructions (e.g. make conscious = faire prendre conscience ‘make become aware’) and various other constructions, among which the use of a finite structure where the causee becomes the subject (e.g. to make its relaunch credible = pour que sa relance paraisse crédible ‘so that its relaunch appears credible’).

(Table 9 here)

The data concerning the English equivalents of adjectival causative constructions with rendre (Table 9) reveal that the most common equivalent here is a congruent make-construction, with a total of some 39%. In the case of translations, the proportion even reaches 42.9%, but it drops to 34.4% when the source text is in English, which means that, although it is still the most common equivalent, the competition of other alternatives is stronger then. The alternatives include the use of a verb other than make (eight times with render, twice with leave and once with bring) and patterns involving the nominalisation of the adjective (e.g. rendre dépendant = create dependency). Synthetic causative verbs are possible too (rendre public = release, rendre furieux = infuriate), although they are chosen less frequently than as an equivalent of make + adjective (10.8%, as opposed to 36%). Finally, rendre can correspond to a verbal or nominal causative construction (e.g. me rendait mal à l’aise = made me feel uneasy) or to various other structures, such as the use of a connector:

(10) Cela rend le budget déficitaire.
That renders the budget in deficit
“As a result, there is a budget deficit.”

(11) ..., ce qui les rend plus efficaces sur un champ de bataille.
which them renders more efficient on a battlefield
“and they are consequently much more useful in battle.”

or a finite clause:
Their presence would render the success of the negotiation highly uncertain.

On the basis of the above data, it transpires that adjectival causative constructions, whilst exhibiting a higher degree of congruence than verbal causative constructions, are mutually translatable in only 31% of the cases. This blurred correspondence between French and English, possibly combined with the relative low frequency of the French construction, helps explain why French-speaking learners tend to underuse adjectival causative constructions with *make*. Here again, the objective language distance is perhaps to be linked to the more subjective dimension of perceived distance, the actual lack of correspondence leading learners to (consciously or unconsciously) consider the structures as non-equivalent.

As demonstrated with verbal causative constructions, however, this general approach is only part of the answer to the problem of transfer. Equally important is the question of usage parameters. In the case of adjectival causative constructions, it appears that the use of simple and comparative adjectives, e.g.

(13) *By using drugs athletes are making the competition unfair.* (LOCNESS)

vs.

(14) *The computer has made life easier from a physical standpoint and harder from a mental standpoint.* (LOCNESS)

differs in native and non-native English (Table 10). Whereas the two types of adjectives are equally represented in native English, French-speaking learners significantly underuse comparative adjectives ($X^2 = 12.81, p < 0.001$). Since this tendency is reflected in the French corpus ($X^2 = 7.03, p < 0.01$), it is plausible to posit that transfer takes place in this respect. The French data exhibit other significant differences compared with English, such as a higher frequency of singular causees and of adjective + causee combinations, but these do not make their way into IL.

In our search for an explanation for French-speaking learners’ underuse of *make* + adjective constructions, we have found at least two factors that can be of some
importance, viz. the relative low frequency of the French counterpart and the blurred correspondence between the French and the English construction. The former relates to a simple notion of transfer according to which low frequency in L1 leads to low frequency in IL, whereas the latter involves a more refined notion of transfer taking the degree of correspondence between L1 and L2 into account. While simple transfer cannot be taken as the sole explanation for learners’ behaviour (cf. analysis of verbal causative constructions), it seems reasonable to assume that it plays at least some part in the process, reinforcing the effect of the more elaborate type of transfer. This would explain why the underuse is statistically significant with adjectival causative constructions, but not with verbal causative constructions, despite the fact that the link between make + adjective and rendre + adjective is actually stronger than that between make + non-finite complement and faire + non-finite complement (cf. mutual translatability). Finally, as was the case with the study of verbal causative constructions, this analysis has underlined the importance of a more subtle level of analysis, one which leaves room for a more in-depth investigation of usage parameters and can also reveal the existence of transfer-related phenomena.

6. Food for thought
The advent of well-designed bilingual and learner corpora has given CA and CIA a brand-new flavour. By relying on authentic data, the two disciplines can now make much firmer pronouncements than was hitherto possible. What is more, they can be combined, thus offering unparalleled insights into the relations between L1, L2 and IL. What such an integrated approach brings out, and what has been illustrated through the case of causative constructions, is that the phenomenon of transfer is far more complex than was traditionally thought (see also Benson 2002). First, transfer has more to do with the degree of interlingual correspondence between the words or structures investigated than with their respective frequencies in L1 and L2. This refined notion of transfer makes it possible, for example, to explain why verbal causative constructions with make are not overused by French-speaking learners, although equivalent faire-constructions are actually more frequent. As shown by the CA data, the two constructions rarely correspond to each other, and so it can be assumed that learners do not perceive them as obvious counterparts of each other and consequently do not transfer the construction to their L2. Second, transfer can be of a different nature and occur at a more delicate level, as when it leads to the underuse of
adjectival causative constructions with a comparative adjective in the English IL of French-speaking students. This type of transfer, which can be discovered through a careful investigation of the conditioning factors behind the figures, equally contributes to the foreign-soundingness of learners’ writing and should therefore be studied along with the overall frequency of the word or structure. Third, transfer is by no means a systematic and automatic phenomenon. It does not always apply (cf. word order in adjectival constructions), nor does it account for all errors (cf. overuse of animate causeses in verbal causative constructions).

It is precisely the complexity of the notion of transfer that explains why it is so difficult to make predictions or give explanations in this matter. An integrated approach such as the one advocated by Granger (1996a), however, makes it possible to go one step further towards a better understanding of transfer and transfer-related phenomena. At a time when the field of CIA has only just emerged and we are only just starting to rediscover the potential of contrastive descriptions that were (too) roughly sketched by past contrastivists, it seems as if the time is about right to go to our kitchen and prepare what is sure to become a popular dish in the near future. For the Integrated Contrastive Model has undoubtedly much to offer to anyone interested in SLA and should therefore be consumed without moderation. One taste and you’ll want more!
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**Figures and Tables**

Figure 1. Types of comparisons possible in a translation/comparable integrated corpus [O = original text; S = source text; T = translated text].

Figure 2. Integrated Contrastive Model (based on Granger 1996a: 47).
Table 1. Material from the English-French PLECI corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Number of words</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>Non-fiction</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English original → French translation</td>
<td>78,525</td>
<td>217,526</td>
<td>296,051</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French original → English translation</td>
<td>76,512</td>
<td>220,538</td>
<td>297,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Verbal causative constructions with *make* and *faire* in source texts and translations (n/100,000 words)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>X²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>9.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Causative uses of *make* by French-speaking learners (FR) and native American students (US) (Altenberg and Granger 2001: 181)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of English equivalents</th>
<th>English translations</th>
<th>English sources</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Synthetic causative verb</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Verbal causative construction with a verb other than <em>make</em></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Verbal causative construction with <em>make</em></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Causative verb + NP (+ Prep. phrase)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Adjectival causative construction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Nominal causative construction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Other constructions</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>138</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>137</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. English equivalents of verbal causative constructions with *faire*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of French equivalents</th>
<th>French translations</th>
<th>French sources</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Verbal causative construction with <em>faire</em></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Synthetic causative verb</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Causative verb + NP + Prep. phrase</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Verbal causative construction with a verb other than <em>faire</em></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Adjectival causative construction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Nominal causative construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Other constructions</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. French equivalents of verbal causative constructions with *make*
Table 6. Some features of verbal causative constructions in native English, non-native English and native French

Table 7. Adjectival causative constructions with make and rendre in source texts and translations (n/100,000 words)

Table 8. French equivalents of adjectival causative constructions with make
### Types of English equivalents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of English equivalents</th>
<th>English translations</th>
<th>English sources</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Adjectival causative construction with <em>make</em></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Adjectival causative construction with a verb other than <em>make</em></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Nominalisation of adjective</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Synthetic causative verb</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Verbal or nominal causative construction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Other constructions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. English equivalents of adjectival causative constructions with *rendre*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>LOCNESS</th>
<th>ICLE</th>
<th>CODIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- simple</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- comparative</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- singular</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- plural</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- causee + adjective</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- adjective + causee</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Some features of adjectival causative constructions in native English, non-native English and native French
Endnotes

1 Terminology regarding these two types of corpora varies. While Baker (1993: 248) refers to the first type as ‘parallel corpora’ and to the second as ‘comparable corpora’, Aijmer et al. (1996b) use the terms ‘translation corpora’ and ‘parallel corpora’ respectively. Moreover, the term ‘parallel corpora’ is sometimes used to cover both types (cf. Johansson and Hofland 1994). The terminology adopted here is that of Johansson (1998).

2 A special case thereof is the deliberate avoidance of some troublesome L2 pattern through paraphrase or circumlocution. On the so-called ‘Avoidance Strategy’, see Schachter (1974) and Kleinmann (1977).

3 French adjectival causative constructions with rendre usually allow two different word orders, with the adjective preceding or following the NP, cf. rendre possible la fusion/rendre la fusion possible (see Grevisse 1993: 474-475).

4 Another possible resource for comparing English and French is the Canadian Hansard corpus, consisting of the proceedings from the Canadian Parliament, which can be queried via the web-based TransSearch interface (http://www.rali.iro.umontreal.ca/TransSearch/TS-project.en.html). A major drawback of this tool, however, is that it does not distinguish between original texts and translations. Yet, it can be useful if one wishes to determine the mutual translatability (see below) of two words, as it can retrieve all the cases where, say, make is translated by faire. However, concordances have to be checked manually in order to discard sentences such as L’Action nationale m’a fait parvenir une lettre dans laquelle elle demande au ministre de me donner accès à son dossier fiscal et autorise que les renseignements soient rendus publics = L’Action nationale has sent me a letter in which it requests the minister to allow me access to its tax file and authorizes the information to be made public, where the two verbs do not actually correspond to each other.

5 The importance of using a corpus of comparable genre has been emphasised by e.g. Granger and Tyson (1996), who show that a comparison of the frequency of some connectors in learner writing with a general corpus of written English is flawed.

6 Faire + infinitive can also be used with an experiential meaning, in which case faire is reflexive, e.g. Il s’est fait prendre ‘He got himself caught’. These cases are not taken into account here.

7 That is, if one only takes into consideration those causatives that express nothing but the idea of ‘cause’ or ‘bring about’ and have no or little semantic content of their own. By contrast, verbs like forcer (‘force’) or persuader (‘persuade’), though causative too, clearly convey the idea of coercion and persuasion, respectively.

8 This, at least, is true of its causative uses. In its lexical uses, faire has two main equivalents, viz. make (e.g. faire un gâteau = make a cake, faire un effort = make an effort) and do (e.g. faire ses devoirs = do one’s homework, faire la vaisselle = do the washing-up), the choice of which is often problematic for French-speaking learners.

9 Besides this syntactic unity, faire and the infinitive are also said to form a semantic unity. Thus, Achard (1996: 334) notes that “[r]egardless of its own lexical semantics, the infinitive forms a tight semantic unit with the main verb [i.e. faire] by virtue of being directly induced by the subject of that verb.”

10 This seems to be the case when the causee has indefinite personal reference (Cannings and Moody 1978: 11). Thus, the following example was found in the corpus: Pour certains, le président Clinton a cherché à faire oublier [aux gens, aux Américains, etc.] l’affaire Lewinsky ‘For some, President Clinton has tried to make [people, the Americans, etc.] forget the Lewinsky affair’. On this type of structure, see Cottier (1991b). English, by contrast, does not allow the causee to be deleted in such circumstances. As rightly observed by Hantson (1981: 164), ‘this difference between French and English as regards the deletion of the notional subject of the infinitive is also found with other verbs.’ He gives the following example: Cela (nous) permettra de résoudre le problème vs. This will enable us to solve the problem. Causeless constructions in French can also be used slightly differently, namely with a “(seeming) passive force” (Fraser and Squair 1965: 245), as in Je ferai écrire une lettre = ‘I shall have a letter written’. See note 16 on this type of structure.

11 The coercive meaning of causative make, however, represents only a small proportion of its uses (see Gilquin 1999).

12 This possibility is absent from traditional contrastive accounts. Thus, Vinay and Darbelnet (1995: 196-197), while giving examples of French periphrastic causative constructions translated by English synthetic verbs (e.g. faire pousser = to grow), do not recognize the reverse tendency.

13 Mutual translatability = ( (At + Bt) / (As + Bs) ) x 100, where At and Bt are the compared items in the translations and As and Bs, the compared items in the source texts (see Altenberg 1999). Here, mutual translatability = ( (16 + 8) / (36 + 138) ) x 100 = 13.79%.
This is to be contrasted with English and Swedish (see Altenberg 2002a), where the two constructions show a cross-linguistic correspondence of 52% – not taking past participle constructions into account – and are obviously perceived as very similar to each other, which explains Swedish learners’ overuse of such constructions in English. It is perhaps noteworthy that in Swedish, verbal causative constructions exhibit the same word order as in English, viz. få + NP + infinitive. For a more in-depth qualitative treatment of the relation between causative faire and make, see Cottier (1992). For a contrastive analysis of English and French causative constructions within the framework of the standard transformational theory, see Hantson (1981).

This might be due to the heavy constraints placed on subclause passivisation with causative make. According to van Ek and Robat (1984: 327), this structure “seems to be limited to collocations denoting the exercise and recognition of influence in the widest sense” (e.g. make oneself heard, make one’s intention understood). By contrast, subclause passivisation with causative faire appears to be possible in a larger number of cases. It should be noted, incidentally, that subclause passivisation in French causative constructions is more adequately described as ‘partial passivisation’, the only passive feature being the transformation of the subject into an (explicit or implicit) par-agent, e.g. Elle a fait tuer son mari par son amant ‘She had her husband killed by her lover’ (cf. Hantson 1981: 156-158). Examples from the corpus, all of them agentless and many of which involve the use of a reflexive pronoun, are: L’Europe sait parfois se faire entendre d’une seule voix; L’homme devra malgré tout se faire aider; Chaque personne s’engageait à faire respecter une des chartes des droits de l’homme. Unlike causative make, faire does not normally allow main clause passivisation. However, Cottier (1992: 91) gives the following example: Le couscous fut fait pétrir par un cadavre exhumé de sa fosse, which actually exhibits both a subclause and main clause passivisation.

Adjectival causative constructions with faire, however, are not totally excluded, cf. C’est le temps que tu as perdu pour ta rose qui fait ta rose si importante (A. de Saint-Exupéry, 1946, Le Petit Prince).

To be compared with English and Swedish adjectival causative constructions, which show a cross-linguistic correspondence of 55% (Altenberg 2002b).