A Multifaceted Approach to the Translation of Collocations from English to Persian

Hamzeh Haghighi[1]* and Fatemeh Hemmati[2]

[1]* Department of Applied Linguistics, Payame Noor University, Iran (Corresponding author)

E-mail: **hamzeh_haghighi@yahoo.com**

[2]Department of Applied Linguistics, Payame Noor university, Iran

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Original Research Paper

Keywords:

Translation
Collocations
Mistranslation of collocations
Context

ABSTRACT

The study set out to scrutinize the translation of Verb-Noun and Adjective-Noun collocations from English into Persian from different perspectives. The causes of mistranslation of collocations, procedures employed in translating collocations and the effect of context in translating collocations constitute the main perspectives of this study. For this purpose, two translation tasks including 20 verb-noun and adjective-noun collocations each, one in context and the other out of context, were given to 20 Iranian BA English Translation students. Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) and Newmark's (1988) translation models were adopted as the main theoretical frameworks of the study. The results showed that literal translation in task 1 (i.e. collocations in context) and restricted collocational competence in task 2 (i.e. collocations out of context) were the main causes of mistranslation of collocations. The findings also revealed that equivalence, literal translation, and transposition were the most conspicuous procedures in translating collocations in both tasks 1 and 2. The result of paired sample t-test signified the outperformance of subjects in translating collocations in context to those of out of context.

1. Introduction

Collocations are inseparable parts of each language found in large numbers. Since the meaning of some collocations might not be understood from the superficial meanings of the single words constituting them, there are some problems in both processes of comprehending and translating them (Baker, 2011). If we take the construction black coffee in English and attempt to translate it into Persian, we find that a literal translation of black yields the wrong result. Hence, translating collocations is a demanding task on the part of translators since

they should understand it first, and then provide the appropriate equivalent. The process of translating collocations from one language into another is a fine work which requires a translator to have a good knowledge of both languages and cultures and be able to find out and cope with the contingent problems in the process of finding a proper equivalent for the inter-lingual collocations (Toury, 1995). Translation of collocations seems to be a daunting process for translators as most of them often rely on their native language in trying to translate them. They always assume that a one-to-one correspondence exists between L1 and L2 lexical items. Nida (1964) states, "Since no two languages are identical either in meanings given or in phrases and sentences, then there can be no absolute correspondence between languages" (p. 156). Moreover, geographical, ideological, religious, and social factors make the process of understanding and translating collocations from one language into another so difficult (Hatim & Mayson, 1997). Therefore, there are two main problems in this regard: 1) How to understand the meaning of collocations of a specific language, and 2) How to translate collocations of one language in another language in a way that they convey exactly the same ideas of the original language.

Searching for acceptable collocations requires translators make a considerable effort to provide a translation that is equivalent in both meanings and use to the collocations in the source language. Nevertheless, when translators encounter the obstacle of not finding a corresponding target language (TL) equivalent for the source language (SL) lexical item, they resort to several strategies to overcome the problems faced. Faerch and Kaspers (1983) justify translators' resorting to different strategies "if the concept of translation strategy were of an empirical value, it would have to be linked to translation problems. Strategies emerge as soon as the translation cannot be carried out automatically" (p. 286). Garcia (1996) states, "different procedures for the translation are implemented to achieve a partially successful transfer, when these difficulties in translation often become unavoidable" (p. 64). The interest in studying the translation of collocations comes from their important role in the coherence of the structure of texts. Nevertheless, the translation of collocations has not received enough attention and deserves further considerations. The current study seems significant since it hypothesizes that Iranian BA translation students face difficulties in translating English collocations into Persian. Therefore, the research attempts to diagnose these difficulties and find out the procedures the translators resort to in translating collocations.

2. Review of Literature

Lewis (1993) proposes a lexical approach and greatly stressed the importance of collocations in language learning and teaching. Sinclair (1991) defined collocation as "the concept of word co-occurrence, where certain words appear predictably next to or within a certain number of words" (p. 121). For example catch a cold and severe cold are two commonly used collocations. The verb catch and the adjective severe recurrently co-occur with the noun cold. Benson, Benson, and Ilson, (1986) classifies collocations into two main categories of grammatical and lexical collocations. Grammatical collocations consist of a dominant word linking with a preposition or grammatical structure. For example, fond of and angry at are the adjective plus preposition combinations. Lexical collocations, in contrast to grammatical ones, refer to frequent word combinations of content words (verbs, nouns, adjectives, and adverbs). For instance, heavy traffic is the adjective plus noun lexical collocation while totally wrong is the adverb plus adjective lexical one.

Translation Strategies and Procedures

According to Chesterman (1997), the term "strategy" is used to describe different concepts in the field of translation. Lorscher (1991) distinguishes between translation methods and translation strategies, conceiving translation strategies as "procedures, often of a highly individual kind, which are applied when a SL text is transferred into the target-language" and which "can, but need not, result in an optimal translation", while

translation methods "are supra individual, tried and tested procedures which, when applied systematically by the translator, guarantee a high degree of success. Nevertheless, Lorscher (1991) argues that "even though this distinction is theoretically reasonable, it must be acknowledged that translation strategies have hardly been investigated in translation theory and that practicable translation methods are not much more than a desideratum at the moment" (p. 71). The classic concept of Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) and that of Newmark (1988) are considered as the translation method and translation procedure. Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) observed texts in French and English and mentioned differences in the languages and identified different translation 'strategies ' and ' procedures '. In fact, these two terms are often applied interchangeably in translation studies. Munday (2012) defined strategy as an overall orientation of the translator (e. g. towards ' free ' or ' literal translation ') whereas a procedure is a specific technique or method used by the translator at a certain point in a text (e. g. the borrowing of a word from the source language, the addition of an explanation or a footnote in the target text). Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) introduces two general strategies of direct translation and oblique translation. By direct translation, they meant three procedures of borrowing, calque and literal translation. In the framework of oblique translation, they introduced four procedures of transposition, modulation, equivalence and adaptation.

Newmark (1988) argues that "while translation methods relate to whole texts, translation procedures are used for sentences and the smaller units of language" (p. 81). Newmark's classification of translation methods and procedures is partially in line with that of Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) but is much more detailed-oriented. He categorized translation methods into 15 subcategories of transference; naturalization; cultural equivalent; functional equivalent; descriptive equivalent; synonymy; through translation; shifts or transposition; modulation, recognized translation; compensation; componential analysis; paraphrase; couplets; notes, addition, and glasses. A more detailed description of terms is explained in procedure section since Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) and Newmark's (1988) translation models were adopted in the present study.

2.1. Collocation translation

Generally, collocations are difficult for non-native speakers to translate because they are obscure and some of which cannot be translated on a word by word basis. So, it is highly recommended that translators use acceptable procedures in translating them. Baker (2011) suggests that patterns of collocation are largely arbitrary and independent of meaning. This is so both within and across languages. Furthermore, Lewis (2000) argues that collocation is a language-specific phenomenon which has definite features that make it different from one language to another. Moreover, this phenomenon is also affected by the cultural differences between languages. Eventually, they all make the process of translating collocations so problematic and demanding. Al-Rawi (1994) maintaines that finding collocational equivalences between two different languages is often 'far-fetched and not feasible'. However, he suggests that one of the reasonable ways to translate collocations is to examine the collocational ranges of any lexical items in the TL that are acceptable and possible because "each item in a language has its peculiar ranges and its sets of collocations which usually limit its meaningful usages "(p.186). Specificity is an important factor that should be taken into account while dealing with the translation of collocations. Baker (2011) believes that the correct choice of a collocation across two languages should also be influenced by register or genre; collocations that are acceptable in one discourse might not be appropriate in another. Take a swerving cross or a long or short cross as examples may not function as credible collocations in a religious text, but they would be considered appropriate in a text on football.

Baker (2011) maintaines that there are certain collocations that their meaning as a whole is different from its individual components. For instance, sharp eyes would be translated wrongly if the translator failed to notice that the word sharp when collocates with eyes, needs to be translated as keen. Some linguists have widely

investigated the process of translating collocation. (Baker, 2011; Newmark, 1988; Lorscher, 1991; Vinay & Darbelnet, 1995). Their studies focused on the correlation between the strategies employed by the translators and the difficulties encountered in translation. Originally, past studies took the translation strategies as solutions for handling translational problems. However, employing certain strategies can themselves result in further complications and problems. Newmark (1988) has acknowledged the complications translators might encounter at different levels and thus formulated certain strategies that would be helpful for the translator to overcome these problems. These problems can be minimized when "translators depend on certain strategies, which may be quite effective when dealing with linguistic similarities but lead to serious problems in case of cultural disparity" (p. 81). The strategies are, "word-for-word translation, literal translation, faithful translation, semantic translation, adaptation, free translation, idiomatic translation and communicative translation" (p.45). Newmark (1988) emphasizes communicative translation in which the "translator attempts to render the exact contextual meaning of the original in such a way that both content and language are readily acceptable and comprehensible to the readership" (p. 47). Baker (2011) also formulates eight strategies to cope with the lack of equivalence at a phrase level. She suggested certain strategies such as superordinate by using a more general word or by more neutral or less expressive word, by cultural substitution translation applying a loan word with further explanations such as footnotes, by omitting information; omission and eventually, translators can paraphrase by lengthening the target text.

2.2. Empirical studies on collocation translation

Some researchers (Abdul-Fattah & Zughoul, 2003; Bahumaid, 2006; Brashi, 2005) have extensively investigated the procedures followed either by EFL or by translators in order to overcome obstacles in the translation of collocations. Abdul-Fattah & Zughoul (2003) carried out their study on EFL university learners at both graduate and the undergraduate levels. The researchers aimed at finding out the proficiency of EFL learners in rendering collocations and the strategies used in producing Arabic collocations. They wanted to investigate the competence of those learners in rendering into English the Arabic verb "kasara" "broke". The test was administered in two forms that consisted of 16 lexical sequences of the verb "broke". The sample of the study consisted of two groups of EFL university students at Yarmouk University. Data analysis revealed that the overall performance of the subjects in the target collocations was far from satisfactory. It also identified twelve distinct communicative strategies that were characterized as, "avoidance, literal translation, substitution, overgeneralization, quasi-metaphorical similarity, assumed synonymy, derivativeness, imitation of literary style, idiom, paraphrase and circumlocution, graphic ambiguity and finally, false TL assumption" (Abdul-Fattah & Zughoul, 2003).

Bahumaid (2006) studied the strategies employed by the translators in translating collocations whose TL equivalents are unknown to them. The result indicated that translators resorted to several procedures. He conducted his study on four Arab university professors who taught translation and did translation work. The two-part translation test consisted of thirty sentences on contextualized collocations of different types. The sentences contained 15 English collocations. Some of the collocations selected for the test were of the general type as "to make noise" while others were associated with a specific register. The results indicated that culture-bound and register-specific posed the greatest challenge in translation whereas, collocations that have literal meanings were relatively easier to render. In addition, translators utilized certain strategies such as giving the meaning of the collocations, using synonyms or near-synonyms, attempting literal renditions and finally avoiding to translate.

The present study mainly aims at discovering the various procedures applied by BA translation students as a result of the difficulties faced in translating collocations from English to Persian. Accordingly, following

research questions are posed:

1. What are the main causes of mistranslation of collocations in context by Iranian BA Translation students?

2. What procedures do BA Translation students employ in translating collocations in context from English to Persian?

3. What are the main causes of mistranslation of collocations out of context by Iranian BA Translation students?

4. What procedures do BA Translation students employ in translating collocations out of context from English to Persian?

5. Is there any significant difference between the translation of collocations in context and out of context?

3.Method

3.1.Participants

The participants of this research (N=20) were Iranian male and female (12 females and 8 males) English Translation students between 18 and 20 of age, studying at a B.A. level at the University of Kashan. They had taken a speaking course with the researcher of the present study. They were at an intermediate level and were studying Topnotch 3B. A professional translator was also invited to translate the collocations to consider his translations as a criterion for evaluating the accuracy of participants' responses.

3.2.Instrument

In order to collect the data, the researcher utilized two tasks. Task 1 (Appendix A) consisted of 20 sentences containing verb-noun and adjective-noun lexical collocation. The second task (Appendix 2) consisted of 20 verb-noun and adjective-noun lexical collocations out of context. The collocational scope of these tests was restricted to the verb-noun and adjective-noun since it was hypothesized that these two combinations were more difficult to translate. Regarding the sources of the lexical collocation in the translation task, the researcher decided to use the collocations in the course books the subjects had already studied, the Top Notch series. Since the tests were designed by the researcher, they were subjected to a pilot study to make sure of their reliabilities. The reliabilities of translation tasks 1 and 2 proved to be 87% and 85% respectively.

3.3.Procedure

To achieve the goals of the study, two collocation translation tasks were designed and given to a group of BA translation students to translate from English to Persian. The subjects took the tests one by one since they were supposed to be interviewed as soon as they finished translating. Elicited imitation technique was employed to explore how they came up with those translations for the collocations. All responses were recorded for further analysis. As it was mentioned before, a professional translator was asked to translate the collocations and his translation was used as a criterion for judging the accuracy of the participants' responses. As for the inter-rater reliability, the researcher asked one of his colleagues, who had been teaching translation courses for a couple of years, to rate the translations and examine the extracted procedures. In order to categorize the procedures the subjects employed in translation collocations, Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) and Newmark's (1988) translation models were adopted. Both translation models have been regarded as very popular and comprehensive classifications among scholars. Accordingly, they were chosen as the theoretical framework of this study. The procedures which were applied from these two models are explained in details below.

1. Calque: Calque is "a special kind of borrowing whereby a language borrows an expression from another, but then translates literally each of its elements" (Munday, 2009, p.171). For instance, when a translator translates 'black coffee' to 'قهوه سیاه' in Persian, they resort to calquing strategy. Newmark (1988) called it 'Through-Translation'where the translator imitates the structure or manner of expression of the ST in his translation.

2. Literal translation: literal translation is "a word-for-word rendering which uses the same number of TL words in the form of established equivalents as well as the same word order and word classes" (Munday, 2009, p. 182)

3. Transposition: Transposition "concerns grammatical shift such as word class changes" (Munday, 2009, p. 212). It involves a change in the grammar from SL to TL, for example, change from singular to plural or the change needed when a specific SL structure does not exist in the TL or change of an SL verb to a TL word, change of an SL noun group to a TL noun and so on (Newmark, 1988). For example, 'happily married' in English is considered as an 'adverb +adjective' collocation but it is translated to 'زوج خوشبخت' in Persian which is an adjective + noun combination.

4. Modulation: This procedure requires a "variation of the form of the message, obtained by a change in the point of view" (Venuti, 2000, p. 89). According to Newmark (1988),it occurs when "the translator reproduces the message of the original text in the TL text in conformity with the current norms of the TL, since the SL and the TL may appear dissimilar in terms of perspective" (p.88). For example, when 'no harsh voice' is translated to 'صدای ملایم', modulation is employed.

5. Equivalence: "Equivalence refers to cases where languages describe the same situation by different stylistic or structural means" (Munday, 2001, p. 58). For example, when "her deceased husband" is translated to " همسر فقیدش" in Persian, it is considered as an equivalence in this classification.

6. Adaptation: Adaptation is "changing the cultural reference when a situation in the source culture does not exist in the target culture" (Munday, 2001, p. 58). For instance, "the traditional turkey dinners served by British at Christmas are still largely unknown to most Germans" (Munday, 2009, p. 212).

7. Omission: this strategy is used to concentrate or suppress elements in the TL text. This strategy refers to items where no translation or partial translation is offered by a translator (Munday, 2009).

8. Neutralizing: According to Newmark (1988), this is "when a translator cannot recall a specific verb inthe target language to describe an action and resort to using a neutral or generic verb"(p.82). For example, when 'keep awake' is translated to 'بیدار نگه داشتن'instead of 'بیدار ماندن' in Persian, translators resort to neutralizing procedure.

3.4.Data analysis

In order to respond to the last research question, whether the context has any effect on translating collocations, the results had to be first numerically coded. To do so, the following guidelines were developed. The scoring guidelines are presented in Table 1 below:

Table 1

Guidelines for Scoring the Translation of Collocations

0

No response or the translation is incorrect (e.g. the participant's translation is unrelated
to the meaning of the collocation.

0.5

The response is relevant, but it is not the exact collocation in Persian (e.g. the participant has neutralized the
verb or used it in a generic sense or applied near synonyms for adjectives and verbs)

1

The response is correct (e.g. the participant has captured the meaning of the collocation and applied the
exact Persian collocations)

The collected data were analyzed using SPSS version 24 software package for statistical analysis in social
sciences. It included descriptive analysis of both translation tasks and a paired sample t-test to examine the effect
of context in the translation of collocations and whether the mean difference is significant.

4.Results

This section presents the results of tasks 1 and 2, causes of mistranslation of collocations inside and outside of
context as well as the procedures employed by the participants in translating the collocations from English to
Persian.

Task 1

The first research question aimed at investigating the causes of mistranslation of collocations in context. To do so,
the researcher and another translation instructor analyzed the translations provided for each lexical collocation
and classified them into two groups of acceptable and unacceptable, then the explanations they had provided for
each translation through elicited imitation technique were all scrutinized. The result of this analysis is provided
in Table 2 below.

Table 1

Causes of Mistranslation of Collocations in Context

	English Collocations	Acceptable Persian Translation	N of acceptable translations		N of unacceptable translations		Subjects mistranslations	Causes of mistranslation
1	Shake hands	دست دادن	17	85%	3	15%	دست تکان دادن	L.T
2	get the message	منظور کسی رو فهمیدن	11	55%	9	45%	پیغام کسی رو گرفتن	L.T
3	play a joke	دست انداختن	4	20%	16	80%	شوخی کردن	R.C.C
4	make a living	امرار معاش کردن- پول در آوردن-نان در	6	40%	14	60%	ساختن زندگی- سبک زندگی- زندگی کردن	L.T R.C.C

		آوردن					
5	passed a law	قانونی را وضع کردن- قانونی را تصویب کردن	16	80%	4	20%	قانونی را درست کردن	Neutralizing
6	serve a sentence	دوران محکومیتی رو گذراندن	16	80%	4	20%	خدمت کردن در زندان	R.C.C
7	keep an eye on	مراقب.....بودن – مواظب.....بودن- زیر نظر گرفتن – پاییدن	18	90%	2	10%	چشماتو تگه دار روی	L.T
8	Make room	جا باز کردن	14	70%	6	30%	گذاشتن / جا پیدا کردن	R.C.C / Neutralization
9	Sprained my ankle	مچ پام پیچ خورد	12	60%	8	40%	مچ پامو پیچوندم	L. T
10	Make the bed	تخت رو مرتب کردن	10	50%	10	50%	تخت رو درست کردن / استراحت کردن	L.T / R.C.C
11	soft drink	نوشیدنی غیر الکلی	2	10%	18	90%	نوشیدنی / آب میوه / نوشیدنی ملایم	omission / R.C.C / L.T
12	Strong smell	بوی زننده – بوی تند	17	85%	3	15%	بوی قوی	L.T
13	junk food	هله هوله	18	90%	2	10%	غذای غیر ضروری	L.T
14	fast read	روان خونده شدن -	18	90%	2	10%	تند خوانی	L.T
15	black coffee	قهوه تلخ	2	20%	18	80%	قهوه غلیظ- قهوه سیاه	L.T / R.C.C
16	Express train	قطار سریع سیر-قطار تند رو	18	90%	2	10%	قطار بیان شده	L.T
17	Heavy smoker	سیگاری قهار	18	90%	2	10%	معتاد	R.C.C
18	Poor condition	شرایط بد- اصفناک	15	75%	5	25%	شرایط فقیرانه	L.T
19	Excess baggage	اضافه بار	15	75%	5	25%	چمدان زیادی	R.C.C
20	Criminal record	سابقه کیفری	16	80%	4	20%	سابقه مجرم	L.T

L.T: Literal Translation

R.L.C: Restricted Collocational Competence

The above table shows that there are 263 instances of acceptable translations (65.83%) and 137 (34.17%) unacceptable ones from a total of 400 instances of translatedcollocations. The figures prove that the subjects provided higher appropriate equivalents for English collocations. The last column of Table 2 shows the causes of mistranslation of collocations. Table 3 illustrates the percentages and frequencies of reasons for the wrong translations of collocations.

Table 2

Frequencies and percentages of the causes of mistranslating collocation

Kinds of Causes of Mistranslation	Frequency of mistranslations	Percentages of mistranslations
Literal translation	14	53.84%
Neutralizing	9	7.69%
Restricted collocational competence	2	34.61%
Omission	1	3.84%

According to Table 3 above, literal translation (53.84%) and restricted collocational competence (34.61%) were the most noticeable causes of mistranslation of collocations. Two instances of neutralization (7.69%) and one instance of omission (3.84%) were also discovered. Restricted collocational competence was not included in the theoretical framework chosen for the study and it was added based on the subjects' explanations.

Table 4 below demonstrates the different types of procedures the subjects resorted to in translating English collocations into Persianin context. They were categorized based on the theoretical framework offered by Vinay and Darbelnet (1995) and Newmark (1988) and the subjects' explanations after doing the task 1.

Table 3

Frequencies of applied procedures for translating collocation in context

	English collections	Calque	Modulation	transposition	Omission Partial	Omission Total	Literal Translation	Equvalence	adaptation	neutralization
1	shake hands			17			3			
2	get the message						9	11		
3	play a Joke	8						4		8
4	make a living		4	2			8	6		
5	passed a law							15		5
6	Serve a sentence	8						12		
7	keep an eye on						2	17		
8	make room		10			2	3	3		2
9	sprain ankle		4	5			10	1		
10	make the bed						10	10		
11	soft drink				9			5	6	
12	strong smell						3	17		
13	junk food			18			2			
14	fast read			18			2			
15	black coffee	17						3		
16	express						18	2		

	train											
17	Heavy smoker						5	15				
18	Poor condition											
19	Excess baggage	5		15								
20	criminal record						4	16				

As shown in Table 4, the subjects used different procedures intranslating collocations among which some seem more noticeable. In order tohave a better understanding of what translation procedures the participants more resortedto, the frequency and the percentage of each procedure was calculated. Table 5 belowillustrates the frequencies and the percentages of strategies used by the subjects intranslating English collocations into Persian within sentences.

Table 4

The frequency and percentage of translation procedures

Translation Procedures	Frequency	Percentage
Calque	38	9.50%
Modulation	18	4.50%
Transposition	77	19.25%
Partial Omission	9	2.25%
Total omission	2	0.50%
Literal Translation	80	20%
Adaptation	6	1.50%
Equivalence	155	38.75%
Neutralization	15	3.75%

As can be seen from Table 5, equivalence (38.75%) emerged as the most conspicuous procedure in translating collocations into Persian. Literal translation is the next noticeable procedure to which 20% of the subjects resorted. Transposition (19.25%),calque (9.5%), modulation (4.5%), neutralization (3.75%) and partial omission (2.25%)were the next applied procedures in a row. Total omission (1.59%) and adaptation (1.59%) were the least resorted procedures.

Task 2

The second task aimed at exploring the procedures the translators employ in translating verb-noun and adjective-noun types of collocations out of context. Similar to tasks1, Vinay and Darbelnet (1995) and Newmark' (1998) model of translation and explanations of subjects were utilized to explore the causes of mistranslations and the procedures they employed in translating English collocations into Persian. The frequencies and percentages of acceptable and unacceptable translations and the causes of mistranslation of collocations are provided in Table 6 below.

Table 5

Causes of mistranslation of collocations out of context

N	English Collocations	Acceptable Persian translation	N of acceptable translation		N of unacceptable translation		Subjects' mistranslation	Causes of mistranslation
1	Take a chance	ریسک کردن- شانس خود را امتحان کردن	17	85%	3	15%	شانس آوردن	R.C.C
2	Keep a diary	خاطرات رو نوشتن	14	70%	6	30%	نگه داشتن محصولات لبنی	Malapropism L.T
3	Raise money	پول جمع آوری کردن	5	25%	15	75%	اضافه حقوق	R.C.C L.T
4	Make excuses	بهانه آوردن	14	70%	6	30%	عذر خواهی کردن	R.C.C
5	Grow beard	ریش گذاشتن	10	50%	10	50%	ریش بلند	R.C.C L.T
6	Deposit money	پول به حساب واریز کردن	3	15%	17	85%	سپرده گذاری پول	L.T R.C.C
7	Take advice	نصیحت پذیرفتن	9	45%	11	55%	نصیحت کردن	R.C.C
8	Expect a baby	باردار بودن	14	70%	6	30%	منتظر بچه بودن	L.T
9	Take an exam	امتحان دادن	8	40%	12	60%	امتحان گرفتن	L.T
10	Hire a taxi	دربست گرفتن	9	45%	11	55%	تاکسی گرفتن	R.C.C
11	Sharp eyes	تیزبین	14	70%	6	30%	چشم تیز کردن	R.C.C
12	Strong tea	چای پررنگ	11	55%	9	45%	چای قوی	L.T
13	Runny nose	آبریزش بینی	13	80%	7	20%	بینی روان	L.T R.C.C
14	Tough time	دوران سخت- مشقت بار	13	65%	7	35%	ساعت سخت	L.T
15	False teeth	دندان مصنوعی	10	50%	10	50%	دندان خراب	R.C.C
16	Dull pain	درد مزمن	9	45%	11	55%	درد خفیف	R.C.C
17	Tender meat	گوشت ترد	11	55%	9	45%	گوشت فاسد	R.C.C
18	Tight budget	بودجه محدود	14	70%	6	30%	بودجه کساد	R. L.C
19	Flat battery	باطری بدون شارژ	13	65%	7	35%	باطری تخت	L.T
20	Sharp turn	گردش ناگهانی	2	10%	18	90%	گردش تیز	L.T
	Total		213	53.25	187	46.75		

Table 6 above is indicative of 213 instances of acceptable translation (53.25%) and 187 (46.75%) unacceptable ones from a total of 400 instances of translated collocations out of context. It proves that the subjects provided almost the same number ofacceptable and unacceptable equivalents for the collocations. The last column suggests the causes of mistranslation of collocations. Table 7 belowshows the percentages and frequencies of reasons for the mistranslations of collocations.

Table 6

Frequency of the subjects' causes of mistranslation of collocations out of context

Kinds of Causes of Mistranslation	N of mistranslations	Percentages of mistranslations
Restricted Collocation Knowledge	13	52%
Literal Translation	11	45.83%
Malapropism	1	4.17%

As it is represented in Table 7 above, the subjects mistranslated the collocations out of context for three reasons. Restricted collocational competence and literal translation were the most obvious reasons, 52% and 45.83% respectively. There was one instance in which the subjects mistranslated due to the confusion of similar sounds called 'malapropism' (4.17%). This procedure was not included in the theoretical translation model of the study and the researcher identified it based on the explanation of subjects after the translation task. Malapropism is defined, according to the *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (2010), as "the unintentional misuse of a word by confusion with one of similar sound, especially when creating a ridiculous effect." That is, the translator uses a word similar to the one that collocates with the word in the collocation. In translation task 2, some subjects confused the word 'diary' with 'dairy'.

Table 8 below represents the procedures the subjects employed in translating English collocations out of context into Persian. The last two columns were not included in the translation framework suggest by Vinay and Darbelnet (1995) and Newmark (1998) and they were added by the researcher based on the subjects' explanations immediately after doing the translation task.

Table 7

Frequencies of procedures for translating lexical collocations out of context

N	English Collocations	Calque	modulation	transposition	omission	Literal translation	Equivalence	Malapropism	others
1	Take a chance	3					17		
2	Keep a diary				8		10	2	
3	Raise money		2		2	11	5		
4	Make excuses			11					9
5	Grow beard			4		6	10		
6	Deposit money			3		14	3		
7	Take advice					11	3		6
8	Expect a baby					6	14		
9	Take an exam					12	8		
10	Hire a taxi						9		11
11	Sharp eyes			14			6		
12	Strong tea				3	7	10		
13	Runny nose				3	2	13		2
14	Tough time				2	4	14		

#											
15	False teeth					5		5	10		
16	Dull pain	5			6			5			4
17	Tender meat				5			13			2
18	Tight budget				4			15			1
19	Flat battery	7	9				4				
20	Sharp turn						18	2			

As illustrated in Table 8, the subjects applied different procedures in translating collocations among which some strategies stood out as more conspicuous. In order to have a better understanding of what translation procedures the participants more resorted to, the percentage of each strategy was calculated. Table 9 summarizes the frequencies and the percentages of procedures used by the subjects in translating English collocations out of context into Persian.

Table 8

Frequency of applied procedures in translation collocations out of context

Transposition	Frequency	Percentage
Calque	3	0.75%
Modulation	14	3.50%
Transposition	41	10.25%
Partial omission	34	8.50%
Total omission	2	0.50%
Literal translation	100	25%
Malapropism	2	0.50%
Equivalence	167	41.75%
Others	35	8.75%
Total	400	100%

As it is represented in Table 8, most participants attempted to provide appropriate Persian equivalents (41.75%) for the English collocations. Literal translation (25%) is the second procedure to which most subjects resorted. Transposition (10.25%) partial omission (8.5%), and the modulation (3.5%) are the next employed procedures. Calque (0.75%), total omission (0.5%) and malapropism (0.5%) are the least applied procedures. Totally, 8.75% of the collocations did not belong to any translation procedures.

Comparing the Results of Task 1 and Task 2

The first task is about translating 20 English verb-noun and adjective-noun collocations in context into Persian. The results show that 65.83%.of subjects translated appropriately and the other 34.17% did not provide an acceptable translation. The second task is about translating 20 verb-noun and adjective-noun collocations out of context .The result of task 2 indicated that 53.25% and 46.75% of subjects provided acceptable and unacceptable translations respectively. Equivalence, literal translation, and transposition emerged as the most conspicuous procedures in translating collocations in both tasks 1 and 2. In order to examine the effect of context on the

translation of collocations, each participant received a score out of 20 in each translation task. To do so, the translation's result of each subject was numerically coded based on the guidelines explained before. Each score was taken from the deduction of the average marks by two raters. The descriptive statistics of both translation tasks are provided in Table 10 below.

Table 9

Descriptive analysis of task 1 and task 2

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	task1	15.1500	20	3.01357	.67385
	task2	12.9000	20	3.17722	.71045

As Table 10 suggests, there is an obvious difference between the mean scores of the participants in the translation of collocations within and out of context. Apparently, they had a higher mean score in task1 (i.e. collocations in context), 15.15, than that of task 2 (collocations out of context), 12.90. In order to determine whether there is a significant difference between their scores, a paired sample t-test was run. Table 11 represents the results of paired sample t-test.

Table 11

Paired sample t-test between task 1 and task 2

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences							
					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	task1 - task2	2.25000	1.01955	.22798	1.77284	2.72716	9.869	19	.000

As shown in Table 11, the p-value (labeled sig) for the equality of means is .000 and it is smaller than 0.05. Therefore, it proves that there is a significant difference between the performance of the subjects in the translation of collocation within and out of context. The result suggests that providing context makes a significant different in translation collocations.

5.Discussion

This study attempted to investigate the causes of mistranslation of verb-noun and adjective-noun collocations from English to Persian in and out of context among Iranian BA Translation students and also the procedures they resort to in translating those collocations based on Vinay-Darbelnet (1995) and Newmark's (1988) model of translation and the subjects' explanations immediately after doing the translations using elicited imitation technique. It also endeavored to discover whether providing context makes a significant difference in translating collocations. Analyzing the procedures revealed that equivalence and literal translation were the most conspicuous procedures in translating collocations in both task 1 and task 2.Applying procedures such as equivalence, transposition and modulation suggest a tendency to provide dynamic and free translations in TL among the subjects. Analyzing data also showed that there are many differences between English and Persian in

translating verb-noun and adjective-noun collocations and this might be due to specificities and variabilities of the collocations in the two languages.

Our result supports the findings of Al-Sughair's (2011) study that investigated collocations from English to Arabic. He found that "collocations are also modified in translation and therefore both marked and unmarked collocations have unmarked translations. In some cases, collocations end up as non-collocations in the target text" (p. iii). Our finding is also similar to those of Heylen and Kerry (1994) and Hwas and Shalbaq (2012) that suggested literal translation could cause some problems in translating adjective-noun collocations. Similarly, the result of translating verb-noun and adjective-noun collocations from English to Persian in this research indicated that literal translation is not a suitable method in translating collocations and cannot create an appropriate, natural and familiar translation that could have the same effect as the original on the target audience.

With regard to the causes of mistranslation of collocations, our findings, to some extent, supports the result of the research done by Rabeh (2009). He found out that literal translation is the main cause of mistranslation of collocations out of context. In our study, however, literal translation stood in a second rank and restricted collocational competence came out as the main apparent cause of wrong translation of collocations. The result of the causes of mistranslation of collocations revealed that there are a number of reasons for such a difficulty. Firstly, the influence of source language (i.e. English here) which resulted mainly in transferring the source language collocation directly into Persian (literal translation).Secondly, the misunderstanding of the meaning of the source language collocations which resulted in mistranslating the English collocation, omitting part of the collocation, or even not translating the collocation at all. For example, most participants provided a wrong translation for 'soft drink'. Another important reason might lay in the lack of enough exposure to Standard Persian. Thus, the more the translators are exposed to Standard Persian through reading and listening, the more they should be able to demonstrate appropriate collocations in their translations, as it is not open for translators to misuse and misinterpret the collocations. It should also be pointed out that the production of inappropriate translation outcomes could possibly be attributed to the use of general-purpose bilingual dictionaries. The use of such dictionaries with their lists of context-free words without any detailed explanations or examples of collocations could be another source of producing inappropriate translation outcomes.

Comparing the translation of collocations in and out of context provides new insights into the way the subjects processed and translated collocations. The significant outperformance of the subjects in translating collocations in context to their translations out of context suggests that collocations are best understood in context. Furthermore, the explanations of the subjects immediately after doing the tasks reveal that some of the collocations sounded unfamiliar to them but the context helped them to come up with the sound translation. Except for one instance, all collocations were translated by the subjects in task 1 but some collocations were partially or totally omitted in task 2 due to the lack of context for them to be guessed. In order to translate collocations, the translator needs to analyze the source text and find out the writer's intention to understand the right meaning. Hatim and Munday (2004) maintained that meaning and translation are affected by the context in which they occur.

The main cause of mistranslation of collocations was literal translation in task 1. Literal translation sometimes results in mistranslation of collocations because some collocations cannot be translated on a word by word basis. Restricted collocational competence emerged as the main reason of wrong translation of collocations in task 2. The pre-existing collocational competence has a great role in translational competence of students. This competence should be improved through extensive practice and exposure to both written and spoken discourse. The second reason of mistranslation in both tasks attributed to the literal translation. It shows that most collocations cannot be translated on a word by word basis.

In conclusion, a large number of unacceptable translation of collocations in both task 1 and 2 of this study demand a more serious attention to the notion of collocation in general and translation of collocations in particular and ignoring them will lead to the mistranslation of collocations. Thus, translation students should undergo various programs for learning how to translate collocations and other lexical elements. Results of our study revealed that the subjects had to deviate from the source collocations and change the form or to translate a type of collocation to another type. In some cases they had to translate English collocations to a statement in Persian that is not considered a collocation. This study also concludes that some changes inevitably happen in translating collocations from SL into TL. Changing the form of the original text in the translation of collocations is unavoidable in some places during the translation process because languages have different natures, specifically languages that come from different families like English and Persian. Hence, collocations could be translated freely and sometimes innovative constructions might be created or in some cases, collocations may be completely or partially omitted from the original text.

References

Abdul-Fattah, H. & Zughoul, M. (2003). Translational collocational strategies of Arab learners of English. *Babel*, 49 (1), 57-77.

Al-Rawi,S. (1994).Collocations in Arabic. Unpublished PHD thesis. Baghdad: Baghdad University.

Al-Sughair, Y. (2011).The translation of English collocations in literary texts. Unpublished master thesis. American University of Sharjah College of Arts and Sciences, UAE.

Bahumaid,S. (2006). Collocation in English-Arabic translation. *Babel*, 52, 132-151.

Baker, M. (2011). *In other words: A course book on translation*. New York: Routledge.

Benson, M., Benson, E., & Ilson, R. (1997). *The BBI dictionary of English wordcombinations.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Brashi, A. S. (2005). Arabic Collocations: Implications for Translation. *IRAL*, 33(4).

Chesterman, A. (1997). *Memes of translation: The spread of ideas in translation theory*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: J. Benjamins Publication Company.

Færch, C., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (1983). *Strategies in interlanguage communication*. Longman Public Group

Hatim, B. & Mayson, I. (1997). *The translator as communicator*. London and New York: Routledge group.

Hatim, B. & Munday, J. (2004). *Translation: An advanced resource book*. London and New York: Routledge

Heylen, D., & Kerry M. (1994). Lexical Functions and the Translation of Collocations. In Proceedings of Euralex.http://www.euralex.org/elx_proceedings/Euralex1994/33_Euralex_Dirk%20Heylen% 20and%20Kerry%20Maxwell%20%20Lexical%20Functions%20and%20the%20Tran slation%20of%20Collocations.pdf

Hwas, A. S. A., & Shalbaq, R. A. (2012). *Translating collocations: Difficulties encountered by university students in Libya*. International Conference, the Future of Education. 2ndEd.Retrievedfromhttp://www.pixelonline.net/edu_future2012/common/download/A bstract_pdf/620-SLA13-ABS-HwasFOE2012.pdf.

Lewis, M. (1993). *The lexical approach: The state of ELT and a way forward*. London: Language Teaching Publications.

Lewis, M. (1997). *Implementing the lexical approach: Putting theory into practice*. London: Language Teaching Publications.

Lewis, M. (2000). *Teaching collocation: Further developments in the lexical approach*. London: Language Teaching Publications.

Lörscher, W. (1991). *Translation performance, translation process, and translation strategies: A psycholinguistic investigation* (Vol. 4). G. Narr.

Munday, J. (2009). *The Routledge companion to translation studies.* Routledge.

Munday, G. (2012). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Nida, E. A. (1964). Toward a science of translating. Leiden: E. J. Brill

Oxford (2010): Collocations dictionary for students of English. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Rabeh, F. (2009). *Problems in translating collocations*. Unpublished master thesis Mentouri University. Constantine

Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, concordance, collocation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John   Benjamins.

Vinay, J.-P. & Darbelnet, J. (1958). A methodology for translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (pp. 84-95). London: Routledge.

Appendix A

Translation Task 1

Instruction: Translate the following sentences into Persian

1. I've tried telling him that I don't want to see him again but he doesn't seem to be getting the message.
2. My classmates used to play a joke on the teacher by hiding under their desks before she came into the room
3. It is polite to shake hands at the end of a business meeting when the host and the guest   need to leave.
4. The judge ordered that the thief should serve a sentence of two years in prison.
5. I need to use the restroom. Could you please keep an eye on my luggage till I get back?
6. Last month, the parliament passed a law requiring all motorcyclists to wear a helmet.
7. The secretary entered with the coffee tray and made room for it on the desk.
8. It's nothing very serious. You have just sprained your ankle.
9. I was going to be an artist but it was hard to make a living as an artist, so I decided to study medicine.
10. My wife usually makes the bed on the weekdays and I usually do it on the weekend.
11. I didn't like the house I looked at today. It was rather cramped and there was a strong smell in the basement.
12. My son drinks orange juice every day. In fact, it is his favorite soft drink
13. David took the express train to the airport in order to arrive on time.
14. My sister is very careful about her diet. She always avoids eating junk food.
15. Detective stories are good for a train journey as they are fast read. They are enjoyable and easy to follow.
16. According to the new law, anyone with a criminal record should not be hired in state companies.
17. When I feel dizzy, I drink a cup of black coffee. It really helps me calm down.

18. My father was a heavy smoker for many years. Fortunately, he gave it up last year.

19. In some parts of the world, people are living in poor conditions because of the war.

20. I didn't know I had to pay for the excess baggage in the airport.

Appendix B

Translation Task 2

Instruction: Translate the following combinations into Persian

1. Take a chance
2. Keep a diary
3. Raise money
4. Make excuses
5. Grow beard
6. Deposit money
7. Take advice
8. Expect a baby
9. Take an exam
10. Hire a taxi
11. Sharp eyes
12. Strong tea
13. 13 Runny nose
14. Tough time
15. False teeth
16. Dull pain
17. Tender meat
18. Tight budget
19. Flat battery
20. Sharp turn