The International Journal of Social Sciences World
TIJOSSW is Available Online at:
https://www.growingscholar.org/journal/index.php/TIJOSSW
Vol. 4 No. 2, December 2022, pages: 371~385
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7563533
ISSN **2690-5167**
Growingscholar Publisher

Exploring the Translation Processes Conducted by EFL Students Based on Their English Proficiency Level

Made Dharma Susena Suyasa [1], Ida Bagus Putra Yadnya [2], I Wayan Simpen[3], Ni Luh Ketut Mas Indrawati[4]

Article history:
Received October 01, 2022; Accepted: December 01. 2022; Displayed Online: December 30, 2022; Published: December 30, 2022

Keywords

Translation process;

Foreign language Proficiency;

EFL student;

Translation ability;

Abstract

This study aimed to explore the differences in processes done by students with different foreign language proficiencies in translating an English text into Indonesian. The subjects of the study were 27 students majoring in English Education, Ganesha University of Education, Indonesia. The data were gathered using two types of instruments, namely test and questionnaire. There were two types of tests, namely the TOEFL-like test and the translation test. The translation results were scored using three criteria proposed by Larson (1984), namely accuracy, clarity, and naturalness. The two first instruments were used to gain quantitative data. The gathered data by these instruments were analyzed using Pearson Correlation Test Method. The questionnaire was used to gain qualitative data. These gathered data were analyzed based on the translation process theory proposed by Bell (1991). The findings show that foreign language proficiency does influence students' translation ability with a coefficient of determination of 0.347. It leads to an interpretation that the translation process can also have a valuable influence on the ability of the students in translating English texts into Indonesian. It is supported by the results of qualitative data analyses that show the more processes the students do, the higher the score of their translation. These findings implicate that translation process theory is one of the important factors in translation training for undergraduate students.

[1]*Udayana University, Denpasar, Indonesia. E-mail: bayu.anantawijaya@unud.ac.id*
[2]*Udayana University, Denpasar, Indonesia. E-mail: bayu.anantawijaya@unud.ac.id*
[3]*Udayana University, Denpasar, Indonesia. E-mail: bayu.anantawijaya@unud.ac.id*
[4]*Udayana University, Denpasar, Indonesia. E-mail: bayu.anantawijaya@unud.ac.id*

1. Introduction

For the last decades, the orientation of research in translation studies has changed from research oriented toward products into research oriented toward processes (Sudana et al., 2021). Some experts agree that the translation process orientation of research in translation studies shows the new paradigm (*cf.* Hatim & Mason, 1990; William & Chasterman, 2002; Berneking, 2017; Ghobadhi *et al.,* 2021). Furthermore, Jääskeläinen (2011) states that studying the process of translation will contribute not only to better theories and models of translation but also to better translation training development. Navidinia *et al.* (2021) argue that a translator's role in the translation process is an important thing to consider. In line with that, Kiraly (in Pietrzak, 2019) proposes that students' awareness of the factors involved in translation should be raised to help develop their own translator's self-concept. It means that the process done by an agent in translation should be put forward to get better development in translation training.

In line with that, Bell (1991) states that translation is a kind of process that incorporated systematic cognitive processes. He proposes an ideal model of cognitive process which is usually done by translation experts in order to make a qualified translation (Dewi et al., 2022). There are two phases in the model, namely analysis and synthesis processes (*cf.* Nord, 1991). Each phase consists of three steps. The first phase, analysis, is started with syntactic analysis which is followed by semantic analysis and pragmatic analysis. Whereas, the second phase is started with a pragmatic synthesis which is followed by semantic and syntactic synthesis. The first phase shows the cognitive process of how translators apply their linguistic knowledge of the source language. It is done to get the message contained in the source text, which Bell (1991) says is the semantic representation. The second phase shows the cognitive process of how translators apply their linguistic knowledge of the target language. It is done to yield a natural translation in the target text. By doing these processes, translators would produce qualified translation results.

On other occasions, there are some studies that show the quality of translation done by EFL students. For example, Wongranu (2017) did a study about errors in the translation done by language students in his university. He found that the students did many errors in their translation. He states that the lack of proficiency related to languages involved in the translation process is one of the factors of such errors. He also states that an inappropriate procedure is done by the students, which he calls the "read-and-translate procedure". It is another factor triggering the errors. In another place, Cúe (2018) did a rather similar study about translation errors done by EFL students at Hung Vuong University, Vietnam. The result of the study shows that linguistic errors become one of the most common errors. It is also stated that the source of such errors can be attributed to inter-lingual and intra-lingual interference. Based on the results of these findings, it can be said that the lack of language proficiency of the students learning a foreign language in the translation process leads to unqualified translation results.

These findings implicate that the higher the foreign language proficiency of the students, the better the score of the translation results they will get. Unfortunately, this implication is usually taken for granted by many people. This study, however, tries to find out to what extent foreign language proficiency of students influences their translation ability. Besides that, if the translation process theory proposed by Bell (1991) is linked to this phenomenon, there will be another important question, namely are there cognitive process differences during the translation process among the students with different proficiency in a foreign language, in this case, English proficiency?

2. Materials and Methods

Materials

Bell (1991) proposes a translation theory that focuses on process. In that theory, he describes the ideal cognitive process in a translation. According to him, there are two phases in the translation process, namely the analysis and synthesis phases. The analysis phase includes syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic analysis. In syntactic analysis, translators break down the language structure in the source text into smaller units such as sentences into clauses and clauses into phrases. This syntactic analysis becomes the basis for semantic analysis so that if there are no problems in the structure of the clauses and phrases, the process is immediately followed by the semantic analysis process. That is, if words and phrases in the clause being translated have been stored in the mental lexicon of the translators, the following processes can be done. However, if a language structure in the source text is not stored in the translators' memory, the syntactic analysis process is continued with a parser, for example, parsing the phrases and complex words that are not stored in the translators' memory into smaller units.

Meanwhile, the semantic analysis includes the cognitive activities of the translators in order to find the words and sentences meaning contained in the source text. The semantic analysis can be done using various semantic theories such as meaning relationship analysis and componential analysis. The analysis of the meaning of the sentence can be done by analyzing the proposition of the sentence. According to Bell (1991), propositions have universality between one language and another. Thus the proposition that is revealed can be the basis of the translators' understanding. In this study, however, the proposition analysis is considered too high for the students, so this kind of analysis is not included in the study.

Next, It is also said that syntactic and semantic analyses in a translation process are not enough because if someone views a text as a process, the text is also considered a communication event that is included in an interaction between individuals. Thus, there will be a specific purpose/s that the writer wants to convey in a text. Therefore, a pragmatic analysis needs to be done. This analysis can be done by looking at 3 parameters, namely tenor, mode, and domain of the text. The first can be done by looking at the style and context used in the source text. The second has something to do with the medium. in this study, it is clear that the term translation used here refers to a text which is written. The last refers to the communicative value of the text. It can be seen by the dominant function of the text such as referential, affective, or other functions.

Following the analysis phase and before the synthesis phase, there are three stages in the translation process, namely semantic representation, idea organizer, and planner. After the three analysis phases have been carried out, a translator will get an understanding of what Bell (1991) calls the semantic representation. Then, the understanding can be revised if necessary in the idea organizer. The decision to translate the understanding is at the planner stage. If the translators decide to translate their understanding they can do the next phase, namely the synthesis phase. If they don't get an understanding of the source text or they still need other additional information, they can do the analysis phase again.

In contrast to the analysis phase, the synthesis phase begins with the pragmatic synthesis in the target language, which is then followed by the semantic synthesis in the target language, and finally the syntactic synthesis in the target language so as to produce an acceptable and grammatical translation in the target language. The pragmatic synthesis is an activity that underlies the translators' decision in changing or maintaining the style of the source text. In the semantic synthesis, the translators should try to choose natural words of the target language, which still convey the message contained in the source text. The important thing here is to recognize the semantic

characteristic of the target language. In the syntactic synthesis, the translators should try to make grammatical sentences of the target language in the target text. Doing these processes will help translators yield better translations of the target text. However, it is said that the processes are not always done in that order.

Apart from that, Zainudin and Awal (2012) conducted translation observations on 43 students who were students of the Language and Linguistics Study Program, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities at Universitas Kebangsaan Malaysia. The results of these observations indicate that students tend to use literal translation techniques, namely word-for-word translation techniques. It affects the quality of the translation. After that, they applied the teaching of translation techniques, namely the translation technique proposed by Vinay and Darbelnet, using the cooperative learning method. After applying the cooperative learning teaching method, the research subjects showed a better level of mastery in translation ability, namely by applying the transposition technique in translation. Although it does not focus on the theory of the translation process as in this study, the research shows that knowledge of a translation theory can help students to produce higher-quality translation results.

There are also some studies that show the quality of translation done by foreign language students. For example, Wongranu (2017) did a study about errors in the translation done by English Language students in his university. He found that the students did many errors in their translation. He states that the lack of proficiency related to languages involved in the translation process is one of the factors of such errors. He also states that an inappropriate procedure, which he calls the procedure as a "read-and-translate procedure", is another factor triggering the errors. In another place, Cúe (2018) did a rather similar study about translation errors done by EFL students at Hung Vuong University, Vietnam. The result of the study shows that linguistic errors become one of the most common errors. It is also stated that the source of such errors can be attributed to inter-lingual and intra-lingual interference. Based on the results of these findings, it can be said that the lack of language proficiency of the students learning a foreign language in a translation process leads to unqualified translation results.

Based on the results of the studies that have been alluded to, it can be said that there is a correlation between language proficiency and translation results. Although there will be at least two different languages involved in the translation process, the correlation between students' proficiency in a foreign language becomes the main focus of this study, namely English. The choice of the language becoming the focus in this study is based on the assumption that a foreign language proficiency will have more impact on the translation ability of the students. This assumption is also in line with Hale *et al.* (2012) and Fang & Wang (2022). In addition, it is based on the fact that the students have been using the target language, namely the Indonesian language, since they joined the elementary school, and they also use the language every day to communicate with their peers. With this in mind, they must have mastered the language.

Method

27 third-year students majoring in English Education were taken as the participants in this study. They consisted of 21 female and 6 male students. In this grade, they had the first translation course. Therefore, they had no idea about translation theories. However, they had got English Structure Subject and also had learnt Introduction to Linguistics. It means they had had some linguistic competence in English to some extent.

The data were collected using two types of tests and a questionnaire. The first is the TOEFL-like test. Usually, such tests consist of three types: listening, structure, and reading. However, in this study, the listening test was not applied because it was considered rather irrelevant to the focus of this study,

namely written translation. Thus, there were 40 questions for the structure test and 50 questions for the reading test. All of the questions were multiple choice. The test should be finished in 90 minutes. All of the questions were adapted from two TOEFL-test books (Pyle and Page, 1991; Phillips, 2001). The questions in the test had been judged valid by two experts. The reliability of the TOEFL-like test using KR-20 was above the internal consistency reliability value, namely 0.83 > 0.70. Thus, it was reliable. After knowing the results of this test, the participants were classified into five groups, namely high, mid-high, mid, mid-low, and low levels of English proficiency.

The second test is the translation test. In this test, they were asked to translate two English texts extracted from Alexander (1975). The texts consist of 10 -13 sentences. The first text talks about the ancestor of humans, and the second text talks about spiders. They are both informative texts. The time allocation was 90 minutes for each period. The participants were allowed to use every source that they need, including google translate. It was done to encourage student agency in translation practice, for more explanation about this, see Pietrzak & Kornacki (2021) and Davies (2021). In order to reduce bias, the results of the students' translation were assessed by one of the authors in this study and another translation expert (cf. Regmi *et al.,* 2010). The assessment was based on criteria proposed by Larson (1984) namely accuracy, clarity, and naturalness. The criteria were scaled from 1 to 10. The texts and the assessment criteria had been judged valid by two experts. The results of the assessment were calculated to get the average. The average of the translation assessment constitutes the students' translation scores.

In addition to those instruments, a questionnaire was also used to gain accurate information about their cognitive processes during the translation process (Williams & Chesterman, 2002; Regmi *et al.,* 2010; Jääskeläinen, 2011). There were 5 open questions in the questionnaire. The first question was about the steps they did during the translation process. The second question was about the problems faced by the participants during the translation process. The third question was about the way they solved the problems. The fourth question was about the means they used such as the type of dictionary or other sources. The last question was about the way they arranged their translation in the target text. The answers to the questionnaire of every participant were analyzed based on the translation process theory proposed by Bell (1991) and then compared to their English proficiency and translation results respectively.

Based on the brief explanation before, it can be said that this study used two types of methods, namely quantitative and qualitative methods to analyze the data. The first was done by correlating the TOEFL-like test scores and the translation scores of the participants. It was done using the excel program provided in Microsoft Office 16. The second analysis was done by comparing the answers to the questionnaire with the results of their translation. This was done to uncover the differences in the translation process done by the participants.

3. Results and Discussions

Results

The results of the TOEFL-like test show that the lowest score is 340 and the highest score is 530. Therefore, the measurement range of the data from the TOEFL-like test is 190. This measurement range becomes the base for the classification of the participant levels of English proficiency, namely 190 divided by 5. The result is 38. Based on this, those who got a TOEFL-like score of 340 ≤ 378 were classified as having a low level of English proficiency. Those who got 379 ≤ 416 were classified as having a mid-low level of English proficiency. Those who got 417 ≤ 454 were classified as a mid-level of English proficiency. Those who got 455 ≤ 492 were classified as having a mid-high level of English

proficiency. Those who got 493 ≤ 534 were classified as having a high level of English proficiency. The complete distribution of English proficiency classification can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1
The distribution of the TOEFL-like score

TOEFL-like score	f
340 – 378	4
379 – 416	6
417 – 454	7
455 – 492	5
493 – 534	5
	N = 27

Based on the results of the analysis using the Pearson Correlation test method at alpha .05, there is a significant correlation between English proficiency – in this case, it is indicated by the TOEFL-like score – (M = 436.11, SD = 54.57) and the ability to translate an English text into Indonesian text (M = 73.69, SD = 7.15). r (27) = 0.589. p < 0.05. It means that the higher the English proficiency, the better the participants' ability to translate an English text into Indonesian. This finding supports the statement in the previous studies by Wongranu (2017) and Cúe (2018), namely the lack of proficiency in languages involved in a translation process is one of the factors causing the unqualified translation results. However, the coefficient of determination was 0.347. It means that the influence of English proficiency on the ability to translate an English text into Indonesian is 34.7%.

The result implicates that there are other factors influencing the translation ability. The findings of the questionnaire analysis are presented based on their English proficiency. Thus, there are five tables presented in this section. The first can be seen in Table 2. The first column in Table 2 shows the number of participants in the same group of English proficiency levels, namely 340 ≤ 378. The second column shows the ID number of the participants in their university. The third column is their TOEFL-like score. The fourth shows the average score of their translation results. The next six columns show the results of the analysis processes done by the participants based on their answers to the questionnaire. The last three columns show the synthesis processes done by them based on their answers to the questionnaire.

Table 2.
Translation Processes of The Participants with the TOEFL-like Scores 340 ≤ 378

No	ID Number	TOEFL like	Translation Score	Syntactic Analysis		Semantic Analysis		Pragmatic Analysis		Pragmatic Synthesis	Semantic Synthesis	Syntactic Synthesis
				Reading	Parsing	Monolingual	Relation	Style	Domain			
1	026	340	68	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	X	x
2	003	350	68	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	X	x
3	004	365	68	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	X	x
4	002	370	72	v	x	x	x	x	x	x	X	x

It is shown that there are 3 out of 4 participants had not read the whole text before they translated the text. It is shown by the 'x' symbol in the table. Based on the answers to the fourth question in the questionnaire, they admitted that they translated word per word as they read the source text. It shows the same phenomenon as written by Zainudin and Awal (2012). It is also related

to Wongranu (2017) statement that students tend to do the "read-and-translate" technique in the translation process.

The next column in the syntactic analysis phase shows that all participants didn't do the parsing. These results are based on their answers related to the problems faced during the translation process. There were no participants who reported the problems above word level. All participants only reported some difficult words that they found as problems. With this in mind, all participants did not parse some sentence structures in the source text because no phrase or sentence was reported as their problem in the translation process. In other words, they did not do elaboration on the phrases and sentences' structure in the source text.

The next column shows the means used by the participants in this group. All participants wrote that they only used google translate to solve the problems they found during the translation process. It is clear that google translate automatically gives the "equivalence" of a word typed by the user into another language. It doesn't give some definition or explanations of a word in the same language as the word typed by the user. Consequently, the participants who used it did not analyze the sense and lexical relation of the words in concern. Thus, it can be said that they did not do appropriate semantic analyses or even they didn't do semantic analysis at all during the translation process. It would be different if they had used a monolingual dictionary. They would activate the cognitive activities related to sense and lexical relations as they found the definition of the words of concern.

The next is pragmatic analysis. From table 2., it is shown that no participant did the pragmatic analysis. It is shown in their answers. they didn't report that they read the previous sentence and the sentence following the problems again when they tried to solve the problems in the translation process. They also didn't report that they had used other dictionaries or other sources, such as finding out similar texts, to cope with the difficult words they encountered in the source text. Thus, it can be considered that they had not done the pragmatic analysis.

The next three columns show the process of syntheses the participants did during the translation process. It can be seen that no one did the syntheses during the translation process. No one answered the last question of the questionnaire in detail. They just reported that they wrote the target text for granted. With this report, it can be said that they even did not read their translation again during the translation process. Thus, based on Bell's (1991) model, it can be said that the participants in this group didn't do the synthesis phase in the translation process. The results of the questionnaire analysis on the second group can be seen in Table 3. This is a low-mid of English proficiency group, that is the TOEFL-like score of this group ranged from 379 to 416.

Table 3
Translation Processes of The Participants with the TOEFL-like Scores 379 ≤ 416

No	ID Number	TOEFL like	Translation Score	Syntactic Analysis		Semantic Analysis		Pragmatic Analysis		Pragmatic Synthesis	Semantic Synthesis	Syntactic Synthesis
				Reading	Parsing	Monolingual	Relation	Tenor	Domain			
1	034	380	62	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	X	x
2	012	385	57	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	X	x
3	030	390	78	v	v	v	v	v	v	x	X	x
4	001	400	66	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	X	x
5	029	400	73	x	v	v	v	x	x	x	X	x
6	033	410	74	v	v	x	x	x	x	x	X	x

As shown in Table 3, the phenomenon of translation processes by the participants in this group is somewhat different from the previous group. In this group, 2 out of 6 admitted that they had read the whole text before they translated the source text. In the next column, it is also shown that 3 out of 6 participants do the parsing process. The judgment that they did the parsing process because they reported the problems above the word level. It means that they had more awareness of the structures in the source text rather than those who didn't report the problem above word level. This implies that the 3 participants might have elaborated some sentence structures in the source text during the translation process. In other words, they parsed some clauses and sentences in the source text. Thus, it can be said that they did do the process of parsing to some extent during the translation process.

As for semantic analysis, it can be seen that there were 2 participants who used a monolingual dictionary. The other 4 participants reported that they only used google translate. In this case, the phenomenon of this group is rather similar to the phenomenon of the previous group in which they tended to use google translate during the translation process. Because of this, they can be considered using a bilingual dictionary. Consequently, they did not analyze sense relations such as paradigmatic and syntagmatic relationships or lexical relations such as synonymy and antonymy for the words constituting the problems for them during the translation process. In other words, they did not do semantic analysis appropriately. On the contrary, 2 out of 6 participants reported that they used both types of dictionary. They used google translate and the well-known monolingual dictionaries such as Oxford and Longman dictionaries. In short, it can be said that they did semantic analysis during the translation process to some extent.

The next column in table 3. is pragmatic analysis. It is shown that only one participant had done the pragmatic analysis. In her answers to the questionnaire, she reported that she also used other sources on the internet. She used Google search machines to solve the problems they found during the translation process. They also tried to solve the problems by looking at the co-text available in the source text during the translation process. It led us to think that she had done some analysis related to the context and the function of the source text to some extent. In other words, she had done the two parameters in the pragmatic analysis, namely the tenor and domain of the text.

Similar to the previous group, it can be seen that no one did the syntheses during the translation process. No one answered the last question of the questionnaire in detail. Based on the report, there was no clue that can be the base for judging whether the participants had done the synthesis phase during the translation process. The same interpretation as the previous group, it can be said that they also did not read their translation again during the translation process. Thus, based on Bell's (1991) model, it can be said that the participants in this group didn't do the synthesis phase in the translation process.

Next, the results of the questionnaire analysis on the third group can be seen in Table 4. This is a mid-level of English proficiency group, that is the TOEFL-like score of this group ranged from 417 to 454.

Table 4.
Translation Processes of The Participants with the TOEFL-like Scores 417 ≤ 454

No	ID Number	TOEFL like	Translation Score	Syntactic Analysis		Semantic Analysis		Pragmatic Analysis		Pragmatic Synthesis	Semantic Synthesis	Syntactic Synthesis
				Reading	Parsing	Monolingual	Relation	Tenor	Domain			
1	016	420	78	x	v	x	x	x	x	x	X	x
2	005	425	75	v	v	x	x	x	x	x	X	x
3	024	425	71	x	v	x	x	x	x	x	X	x
4	008	430	81	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	V	x

5	023	430	64	v	x	x	x	x	x	x	X	x
6	017	445	80	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	X	x
7	015	455	75	v	v	x	x	x	x	x	X	x

As shown in Table 4, the phenomenon of translation processes by the participants in this group is quite different from the two previous groups. As shown in the syntactic analysis columns, only 2 out of 7 participants admitted that they had not read the whole text before they translated the source text. In the analysis related to clause/sentence parsing, one participant didn't do this type of analysis because he didn't report any problem above word level. In the semantic analysis column, it is also shown that 2 out of 7 participants used a monolingual dictionary. The other 5 participants reported that they only used google translate. In this case, the phenomenon of this group is rather similar to the phenomenon of the previous groups in which they tended to use google translate during the translation process. In short, 5 participants did not do semantic analysis appropriately. In the pragmatic analysis column, it is shown that 2 out of 7 participants did analyze both the context in the text or usually called co-text, and the context outside the context. In this case, they reported that they read the source text more than one time to solve the problems they found during the translation process. In addition, they also wrote some sources they used to solve the problems. Moreover, two of them stated that they read another article related to the problems they found in the target language. In other words, they compared the common words used in the target language. It implies that they have done the pragmatic and semantic synthesis, too. However, there was no clue that could be used to judge that they had done syntactic syntheses during the translation process.

Meanwhile, the results of the questionnaire analysis on the fourth group can be seen in Table 5. This is a mid-high of English proficiency group, that is the TOEFL-like score of this group ranged from 455 to 492.

Table 5.
Translation Processes of The Participants with the TOEFL-like Scores 455 ≤ 492

No	ID Number	TOEFL like	Translation Score	Syntactic Analysis		Semantic Analysis		Pragmatic Analysis		Pragmatic Synthesis	Semantic Synthesis	Syntactic Synthesis
				Reading	Parsing	Monolingual	Relation	Tenor	Domain			
1	020	465	84	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	V	x
2	006	475	86	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	V	v
3	018	475	80	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	V	x
4	009	485	75	v	x	x	x	x	x	x	X	x
5	019	495	70	v	v	x	x	x	x	x	X	x

Table 5. shows that all of the participants in this group had read the whole source text before they translated it into the target text. Then, it can be seen also from table 5 that only one participant was not aware of the structure of sentences in the source text. It was because she didn't report any problems above the word level. She just reported some difficult words as her problems during the translation process. In other words, she didn't elaborate on the sentence structures contained in the source text. In the process of the semantic analysis, it is shown that 2 out of 5 participants used only a bilingual dictionary. They only reported that they used google translate. Consequently, they didn't analyze the sense relation and lexical relations of difficult words for them. Thus, it could be said that they didn't do semantic analysis appropriately during the translation process. The other 3 participants reported that they used both monolingual and bilingual dictionaries. In the process of pragmatic analysis, it is shown that 3 out of 5 participants did analyze the context in the text or usually

called co-text. They also consider the domain of the source text by using some sources such as Wikipedia and other articles similar to the source text to solve the problems during the translation process. In addition, they also stated that they read another article related to the problems they found in the target language. Thus, it can be said that they have done pragmatic and semantic syntheses to some extent.

Finally, the results of the questionnaire analysis on the fourth group can be seen in Table 6. This is a high-level English proficiency group, that is the TOEFL-like scores of this group are above 492.

Table 6.
Translation Processes of The Participants with the TOEFL-like Scores above 492

No	ID Number	TOEFL like	Translation Score	Syntactic Analysis		Semantic Analysis		Pragmatic Analysis		Pragmatic Synthesis	Semantic Synthesis	Syntactic Synthesis
				Reading	Parsing	Monolingual	Relation	Tenor	Domain			
1	031	500	73	v	v	x	x	x	x	x	X	x
2	025	505	75	v	v	v	v	x	x	x	X	x
3	032	505	76	v	v	x	x	x	x	x	X	x
4	027	520	86	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	V	v
5	014	530	81	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	V	x

Similar to the phenomenon shown in Table 5, all of the participants in this group had read the whole source text before they translated it into the target text. In addition, all participants had also done parsing to some extent. In the process of the semantic analysis, it is shown that 2 out of 5 participants didn't use a monolingual dictionary. The other 3 participants reported that they used both monolingual and bilingual dictionaries. In the process of pragmatic analysis, it is shown that 3 out of 5 participants did analyze the context of the text. They also consider the domain of the source text. The two participants who had done the pragmatic analysis also did the pragmatic and semantic syntheses. Besides, one of them did syntactic synthesis. It was revealed by her statement in the answer to the last questionnaire. She reported that she rechecked her translation by reading it twice and tried to change the words, phrases, and sentences if they were not sound good to her. In spite of the intuitive way, it can be said that she had done the syntactic synthesis to some extent.

Discussions

As stated previously, the results of the quantitative data analysis show that there is a significant correlation between foreign language proficiency and translation ability. The results, however, also show that there are other factors that could influence translation ability. This statement is in line with most translation experts such as Vermeer (1989) and Hatim & Mason (1987) to name just a few. Vermeer's (1989) skopos theory implicates that linguistic competence does help a translator overcome problems faced in the translation process, but problems in a translation process are not just about language. A translator needs to go beyond the linguistic process by considering the purpose of the translation and the potential reader of the target language. Meanwhile, Hatim & Mason (1997) go further to state that translation constitutes communication in a sociocultural context. In this case, sociocultural messages reflected in a source text should be considered too in the translation process.

Those two arguments are actually incorporated into the translation process theory proposed by Bell (1991) which states that a translator needs to do the pragmatic analysis and synthesis. Both processes accommodate a small scale of Vermeer's (1989) and Hatim & Mason's (1997) arguments

in which the pragmatic analysis emphasizes the tenor and domain of the source text and the pragmatic synthesis emphasizes some adjustments to the function and purpose of the source text with the target text in the process of translation. In this case, tenor and domain can give some clues to the function, purpose, and sociocultural context contained in the source text, and it will be the base for making adjustments in the target text. In addition, adjustment implicates that a translator should do a need analysis before translating the source text. With this in mind, it can be said that the translation process constitutes one of the other important factors that influence translation ability.

In relation to the translation process analysis, It is shown that participants with a low level of English proficiency tend to not do both the analysis phase and synthesis phase. In the mid-low level of English proficiency, some participants show that the analysis phase has begun actively in their cognitive. In the mid-level of English proficiency, the same phenomena as the mid-low level of English proficiency are shown. However, there are two participants who have done the synthesis phase. In the mid-high level of English proficiency, the analysis phase tends to be activated in the participants' cognitive process. It is also seen that some synthesis phase has been active. Rather similar phenomena with the mid-high level of English proficiency are also seen in the high level of English proficiency.
At a glance, these data analyses could tempt some people to conclude that the higher the foreign language proficiency of a translator, the more processes the translator does in a translation process. This type of conclusion will in turn lead to another interpretation, that it is the foreign language competence or linguistic competence (for a detailed discussion on types of competencies needed by a translator see Klaudy, 2006) that is the only factor that influences the translation ability.

However, if we look at the results of the qualitative data analyses again, we will find some interesting things. In the mid-level of English proficiency which is shown in Table 4, two participants were able to get higher scores than some participants with higher levels of English proficiency. Two participants with a mid-high level of English proficiency shown in Table 5 and three participants with a high level of English proficiency shown in Table 6 got lower scores. It is seen that they have some differences in relation to the processes. The two participants in Table 4, did more processes. They did some syntheses during the translation process. One of them reported that potential readers of his translation had been flashed into his mind. Thus, he stated that he translated the pronoun "you" in the source text into "*kalian*" ("you" in the plural form). In this case, most participants tended to translate "you" into "*kamu*" ("you" in singular form) and "*Anda*" ("you" in singular form and rather formal – shows some distance).

The two participants who got the higher score also reported that the function of the source text had come into their minds. They reported that the source text was an informative text addressed to junior high school students, so they tried to find rather informal words in the target text in order to match the expectation of their potential readers. Thus, it can be said that they did pragmatic synthesis in writing the target text to some extent during the translation process. Whereas, the answers to the questionnaire from the two participants with a mid-high level of English proficiency shown in Table 5 and three participants with a high level of English proficiency shown in Table 6 didn't give any clue showing that they had done the synthesis phase. Based on this, it can be said that the two participants with a mid-level of English proficiency shown in Table 4 have more awareness than the two participants with a mid-high level of English proficiency shown in Table 5 and the three participants with a high level of English proficiency shown in Table 6 who got lower scores. Thus, a foreign language proficiency does not necessarily lead a translator to do more processes during the translation process.

In addition, the translation result of the participant who got the highest score in the mid-level of English proficiency shows that he has done semantic synthesis to some extent during the translation process. It is shown by the result of his translation in translating the word "lived" in the following sentence.

> "But the first people who were like ourselves **lived** so long ago that even their sagas, if they had any, are forgotten."

Was translated into:

> "*Tetapi orang pertama yang seperti kita **sudah lama meninggal** sehingga legendanya, itu pun jika mereka punya, sudah terlupakan".*

Translated back to English:

> "But the first people who were like ourselves **had died** so long ago that even their sagas, if they had any, are forgotten."

The participants used the antonym of the word "live" in the target text to gain a natural sentence but still conveyed the message contained in the source text into the target text. Those who got translation scores below 80, including the two participants with a mid-high level of English proficiency shown in Table 5 and three participants with a high level of English proficiency shown in Table 6, tended to translate the word "live" literally, so the sentence in the target text didn't convey the message. The back translation into English made by them can be seen in the following.

> *"Tetapi orang pertama yang seperti kita hidup sangat lama bahkan legendanya, jika mereka punya, sudah terlupakan"*

Translated back into English:

> But the first people who were like ourselves have lived so long Ø that even their sagas, if they had any, are forgotten."

The message brought by the inflectional past tense suffix in the word "lived" plus the word "ago" is hard to convey in the target text if the word "live" is translated literally. In this case, the literal translation could change the grammatical meaning of the source text, namely literal translation changed the past tense meaning into the present meaning. It will confuse the readers or even it doesn't make sense in the target language. Based on this consideration, it could be said that the participant with student ID number 008 had tried to adjust the word semantically in the target text by using the antonym of the word. In other words, it could be said that he did the semantic synthesis. Meanwhile, for the last process or syntactic synthesis, nothing can be said related to that because he didn't report anything about that. He might have done this process unconsciously, but there was nothing to be the base to say that.

Another interesting in the results of qualitative data analysis can also be seen in Table 5. It is shown that 3 out of 5 participants did the synthesis processes proposed by Bell (1991), and one of them did all synthesis processes. The differences among the participants in this group start from the semantic analysis. It is shown that 2 out of 5 participants used only a bilingual dictionary. They only reported that they use google translate. Consequently, they didn't analyze the sense relation and lexical relation of difficult words for them. Thus, it could be said that they didn't do semantic analysis appropriately during the translation process. The other 3 participants reported that they used a monolingual dictionary besides google translate.

In the process of pragmatic analysis, it is shown that 3 out of 5 participants did analyze both the context in the text or usually called co-text, and the context outside the context. In this case, they reported that they read the source text more than one time to solve the problems they found during the translation process. In addition, they also wrote some sources they used to solve the problems. Moreover, two of them stated that they read another article related to the problems they found in the source language. Further, one of them wrote that she also read similar articles in the target language, she wrote:

"The phrase 'Near East' in the sentence "We can read things that happened 5,000 years ago in the Near East, where people first learned to write" is not familiar to me. So, I try to find it on google by typing the phrase in Indonesian language. And I find that it is different from Middle East. The explanation in the article is not same with what I thought before. So, I didn't translate it into Indonesian language."

Her report shows that she was aware of a specific referent of a proper noun. Based on this, we can assume that she did pragmatic analysis consciously during the translation process. As for the synthesis phase, those who did pragmatic analysis also did pragmatic synthesis. All of them stated that they were aware of the potential readers of their translation. In short, they did pragmatic synthesis to some extent. For the semantic analysis, the same phenomenon with the previous phenomenon in the previous group discussed previously was also found, namely they used antonymy for the word "live". The phenomenon of the last process is interesting in this group. As stated before, the participant who got the highest score also read some related articles besides the source text. In this case, she reported that she used the related articles to the source text in the target language to help her check her translation. The results of her translation also support this. Some structure adjustments are found in her translation. She translated the following sentence.

> "Fortunately, **however**, ancient men made tools of stone, especially flint, because this is easier to shape than other kinds"

Her Translation:

> "Namun demikian, untungnya manusia purba membuat perkakas dari batu, khususnya batu api karena batu jenis ini paling mudah dibentuk daripada jenis batu lainnya"

Translated back into English:

> "**However**, fortunately, ancient men made tools of stone, especially flint because this is easier to shape than other kinds"

The change of position of the word "however" in Indonesian language is important. If the position is not changed, the translation will be unnatural in Indonesian language. It is because Indonesian language doesn't have the structure like in the source text. With this in mind, we could say that she did syntactic synthesis during the translation process.

The findings of the three participants in this study lead us to the same interpretation, namely, the more processes the participants did during the translation process, the higher the translation score they got. Not only does it occur in a group but also occurs in different groups. The three participants in Table 5 are able to get higher translation scores compared to the three participants with higher English proficiency in Table 6. The phenomenon shown in Table 6 is also similar to the

phenomenon shown in Table 5 in which the participants who did more processes got higher translation scores than the participants who did fewer processes. Based on the findings, it can be stated that the three participants, in Table 5, who got higher translation scores than the three participants in Table 6 did more cognitive processes. In other words, the more awareness of a translator, the better his or her performance during the translation process.

Such awareness constitutes a clear example of competence that is out of linguistic competence. Thus, based on a qualitative point of view, it can be concluded that the translator's knowledge of translation theory especially the translation process theory will influence his or her ability in translating a foreign language text into his or her language. This conclusion, however, doesn't mean that foreign language competence is not important for a translator.

4. Conclusion

Based on the findings and discussions that have been presented before, it can be stated that English proficiency does influence the ability to translate English text into Indonesian text. The coefficient of determination was 0.347. It means that there are other factors that influence the ability to translate English text into Indonesian text. It is also seen that there are some differences among the participants related to the process of translating the texts given. It is seen that the participants with a low level of English proficiency tended to not do the processes proposed by Bell (1991). Some participants with mid-low and mid-level English proficiency did some processes proposed by Bell (1991). Some participants with a mid-high and high-level English proficiency did most processes proposed by Bell (1991). The participants who did more processes got higher scores than the participants who did fewer processes in translating English texts into Indonesian text wherever group they are. Even if they are compared to a higher level of English proficiency, the results of their translation still show that the more processes they do the better their translation results will be.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank all the parties and also professional editors who have contributed so that this manuscript can be published.

References

Alexander, L. G. 1975/2012. *Fluency in English. An Integrated Course for Advance Students*. (27th Impression). Yogyakarta: Kanisius Publishing.

Bell, Roger. (1991). *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice*. New York: Longman Inc.

Berneking, Steve. 2017. "A Sociology of Translation and The Central Role of The Translator". In *Sage Journal*. 67 (3). 265-281. Available on https://doi.org/10.1177%2F2051677016670232

Cúe, P. T. K. 2018. "An Analysis of Translation Errors: A Case Study of Vietnamese EFL Students". In *International Journal of English Linguistics*. 8 (1). 22 – 29. Available on http://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v8nlp22

Davies, M. G. 2021. "Student Agency in Translator Training: Setting a Framework for Good Practice". In *Research in Language*. 19 (2). 117-133. Available on https://digijournals.uni.lodz.pl/rela/vol19/iss2/2

Dewi, P.C., Artawa, I.K., Yadya, I.B.P. and Simpen, I.W., 2022. The form of environment ecolexicon found in the balinese translation. *The International Journal of Language and Cultural (TIJOLAC)*, *4*(1), pp.24-31.

Ghobadi Mehdi, Sadaf Khosroshahi, and Fatemeh Giveh. 2021. "Exploring Predictors of Translation Performance". In *The International Journal for Translation & Interpreting Research*. 13 (2). 65 – 78. Available on www.trans-int.org/index.php/transint/article/view/824/389

Hale, Sandra, Ignacio Garcia, Jim Hlavac, Mira Kim, Miranda Lai, Barry Turner, Helen Slatyer. 2022. *Improvements to NAATI Testing: Development of a Conceptual Overview for a New Model for NAATI Standards, Testing, and Assessment*. Available on https://www.naati.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Improvements-to-NAATI-Testing.pdf

Hatim, Bassil, and Ian Mason. 1997. *The Translator as Communicator*. London: Routledge.

Jääskeläinen, R. 2011. "Studying Translation Process". In *The Oxford Handbook of Translation Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Klaudy. K. 2006. "The Role of Translation Theory in Translation Training". Paper presented at the EMT Conference, Brussels, 19-20 October 2006. Available on (PDF) The Role of Translation Theory in Translator Training (researchgate.net)

Larson, M. L. 1984. *Meaning Based Translation: A Guide to Cross-language Equvalence*. New York: University Press of America.

Malmkjær, K. and Kevin Windle (Editor). 2011. *The Oxford Handbook of Translation Studies.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Navidinia, Hossein, Parisa Imani, and Mohsen Mobaraki. 2021. "Exploring the relationship between translation students' personality characteristics and their preference for using translation strategies". In *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 11 (2). 341-350. Available on https://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/IJAL/article/view/23985.

Nord, Christiane. 1991. *Text Analysis in Translation. Theory, Methodology, and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis.* Translated from German by Christiane Nord and Penelope Spparow. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Phillips, Deborah. 2001. *Longman Complete Course for the TOEFL Test*. New York: Pearson Education.

Pietrzak, Paulina. 2019. "The potential of reflective translator training". In *Intralinea Online Translation Journal*. Special Issue. Available on https://www.intralinea.org/specials/article/2431

Pietrzak, P., and M. Kornacki. 2021. "Focus on the Translation Trainee". In *Research in Language*. 19 (2). 107-115. Available on https://digijournals.uni.lodz.pl/cgi/viewcontent

Regmi, Khrisna, Jennie Naido, and Paul Pilkington. 2010. "Understanding the Process of Translation and Transliteration in Qualitative Research". In *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*. Available on http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0

Sudana, I.G.P. and Yadnya, I.B.P., 2021. Semantic Adjustments in The Translation of English Memorandum. *The International Journal of Social Sciences World (TIJOSSW)*, *3*(01), pp.270-279.

Venuti, L. (ed). 2004. *The Translation Studies Reader* (2nd Edition). New York: Routledge.

Vermeer, H. J. (1989/2004) "Skopos and commission in translational action", in L. Venuti (ed.) (2004), pp. 227–38.

Williams, J. and Andrew Chesterman. 2002. *The Map. A Beginner Guide to Doing Research in Translation Studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Wongranu, P. 2017. "Errors in Translation Made by English Major Students: A Study on Types and Causes". In *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*. 38. 117 – 122. Available on http://www.elsevier.com/locate/kjss