The Relationship between EFL Learners' Explicit Knowledge of Source Language and Their Translation Ability

Fatemeh Safari[*]

PhD Candidates in TEFL, Faculty of Persian Literature and ForeignLanguages,
South Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between students' explicit knowledge in grammar and their translation ability. The importance of grammatical knowledge and its effectiveness in translation quality motivated the researcher to run this study and consider grammatical knowledge in Persian as the source language of Iranian students. It is clear that grammar is an area that may merit some level of explicit teaching in English translation curriculum, particularly if explicit knowledge is in the grammar of the source language. Through a Language Proficiency Test, Explicit knowledge of Persian Grammar Test, and Translation Ability Test, the explicit grammatical knowledge in Persian and the translation ability of 60 translation students at Islamic Azad University were measured. The result demonstrated that there was a moderately significant relationship between the students' grammatical knowledge and translation ability. On the other hand, the explicit knowledge of Persian grammar provides a significant impact on the quality of translation from English to Persian among Iranian undergraduate English translation students. An implication of this study is that awareness assists practitioners to employ some practical and useful techniques of translation in order to consider more practical knowledge of structural differences existing between languages as well as to reduce the learners' misunderstandings and to talk over the learners' needs in translation.

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays translation is considered as a medium through which people come to know different subjects and plays a crucial role in communication among nations. The 19th century faced with translation as a unilateral means of communication between scientists and scholars of the world. It was 20th century that was called translation era

and translation gained more importance. Then the emergence and flourishing of translation studies created it as a new field with a lot of ideas springing from anthropology, philosophy, literature, linguistics, literary studies, lexicology, semiotics, computer science and many other fields. Evidently, translation has played an important role in the human communication history for a long time. Munday (2016) mentions a long establishment for translation practices, although the study of the field developed into an academic

* Corresponding Author's Email:
safari.fateme1354@gmail.com

discipline only in the latter part of the twentieth century. The unique nature and extraordinary role of language used in various levels of human life caused the complexity of translation and necessitated the connection between language and linguistics studies with that discipline to pay more attention and consider its critical role in many international commercial, political and academic exchanges(Mohammadian & Hashemi Toroujeni, 2017).

As English became the universal language of science in the 20th century and English language began to consolidate its position as the strongest mediator, most scientific research is written in English all over the world. At the same time, there is a growing demand for communicating scientific knowledge to the public in the form of popular science magazines and TV documentaries as well as encyclopedias and books. Consequently, there is also an increasing call for translation of these works into language for the public reader in any country. They all make translation art and industry to undertake the serious responsibility of understanding various subjects, and interpreting meanings and implications of the languages to get the meanings in a source language, and then reconstructing their equivalents in the target language; i.e. creating and approving official equivalents for any general or technical terms in the target language. But there are various factors such as lack of proficiency of translator in both source and target languages and his/her limited knowledge in different specialized areas, cause deficiencies and disorders that make texts difficult to understand. Speaking professionally, it seems essential for translators and translation trainees to be aware of the problematic and effective factors on the quality of translations. In today's world, communication between different nations with different languages is feasible through translation. Whether translation is regarded as a science, art, or craft, it seems significant to note that good translation should play the same role in target language as the original did in the source language.

LITERATURE REVIEW
Translation
The word translation originally comes from Latin which means the ‗movement'. In translation, the movement happens between the language texts. As Catford (1965) states, translation is the replacement of textual material in one language by equivalent textual material in another language. Similarly, Newmark (1982) defines translation as a technique that replaces a text or written message with the same message in another language. So it is the interpreting of the meaning of a text and the subsequent production of an equivalent text. The text to be translated is called ―source text‖ and the language that it is to be translated into is called ‒target language‖; the final product is sometimes called the ―target text‖.

Leonardi (2009) states that "translation plays a very important role in an increasingly globalized world and in increasingly multilingual Europe where it is used on daily basis (p.17). Cronin (2003) argues that any form of global interaction cannot occur without interlingual activities and thus globalization denotes translation, yet many of us are simply unable or unwilling to overcome the associated language barrier and must therefore rely on translation provided by others to access information beyond our own individual linguistic reach. Traditionally, the translator (and interpreter) has played this role and provided a professional service in acting as an interlingual and intercultural communicator.

The term ‒translation‖ is defined as a process of replacing a text in one language by a text in another(House, 2009, p. 4). This is a very common definition of translation, which highlights its linguistic function. Yet translating is not only a linguistic act; it is also a cultural one, an act of communication across cultures(House, 2009, p. 11). From this perspective, translation may sometimes act as a means of learning about other cultures, a vehicle for the transfer of not only meaning but also of cultural values and experiences. It tends to be a component of many other disciplines such as literature, linguistics and language learning.

How translators perform in transforming the source language text to another one brings about four types of translation. Literal translation, proposed by Catford (1965)and Jerome (as cieted in Munday, 2016),refers to word by word translation regardless of the combination of words and putting the words in the correct positions regarding to the target language. Conceptual translation, as the best kind of translation, is not corresponding only to the text of source language, but it is done according to the text of target language regarding the order and combination of target language words. Free translation, in which the translator does not make himself to translate according the target language text and its expressions, but she / he changes the text according to the context and his preferences (Thomas, 1992). Narrative translation refers to a transforming when the translator may express the concept and meaning of text in the form of story (Mohammadian & Hashemi Toroujeni, 2017). Researchers (e.g., Mohammadian & Hashemi Toroujeni, 2017) state that every translation has almost a color of free translation and it is impossible to have literal translation. The reason is that the languages do not conform each other completely and finding the equivalencies between two languages shows the capability of a good translator.

In certain contexts, translation is a process, referring to what is happening when someone translates. In this view, Saʿedi (2004) defines translation as ―the process of establishing equivalence between the source language texts and target language texts‖ (p. 25). It aims at passing on ―an understanding to people in their own language and create the same impact as the original text‖(Galibert, 2004, p. 1). Houbert (1998) believes that ―translation is to be understood as the process whereby a message expressed in a specific source language is linguistically transformed in order to be understood by readers of the target language‖ (p. 12), In a similar vein, House (2009)believes that translation is always a process, because not only the target language text cannot be considered the exact equivalent of the source language text in terms of all the simulated,

stylistic, conceptual, and pragmatic aspects, but also a third party factor or subject (human commentator) with a complicated and dynamic thinking system is always between two source and target language texts. The commentator interprets source language text based on his/ her own modeling and release the final text as a result of his/her own interpretation. According to House (2009), modeling refers to the equivalences at macro-linguistics and functional-pragmatic levels. In the analytical framework of House, macro-linguistics includes lexical, grammatical and communicational transforming, while functional-pragmatic equivalence includes cultural contacts and situational contexts of two languages.

In a different assessment modeling, Abdulla (1994) holds that a successful translation is one that attempts to preserve ―the appropriate stylistic resources of the target language (p. 70). Furthermore, a good translation ‒must use the same register‖ (McNamara, 2002, p. 6). Similarly, Warren (2004) points out:

> The translated text has long occupied a relatively low status within the academic culture, due to its seemingly derivative and secondary nature. Lacking the ‗originality' still valued by many teachers and students of literature, translations generally only gain firm purchase in literary history when they somehow manage to surpass their source and to function as autonomous expressions. And yet translation is ubiquitous in medieval writing practices, literary and non-literary alike. (p.1)

In other contexts translation refers to a product, a text reproduced in one language based on an original text in another language. Considering the process of translation, students translate consciously or subconsciously when they are learning a language but the product refers to the translated texts produced by learners as an activity or part of an activity, as well as the interpreting of dialogues or spoken texts by students. The term ‗translation' commonly refers to both the written and the spoken modes although they are widely

different. As Munday (2016) mentions, the translation of written texts is named ―translation‖ while the translation of speech is called ‒interpreting‖.

To translate successfully, translators should be familiar with knowledge of source language, target language and the topic. The importance of translator knowledge in source language led Nida (1971, as cited in Thomas, 1992) to take into account the crucial problems in finding the closest natural equivalents for componential features. Correctness of translation is not determined in terms of corresponding sets of words but rather on the basis of corresponding sets of semantic components accurately represented in the restructuring. (Catford, 1965)calls it the formal correspondence representing that a structural category of the TL fills in the same place in SL. It's a system-based concept roles between any pair of languages whenever the concepts differ translation shifts would occur. It would be in the form of level shift or category shift. The former occurs when an SL item has an equal TL translation by which differences at the linguistic level emerge. According to Catford, the only possible shifts in translation are from grammar to lexis, or vice versa. The category shift happens in structure, class, intra-system, and unit.

The natural equivalents require syntactic and semantic knowledge but the first primary element to decode the text is the grammar used in the text. It is possible through grammar to find the meaning of a language text and then transfer it to the other language text. Catford (1965)mentions the textual equivalence in TL as an equivalent to the given text in the source language. Hatim and Munday (2004) stated that textual equivalence within translation notion is unavoidable and translators should make changes in translation due to the fact that there is no typical linguistic system between languages. Due to the nature of translating, it must always remain firmly linked with the grammatical features of language although these features are used for pragmatic ends.

The word equivalence is defined in dictionary as the condition of being equal or equivalent value and function. So the dictionary of translation studies explains the translation equivalence as the nature and extent of the relationship obtained within the source and target texts. Catford (1965) argued that the notion textual equivalence means ―any TL text or portion of text which is observed on a particular occasion to be the equivalent of a given SL text or portion of text‖ (p. 27). Based on this premise, the translator discovers the meaning behind the forms in the source language and does his best to produce the same meaning in the target language-using the forms and structures of the target language. So the translation must reflect the correct use of grammar, appropriate writing style, and terminology consistent with the subject to share the same meaning. They all refer to the translator's knowledge. The relationship between language learning and translation seems mutually valuable. The more proficient learners become in a language, the more competent they are likely to be at translating. On the other hand, translation can also be an indicator for students to be a more competent user of that language.

Grammar and Grammatical Knowledge

Grammatical knowledge plays a prominent factor in language learning and without a good knowledge of grammar, learners' language development will be severely constrained. It enables translators to know and apply how such sentence patterns should be put together. Chomsky (1965) defines grammar as ―the study of structural relationships in language or in a language sometimes including pronunciation, meaning, and linguistic history‖ (p. 17). But Williams. (2005) believes that ―grammar is about sentences—the form of the words and their functions in sentences,‖ and that ―analyzing individual sentences is a major part of grammatical study,‖ (p. 107).‖ Similarly, Huddleston. (1995) Huddleston (1995) considers the grammar of a language as a full description of the form and meaning of the sentences.

A knowledgeable translator should be aware of different perspectives in types of grammar ranging from prescriptive to cognitive grammar. Meanwhile, it is useful to be aware that there are two kinds of knowledge necessary to gain proficiency in a second language. These are known as explicit (conscious learning) and implicit (subconscious acquisition) knowledge . In terms of grammar teaching, explicit and implicit knowledge relates to declarative - procedural knowledge. As Anderson (1990) defines, ―Declarative knowledge refers to knowledge about facts and things; procedural knowledge refers to knowledge about how to perform various cognitive activities. Declarative knowledge is knowing that or what …; procedural knowledge is knowing how…‖ (p. 219). The declarative-procedural knowledge distinction is important in language teaching since it provides a knowledge-based distinction between competence and performance and supports a rationale of specifying the aim of learning grammar in terms of performance rather than competence. The explicit/implicit debate undoubtedly reaches its climax in discussions over grammar acquisition. In second language acquisition, explicit learning occurs when rules are emphasized as a type of metalinguistic knowledge: anything that makes learners aware of rules is explicit. Therefore, explicit knowledge refers to the ability to explain a generalization using metalanguage but implicit knowledge is seen as ‒the ability to learn without awareness when we acquire new knowledge without intending to do so and in such a way that this knowledge is difficult to express(Klein et al., 1986, p. 406).

Terrell (1991) as well as Ellis (1996) comments on explicit grammar instruction (EGI). Terrell (1991) proposes that EGI can affect the acquisition process in three different ways: (a) as an advance organizer, (b) as a meaning-form focuser; and (c) as monitoring. Krashen (1982) elaborates monitoring as an effective factor for self-correcting and improving accuracy. In the same way, Ellis (2009) maintains that explicit knowledge of grammar deals with language and the uses to which language can be put. This knowledge facilitates the intake and development of implicit language and it is useful to monitor language output. Explicit knowledge is generally accessible through controlled processing and it is conscious knowledge of grammatical rules learned through formal classroom instruction. In this respect, a person with explicit knowledge knows about language and the ability to articulate those facts in some way(Brown, 2000b). Sharwood (2004) confirms the effect of explicit knowledge in enhancing performance in implicit knowledge.

Explicit and Implicit Learning

Ellis (2009) considers explicit learning as a necessarily a conscious process in language learning and is generally intentional as well. Ellis relates its consciousness into hypothesis testing on the structural components which learner seeks for them. In a broad sense, Hulstijn (2012, p. 206) defines explicit learning as ‗a conscious, deliberative process of concept formation and concept linking‘. When explicit rules are used in teaching grammar, it brings conscious rules into play. Green and Hecht (1992) believe in its effectiveness and appoint that after stating rules, learners are able to get the correction right. The reason is that learners are exposed to explicit knowledge that Ellis, Loewen, and Erlam (2006) describe it as a kind of knowledge that learners are consciously aware of and it is typically only available through controlled processing. The awareness is related to intentional learning in Hulstijn‗s term. Hulstijn (2012) differentiates intentional and incidental instruction regarding the learners‘ attentiveness towards the upcoming test. According to Hulstijn (2012), label intentional refers to the fact that students are explicitly forewarned of an upcoming test, whereas the label incidental means that students are not forewarned of an upcoming test.

Whereas implicit learning takes place without either intentionality or awareness. Referring to R. Schmidt (2001) degree of awareness, confirms that there is no such thing as complete implicit

learning and so a better definition of implicit language learning might be ‗learning without any metalinguistic awareness' (p. 7). This definition is based on Schmidt's distinction of two types of awareness: awareness as noticing (involving perception) and metalinguistic awareness (involving analysis). So analysis is not involved in learning process with the absence of metalinguistic awareness. This point shows the consensus of all theorists on the implicit learning features (Ellis, 2005).Williams (2005); (Williams., 2005) argued that learning without awareness at the level of noticing is also possible.

In the case of learning, Ellis (1993) mentions that the term implicit refers to ―acquisition of knowledge about the underlying structure of a complex stimulus environment by a process that takes place naturally, simply and without conscious operations‖ (p. 2). In educational settings, teachers provide explicit correction as "an indication to a student that a form is incorrect and providing a correct form" (Brown, 2000a, p. 361) while implicit learning is "acquisition of linguistic competence without intention to learn and without focal awareness of what has been learned as opposed to explicit correction"(Brown, 2000a, p. 383). Some scholars, for example, Doughty and Williams (1998)maintain that knowledge can be gained and represented either implicitly or explicitly and both believe that the goal of explicit teaching is to ―get learner attention‖ whereas the aim of implicit focus on form is to ―attract learner attention‖ while minimizing any interruption to the communication of meaning‖(p. 232). The presence or absence of conscious operation made Rieder (2003)to find the root of this definition of explicit or implicit in psychology. The evidence for her statement was explanation from (Ellis, 2005). According to Ellis (1994), implicit knowledge refers to the acquisition of knowledge about the underlying structure that takes place naturally, simply and without conscious operation whereas explicit learning is characterized by more conscious operation in which learners engage in making and testing hypotheses about the structure. Hinkle and Fotos (2002) remind the

psycholinguistics foundation for instruction through consciousness raising that distinct two types of grammatical knowledge. Explicit knowledge named as declarative knowledge refers to conscious knowledge about grammatical rules and forms developed through instruction. Implicit or procedural knowledge is unconscious developed language through acts of meaning-focused communication.

The effectiveness of grammar instruction and its importance in English language learning situation was confirmed by many researchers(e.g., Fotos & Ellis, 1991; Hinkle & Fotos, 2002), who regard it as conscious raising for communicative exposure the target language. Fotos and Ellis (1991)also point out that knowledge of grammatical structures developed through formal instruction can make these structures more relevant and applicable.

Some researchers considered the extent of consciousness. For instance, Richard Schmidt (1994, p. 38) points out five types of consciousness as follows:

- Consciousness as intentionality (incidental vs. intentional learning)
- Consciousness as a product of attention (attended vs. unattended learning)
- Consciousness as awareness (learning with or without online awareness)
- Consciousness as instruction (implicit acquisition vs. explicit instruction)
- Consciousness as control (implicit vs. explicit memory)

Additionally, Richard Schmidt (1994)argues that the term unconscious can be interpreted in two ways. In first meaning implicit learning can be as unintentional thus incidental, in second meaning it involves induction without awareness. For that reason, consciousness as awareness has been a key element in distinguishing explicit learning from implicit learning.

Explicit Knowledge in Translation
Translation is deeply related to cognition and translator uses his explicit and implicit knowledge of grammar to provide a better translation.

As Chomsky (1976) states, performance is ‒the process of utilizing language knowledge in an actual context in order to encode a meaningful message. As far as explicit knowledge of grammar is concerned, the category of performance will enable us to see grammar as a knowledge-based skill. The aim of learning grammar is not to be able to transform one sentence into another nor to fill in the gaps in a sentence but to attain a level of competence which enables speakers to process contexts and to encode messages in meaningful, appropriate, and accurate ways.

Experts on L2 teaching and learning put emphasis on the combination of explicit grammar instruction with positive aspects of natural and authentic learning to consider both structure and meaning in text. This discourse-based approach has addressed instructional approaches and techniques for grammar teaching to determine what classroom pedagogy and techniques can best serve the needs of learners at various level of proficiency (Hinkle & Fotos, 2002).

Language learners and translation students may have a large vocabulary at higher level of proficiency which can help them to comprehend the text but as Nation (2014) states they don‘t know how to use those words in different contexts. According to Weston (1991), the problem is the existence of dissimilar thought patterns in learners‘ first and second language. So the methodologies applied in translation classes focus mainly on grammar and translation process. When students are engaged in translation, they have to think about grammar, verbal agreement, tense, etc. It takes time. While there is a time issue involved, they mostly apply existing language patterns in their mind and put them into translated words or sentences. This happens when they are interpreting or they are writing in English.

The lack of English-speaking practice and exposure to the target language cause translation students be challenged linguistically, academically, and socially. They construct their idea using their native language and then translate them into English. However, it brings up some translation difficulties due to the structural differences between the source language and the target language which lead to some changes in the content of the translated text. Catford (1965, as cited in Hijjo & Kadhim, 2017) used the term ‗translation shift‘ for the first time in order to explain transposition and shift in translation. To convey the message of a text in a specific context, the translator needs a certain amount of lexical and grammatical knowledge of both source and target languages. The differences at the structural features leads to some translation difficulties and requires changes in the content during the process of translation. Baker (1992) believes that the shifts happen if there is a lack of grammatical category either in the TL grammatical system or in the SL grammatical system. Munday (2016) also mentions them as small linguistic changes in the process of translation, however, it would affect the translator‘s decision to apply the shift. AsCatford (1965) states, translation shifts departure from ‗formal correspondence in the process of going from the SL to the TL‘ (p. 73). According to Catford (1965), formal correspondence is built between two languages since both languages texts function at the same grammatical units such as morpheme, word, clause, and sentence to cover the form and the content of the source text in the target text. Moreover, in Munday (2008) term translation shifts are considered as small linguistic changes occurring in translation of source text to target text and the main goal is to preserve the style and the expressive character of the source language(iko, 1970, as cited in Hijjo & Kadhim, 2017). The failure of translators in producing a proper translation shifts results in mismatches between the source language text and the target language text with many annotation errors (Nemati Moghaddam, Rezaee, & Translation, 2017).

Thus, the importance of explicit knowledge of grammar reveals that grammatical knowledge-understanding the rules in an intuitive ways-enables translators to act quickly and easily for purposes of communication. However, the implicit and explicit knowledge are deeply linked together in translator‘s mind. Due to some mistranslation stemming from poor explicit knowledge

of grammar and its relative effectiveness for detecting mistranslation or major interpretation problems (Hambleton, 2002) this study intends to examine the relationship between explicit knowledge of source language and EFL learners' translation ability. Therefore, the following research question was formulated:

- Is there any significant relationship between explicit knowledge of Persian grammar and translation ability of the translation students?

METHODS
Participants
The participants were undergraduate students studying in the last semester of English Translation studies at B A level atIslaic Azad University, Central Tehran Branch. Through the simple random sampling, total number of 60 senior students was selected. These students were informed about the reason for taking tests and were assured that their results would be confidentially used only for research purpose.

Instruments
The data of this study was gathered by three types of tests: a Language Proficiency Test, Explicit knowledge of Persian Grammar Test, and Translation Ability Test. First, the general test of TOEFL as a proficiency test was administered to assure the homogeneity of the participants. The second test was used to find out the students' explicit knowledge of Persian grammar. It was provided from an accredited Persian test source published by the Ministry of Education from 1998 to 2008 for Iranian University Entrance Exam. The test was composed of 40 questions in a multiple-choice format selected from 80 questions based on a Persian Literature experts' advice to best fulfil the research purposes. Then, the Translation Ability Test with two selected texts in English langauge was administered one week later. In addition to the tests, Farahzad's translation quality assessment model was used to score the translation test. As one of the most applocable

models in assessing, it was designed for eductional settings to score the translated texts considering their appropriateness, accuracy, naturalness, cohesion, and style. According to Farahzad (1992), the model enables the rater to evaluate the target text. For scoring each type of the translated text, the rater reads the text twice. He/she reads holistically first and checks the accuracy and appropriateness following the sentences and clauses as the unit of translation. The cohesion and style of the target text is checked later. However, in every analysis of the clauses, sentences, or the whole text, three features determine the score of the translator. The degree of closeness to the source text and the precision in the translation refer to accuracy. Conveying the fluency and the correctness of the structures in the sentences represent the appropriateness. Then cohesion and style are applied to the whole text.

Procedures
In order to obtain the required data on the research variables, the study was conducted among English Translation students in Islamic Azad University. First the proficinecy test of TOEFL was administered. Then the students knowledge at Persian grammar was measured. Finally, the Translation Ability Test was run. The type of questions in proficiency and grammar tests were in multiple-choice format. and Then the translated texts were scored according to Farahzad's (1992) scale by two expert raters. Based on Farahzad's scale, the target text must be read two times, first for checking the accuracy and appropriateness, then for cohesion and style. The sentence and clause were the unit of translation in checking for accuracy and appropriateness and each verb in the source language text was marked a score. In addition to the main clause, each sub-clause recieved one score. As regard with the cohesion and style, a correct sentence which didnot preserve the content, recieved no score. When the target version conveyed the message in which the structure distorted the meaning, the translation

recieved no score. In the case that the message was conveyed, albeit in a grammatically unnatural form, the translation recieved half a score.

RESULTS

The data collected through the study were analyzed using descriptive statistics for the TOEFL test. As Table 1 indicates, in proficiency test the mean was 56.733, with the standard deviation of 2.72. The participants whose score was within the range of 34-78 (one SD higher and lower than the mean score) were selected.

Table 1.
Descriptive Statistics for TOEFL

TOEFL Test	
Mean	56.733
Median	48.000
Mode	38.00
Std. Deviation	2.7282
Variance	516.5717
Range	75.00
Minimum	17.00
Maximum	92.00

According to the descriptive statistics obtained for Persian grammar test, the highest score was 98 and lowest score was 26. The frequency of the score 60 was the highest (9) and the lowest frequency (1) was in common among different participants. The mean score was 63.96 with the standard deviation of 6.52 (Table 2).

Table 2.
Descriptive Statistics for Persian Grammar Test

TOEFL Test	
Mean	63.966
Median	64.000
Mode	60.00
Std. Deviation	6.5221
Variance	272.9819
Range	72.00
Minimum	26.00
Maximum	98.00

Translation test was describes statistically and it was revealed that the highest score obtained in the test was 88 and lowest score was 30.

The frequency of score 62 was the highest (9) and the lowest frequency (1) was in common among different subjects. The mean score for translation test was 58.31 with the standard deviation of 6.24 (Table 3).

Table 3 .
Descriptive Statistics for Persian Grammar Test

TOEFL Test	
Mean	58.316
Median	62.0000
Mode	62.00
Std. Deviation	6.2454
Variance	263.9149
Range	58.00
Minimum	30.00
Maximum	88.00

Comparing the data obtained in descriptive statistics for three tests indicates that the mean score of Persian Grammar test (63.9) is more than the two others. The standard deviation of grammar and translation tests are the same and in fairly low level (6.52 and 6.24 respectively), representing the homogeneous participants in two tests. However, the low standard deviation obtained for TOEFL test (2.72) confirmed the homogeneity of participants too.

To measure the relationship between the tests, Pearson Correlation was run and a moderate correlation between explicit knowledge of Persian grammar and translation ability was found (Table 4).

Table 4.
Correlation between Explicit Knowledge and Translation Ability

		Translation	Persian Grammar
Persian Grammar	Pearson Correlation	.357(**)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005	
	N	60	60
Translation	Pearson Correlation	1	.357(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.005
	N	60	60

DISCUSSION

The data acquired through the research was intended to examine the relationship between learners' grammatical knowledge and translation ability. However, the results obtained in the statistical analysis proved the correlation between the variables of the study. The Pearson Correlation obtained in Table 4 represents moderate correlation between students' Persian grammar and their translation ability. That is to say, the students who were taught under explicit conditions generally received the grammatical explanation directly and finally their translation showed moderately high level of quality. The results of most studies point to the notion that the explicit instruction has a better effect on the improvement of grammar among language learners.

CONCLUSION and IMPLICATIONS

This study was conducted to examine whether there is a relationship between the explicit knowledge of Persian grammar and translation ability of Iranian translation students. To fulfil this goal, the grammatical knowledge as well as translation ability of 60 participants was measured via related instruments. Upon conducting a series of statistical tests, the findings of the study indicates that Explicit Knowledge of Persian Grammar is moderately associated with English-Persian Translation ability. It presents that everyone who has a good mastery over explicit knowledge of Persian grammar can perform better in Persian translations of English texts. Therefore, it is concluded that in translation field more special attention should be devoted to teaching explicit knowledge of Persian grammar to achieve high quality translations. The effectiveness of explicit knowledge of grammar has been proved in different foreign language learning context but this

research has focused on explicit knowledge of grammar in relation to learners' translation ability. The results obtained in this study were in agreement with those of some other studies. For instance, Klapper and Rees (2003)examined the effectiveness of explicit grammar instruction considering focus-on-form and focus-on-forms instruction. They assessed the relative merits of the two approaches through analysis of proficiency gains for classroom instruction and residence abroad, using holistic and discrete proficiency-testing instruments. However, the researchers contend that less explicit, consciousness-raising approaches to grammar instruction (focus-on-form), whether planned or incidental, can be just as effective when linked to extensive exposure to naturalistic use of the target language, as in second language or study abroad settings. They conclude this from the absence of significant differences in the groups' overall proficiency on either measure by the final year of the degree program, and from the dramatic compensatory effect of residence abroad on the focus-on-form learners' grammatical competence.

It is hoped that the findings of this research would be a help for Iranian or other translation students and teachers to get the new perceptions of the effects of grammatical knowledge on the translation process and to lead them to a kind of well-considered use of consciousness about the explicit grammatical knowledge of source language in instructional settings. The awareness assists the practitioners to employ some practical and useful techniques of translation in order to consider more practical knowledge of structural differences existing between languages as well as to reduce the learners' misunderstandings and to talk over the learners' needs in translation.

References

Abdulla, S. (1994). Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translati. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (pp. 293-313). London: Routledge.

Anderson, F. (1990). *Implicit tanulas nyelvi zavaros gyerkeknel.* Paper presented at the Presentation at Budapest Mechanical University. Hungarian.

Baker, M. (1992). *in other words:a coursebook on translation* (2nd ed.). London and New york: Routledge.

Brown, H. (2000a). Learning and teaching styles in foreign and second language education. *Foreign Language Annals, 28*(1), 21-23.

Brown, H. (2000b). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4th ed.). New York: Addison-Wesley Longman, Inc. .

Catford, J. C. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation: An essay in applied linguistics*: Oxford University Press.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.

Cronin, M. (2003). Translation and globalization. In C. Millán & F. Bartrina (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of translation studiesF. Bartrina* (pp. 491–502). London, UK: Routledge.

Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998). *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition. The Cambridge Applied Linguistics Series*: ERIC.

Ellis. (2005). *Planning and task performance in a second language* (Vol. 11): John Benjamins Publishing.

Ellis. (2009). *Handbook of Language Teaching*. Oxford Oxford University Press.

Ellis, N. C. (1996). Sequencing in SLA: Phonological memory, chunking, and points of order. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18*(1), 91-126.

Farahzad, F. (1992). Testing achievements in translation classes. In D. C. & L. A. (Eds.), *Teaching Translation and*

Interpreting. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Fotos, S., & Ellis, R. (1991). Communicating about grammar: A task-based approach. *TESOL quarterly, 25*(4), 605-628.

Galibert, J. (2004). *A communicative grammar of English* (2nd ed.). London: Longman.

Green, P. S., & Hecht, K. J. A. L. (1992). Implicit and explicit grammar: An empirical study. *13*(2), 168-184.

Hambleton, R. K. J. M. a. i. c.-n. s. o. e. a. (2002). Adapting achievement tests into multiple languages for international assessments. In A. C. Porter & A. Gamoran (Eds.), *Methodological advances in cross national surveys of educational achievement.* (pp. 58-79). Washington DC: National Academy Press.

Hatim, B., & Munday, J. (2004). *Translation: An advanced resource book*: Psychology Press.

Hijjo, N. F., & Kadhim, K. A. (2017). The analysis of grammatical shift in English-Arabic translation of BBC media news text. *17*(10), 78-104. .

Hinkle, E., & Fotos, S. (2002). *New perspectives on grammar teaching in second language classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

House, J. (2009). *Translation*. Oxford University Press: Oxford

Huddleston., R. (1995). *Introduction to the grammar of English*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hulstijn, J. H. (2012). Incidental learning in second language acquisition. In C. Doughty & M. H. Long (Eds.), *Handbook of second language research* (pp. 349-381). London Blackwell.

Klapper, J., & Rees, J. (2003). Reviewing the case for explicit grammar instruction in the university foreign language learning context. *Language Teaching Research, 7*(3), 285-314.

Klein, W., Klein, W. W., & Wolfgang, K. (1986). *Second language acquisition*: Cambridge

University Press.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Leonardi, V. J. J. o. U. L. (2009). Teaching business English through translation. *10*(1), 139-153.

McNamara, D. (2002). *TESOL- Techniques and Procedures*. Rowley, MA. Newbury: House Publishers.

Mohammadian, A., & Hashemi Toroujeni, M. (2017). The effect of translation on the grammatical structure of Persian language: case of French and English affixes translation into Persian study. *European Journal of English Language and Literature Studies, 5*(2), 22-35.

Munday, J. (2008). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications* (2nd ed.). Routledge: Taylor & Francis.

Munday, J. (2016). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications* (4th ed.). Routledge: Taylor & Francis.

Nation, P. (2014). *What do you need to know to learn a foreign language?* . New Zealand: University of Wellington.

Nemati Moghaddam, M., Rezaee, M. J. J. o. L., & Translation. (2017). Assessing the Quality of Persian Translation of the Book â Principles of Marketingâ Based on the Houseâ s (TQA) Model. *Journal of language and translation,, 7*(4), 49-64.

Newmark, P. (1982). *A further note on communicative and semantic translation* (Vol. 28). Oxford: Oxford Pergamon Press.

Rieder, A. (2003). Implicit and explicit learning in incidental vocabulary acquisition. *Views, 11* (1 & 2), 53-71.

Sa'edi, D. (2004). *Cognitive linguistics: an introduction*. . Oxford Oxford University Press.

Schmidt, R. (1994). Implicit learning and the cognitive unconscious: Of artificial grammars and SLA. In N. Ellis (Ed.), *Implicit and explicit learning of*

languages (Vol. 22, pp. 165-209). London: Academic Press.

Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and Second Language Instruction* (pp. 3–32). Cambridge Cambridge University Press.

Sharwood, S. (2004). *Grammar and second language teaching*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc.

Terrell, J. (1991). 30 years of TEFL/TESL: A personal reflection. *RELC Journal, 33*(2), 1-35.

Thomas, S. F. (1992). *The implications of translation theories for language teaching pedagogy*. Institute of Education, University of London,

Warren, H. (2004). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4th ed.). New York: Addison-Wesley Longman, Inc.

Weston, M. (1991). *An English reader's guide to the French legal system*: Oxford: Berg.

Williams, J. N. (2005). Learning without awareness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 27*(2), 269-304.

Williams., J. D. (2005). *The teacher's grammar book* (2nd ed.). NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. Publishers.

Biodata

Ms Fatemeh Safari is a PhD candidate of TEEL (English language Teaching) at South Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad university. Tehran, Iran. She has also obtained her B.A and M.A degrees in translation studies (English translation), both from Central Tehran branch, Islamic Azad university. She has been teaching general English, teaching and translation related courses since 2008 at different universities including Sharif University of Technology, Tehran University of Medical Sciences and Islamic Azad University. Email: safari.fateme1354@gmail.com