The Efficacy of Two Teaching Methods
on Minimizing the Grammatical Errors
in Translating Persian Sentences into English

Mostafa Bahraman (Corresponding Author) [1]

Kashmar Higher Education Institute, Kashmar, Iran

Roya Movahed [2]

Kashmar Higher Education Institute, Kashmar, Iran

Abstract

This study deals with spotting the grammatical errors committed by the Iranian students majoring in English translation while translating the Persian sentences into English and investigating the effect of two teaching methods, including Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) and Communicative Language Teaching Method (CLT), on minimizing these errors. For this purpose, the grammatical errors in the translation of thirty students were identified. These errors were analyzed and classified according to Keshavarz's model of error analysis. The students were divided into two groups; the first group received the learning materials based on GTM, and in the second group CLT was applied. Afterward, a test which included English sentences extracted from *Modern English* 1 and 2 was designed based on the errors taken from the corpus compiled by the students' translations. Then the frequency of the errors in both groups were analyzed by SPSS software to determine the significance of using these methods on minimizing the grammatical errors made by the students in their translations into English. To determine the level of significance, the probability value was calculated for raw errors, GTM and CLT errors. The analysis of Pearson correlation showed that both methods had their significance; however, the communicative method proved to be slightly more effective than the other. Undoubtedly, this does not mean to underestimate the efficacy of grammar translation method since it seems that it plays a complementary role in teaching environment, and achieving better pedagogical results cannot be prescribed on a single method.

Keywords

1. Introduction

It has been noticed that error analysis (EA) as a very effective tool is capable of enhancing students' English language acquisition and skills. Corder (1967) and James (1998) stated that errors committed by learners are very important because

---

[1] msph_bahraman@yahoo.com

[2] rmovahed1239@gmail.com

they are the sign of how learners acquire/learn the language. They expressed that teachers, learners, and researchers can benefit from the errors made by learners if they perceive them as the evidence of learners' progress and improvement of the language learning process. Teachers can tackle these errors to help the learners to improve their translation skills. In this sense, researchers can find out how learners learn and acquire the language by analyzing the errors.

Researchers have always seen error analysis as a prominent method in writing and translation classes because it can help the learners to improve their writing and rendering performance. For instance, Presada and Badea (2014) make a reference to the causes of errors made by learners in their translation classes and claimed that this method can help them to deal with the real problems. They admitted that error analysis can lessen the number of errors in learners' work. Given the advantages of error analysis, the researchers believe that this method can be useful for improving their students' translation skills.

The authors of this study have been teaching English translation for several years. They found that Persian sentences which were translated into English by Iranian English translation students contained different kinds of errors such as wrong word order, errors in the use of prepositions, misplacement of adverbs, and double negation (cf. 3.3 10). It is worth noting that one of the main purposes of teaching translation is to help learners to expand and improve communicative skills and strategies, oral fluency and their skill of using the correct forms of the target language effectively. Therefore, the purpose of the current study is to investigate and analyze the morhpo-syntactical errors made by students of English translation and to examine the effects of two different teaching methods, GTM and CLT, on minimizing the grammatical errors in translating Persian sentences into English.

2. Error Analysis

In recent years, as the concept of error analysis (EA) gained momentum, many scholars in the field of second/foreign language learning/acquisition were obsessed by the issue. Dulay et al. (1982) define it as a method of analyzing errors made by EFL and ESL learners when they learn a language. Not only can it help reveal the strategies used by learners to learn a language, it also helps teachers, as well as the concerning scholars, to know what difficulties learners face in order to improve their teaching. James (1998) states that EA is the analysis of learners' errors by contrasting what the learners have learned with what they have not. It also deals with giving the explanation of the errors in order to accurately reduce them. Similarly, Keshavarz (2012) asserts that EA is "a procedure used by both researchers and teachers which involves collecting samples of learner language, identifying errors, classifying them according to their nature and causes, and

evaluating their seriousness" (168). Therefore, it is inferred that EA is a technique through which wrong structures written by students can be detected, analyzed, and categorized which is of tremendous effect on teaching and learning environment.

3. Literature Review
3.1. Classification of Errors

Different classifications for errors have been introduced by well-known scholars in the field. Some of them are as follows: Dulay et al. (1982) classified the errors into six different categories including omission of grammatical morphemes, double marking of semantic features, use of wrong forms, disordering, and alternating use of two or more forms. James (1998) provides a five-category model for errors including grammatical errors (adjectives, adverbs, articles, nouns, possession, pronouns, prepositions, and verbs), substance errors (capitalization, punctuation, and spelling), lexical errors (word formation and word selection), syntactic errors (coordination/subordination, sentence structure, and ordering), and semantic errors (ambiguous communication and miscommunication). Keshavarz (2013) presents a linguistic-based classification of errors for the Persian and English languages. There are four major categories in his model: Orthographic errors such as sound / letter mismatch, same spelling but different pronunciation, similar pronunciation but different spelling, and ignorance of the spelling rules. Phonological errors occur because of the differences in syllable structures in L1 and L2, lack of certain L2 phonemes in the learner's L1, spelling pronunciation of words, and the problem of silent letters. Another category is lexico-semantic errors which are related to the semantic properties of lexical items. The last category is morphological- syntactic errors including wrong use of plural morpheme, wrong use of tenses, wrong word order, wrong use of prepositions, and errors in the use of articles. Since the focus of this study is on grammatical errors committed by Iranian university students, the last category proposed by Keshavarz. i.e. morphological- syntactic errors is employed in this study.

3.2. Sources of Errors

Language experts state that there are many sources of errors made by language learners. Richards (1974) expressed that two main sources of errors are intralingual errors and interlingual errors. The former refers to errors caused during learner's language process such as overgeneralization and false analogy while the latter refers to errors caused when learners wrongly use the rules of their mother tongue when they produce sentences of the target language. Runkati (2013) and Phuket and Othman (2015) mention that there are two main

sources of errors: interlingual interference and intralingual interference. The former is the negative transfer of learners' mother tongue, and the latter is learners' incomplete knowledge of the target language. With regard to errors committed by Iranian learners, the source of the errors can be rooted in interlingual interference as well as intralingual interference (Heydari and Bagheri 2012; Kaweera 2013).

3.3. Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) VS Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

As the current study attempts to examine the efficacy of two teaching methods, i.e. GTM and CLT on minimizing the grammatical errors in translating Persian sentences into English, these methods are described as follows. GTM (the traditional approach) is a teaching method for foreign languages. The origin of this method is classical method of teaching Greek or Latin in the early 1500s when Latin was the most widely- studied foreign language due to its prominence in government, academia, and business. As Richards and Rodgers (2001) state, the primary goals of this method were to prepare students to translate classical literature and to develop students' general mental discipline. In this method, grammar is taught deductively, that is the rule is introduced first, and then examples are presented. Although GTM lost popularity as a method in some foreign language classrooms, it is still considered a good method for individuals who want to be translators and are not concerned with the knowledge of how to speak the target language.

Compared to GTM, CLT, or the communicative approach, is a language teaching approach that emphasizes interaction as both the means and the ultimate goal of study. In fact, it could be of great importance to apply and make use of group-work techniques and strategies to enhance the students' language proficiency through accomplishing the target as well as pedagogic tasks in the collaborative environment of a group which is the very characteristic of the CLT in order to maximize the learning opportunities in the class. Applying CLT in the class prepares the grounds for teachers as the needs analysts, counselors, and group process managers to present the materials and follow the educational goals through a variety of games, role plays, simulations, and task-based communication activities (Richards and Rodgers 2001). The origin of the approach in question can be traced back to the increased demands for language learning created by a series of concurrent developments in Europe and North America in the 1960s (Mitchell 1994; Richards and Rodgers 2001; Whong 2011). In this method grammar is taught inductively, that is, first the examples are given, and then the rule is extracted from them.

3.4. Previous Studies

Comprehension and production are the erroneous parts of language learning, and most of the learners make many errors in these areas. As stated earlier, errors are good sources for teachers and learners. Teachers can use errors to help their learners to write or translate better. Error analysis is a good tool that can help teachers to find the erroneous parts of language, and it is the process to analyze the errors systematically. Many experts and researchers in the field have shown a great deal of interest in error analysis. Zheng and Park (2013) analyzed the errors of English essays written by Chinese and Korean students. The results of their study revealed that errors made by these two groups of writers were various. They had problems in using articles, punctuation marks, and word orders. According to Zheng and Park (2013), negative transfer of the learners' mother tongue was the major source of the errors. Liu (2013) has conducted a similar study on Chinese learners who made errors when they wrote English sentences due to carelessness and negative influence of the learners' first language. Presada and Badea (2014) have conducted a pilot study on the effectiveness of error analysis in translation classes. They analyzed learners' translation samples and found that a large number of the errors they produced are the result of both negative and positive linguistic transfer. They mentioned that the first type of transfer is predominant, demonstrating that the learners resort to the linguistic system of their native language as a mechanism of second language acquisition (SLA).

Khansir (2013) compared and investigated the error types found in the written products of ESL and EFL Iranian learners. Based on his findings, there were no significant differences between the errors found in written products of the two groups of the writers. He concluded that both EFL and ESL learners encountered similar problems in writing. Yousofi (2014) explored the errors in the translations of Iranian novice English translators by analyzing the translation products and highlighting the parts seemed problematic to him and found that the translators had committed errors in linguistic, cultural, and stylistic areas. In a recent empirical study conducted by Zafar (2016), error analysis was utilized as a treatment. She first analyzed errors frequently made by her business students, and verb tenses were found to be the most problematic ones. She conducted a two-month writing training course with the focus on the use of the correct form of the verb tenses. At the end of the course, her students made an apparent improvement.

Ilani and Barati (2016) conducted research on the errors of translation of journalistic texts. Their study aimed at determining and classifying the errors and finding the most frequent ones. A hybrid model made by combining

Keshavarz's Model and ATA were employed, and forty students majoring in English translation participated in the study. The participants were assigned four selected texts to translate into English. Based on the results, the most frequent errors pertain to three categories, i.e. a) grammar, b) terminology, c) misunderstanding. The study also came to conclusion that there was no pattern among errors committed by participants.

In a recent study, Soltani et al. (2020) examined translation errors in five literary genres including prose, poetry, non-fiction, play, and media based on the American Translation Association taxonomy. The purpose of the study was three-fold: a) to determine the most frequent error types within each literary genre, b) to distinguish any relationship between the text types and the errors, and to extract the possible pattern of committed errors within each genre. The study concluded that the most frequent error types in the aforementioned five literary genres were verb tense, punctuation, terminology, omission, and misunderstanding, respectively. Also, the findings indicated that except for non-fiction and play, text type is significant. Furthermore, the study found a similar pattern among errors in the five genres.

Extensive research on second/foreign language teaching has been conducted on error analysis, but no study exists comparing the effectiveness of communicative language teaching approach with that of grammar translation method at teaching morhpo-syntactic errors, and their relative effectiveness on decreasing students' errors in their translations. The current research tries to fill this gap by comparing the two approach in minimizing the errors in question.

4. Methodology
4.1. Participants and Materials

As mentioned earlier, this study aims at analyzing the morpho-syntactic errors committed by students. To this end, forty junior students majoring in English translation from Kashmar Higher Education Institute participated in the research. In this study ten sentences for each error type were selected from the book *Modern English: exercises for non-native speakers* (Frank 1972).

3.2. Instruments

In order to compare the errors made by the students, a corpus of the students' translation assignments on the courses titled *principles of translation* and *translation of simple texts* was   examined. In order to teach grammatical points, two teaching methods including GTM and CLT were implemented. Spotting the errors after training stage constitutes the post test of the study.

3.3. Procedure

In the first step, a corpus of the students' translation assignments from Persian into English was investigated for the possible errors. The errors are analyzed and classified based on Keshavarz (2013) model of error analysis, known as the morpho-syntactic errors. It is worth mentioning that the model is larger; however, only the most common errors have been adopted for the current research. Listed below are these errors along with examples. Note that PS stands for Persian sentence, ST for student's translation, and CT for correct translation.

1. Errors in the Use of Articles

PS: شیر یک حیوان وحشی است.

ST: Lion is a wild animal.

CT: A lion is a wild animal

2. Errors in the Use of Prepositions

PS: آنها هفته گذشته به آمریکا رسیدند.

ST: They arrived to the United States last week.

CT: They arrived in the United States last week.

3. Misplacement of Adverbs

PS: او با دقت رانندگی میکند.

ST: He carefully drives.

CT: He drives carefully.

4. Double Negation

PS: هیچ کس اجازه ندارد وارد آن ساختمان شود.

ST: No one is not allowed to enter the building.

CT: No one is allowed to enter the building.

 5. Using It is instead of There is

PS: سر و صدای زیادی در این اتاق است.

ST: It is a lot of noise in this room.

CT: There is a lot of noise in this room.

6. Wrong Use of Gerunds and Infinitives

PS: ما دیشب از ملاقات شما لذت بردیم.

ST: We enjoyed to meet you last night.

CT: We enjoyed meeting you last night.

7. Errors Due to Lack of Concord or Agreement

PS. قیچی چند دقیقه قبل اینجا بود.

ST: The scissors was here a few minutes ago.

CT: The scissors were here a few minutes ago.

8. Wrong Use of Active and Passive Voice

PS: اکنون طرح در دست بررسی است.

ST: The proposal is considering right now.

CT: The proposal is being considered right now.

9. Wrong Use of Plural Morpheme

PS: این اطلاعات صحیح هستند.

ST: These inforamtions are correct.

CT: This information is correct.

10. Wrong Use of Parts of Speech

PS: از او بخاطر سخاوتش تشکر کردند.

ST: He was thanked for his generous.

CT: He was thanked for his generosity.

11. Typical Persian Constructions

PS: اگرچه خیلی احساس خستگی می کردم ولی کار را به پایان رساندم.

ST: Although I felt very tired, but I tried to finish the work.

CT: Although I felt very tired, I tried to finish the work.

12. Errors in The Use of Relative Pronouns

PS: خانه ای که خانواده تیلور در آن زندگی می کند خیلی قدیمی است.

ST: The house where the Taylors live in it is very old.

CT: The house where the Taylors live is very old.

13 Subject-Verb Inversion in WH-Questions

PS: چرا ماری دیر کرده است؟

ST: Why Mary has arrived late?

CT: Why has Mary arrived late?

14. Subject-Verb Inversion in Indirect Question

PS: می توانید به من بگویید ایستگاه اتوبوس کجاست؟

ST: Can you tell me where is the bus stop?

CT: Can you tell me where the bus stop is?

15. Wrong Word Order

PS: دو معلم انگلیسی اول ماری خیلی خوب بودند.

ST: Mary's two first English teachers were very good.

CT: Mary's first two English teachers were very good.

Having spotted and classified errors, their frequencies were calculated and tabulated (table 2). Since two teaching methods have been adopted in this research, the students were randomly divided into two groups A and B. While

GTM was employed for teaching grammar in group A, CLT was conducted in group B. In the second stage, ten sentences for each error were selected from the book *Modern English Part 1 and 2* (Frank 1972). These sentences were rendered into Persian, and then the students were tasked to translate them back into English. Once again, the sentences were analyzed for the possible errors, and their frequencies were calculated (table 3 and 4). Having computed the errors, the results of two groups were compared to see the impact of each teaching method on the improvement of students' translation

5. Results

Having analyzed the data, it was found that the source of the errors made by students in translation classes can be rooted back in negative linguistic transfer. In fact, the interference between grammatical structures of the source language and those of the receptor language is very high. It is noteworthy that the most frequent errors in GTM and CLT include use of articles, use of prepositions, and typical Persian constructions. While in group A (GTM) the percentages of these errors are (22%), (18.80%), and (17.43%), respectively, the percentages of the aforementioned errors in group B (CLT) are (17.11%), (15.50%), and (11.76%). However, the least frequent errors in both groups are related to four items including double negation, using *it is* instead of *there is*, subject-verb Inversion in indirect question, and subject-verb inversion in WH question. It should be noted that in CLT the items 1, 2, 3, 6, 11, 12, 13, and 14 show lower errors compared to GTM. On the contrary, the items 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, and 15 have lower errors in GTM. Surprisingly, the item 10, i.e. subject-verb inversion in indirect question has the same frequency in both GTM and CLT. The findings of the data analysis are depicted in the following tables.

Table 1. Morpho-syntactic errors committed by the students in their assignments.

No	Morpho-Syntactic Errors	Number of Errors	Frequency of Errors %
1	Errors in the Use of Articles	205	28.35
2	Errors in the Use of Prepositions	132	18.25
3	Typical Persian Constructions	91	12.58
4	Wrong Use of Active and Passive Voice	86	11.89
5	Errors Due to Lack of Concord or Agreement	46	6.36
6	Wrong Use of Gerunds and Infinitives	44	6.08
7	Misplacement of Adverbs	38	5.25

8	Errors in The Use of Relative Pronouns	24	3.31
9	Wrong Use of Plural allomorphs	17	2.35
10	Wrong Use of Parts of Speech	13	1.79
11	Wrong Word Order	9	1.24
12	Using It is instead of There is	6	0.82
13	Subject-Verb Inversion in Indirect Question	6	0.82
14	Subject-Verb Inversion in WH-Questions	3	0.41
15	Double Negation	3	0.41
	Total	723	100

Table 2. Morpho-syntactic errors committed by group A (Grammar-Translation teaching method) and group B (Communicative teaching method).

No	Morpho-Syntactic Errors	GTM		CLT	
		NO	%	NO	%
1	Errors in the Use of Articles	48	22	32	17.11
2	Errors in the Use of Prepositions	41	18.80	29	15.50
3	Typical Persian Constructions	38	17.43	22	11.76
4	Wrong Use of Active and Passive Voice	19	8.71	25	13.36
5	Errors Due to Lack of Concord or Agreement	12	5.50	13	6.95
6	Wrong Use of Gerunds and Infinitives	16	7.33	10	5.34
7	Misplacement of Adverbs	10	4.58	12	6.41
8	Errors in The Use of Relative Pronouns	8	3.66	11	5.91
9	Wrong Use of Plural allomorphs	6	2.75	9	4.81
10	Wrong Use of Parts of Speech	7	3.21	7	3.74
11	Wrong Word Order	6	2.75	5	2.67
12	Subject-Verb Inversion in WH-Questions	4	1.83	3	1.60
13	Subject-Verb Inversion in Indirect Question	5	2.29	4	2.13
14	Using It is instead of There is	4	1.83	2	1.06
15	Double Negation	2	0.91	3	1.60
		218	100%	187	100%

The frequency of the errors was analyzed by SPSS Software to identify their correlation and the level of their significance. To do so, we have determined "Pearson Correlation" of raw errors (errors before applying teaching) and

respectively CLT errors (errors after applying Communicative Language Teaching method) and GTM errors (errors after applying Grammar-Translation method). Pearson correlation is a value between +1 to -1 to determine the linear correlation of two variables. The more it is close to +1 or -1 the strongest the correlation is. Being close to +1 shows the correlation is positive (increasing variable X increases variable Y) and being close to -1 shows the correlation is negative (increasing variable X decreases variable Y). Then, we determined the Probability-Value (P-value) for raw errors and respectively CLT and GTM errors to determine the level of their significance. If the P-value is in a range of 0 to 0.05 then the relation of the statistics will be significant and if P-Value is more than 0.05 then the statistics won't be considered significant. The more it is closed to 0, the higher the level of the significance is.

The error analysis of the students in both groups showed that since errors of the students as a whole in communicative group has reduced to fewer numbers compared to grammar translation method. Also, the analysis of the Pearson correlation by using SPSS software showed that there is a positive relationship between the numbers of the errors and the methods which have been used. In this sense, it can be inferred that CLT has slightly been more effective than GTM in reducing the students' translation errors. Needless to say that both methods have proved to be significant since the P-Value in both methods is less than 0.05 (nearly 0.01). The below tables present Pearson Correlation" of raw errors and the significant level of GTM and CLT errors.

Table 3. Pearson correlation of Raw errors and GTM errors

Pearson correlation of Raw errors and GTM errors	.907**
P-Value	.000
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).	

Table 4. Pearson correlation of Raw errors and CLT errors

Pearson correlation of Raw errors and CLT errors	. 910**
P-Value	.000
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).	

6. Discussion

The common interlingual errors spotted normally have a logical reason which are discussed separately.

6.1. Wrong Uses of Determiners

Determiners, based on Kroeger, typically provide information about definiteness, number (singular vs. plural), and (in the case of demonstratives) distance from the speaker. Articles and demonstratives are the most common types of determiners. Determiners do not behave like typical adjuncts because the choice of determiner is often limited by the grammatical and semantic properties of the head noun (89). The Persian language does not have covert definite articles so intentional distinction of general nouns and definite nouns are somehow difficult for the Persian students. Moreover, the agreement in demonstratives and their following nouns in some cases are different from English; these two factors are the most common sources of errors in student's translations.

6.2. Wrong Uses of Prepositions

Prepositions are a class of words that serve to relate objects, people or events in space or time (under/before) though often the relationship is more abstract, this class does not have the capacity to appear in a range of different forms (Radford et al. 131). It means they are limited in number, however, it does not lead to fewer errors. While many verbs and structures in Persian use some especial preposition, their corresponding verbs and structures in English take a different preposition or even do not take a preposition at all. These differences lead to some frequent errors in translation.

6.3. Collocation in Persian Structures

According to Kroeger, constraints on what lexical items may occur in combination with each other are referred to as selection restrictions. The violation of a selectional restriction is sometimes referred to as a collocation (73). In other words, collocation can be defined as the "fixed co-occurrence of lexical items based on their semantic restrictions (Widdowson 60). Persian like any other language has some fixed collocations which their literal translation into other languages will lead to grammatical errors.

6.4. Use of Active and Passive Voice

This is the grammatical category governing the way the subject of a sentence is related to the action of the verb (Trask 319-320). Both Persian and English have a two-way distinction of voice. In the active voice, the subject of the sentence is typically the entity performing the action while in the passive voice, the subject is instead the entity undergoing the action. Moreover, in both languages the active voice is unmarked: it is grammatically simpler and far more frequent in speech. The passive voice is marked, and it is most typically used either to make the entity undergoing the action the center of attention, or to remove the entity performing the action (the agent) from the center of attention, and possibly to

remove it from the sentence altogether. These similarities seem to make passive structure and an easy case for translation, but, in fact, it is really problematic when it comes to the translation of the passive structure in continuous and perfect aspects. While in Persian the tense and the subject are usually determined by verb endings and auxiliary verb "*Shodan*", in English it is the form of "*to be*" which determines the tense and aspects of the verbs. These differences seem to be problematic for students and is the source of many errors.

6.5. Agreement

Agreement is a general term used to describe a situation in which the grammatical features of a noun or noun phrase determine the morphological shape of a word that is syntactically related to the N or NP in some way (Haspelmath 65). This syntactic relationship may be anaphoric as when a pronoun agrees with its antecedent, or it may involve a relation between a head and its dependent as when a verb agrees with its subject or object. Agreement is a completely typical phenomenon in Persian and English as for agreement of verb endings and subjects in Persian. However, the cases of agreement seem to be completely different in two languages, and these dissimilarities are the source of many errors in translations.

6.6. Infinitive and Gerund

In English the non-finite form of the verbs includes two categories of infinitives and gerund non-finite refers to a verb which is not inflected for tense number and person. The traditional term of gerund refers to a word derived from a verb and is used as a noun (Crystal 352), but the infinitive is the citation form of a verb, that is, the form we use to name a verb (as in the most irregular verb in English is the verb 'to be'). Although it usually comes immediately before the verb, it can be split from it by an adverb (Radford et al. 134). The corresponding element to both infinitive and gerund structures in Persian is one single structure called "*Masdar*" which means infinitive. Accordingly, the students usually cannot discriminate the uses of gerunds and infinitives and have errors in their translation.

6.7 Misplacement of Adverbs

Adverbs are words used, typically with verbs, to provide more information about actions, states, and events (slowly, yesterday). Some adverbs (really, very) are also used with adjectives to modify information about things (Yule 84). A typical property of adverbs is their position in the sentence. Consider a usual sentence in English: an adverb can be placed at the beginning of a sentence, at the beginning of a verb phrase, and at the end of a sentence. However, not all adverbs are so flexible: "yesterday" and "downstairs" can only fit into the first

and third of the three typical positions, while "fast" can only fit into the last. Naturally, some adverbs such as "uphill" have meanings which do not allow them to fit sensibly into this position, but consider another example like *She threw the ball*. Adverbs with negative or interrogative meanings do something odd when they come first: we cannot say "Seldom had she poured the wine." or "Why she poured the wine?", but must say instead "Seldom did she pour the wine and why did she pour the wine?" (Trask 7). While the place of adverbs in Persian is more deliberate, the above restrictions in placement of adverbs in English cause the students to have many errors.

6.8. Wrong Use of Plural Allomorph

The distinction between one and more than one is a morphological and syntactical feature of languages in linguistic studies, which usually raises some challenge when it comes to agreement of noun and other language categories. There are several forms of number agreement in English: verb agreement, between a verb and its subject; pronoun agreement, between a pronoun and its antecedent; ascriptive agreement, between an ascriptive noun phrase and its predicand; appositive agreement between an appositive noun phrase and its head; and dependent agreement between a noun and its modifiers (Bond 21). While such agreements can be the source of many errors in translation, sometimes the use of wrong plural allomorphs can cause translation errors. Plural morpheme in English can be realized in different forms including -s, -es, -en , Ø (covert morpheme) and a zero morpheme, and use of these allomorphs have certain restrictions. Choosing a wrong allomorph that violates the restriction rules is one of the most common errors in translation.

6.9. Part of Speech

Part of speech (or category) of a word can help to determine its interpretation, and the meaning of the phrase or sentence in which it occurs. All words must be assigned to syntactic categories in order to understand their distribution in sentences. Sometimes students cannot identify the correct part of speech of a word due to the fact that their corresponding structure in source language is ambiguous. For example, in many cases in Persian adjectives and adverbs of manner have exactly the same forms. Such an occasion is a probable source of error in translation.

6.10. Word Order

One of the main ways that languages are classified is by their word order or to be more specific by their basic constituent order. This is taken to be the order of the two independent noun phrases and the verb in a 'basic' or unmarked sentence; 'basic' is generally taken to mean a declarative active voice sentence

whose predicate focus of main clause is a lexical noun phrases (rather than pronouns). Changing one of these features often changes the word order, and so we want to find as 'neutral' an environment as possible. In the area of basic constituent order what seems to be particularly relevant is whether a language is 'head-final' or 'head-first' as this has implications for other structures in the language. There are two types of structures that complicate the issue of basic constituent order: head-marking constructions and 'free' word order languages (Pavey 316). The basic word order in English is SVO (subject verb object), and it is a head-final language while the basic word order in Persian is SOV, and it is mostly a head-first language. These contradictions in word order of the two languages can cause many translation errors.

6.11. Inversion

In some structures in English such as interrogatives, the auxiliaries move out of their normal post-subject position into pre-subject position by an operation often referred to as "inversion" (Radford et al. 294). English main clause questions like questions in direct quotes include inversion. This "subject–aux inversion" pattern is not found in indirect questions of either type, namely indirect Yes–No questions and indirect content questions. Indirect content questions can be easily identified because they contain a question word, a feature they share with main clause content questions (Kroeger 225). Such inversion is not a typical process in Persian, and it may cause errors in translation.

6.12. Using "It Is" Instead of "There Is"

A subject is prototypically a noun phrase, though it is possible for other parts of speech and categories to act as subjects: verb phrases can be nominalized or rank-shifted to operate as subjects (Running up the hill is tiring, to finish this book is his main aim). Some languages allow a dummy subject or expletive (in the grammatical sense) where the syntax requires a subject-slot to be filled, but the pronoun used has no semantic referential value. Typical instances in English are existential statements (There are ten boys here) that introduce modal forms (It is true that there are no bananas) or assertions about the weather (It is raining). (Trask 282). However, Persian is a pro-drop language which means the place for the subject could be kept empty because the subject is identifiable from the verb endings so expletive pronouns do not exist in Persian. Moreover, in Persian there is special verb "hastan" (to be) that is used for existential statements. Thus, rendering these structures into English could be problematic in translation.

6.13. Double Negation

The rules that govern negation are language dependent. In English the negative can be placed either after the auxiliary and optionally contracted with it, or before

a noun phrase if the noun phrase contains a word such as "any". However, sentences such as "I haven't got no money" containing a double negation structure are often characterized as ungrammatical. (Meyer 11). Double negation in Persian seems to be more common. There are lots of Persian structures in which you can find it grammatical. Consider the following example:

"*man ne-mitavanam na-ravam* "
I   couldn't   not go"

Such structure if they are not perceived correctly by students can lead to translation errors.

6.14. Relative Pronouns

A relativizer is basically a special type of complementizer which marks the modifying clause in a relative clause construction. In many languages (Chinese, Tagalog and Persian), the same particle which functions as a relativizer is also used to link other modifiers to the head noun, but in other languages such as English we have relative pronouns. We can define a relative pronoun cross-linguistically as an anaphoric element which introduces the modifying clause and takes the head noun as its antecedent. Relative pronouns in languages may be derived from question words, definite articles, or demonstratives (Kroger 234). In English they are derived from question words and are chosen based on semantic features, but as mentioned above Persian only uses a relativizer "*ke*" in such structures. Consequently, students usually mixed them up and make errors in translation. Yet this is not the only source for errors in relative clauses. Kroeger (230) believes that in every restrictive relative clause, there is an R-element which is co-antecedent with the head-noun that the relative clause defines. Sometimes in some languages this R-element can be Ø and has no overt manifestation. For example: *I saw a man who (R-element) was really short*. The man and the R-element are co-antecedent but R-element has no overt form, but in Persian this R-element sometimes has an overt form, and this difference makes the students' errors like "*I saw a man who he was really short"*.

7. Conclusion

In this research we have developed an experiment to study the efficiencies of two different teaching methods (GTM and CLT) for improving Persian to English translation of the students. On the basis of above discussion, it can be concluded that the vast majority of errors is related to three items, i.e. "errors in use of articles", "errors in use of prepositions", and "typical Persian constructions". Consequently, the focus of teaching should be directed to these items in order to

minimize the errors. In this regard, providing enough examples and exposing to authentic materials are of great help to instructors and learners as well.

In addition to teaching materials, another significant and noteworthy factor is teaching method. Before emerging the new method of teaching like CLT, GTM was the dominant method in teaching languages. However, based on the results of the current research, CLT has a greater efficiency in teaching grammar to the students of translation. Here, one factor which could play a crucial role in enhancing the students' subconscious control over the grammatical rules while translating Persian sentences into English is providing them with purposeful pedagogical tasks while participating in a comforting atmosphere of a group, collaborating and cooperating with their classmates in a student-centered problem solving environment.

This should not overshadow the effectiveness of grammar translation method as in some cases the GTM has been more effective in reduction of errors. In fact, both methods should be regarded to be complementary not against each other. Therefore, it seems that a combination of techniques from both methods could play a better role in teaching grammar and enhancing translation practice.

References

Bond, Francis. *Determiners and Number in English Contrasted with Japanese, as Exemplified in Machine Translation*. diss. University of Queensland, 2001.

Corder, Stephen. *Introducing Applied Linguistics*. Baltimore: Penguin Education, 1973.

Crystal, David. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics 6th Edition*. Hoboken, New Jerssey: Wiley Blackwell, 2008.

Dulay, Heidi, Marine Burt, and Stephen Krashen. *Language Two*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Frank, Marcella. *Modern English, Part of Speech. Prentice Hall*, 1972.

---. *Modern English, Sentences and Complex Structures*. Prentice Hall, 1972.

Haspelmath, Martin, and Andrea D Sims. Understanding Morphology. New York, London: Routledge, 2013.

Heydari, Pooneh, and Mohammad Bagheri. "Error Analysis: Sources of L2 Learners' Errors." *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, 2012.

Ilani, Ali, and Hossein Barati. "Translation of journalist texts in Iranian undergraduate students: An error analysis approach." *International Journal of English Linguistics*, Vol. 6, No. 6, 2016, pp. 147–161. doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v6n6p147

James, Carl. *Errors in Language Learning and Use: Exploring Error Analysis*. London: Routledge, 1998.

Kaweera, Chittima. "Writing Error: A Review of Interlingual and Intralingual Interference in Efl Context." *English Language Teaching*, Vol. 6, No. 7, 2013, pp. 9-18.

Keshavarz, Mohammad Hossein. *Error Analysis: A Practical Course for English Students and Teachers*. Tehra: SAMT, 2013.

Keshavarz, Mohammad Hossein. *Contrastive Analysis, Error Analysis and Interlanguage*. Tehran: Rahnama Press, 2012.

Khansir, Ali Akbar. "Error Analysis and Second Language Writing." *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 2, 2013, p. 363.

Kroeger, Paul R. *Analyzing Grammar: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Liu, Meihua, and Ying Xu. "An Investigation of Syntactic Errors in Chinese Undergraduate Efl Learners' Compositions: A Cohort Study." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, Vol. 2, No. 4, 2013, pp. 182-91.

Meyer, Charles F. *Introducing English Linguistics*. Cambridge University Press, 2009

Mitchell, Rosamond. "The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching." *Teaching modern languages*, 1994, pp. 33-42.

Pavey, Emma L. *The Structure of Language: An Introduction to Grammatical Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Phuket, Pimpisa Rattanadilok Na, and Normah Binti Othman. "Understanding Efl Students' Errors in Writing." *Journal of Education and Practice*, Vol. 6, No. 32, 2015, pp. 99-106.

Presada, Diana, and Mihaela Badea. "The Effectiveness of Error Analysis in Translation Classes. A Pilot Study." *Porta Linguarum: revista internacional de didáctica de las lenguas extranjeras*, No. 22, 2014, pp. 49-59.

Radford, Andrew, Martin Atkinson, David Britain, Harald Clahsen and Andrew Spencer. *Linguistics: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Richards, Jack C. "A Non-Contrastive Approach to Error Analysis." Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition, 1974, pp. 172-88.

Richards, Jack C, and Theodore S Rodgers. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge university press, 2001.

Runkati, K, and M Chatupote. *Organizational Patterns and Common Mistakes in English Research Abstracts*. Thesis, Prince of Songkla University, Songkla, 2013.

Soltani, Fatemeh, Azadeh Nemati and Mortaza Yamini. "An Analysis of Translation Errors in 5 Literary genres based on American Translation Association framework." *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, Vol. 7, No. 1, 2020, doi: 10.1080/23311983.2020.1799732

Trask, Robert Lawrence. *Language and Linguistics: The Key Concepts*. London: Taylor and Francis, 2007.

Whong, Melinda. *Language Teaching: Linguistic Theory in Practice: Linguistic Theory in Practice*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011.

Widdowson, Henry G. "The Linguistic Perspective". *Handbook of Foreign Language Communication and Learning*. edited by Karlfried Kanpp and Barbara Seidlhofer, Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton, 2009.

Yousofi, Nouroddin. "Describing the Errors in the Translations of Iranian Novice English Translators." *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, No. 98, 2014, pp. 1952-1958.

Yule, George. *The Study of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Zafar, Ameena. "Error Analysis: A Tool to Improve English Skills of Undergraduate Students." *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, No. 217, 2016, pp. 697-705.

Zheng, Cui, and Tae-Ja Park. "An Analysis of Errors in English Writing Made by Chinese and Korean University Students." *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 8, 2013.