

Research Article

Using Contrastive Analysis to Teach Collocations in Persian to English Translation of Journalistic Texts

Syedhamed Sadoughvanini*, Hamed Ghaemi

Bahar Institute of Higher Education, Mashhad, Iran

Article History

Received: 04.07.2020

Accepted: 17.07.2020

Published: 28.07.2020

Journal homepage:

<https://www.easpublisher.com/easjhc>

Quick Response Code



Abstract: Contrastive analysis (CA) is a branch of applied linguistics that focuses on the study of two languages in contrast (Brown, D. 1984). Teaching through this method may help the students of translation and EFL learners to use language effectively, accurately and naturally. The paper aims to present a study that explores the role of CA, comparative and contrastive collocational analysis of Persian and English, to teach collocations in Persian to English translation of journalistic texts. More specifically, it tries to provide an answer to the question on whether raising awareness of students to correct English collocations through CA has any significant effect on Persian-English translation ability of Iranian undergraduate students in translating journalistic texts. Hence, this paper invited two groups of Iranian undergraduate students majoring in English translation as the experimental and control group totaling 34 to sit for the pre-test and the post-test. Having shown no significant difference between the control and the experimental group by the pre-test ($t_{32} = 0.507$, $p = 0.616$) regarding collocational knowledge of the participants, the study showed that applying CA led to a significant difference between the two groups in the post-test ($t_{32} = 11.56$, $p = 0.000$).

Keywords: Contrastive Analysis, Collocation, Degrees of difficulty, Translation, Effective Use of L1.

Copyright © 2020 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution **4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)** which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

INTRODUCTION

While studying two languages, it is beyond question that the learners encounter two different linguistic systems. However, the difference between two languages may not be to the same extent as the difference between another two languages. What is obvious is the existence of the difference regardless of the extent to which the two languages are different. These differences can put the learners into trouble. Therefore, the learners should be helped to overcome the differences between the two linguistic systems while they are learning a new language. In this regard, studying the two languages in contrast as it is called Contrastive Analysis, can be helpful to overcome the challenging differences. Regarding Persian and English language, collocations are one the challenging items resulted from the differences between Persian and English collocational patterns. This paper tries to take advantage of CA to help Iranian EFL students overcome the differences between Persian and English collocational patterns. In this regard, effective use of L1 pointed out by different scholars (Butzkamm, W. 2003), (Larsen-Freeman, D. 2000), and (Nazari, M. 2008) is illustrated to be helpful.

CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS

According to Brown (Brown, D. 1984), Contrastive Analysis (CA) is a branch of applied linguistics. It focuses on the study of two languages in contrast and has some advantages in facilitating the learning of a second language. Furthermore, Brown (Brown, D. 1984) argues that second language learning basically involves “the overcoming of the differences between the two linguistic systems” and through contrastive analysis we can find these differences which are also referred to as interference. Therefore, the main goal of CA is to point out similarities and differences between the compared languages based on a systematic comparison of their description.

Lado (1957) points out the importance of differences between two linguistic systems. These differences will cause interference of the native language on second language learning.

Brown (Brown, D. 1984) mentions interference originates from the native language on the second language. This notion turns into a significant issue when the Iranian translators want to translate from Persian to English. In other word, when your native

language becomes your source language and your second language becomes your target language, the interference occurs more frequently than the time when you want to translate from your second language to your native language. Therefore, using CA as a teaching technique in L1 to L2 translation becomes a matter of high importance. So that's why significance of interference becomes more important in Persian to English translation.

Brown (Brown, D. 1984) mentions the interference of the first language with the second language is the paramount obstacle on the way of second language learning and makes it hard for the learner to learn L2. However, Brown (Brown, D. 1984) points out the fact that, what make learning a second language intricate and complicated are the differences between two linguistic systems. Solving the problem of differences is a basic assumption in second language learning. The difficulties in second language learning are yielded by these differences. However, not all the difficulties yielded as the result of the differences between two linguistic systems have an identical degree. In other word, one difference can contain a higher degree of difficulty in second language learning as compared to other ones. Therefore, all types of differences between two linguistic systems do not follow the same degree of difficulty. Brown (Brown, D. 1984) cites Prator (Prator, C. H. 1968) as saying that Difficulties can be categorized in the following ascending order as follow:

Level 0: Transfer

No difficulty is noticed to transfer an item from L1 to L2. This is due to the fact that there is no difference between the two languages in this case. It is called zero level because of absence of difficulty for the learner to transfer, so it is not challenging or problematic for the learner. For example, words such as table, television and house are among the items in Persian that the same items are noticeable in English.

Level 1: Coalescence

One item in the target language is used for two or more ones in the native language. The distinction among items in the native language is disregarded by the learner. The word cousin is a good example in Persian language. The word cousin is an item in English that has 8 equivalent items in Persian.

Level 2: Underdifferentiation

An item in the native language is deprived of equivalence in the foreign language. This item must be erased from the learner's mind. One of the very popular cases of underdifferentiation among Iranian EFL learners happens in prepositions, as shown in this study. By definition, an item in L1 has no equivalence in L2 which is one of the problematic cases resulting in collocational errors. *Reach to, enter to, regarding to, explain about, thank from* and *use from* are part of the

Iranian EFL learners' collocational errors shedding light on underdifferentiation. As obvious, all prepositions of the above examples are present in Persian language (L1) and absent in English (L2). In other words, all of the above examples take no preposition in English. Due to negative transfer of L1 and its interference, the learners transfer the prepositions to L2 through translation disregarding the fact that these items are absent in L2 and transfer of them results in interlingual errors. In other word, eventhough all the above mentioned verbs have a preposition in Persian, they do not have any preposition in English.

Level 3: Reinterpretation

An item is present in the first and second language, but sometimes they are not equivalent. So this similarity will result in overgeneralization. The sentence *we have visited Paris* has also the form of present perfect in Persian language as it is in English. The sentence *we are sitting in the class* is present continuous in English whereas it has the form of present perfect in Persian and this is the case in which overgeneralization is subject to happen due to the mentioned similarity.

Level 4: Overdifferentiation

This is the opposite side of level 2. An item in the target language is deprived of equivalence in the native language. They are the new items to be learned. The sounds [θ] and [ð] are among the examples.

Level 5: Split

This is the opposite side of level 1. Presence of two or more items in the foreign language is noticeable for an item in the first language. This is also one of the cases that is problematic and challenging for Iranian EFL learners and traps them. This degree of difficulty is also evident in collocational errors of Iranian EFL learners. An item or a word in Persian may have more than one or two equivalents in English, but they are supposed to be used in different contexts and the learner cannot interchangeably use them. This degree of difficulty seems to be the most dominant one in collocational errors of Iranian EFL learners showing the fact that collocations are very difficult for Iranian EFL learners. *Sweet water* instead of *fresh water*, *different with* instead of *different from*, *return data* instead of *retrieve data*, *vast mind* instead of *open mind*, *heavy tea* instead of *strong tea*, *meet challenges* instead of *eliminate challenges*, and *simple worker* instead of *ordinary worker* are among the Iranian EFL learners' collocational errors pertaining to this degree of difficulty. In these cases, the interchangeably used pairs of words have the same meaning in Farsi. Thus, the learners used them interchangeably without considering the collocational patterns.

Prepositions are also one of those challenging issues in Persian to English translation falling under degree of difficulty 5, split. For example, the preposition “ از

"[AZ] in Farsi is not translated only into "from" in all cases. The following examples will be illustrative enough.

I am angry from (with) you.

I am angry from (at) your behavior.

I am tired from (of) this job.

I escaped from (through) the window.

In the above cases, the problem is that the students resort to word for word translation in which the L1 shows its most prominent effect or interference on the output of the learner or the L2. Since there are more than 2 or 3 items in English for the preposition "از" [AZ] and they cannot be used interchangeably in different sentences, the students make the above mistakes and produce incorrect collocational patterns. In the above examples, the students used the preposition "from" for the prepositions "with", "at", "of", and "through" resulting from word for word translation and ignoring the collocational patterns.

How do the differences help us? Lado (Lado, R. 1957) argues that, "those elements that are similar to the learner's native language will be simple for him and those elements that are different will be difficult".

Corder, S. P. (1981) mentions that these points of difficulty can be vital clues about the processes of FL learning. They are "predictable" and "systematic". This predictability will unveil the potential sources of challenge for the EFL learners (Di Pietro, R. J. 1971; Ferguson, C. A. 1965; Rivers, W. 1970; & Strevens, P. 1965). Therefore and since the errors and sources of them are predictable, the awareness and consciousness of the learners must be raised to the challenging points such as the ones resulted from the degrees of difficulty to prevent them from making the related mistakes.

As noticed above, collocations have been also pointed out to have degrees of difficulty due to L1 interference and different collocational patterns of English and Persian. By being well aware of points of difficulty in collocations, teachers can predict the points that are challenging for EFL learners in the case collocations.

By taking advantage of CA, the deterring and negative effect of L1 can be turned into an effective and facilitating role. By contrastively analyzing and comparing a correct Persian collocation with the correct English collocation and the incorrect ones as well as raising consciousness of EFL learners to how L1 has resulted in the incorrect English collocations due to the degrees of difficulty, the learners will figure out cases of difficulty and as a result they may no longer make the collocational errors.

This predictability attracts attention of students to all challenge-probe parts of learning a language. In this case and beside all linguistic and methodological

points of view in language teaching and learning, any technique, such as CA, that attracts attention of students and highlights a concept to make an ever-lasting and never-fading impression of that concept in the mind of the learner can be regarded as helpful and effective in the process of language teaching and learning.

Attention has also been focused by neuropsychology. The great majority of experimental approaches to the study of attention have focused on how it affects the way we perceive the world and how it enables us to navigate adaptively the myriads of alternatives we encounter (Posner, M. I., & Rothbart, M. K. 1988). For example, choosing one item among the different items or alternatives in English for an item in Persian shows how attention can help to navigate among different alternatives adaptively. This notion bears resemblance with the process that limits the unmanageable amounts of information offered by the environment and inspires selecting only what is relevant for further action (Hill, J. 1999). Extensive work has been done on how we select, choose, or enhance objects of our interest while at the same time attenuate, dim, or filter out those we are not concerned with (Corbetta, M., & Shulman, G. L. 2002). Attending enhances detection of an object; it allows us to hold it in our mind's "gaze" without distraction; it facilitates recall and ultimately determine if we perceive the object at all (Parasuraman, R. 1998). Attracting attention of learners to tiny points that are usually ignored is upon teachers so that the learners can later maintain their analytical eyes to subtleties and nuances such as collocations for further independent learning.

COLLOCATIONS

Collocations, as a subcategory of fixed phrases and prefabricated chunks (Nattinger, J., & Decarrico, J. 1992), focus on the regular and arbitrary relationship among words. Which words does a word tend to absorb in a context? There are different definitions for collocations. "The way in which words co-occur in natural text in statistically significant ways" (Lewis, M. 2000), "tendency of two or more words to co-occur in discourse" (Schmitt, N. 2000), "the co-occurrence of two items in a text within a specified environment (Sinclair, J. M. *et al.*, 2004)," "strings of specific lexical items that co-occur with a mutual expectancy greater than chance, such as *rancid butter* and *curry favor*" (Nattinger, J., & Decarrico, J. 1992) and "The other words any particular word normally keeps company with (James, C. 1998)" are among the numerous and various definitions of collocations. Newmark (Newmark, P. 1998) has the idea that, "the collocates within a collocation define and delimit each other by eliminating at least some other possible meaning; the defining may be mutual and equally balanced, but more often it is closer for one collocate than for the other". Thus to pay attention is a collocation, since it excludes pay in the sense of monetary. To buy a hat is not a collocation, since it

does not limit the sense of buy or hat.

Newmark (Newmark, P. 1998) suggests different categories for collocations which are "syntagmatic or horizontal, therefore consisting of common structure; or paradigmatic or vertical, consisting of words belonging to the same semantic

field which may substitute for each other or be semantic opposite".

According to Newmark (Newmark, P. 1998), syntagmatic collocations are divided into seven main groups as shown in Table 1. (The examples are not mentioned in the book)

Table1: Seven main groups of syntagmatic collocations

Collocation	Example
Verb + verbal noun	Make a decision
Determiner + adjective +noun	The dense fog
Adverb + adjective	Completely useless
Verb + adverb	Criticize severely
Subject + verb	The woman curtseyed The man genuflected
Count noun + <i>of</i> + mass noun	Bar of soap
Collective noun + count noun	Pride of lions / Colony of ant

Lexical and grammatical collocations

Benson *et al.*, (1986) divide collocations into two categories in their dictionary: lexical and grammatical. Lexical and grammatical collocations represent two different but related aspects of

collocation, since include both lexis and grammar. Grammatical collocations consist of the main word like *a noun, an adjective and a verb plus a preposition or 'to + infinitive' or 'that-clause'* and is characterized by eight basic types of collocations as shown in table 2:

Table 2: Grammatical collocations

Collocation	Example
Noun + Preposition	Exception to
Noun + to-infinitive	It was a pleasure to do it
Noun + that clause	We reach an agreement that he could be freed on bail.
Preposition + Noun	By accident
Adjective + Preposition	Angry at
Adjective + to-infinitive	It was necessary to work
Adjective + that clause	She was afraid that she could not meet the deadline
Verb collocations such as: Verb+ to-infinitive Verb +Verb-ing Verb + Bare infinitive Verb +Preposition etc.	Force to do Enjoy watching We must work Adhere to

Lexical collocations do not include prepositions, infinitives or relative clauses but consist of nouns, adjectives, verbs and adverbs. Benson *et al.*,

(1986) distinguish several structural types of lexical collocations as illustrated in table 3.

Table 3: Lexical collocations

Collocation	Example
Verb + Noun	Make a decision
Adjective + Noun	Dense fog
Noun + Verb	Bombs explode
Verb + adverb	Criticize severely
Adverb + Adjective	Strictly accurate
Noun + of + Noun	Swarm of bees

This study considers both types of collocations mentioned by Benson *et al.*, (1986).

Collocations and EFL learners

"Students with good ideas often lose marks because they don't know the four or five most important

collocations of a key word that is central to what they are writing about (Hill, J. 1999)."

The necessity of the idea that selection of a word is limited by what precedes and follows is the only and the most difficult part of lexical system for learners (Thornbury, S. 1997).

Many articles have shown the problem of EFL learners in the field of lexical and grammatical collocation (Fan, M. 2009; Kuo, C. 2009; & Wang, H. C., & Shih, S. C. 2011). EFL learners have trouble with collocations specifically where collocations are language specific. Thus, in such a case, they are subject to carrying over the collocational patterns of their L1 into L2 settings. Gabrys-Biscup (1992) contends that one of the areas of SLA that is strongly influenced by L1 is the transfer of collocational patterns. There are now abundant empirical evidences such as the studies conducted by Fan (Fan, M. 2009), Sadeghi, K. (2009), and Kuo, C. (2009) that have pointed out and shown the effect of L1 transfer on collocational problems. First language transfer is a real and central phenomenon that must be fully taken into account in SLA (Ellis, R. 1986).

Ellis, R. (1997) claims "explicit instruction" or "consciousness-raising." can result in hastening acquisition. The most useful role of the teacher, therefore, is consciousness-raising and encouraging noticing on the part of the learners. In other words, the teacher becomes more of a learning facilitator giving students strategies to use outside the classroom while at the same time providing exposure to as much appropriate and natural language as possible.

Nattinger, J. (1980) suggests that teaching should be based on the idea that language production is the piecing together of ready-made units appropriate for a particular situation. Comprehension of such units is dependent on knowing the patterns to predict in different situations. Instruction, therefore, should center on these patterns and the ways they can be pieced together, along with the ways they vary and the situations in which they occur. Activities used to develop learners' knowledge of lexical chains include the following:

- Intensive and extensive listening and reading in the target language.
- First and second language comparisons and translation carried out chunk for chunk, rather than word for word aimed at raising language awareness
- Noticing and recording language patterns and collocations.

Collocations in Translation

In order to judge about naturalness of translation, the norms of target language are considered as the scales of evaluation. These norms are specified

by native speakers of that language. Native speaker is defined by The Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary as follow: "A person who speaks a language as their first language and has not learned it as a foreign language".

One of the norms of a language is its terminology. All languages have particular terminology. Collocations are one of the constituents of this terminology -as the norms of that language. Toury (Toury, G. 1995) points out that interference happens whenever translator fails to adapt translation to target language. The case of adaptation in this study is finding appropriate collocations. When there is an acceptable collocation in the source language, the translator must find and use its equivalent in the target language, if it exists. In Persian to English translation of journalistic texts, observing collocations in the target text is an important factor to produce a natural and accurate translation.

Due to differences between source and target languages, lexical and grammatical patterns may cause interference from source language. Observing collocations of the target language become of very high importance in this case in the way that lexical and grammatical patterns of the target language are taken into consideration.

Aim of the study

This study investigates the effect of using CA to teach English collocations in Persian-English translation of journalistic texts. The study shows how to use CA in a classroom to boost EFL learners' competence of collocational use in translation. The study endeavors to lead the students and learners toward an accurate, natural and fluent performance in L2.

Research Questions

Among the so many probable questions, this study focuses on the following questions:

1. Does the awareness of collocation through Contrastive Analysis have any significant effect on Persian-English translation ability of Iranian undergraduate students in translating Journalistic texts?
2. Does awareness of collocation through Contrastive Analysis have any different significant effect on each of the three different types of collocations tested in Persian-English translation ability of Iranian undergraduate students in translating Journalistic texts?

Significance of the study

This study will shed light on achieving effectively teaching collocations in Persian-English translation of journalistic text. The study shows that by introducing some challenging cases in Persian-English translation of journalistic texts as well as highlighting tiny points such as collocations through CA, the

awareness of students is increased. This awareness helps the students to obviate the problem of interference and noticing tiny points such as collocations. This notion of awareness helps to decrease interference which is initiated from L1 into L2. Since our study is on L1-L2 translation, the effect of interference becomes more prominent. Therefore, raising the awareness of the students turns into a matter of higher significance.

Design

This study uses the experimental design benefiting from quantitative method. Two Persian to English translation tests of journalistic sentences were administered on two groups of students as the control and experimental groups. The control and experimental groups consisted of 18 and 16 Iranian undergraduate students respectively. One test was administered as the pre-test and the other one as the post-test. Comparing means of the two pre-tests showed no significant difference between the two groups while the difference in the post-tests was significant providing evidence for effectiveness of applying CA to teach collocations.

Participants

To access the required data and to prove any significant effect of CA on teaching collocations in Persian to English translation of journalistic texts, 34 Iranian undergraduate English translation students in the only two Journalistic Translation Classes in Islamic Azad University at South Tehran were invited to participate in this study. The students were majoring in English translation. They sat for the pre-test and post-test to fulfill the objective of this study.

As the objective of this study was to investigate the role of Contrastive Analysis to teach collocations in Persian to English translation of journalistic texts, the tests were administered in the class of journalistic translation.

Instrumentation

Two tests, the pre-test and the post-test, were administered to the participants in Class 1, the control group, and Class 2, the experimental group. The pre-test and the post-test consisted of 40 Persian targeted sentences. Each sentence tested a different type of collocation. By distinguishing and observing the correct English collocation, the students were supposed to translate the sentences into English.

Three types of collocations were tested in the pre-test and the post-test which are as follows: 1) Verb-Noun, (14 sentences) 2) Adjective-Noun and (13 sentences) 3) Preposition-Noun collocation (13 sentences). Even though there are other types of collocations as mentioned before, in our study, only these three types of collocations which are more dominant in the field of journalism are tested. Dominancy of the three types of collocations in this study was determined by interviewing 20 professional

Persian to English translators of journalistic texts. They were asked regarding the most dominant types of English collocations in the field of journalism based on the all types of collocations mentioned by Benson *et al.*, (1986). The results of the interview revealed that the three types of collocations of this study showed a significantly higher frequency in English journalistic texts. Verb-Noun collocations, adjective-Noun collocations and Noun-preposition collocations were presented to be of dominant types of collocations in the field of journalism by 100%, 90% and 85% of the interviewees respectively. Adjective-Preposition collocation followed the three types of collocations in frequency pointed out by 55% of the interviewees. Other types of collocations were below the frequency of 55%. Due to significant difference between the three types of collocations of the study and the other types of collocations in terms of frequency and dominance shown by the interview, it was justified to only use the three most dominant types of collocations. Each item had 0.5 score out of 20, and the students who provided the correct English collocation for each item were given 0.5 score.

Procedure

As mentioned earlier, two data elicitation instruments, two 40-item journalistic tests of Persian to English translation as the pre-test and the post-test, were administered to two groups of Iranian undergraduate English translation students, the control and the experimental group, in the class of journalistic translation.

The whole procedure was conducted over one semester. In the first session, the pre-test was administered to show if there was any difference between the two groups regarding their journalistic collocational knowledge. For the rest of the semester, 14 sessions, the students were exposed to the instructions for about one and half an hour in each session. The instructions consisted of targeted English texts, sentences and phrases which consisted of different types of journalistic collocations (verb-noun, adjective-noun, noun-preposition or adjective-preposition). The texts, sentences and phrases were translated into Persian.

The content of instructions was similar in both groups. The difference between the control and the experimental group was in the way the instructions were presented to the students. In the experimental group, the instructions were presented through CA and highlighting the cases of correct and natural collocations and comparing them with the inappropriate and incorrect ones that are mostly resulted from L1 transfer, degrees of difficulty and word for word translation to make the students aware of challenging, difficult and tiny points of collocations. In this way, the students' awareness or consciousness to correct selection of collocations may be raised. Through

applying CA, it was intended to highlight English journalistic correct and natural collocations to prevent the students from word for word translation resulting from transfer of L1. For example, if in a sentence there was a collocation such as *launch a rally*, first it was translated into Persian and then it was compared with the incorrect collocations that the students would make while they wanted to produce the same meaning through an incorrect collocation such as *start a rally*. *Start* is not the correct journalistic collocate for *rally* but because *start* and *launch* have the same meaning in Persian, the learner used them interchangeably. In this case, degree of difficulty 5, the students will choose either if they do not have the collocational knowledge that only the verb *launch*, and not the verb *start*, is the correct journalistic collocate for the word *rally*. The probable collocational errors that were compared with the correct ones were extracted from the pre-test's collocational errors or based on the experience of encountering cases of collocational errors of Iranian EFL learners during years of teaching. In the control group, the instructions were only translated into Persian with no emphasis on CA and comparing the collocations with the inappropriate alternatives. The post-test is based on class instructions, the texts, sentences and phrases. The instructions in both classes are the same, but they are different in the way, as mentioned earlier, they have been presented to the students. In Class 2 (the experimental group) the students were presented through contrastive analysis, but in Class 1 (the control group) they just practiced the

sheer translation of the English sentences. It was predicted that the students in class 2 would get a higher scores in the post-test.

Due to presenting abundance of texts, sentences and phrases that included different types of collocations in the two classes, the instructions could not remain fresh in the mind of students so that remembering them in the post-test could be inferred as the result of applying CA.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 4: Total scores on the pre-test

N	34
Mean	2.6671
Std. Deviation	2.3784

Table 4 illustrate the total scores of both groups on the pre-test showing a very low mean, 2.6671. Table 5 sheds light on performance of the experimental and control group on the pre-test. The descriptive statistics of the pre-test shows the mean scores of the control group (2.250) and the experimental group (3.0843) which are very low mean scores. In order to examine the homogeneity of the control and the experimental group, an independent T-test was performed. The result showed that there is no significant difference between these two groups ($t_{32} = 0.507, p = 0.616 > 0.05$).

Table 5: An independent t-test of the pre-test scores of the control and the experimental group

	Group	N	Mean	t-value	df	sig
Pre-test	Control	18	2.2500	0.507	32	0.616
	Experimental	16	3.0843			

The results also showed that the experimental group (SD= 1.94) was more homogeneous than the control group (SD= 2.81). The standard deviation of experimental group (SD= 1.94) is lower than that of control group (SD= 2.81).

To find an answer to the first question of this study and to compare the performance of the subjects on the post-test in the control and the experimental

group, an independent T-test was performed. The results showed that the experimental group outperformed the control group as the mean score of the experimental group is (15.23) while that of the control group is (6.44). The independent t-test shows $t_{32} = 11.56, p = 0.000 < 0.05$ on the significance level of 0.05 illustrating a significant difference between the control and experimental group. Table 6 clarifies the above explanation.

Table 6: An independent t-test of the post-test scores of the control and the experimental group

	Group	N	Mean	t-value	df	sig
Pre-test	Control	18	6.4471	11.56	32	0.616
	Experimental	16	15.2351			

Results of verbal, adjectival and prepositional collocation in the post-test and pre-test

In order to examine the verbal, prepositional and adjectival collocation, independent T-tests were

used. The results showed that except the adjectival collocation ($t_{32} = 2.001, p = 0.054$), there was no significant difference between the subjects in the pre-test as shown in table 7.

Table 7: Distinct results of verb, adjective, and preposition collocation on the pre-test

	Group	N	Mean	t-value	df	sig
Pre-test Verb	Control	18	0.9142	0.620	32	0.95
	Experimental	16	1.0861			
Pre-test Adj.	Control	18	0.7751	2.001	32	0.054
	Experimental	16	1.2672			
Pre-test Prep.	Control	18	0.5607	0.246	32	0.807
	Experimental	16	0.7310			

In contrast, the independent T-tests of the subject scores in the post-test, as illustrated in table 8, showed that there is significant difference between the scores of the subjects in the control and experimental group with regard to adjectival collocation ($t_{32}= 8.754$, $p= 0.000$), prepositional collocation ($t_{32}= 9.76$, $p= 0.000$) and verbal collocation ($t_{32}=7.643$, $p=0.000$)

providing an answer to the second question of the study. Now we can even turn to the *t*-distribution table. The *t* value needed for our number of d.f., 32, and the selected significance level of 0.05 in a two-tailed test is 2.064. Fortunately our *t* values are enough above the *t* critical.

Table 8: Distinct results of verb, adjective and preposition collocation on the post-test

	Group	N	Mean	t-value	df	sig
Pre-test Verb	Control	18	2.27594	8.754	32	0.000
	Experimental	16	5.07064			
Pre-test Adj.	Control	18	1.97680	9.76	32	0.000
	Experimental	16	5.37686			
Pre-test Prep.	Control	18	2.1944	7.643	32	0.000
	Experimental	16	4.7876			

It is worth noting that in the results of verbal, adjectival and prepositional collocations in the pre-test, the lowest mean in both groups belonged to the category of prepositional collocation. The mean of prepositional collocations in the control and experimental group was 0.5607 and 0.7310 respectively. This category of collocations had the lowest mean as compared to the means of the other 2 categories of collocations in each group. In the post-test, the prepositional category of collocations has still the lowest mean, 1.97680, in the control group whereas the highest mean in the experimental group belongs to this category of collocations, 5.37686. In other word, the Iranian EFL learners of the experimental group showed the highest improvement in prepositional collocations while the prepositional collocations have still remained as the most challenging category of collocations for the Iranian EFL learners of the control group. The result is indicative of the fact that CA has been effective in raising consciousness of students in the experimental group to the prepositional collocations which were the most challenging category of collocations for the Iranian EFL learners as shown in the pre-test.

The statistical analyses proved that using CA as a teaching technique in teaching Persian to English translation of journalistic texts did affect the participants' performances. There was evidence that the greatest influence on the students' performance was due to the awareness made by CA.

The students performed equally weak as to the translation of different types of collocations on the pre-test. As CA helped class (2), the experimental group, the subtleties and nuances in the field of collocations were highlighted to the students and this very fact made the students aware of the challenging points. This awareness of the targets, collocations, was not possible other than through CA. Participants in Class (2) could perceive tiny points like noun-preposition collocations with a good recollection of it while performing on the post-test. It was found that, CA paved the way for learning and specially the awareness needed for it.

CONCLUSION

The present study showed that Contrastive Analysis could have a significant effect on teaching and learning collocations in the field of Persian- English translation of journalistic texts. In this way, it was a contribution into researches done on Contrastive Analysis. For example, the majority of studies cited by Brown, D. (1984) and Ferguson, C. A. (1965) were successful in showing significant effect of Contrastive Analysis on teaching and learning. Lado, R. (1957) also signified the importance of differences between two linguistic systems and through Contrastive Analysis we can find these differences. Overcoming these differences facilitate the process of Language Learning.

The statistical analyses proved that using Contrastive Analysis to teach collocations in Persian to English translation of journalistic texts did affect

participants' performances. There was evidence that the greatest influence on students' performance to well grasp collocations was due to the awareness made by Contrastive Analysis. The students performed identically as to the translation of different types of collocations on the pre-test. As contrastive Analysis helped in class (2), the experimental group, the subtleties and nuances in the field of collocations were highlighted to the students through CA and this very fact made the students well aware of the collocations. The participants in class (2) could perceive tiny points like noun-preposition collocations with a good recollection of them while performing on the post-test. It was found that, contrastive Analysis could pave the way for learning collocations which need noticing and consciousness.

Implications for Teaching Collocation

1. "No noticing, no acquisition (Thornbury, S. 1997)."
Teachers must raise learners' awareness of collocation as early as possible. Students who meet words initially with their common collocates use them far more naturally, pronounce them better and have a greater amount of ready-made language to aid fluency, allowing more time to focus on the message. Learning lexical strings first seems to enable students to extract the grammar themselves as they begin analyzing acquired language.
2. For advanced learners, especially if new to the concept, teachers need to use activities highlighting collocation. They should also stress the importance of actively seeking an increasingly large amount of exposure to primarily written but also spoken language outside the classroom, and noticing collocations within that material.
3. Moon (Moon, R. 1997) calls ignoring collocations as considering the words "dangerously isolationist" and continues to say that "words are again and again shown not to operate as independent and interchangeable parts of the lexicon, but as parts of a lexical system". Understanding collocations is vital for all learners and for those on advanced level courses. It is essential that they are not only aware of the variety and sheer density of this feature of the language but that they actively acquire more and more collocations both within and outside the formal teaching situation. It is only by doing this through increased exposure that they can be assured of leaving the intermediate plateau behind.

REFERENCES

1. Benson, M., Benson, E., & Ilson, R. (1986). *A Guide to Word Combinations, the BBI Combinatory Dictionary of English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
2. Brown, D. (1984). *Principles of language learning and teaching*: New Jersey: hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs.
3. Butzkamm, W. (2003). We only learn language once. The role of the mother tongue in FL classrooms: death of a dogma. *Language Learning*, 28, 29-39.
4. Corbetta, M., & Shulman, G. L. (2002). Control of goal-directed and stimulus-driven attention in the brain. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 3(3), 201-215.
5. Corder, S. P. (1981). *Error Analysis and Interlanguage*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
6. Di Pietro, R. J. (1971). *Language Structures in Contrast.*, Rowley, Massachusetts: *Newbury House Publishers*.
7. Ellis, R. (1986). *The study of second language acquisition*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
8. Ellis, R. (1997). *Second language acquisition*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
9. Fan, M. (2009). An exploratory study of collocational use by ESL students - A task based approach. *System*, 110-123.
10. Ferguson, C. A. (1965). *General Introduction to Contrastive Studies, The Grammatical Structure of English and Spanish*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
11. Gabrys-Biskup, D. (1992). L1 influence on learners' renderings of English collocation. A Polish/German empirical study, in P. J. Arnauld and H. Benjoint, (eds.), *Vocabulary and applied linguistics*. London: Macmillan, 1992; 85-93.
12. Hill, J. (1999). Collocational competence. *ETP*, 11: 3-6.
13. Itti, L., Rees, G., & Tsotsos, J. K. (2005). *Neurobiology of Attention Elsevier Academic Press*.
14. James, C. (1998). *Errors in language learning and use :Exploring error analysis.* , New York: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.
15. Kuo, C. (2009). An Analysis of the Use of collocation by Intermediate EFL college students in Taiwan. *ARECLS*, 6, 141-155.
16. Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics Across Culture*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
17. Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*, New York: Oxford University Press.
18. Lewis, M. (2000). Learning in a lexical approach, in M. Lewis, (ed.), *Teaching collocation : Further development in the lexical approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 126-154.
19. Moon, R. (1997). Vocabulary connections : multi-word items in English, in M. J. McCarthy and N. Schmitt, (eds.), *Vocabulary : description, acquisition, and pedagogy*. London: Cambridge University Press.
20. Nattinger, J. (1980). A lexical phrase grammar for ESL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 14: 337-344.
21. Nattinger, J., & Decarrico, J. (1992). *Lexical phrases and language teaching*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

22. Nazari, M. (2008). The role of L1 in L2 acquisition: Attitudes of Iranian university students. *Novitas-ROYAL*, 2(2), 138-153.
23. Newmark, P. (1998). *Approaches to translation*, London: Prentice Hall International.
24. Parasuraman, R. (1998). *The Attentive Brain*, Cambridge: MA:MIT.
25. Posner, M. I., & Rothbart, M. K. (1988). Attention, self-regulation and consciousness. *Psychological transaction of the royal society of London*. 353, 1925-1927.
26. Prator, C. H. (1968). Hierarchy of difficulty. Unpublished classroom lecture. Los Angeles: University of California.
27. Rivers, W. (1970). *Teaching foreign language skills*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
28. Sadeghi, K. (2009). Collocational Differences Between L1 and L2: Implications for EFL Learners and Teachers. *TESL Canada. Journal./REVUE TESL DU CANADA*, 26(2), 100-124.
29. Schmitt, N. (2000). *Vocabulary in Language Teaching*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
30. Sinclair, J. M., Jones, S., & Daley, R. (2004). *English Collocation Studies: The OSTI Report*, London: Continuum.
31. Strevens, P. (1965). *Papers in Language and language teaching*, London: Oxford University Press.
32. Thornbury, S. (1997). Reformation and reconstruction : Tasks that promote noticing. *ELT*, 51(4), 326-335.
33. Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*, Amsterdam: Benjamins Library.
34. Wang, H. C., & Shih, S. C. (2011). The Role of language for thinking and task selection in EFL learners' oral collocational production. *Foreign Language annal*, 44(2), 399-416.