Translation Ability and Its Influential Factors of English Club Students in Debate Class
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Abstract: Translation is considered an essential element in the process of English learning. This descriptive qualitative study explores the translation ability and its influential factors performed by nine English club students of SMK Negeri 2 Surakarta in their debate class. Data were obtained by conducting a translation test. The students answered a questionnaire tested by the KR-20 formula to acknowledge the factors deeply. The results reveal that their ability to translate texts was good and excellent. Also, by using Microsoft Excel and interpreting using various theories in ELT, it was found that their ability was influenced by not only the external, internal, and individual factors but also their general learning strategies, way of learning vocabulary, teachers’ strategies in teaching grammar, and online tools as the part of learning media utilized by them. As translation becomes an inevitable process in ELT, these findings provide theoretical evidence that conducting TEFL by being attentive to the potential factors above and emphasizing the instructional designs is crucial. In addition, they directly influence the EFL learners’ translation ability, reflecting their English mastery and determining their success in the language learning process. Further, EFL teachers should pay more attention to their teaching strategy, consider allowing students access to online tools and motivate them to have a proper learning environment and reach optimal learning outcomes.

INTRODUCTION

Translation is considered essential in TEFL (Teaching English as a Foreign Language) since it becomes the stage passed by EFL (English as Foreign Language) learners. It can be used as a bridge to minimize the gap in language and culture between students’ foreign and native languages to understand the topic or comprehend the context of specific texts by knowing the equivalent meaning. In line with Colina (2002), translation is not only an exercise in transferring or replacing the operative meaning among languages but also an activity performed in second language acquisition as a language used for achieving a particular
communicative function across cultural and linguistic barriers (as cited in Whyatt, 2012). Moreover, Davis (2004) states that translation as a complex linguistic process is crucial to persuade students to acquire necessary linguistic skills and maintain a ‘delicate balance’ when dealing with language and culture (as cited in Zainudin & Awal, 2012). Language transfer appears when the elements of L2 that are sufficiently similar to elements in the learner’s L1 repertoire will be substituted by L1 elements, to begin with (Ellis, 1994).

Four skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) must be developed and mastered well for EFL learners to communicate and be considered qualified (Derakhshan, 2015). In addition, Newmark (1988) states that translation takes the role of the fifth skill in the final stage of the EFL learning process and is the practical intelligence on developing the language learner competence since it can reflect the knowledge of the target language (as cited in Sundari & Febriyanti, 2016). Malmkjær (1997) argues that translation cannot be separated from the four skills because it involves a good deal of reading, writing, speaking, and listening in a foreign language (as cited in Laviosa, 2014). Primarily, learning to translate a broad range of text types, styles, and registers (both written and spoken language) is highly able to enhance the variety of essential skills in the second language acquisition (L2) and multilingual work environment (Duff, 1989) (as cited in Laviosa, 2014).

The ability of humans to translate one language into another is called translation ability. From a foreign language teaching and learning perspective, translation ability is defined as the second stage in the evolutionary continuum. According to Whyatt (2012, p. 28), the evolutionary continuum is arranged into several stages, which are illustrated in the figure below:

| PREDISPOSITION → ABILITY → SKILL → COMPETENCE → EXPERTISE |

**Figure 1.** Evolutionary continuum in the process of learning

Based on the Figure 1, it can be understood that ability is the second stage of evolution which illustrates people how they are ‘able’ to learn, use and improve their predisposition (natural or innate knowledge) into the next level of evolution, which are skill, competence until becoming expertise (Whyatt, 2012). It is equivalent to Shreve (1997), who defines translation ability as the part of evolutionary space, which is indeed the natural ability of bilinguals to translate Source Language (SL) into Target Language (TL) (as cited in Whyatt, 2012). It drives the conclusion that in the field of foreign language education, translation ability is defined as
the ability of the EFL learners to utilize their natural ability to translate a foreign language into their native language (or opposite) in order to build their skill in translation and enhance the four other language skills such as listening, speaking, reading and writing to reach the objective of language learning which is as the communicative purpose. It can be argued that the ability to translate and knowing the influential factors from the ability are crucial for determining their success in learning English.

English Club in SMK Negeri 2 Surakarta (a vocational high school in Surakarta city which is nationally accredited ‘A’ and avowed as a vocational high school with the complete study department by having nine categories of the department in every level of grades) is an extracurricular activity which attentively focuses in empowering and developing students’ English proficiency. The participants are ten-grade students from across departments. The material taught by the tutor emphasizes enhancing the student’s skills in English Debate (both British and Asian-Australian Parliamentary Debate systems). Interestingly, translation is applied as a supporting element not only for improving students’ vocabularies and knowledge but also for comprehending text used for supporting their arguments in the debate session. It is included in the case-building session when students read several articles to collect supportive data for their arguments related to the prepared motion that will be performed in front of the class. In this session, the tutor allows students to read articles (classified as informational texts) from various sources (magazines, newspapers, or the internet).

As is known, in the case-building session, students’ reading skill in comprehending informational digital text from the internet automatically requires their translation ability. On the other hand, several factors (from an educational perspective) appear and influence their ability to comprehend the texts. Ergo, the researchers were curious about the translation ability and background factors of the EFL learners of the English Club in SMK Negeri 2 Surakarta in translating informational texts (specified on descriptive structure) from English SL into TL. Therefore, the research questions of this study are: (1) How is translation ability acquired by the English Club students of SMK Negeri 2 Surakarta in the academic year of 2020/2021 in translating informational texts? and (2) What are the factors influencing the translation ability of the English Club students of SMK Negeri 2 Surakarta in the academic year of 2020/2021 in translating informational texts?
LITERATURE REVIEW

Translation Ability and Its Influential Factors

The EFL learners’ translation ability is classified into four levels (Ruhansah, 2013) in Table 1 below:

| Level  | Scale  | Indicator |
|--------|--------|-----------|
| Excellent | 80%-100% | The translation is highly accurate and acceptable. |
| Good    | 60%-79%  | The translation is less-accurate with minimum omission, addition, and inappropriate words. |
| Fair    | 50%-59%  | The translation is inaccurate (meaning is different), and some inappropriate words are found. |
| Poor    | 0%-49%   | The translation is not accurate and acceptable (the meaning is unclear), ambiguous, and has a lot of grammatical errors and inappropriate words. |

Source: Ruhansah (2013)

The assessment of the quality of the translation product is required to identify the levels of learners’ ability in translation. As the consequence of translation as part of human ability or skill, its developmental continuum is visible in the quality of the translation performance (Whyatt, 2012). In addition, the formal quality of translation produced by bilingual learners as the part of natural translators can indicate that apart from bilingual knowledge, other capacities are involved and probably would improve the formal quality of the translation product (Malakoff & Hakuta, 1991; Gόmez, 2006) (as cited in Whyatt, 2012: 115). The quality of a translation product can be assessed by checking its accuracy, readability, and acceptability (Nababan et al., 2012). The specific rubric of Translation Quality Assessment proposed by Nababan et al. (2012) is displayed in the Table 2 below:

| Score | Indicator |
|-------|-----------|
| 3 (Accurate) | The meaning of words, phrases, clauses, or sentences in the source text is conveyed accurately in the target text. There are no distortions in meaning. |
| 2 (Less Accurate) | The meaning of words, phrases, clauses, or sentences in the source text is mostly conveyed accurately in the target text. However, there are still distortions in meaning (ambiguity or deletion that distracts the meaning). |
| 1 (Inaccurate) | The meaning of words, phrases, clauses, or sentences in the source text is not conveyed accurately in the target text. |

| Acceptability |
|---------------|
| 3 (Acceptable) | The translation product sounds natural; the words, phrases, clauses, and sentences of the source text are appropriate to the target language’s principles. |
The translation product sounds natural, but there are still problems with the diction or grammar.
The translation product sounds unnatural; the words, phrases, clauses, and sentences used are inappropriate with the target language’s principles.

| Level   | Description                                                                 |
|---------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2       | (Less Acceptable)                                                           |
| 1       | (Unacceptable)                                                              |
| 3       | (Readable)                                                                  |
| 2       | (Less Readable)                                                             |
| 1       | (Unreadable)                                                                |

The translation product is easy to be understood.
The translation product is quite easy to understand; the readers need to read some parts more than once in order to understand the translation.
The translation product is difficult to be understood.

Readability

Source: Nababan, Nuraeni & Sumardiono (2012)

In EFL educational fields, the factors influencing learners’ ability to learn a foreign language (specifically in the term of translation) are classified into three elements which are learner-external factors (consisting of social factors and input and interaction), learner-internal factors (consisting of language transfer, cognitive account and linguistic universal) and learner’s differences as an individual (consisted by general factors which are age, language aptitude, motivation, and cognitive style and learning strategies which are metacognitive strategy, cognitive strategy, and social or affective strategy) (Ellis, 1994). This ability is also influenced by other factors, such as the use of online tools as the learning media (e-dictionary, translation machine, concordance, and search engine) (Wuttikrikunlaya et al., 2018), the application of students’ vocabulary-learning strategy (consisting of metacognitive strategy, cognitive strategy, memory strategy, and activation strategy) (Gu & Johnson, 1996) (as cited in Ghazal, 2017) and teacher’s grammar teaching strategy (certain method with or without comprehensibility and acceptability) (Renandya, 2013).

Empirically, there was a significant correlation between students’ reading comprehension and their translation ability of analytical exposition text among the eleven-grade students of MA Ummatan Wasathan Pesantren Teknologi Riau, indicated by the result students’ reading comprehension and their translation ability which were at a good level (Habibah, 2018). Yessy & Sinambela (2018), in their qualitative study, revealed that 83% of students of the eleventh grade of SMK N 11 Medan were able to translate the analytical exposition text (Indonesia-English) identified by their scores compared to the KKM (Learning Passing Grade). Unlike the previous study, researchers measure students’ translation ability by conducting translation tests. Their translation ability level was based on the score of the analysis of translation quality assessment on their translation products in translating descriptive informational texts from digital base and textbook. Another study found that 62.5% of the sixth-semester students in the English Education Program enrolled in a semantics course (STKIP YPM Bangko in Academic
Year 2013/2014) successfully translated articles (English-Indonesian). Their ability was sufficient, while several (n=30 out of 80) failed in English translation (Ningsih et al., 2019).

Translation in the ELT context has been investigated using various approaches. However, none reveals and breaks down the influential factors of the EFL learners’ ability in translation. However, there was a lack of information answering how and why the EFL learners are able to translate and understand English texts in their learning process, although the influential factors are potentially beneficial for improving and adding innovations in the TEFL activity. Therefore, in order to address this lacuna, this present research emphasized adding new theoretical knowledge and findings about the influential factors of the EFL learners’ translation ability which is helpful to be a basis for adding innovations in conducting TEFL in the classroom and improving the learning outcomes well. It also helps the EFL teachers and students to be more attentively aware that success in learning a language is not merely about ‘being able to translate SL into TL’ but also about ‘developing’ good teaching and learning environment and strategies to ‘optimally making use’ of the influential factors as potential factors in increasing the English performance.

METHODS

Research Design

This study was qualitative research. Qualitative research is intended to comprehend a particular phenomenon on a research subject (related to the behavior, perception, motivation, implementation, evaluation, and so on) described holistically in words and contextual language (Moleong, 2007). The method used in this study was a descriptive qualitative method. The descriptive qualitative approach aims to describe a phenomenon and the characteristic of naturalistic data collected from various sources to understand individual participants’ opinions, perspectives, and attitudes (Nassaji, 2015). The researcher chose this design since it was expected to holistically describe the natural characteristics of translation ability and its background factors from the participants.

Participants

This study involved nine active students of the English club in SMK Negeri 2 Surakarta from ten grades in the academic year 2020/2021. The participants were recruited based on the suitability of the scope of this research since the English club committed to translation in its teaching and learning process, which differed from other English clubs of other vocational high
schools in Surakarta. This study was conducted in May-July 2020 during the pandemic era. Considering the condition of Covid-19, which triggered the regulation of social and physical distancing among people, the researchers conducted this study online by utilizing a specific online platform to collect the data, which was WhatsApp (the feature of WhatsApp group) in spreading instruments and building communication between researchers and the participants.

**Instruments and Procedures**

Firstly, in obtaining the data related to translation ability, the researchers applied the translation test to collect data. It was conducted by selecting the participants, creating a WhatsApp group, inviting the participants to the group, informing the schedule and the rule or guidelines of the translation test, conducting the translation test by sending the source texts to the group, asking the students to translate the texts from English to Indonesian (allowing them to utilize online tools), asking the students to send the results of their translation products to researchers via WhatsApp private chat (not in the group), assessing the students’ translation products using the theory of Translation Quality Assessment by Nababan et al. (2012) (rated by a rater), determining the students’ translation ability by counting the score obtaining from the translation test using several formulas, classifying the level of their translation ability under the theory of Ruhansah (2013) and analyzing it using certain theory.

Secondly, in elaborating the additional information related to the data of the background factors influencing the students’ translation ability, the researchers asked the students to answer questionnaires spread to them as the technique of collecting the data. It was conducted by sharing the link of Google Form (the link of the questionnaire) with the students in the WhatsApp group, asking the students to access the link to fulfill the questionnaire, and closing the link access after all of the students fulfilled it to keep the originality of the result, downloading the result of the questionnaire and analyzing the data under particular theory.

**Data Analysis and Trustworthiness**

The data were analyzed using the theory of qualitative data analysis by Miles and Huberman (Miles et al., 2014), which included the step of data reduction/condensation by using data coding, data display by using extended text to describe the data narratively completed by certain types of table and graphics to convey the findings of the data analysis and data conclusion or verification by elaborating the data with argumentation and result or interpreting the data with the theories mentioned in this study.
In obtaining the trustworthiness of the study, the researchers used the dependability or reliability of interrater reliability. In this case, the researcher rated the data analysis to raters. The researchers also used methodology triangulation since all of the steps of this study were appropriate to particular theories of qualitative research’s methodology.

FINDINGS

The Students’ Translation Ability

This study found that the level of students’ translation ability in translating (English into Indonesian) the text entitled ‘Great Pacific Garbage Patch’ is different from their ability to translate the text entitled ‘Taj Mahal’. The students’ ability to translate the ‘Great Pacific Garbage Patch’ text is at the ‘Good’ level, with 77.54%. On the other hand, the students’ translation ability in translating the text entitled ‘Taj Mahal’ is at the ‘Excellent’ level with a percentage of 88.81%.

The detailed information about the total score of students’ translation quality assessment in translating the text entitled ‘Great Pacific Garbage Patch’ in each aspect of accuracy, acceptability, and readability is displayed in the Table 3 below:

| No. | Name | Accuracy | Acceptability | Readability | Final Score |
|-----|------|----------|----------------|-------------|-------------|
| 1.  | AA   | 62       | 62             | 69          | 193         |
| 2.  | AAY  | 83       | 84             | 90          | 257         |
| 3.  | RFAS | 77       | 76             | 90          | 243         |
| 4.  | REY  | 57       | 59             | 64          | 180         |
| 5.  | RFS  | 69       | 69             | 84          | 222         |
| 6.  | RAS  | 73       | 75             | 89          | 237         |
| 7.  | ZCA  | 69       | 72             | 90          | 231         |
| 8.  | AC   | 81       | 83             | 93          | 257         |
| 9.  | FGBCH| 61       | 61             | 68          | 190         |

Based on the table above, the student’s final score was counted using a formula to classify the students’ translation ability level. The level of students’ translation ability was explained in Table 4:
Based on the table above, the students’ translation ability in translating the text is ‘Good’ with a mean number is 223.33 and a percentage of 77.54%. Five students were at the good level, and four at the excellent level. The students’ translation abilities were counted under the formula as follows:

1. The formula of the mean number:

\[ M = \frac{\sum x}{N} \]

- M : The average of the students’ translation ability
- \( \sum x \) : The total raw score (2010)
- N : The total number of students (9)

\[ M = \frac{2010}{9} = 223.33 \]

2. The formula of the percentage:

\[ P = \frac{M}{N} \times 100\% \]

- P : The percentage of translation ability in general
- M : Average of the students’ translation ability (222)
- N : The maximum score (288)

\[ P = \frac{223.33}{288} \times 100\% = 77.54\% \]

The detailed information about the total score of students’ translation quality assessment in translating the text entitled ‘Taj Mahal’ in each aspect of accuracy, acceptance, and readability is displayed in the Table 5 below:

---

**Table 4. The students’ translation ability (Great Pacific Garbage Patch)**

| No. | Students | Score | Percentage | Level   |
|-----|----------|-------|------------|---------|
| 1.  | AA       | 193   | 67.01%     | Good    |
| 2.  | AAY      | 257   | 89.23%     | Excellent|
| 3.  | RFAS     | 243   | 84.37%     | Excellent|
| 4.  | REY      | 180   | 62.50%     | Good    |
| 5.  | RFS      | 222   | 77.08%     | Good    |
| 6.  | RAS      | 237   | 82.29%     | Excellent|
| 7.  | ZCA      | 231   | 80.20%     | Good    |
| 8.  | AC       | 257   | 89.23%     | Excellent|
| 9.  | FGBCH    | 190   | 65.97%     | Good    |

| Total | 2010   | 697.88% | Good   |
| Mean  | 223.33 | 77.54%  |        |
After counting the score using the same formula and steps as the previous text, there was found that the level of students’ translation ability in translating the ‘Taj Mahal’ text was explained by Table 6:

| No. | Students | Score | Percentage | Level  |
|-----|----------|-------|------------|--------|
| 1.  | AA       | 117   | 72.22%     | Good   |
| 2.  | AAY      | 146   | 90.12%     | Excellent |
| 3.  | RFAS     | 143   | 88.27%     | Excellent |
| 4.  | REY      | 134   | 82.71%     | Excellent |
| 5.  | RFS      | 155   | 95.67%     | Excellent |
| 6.  | RAS      | 159   | 98.14%     | Excellent |
| 7.  | ZCA      | 154   | 95.06%     | Excellent |
| 8.  | AC       | 159   | 98.14%     | Excellent |
| 9.  | FGBCH    | 128   | 79.01%     | Good |

Total 1295 799.34% Excellent

In conclusion, the students’ translation ability was ‘Excellent’ with a mean number is 143.88 and a percentage of 88.81%. There were two students at the good level and seven at the excellent level.

The Factors Influencing the Students’ Translation Ability

Based on the quantitative data analysis, it was found that the students’ good and excellent ability in translating the texts was influenced by many educational factors presented in Table 7 below:
Table 7. The factors influencing students’ translation ability

| No. | The Topic of the Question                                      | Answer | Percentage |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------|--------|------------|
|     |                                                                 | Yes    | No         |
|     |                                                                 | Yes    | No         |
| 1.  | Context interaction with the teacher                          | 7      | 2          | 77.8% | 22.2% |
| 2.  | Context interaction with other                                 | 8      | 1          | 88.9% | 11.1% |
| 3.  | Context interaction with classmates                           | 8      | 1          | 88.9% | 11.1% |
| 4.  | The positive attitude to the interaction                      | 9      | 0          | 100%  | 0%    |
| 5.  | Context non-reciprocal (English music)                        | 9      | 0          | 100%  | 0%    |
| 6.  | Context non-reciprocal English videos                         | 9      | 0          | 100%  | 0%    |
| 7.  | Adjustment interaction with foreigners                         | 6      | 3          | 66.7% | 33.3% |
| 8.  | Adjustment interaction (English Teacher)                       | 6      | 3          | 66.7% | 33.3% |
| 9.  | Adjustment interaction (English Club Tutor)                    | 9      | 0          | 100%  | 0%    |
| 10. | The positive attitude to the interaction                      | 9      | 0          | 100%  | 0%    |
| 11. | Positive attitude to language transfer                        | 9      | 0          | 100%  | 0%    |
| 12. | Language transfer as a habit                                  | 6      | 3          | 66.7% | 33.3% |
| 13. | Cognitive accounts (working on input)                          | 8      | 1          | 88.9% | 11.1% |
| 14. | Cognitive accounts (manifesting to output)                     | 7      | 2          | 77.8% | 22.2% |
| 15. | Linguistic Universal (LAD)                                    | 9      | 0          | 100%  | 0%    |
| 16. | Age (learning English before ten years old)                    | 7      | 2          | 77.8% | 22.2% |
| 17. | Language Aptitude (sensitivity to sound)                       | 4      | 5          | 44.4% | 55.6% |
| 18. | Language Aptitude (sensitivity to structure)                   | 7      | 2          | 77.8% | 22.2% |
| 19. | Language Aptitude (sensitivity to memory)                      | 4      | 5          | 44.4% | 55.6% |
| 20. | Having the motivation to learn English                         | 9      | 0          | 100%  | 0%    |
| 21. | Internal motivation                                           | 9      | 0          | 100%  | 0%    |
| 22. | External motivation (reward)                                  | 0      | 9          | 0%    | 100%  |
| 23. | External motivation (society)                                 | 6      | 3          | 66.7% | 33.3% |
| 24. | Dependent cognitive style                                     | 7      | 2          | 77.8% | 22.2% |
| 25. | Learning strategy (metacognitive)                             | 6      | 3          | 66.7% | 33.3% |
| 26. | Learning strategy (cognitive)                                 | 7      | 2          | 77.8% | 22.2% |
| 27. | Learning strategy (social/affective)                          | 3      | 6          | 33.3% | 66.7% |
| 28. | Metacognitive                                                  | 9      | 0          | 100%  | 0%    |
| 29. | Cognitive                                                     | 6      | 3          | 66.7% | 33.3% |
| 30. | Memory                                                        | 8      | 1          | 88.9% | 11.1% |
| 31. | Activation                                                    | 5      | 4          | 55.6% | 44.4% |
| 32. | Not considering the comprehensibility and acceptability        | 3      | 6          | 33.3% | 66.7% |
| 33. | Considering the comprehensibility and acceptability            | 6      | 3          | 66.7% | 33.3% |
| 34. | Online dictionary                                             | 6      | 3          | 66.7% | 33.3% |
| 35. | Machine translation                                           | 8      | 1          | 88.9% | 11.1% |
| 36. | Concordance                                                   | 4      | 5          | 44.4% | 55.6% |
| 37. | Search engine                                                 | 5      | 4          | 55.6% | 44.4% |
| 38. | Problems with strange words/terms                             | 4      | 5          | 44.4% | 55.6% |
| 39. | Problems in choosing precise words/terms                      | 7      | 2          | 77.8% | 22.2% |
| 40. | ‘Great Pacific Garbage Patch’ is more difficult to be translated than ‘Taj Mahal’ | 8      | 1          | 88.9% | 11.1% |
| 41. | ‘Great Pacific Garbage Patch’ gives more new vocabulary than ‘Taj Mahal’ | 8      | 1          | 88.9% | 11.1% |
In conclusion, the students’ ability to translate texts was influenced by various background factors. The factors consisted of external factors, internal factors, learners as individuals, vocabulary, grammar, and online tools utilized in the translating process as part of learning media. Moreover, the researchers also differentiated the students’ perceptions in translating the texts.

**DISCUSSION**

**EFL Learners’ Translation Ability**

The translation reflects the knowledge and practical intelligence of the students in learning English (Newmark, 1988) (as cited in Sundari & Febriyanti, 2016) and their ability to deal with the four primary skills in language learning (Malmkjær, 1997) (as cited in Laviosa, 2014). In line with the theories above, it can be concluded that the students’ good and excellent ability to translate texts from English into Indonesian reflects their success in comprehending texts in their learning process. This synthesis is supported by the previous study, which shows a significant correlation between eleven-grade students’ reading comprehension and their translation ability, indicated by the good level of their reading comprehension and translation ability (Habibah, 2018). Imandari et al. (2015) revealed that the translation ability of EFL learners in higher education was excellent and reached a good quality. In addition, Ningsih et al. (2018) found that 62.5% of sixth-semester students in the English language education program of a national university performed successfully in translation ability at a sufficient level.

In contrast, this study emphasizes the high school level students in the vocational school. They have been introduced by translation as their language learning process; it has been found that most of them perform excellently. It is linear with Yessy & Sinambela (2018), which found that although the vocational high school EFL learners often used literal translation, 83% of them were able to translate texts from SL into TL. This research also links the findings to discussing the influential factors supporting the ability condition.

**Influential Factors Affecting the Translation Ability**

In contrast with the previous studies, which only explore the excellent and sufficient level of students’ ability to translate texts and its correlation with English reading comprehension (Imandari et al., 2015) (Habibah, 2018) (Yessy & Sinambela, 2018) (Ningsih et al., 2019), this research reveals the influential factors by approaching to the various TEFL theories including
the learner-external factors, learner-internal factors, and the language learner as an individual (Ellis, 1994), online tools (Wuttikrikunlaya et al., 2018), strategy in learning vocabulary (Gu & Johnson, 1996) and strategy in teaching grammar (Renandya, 2013). These factors contribute to the students’ learning outcomes reflected in the results of their English performance, such as translation products. It is in line with Ningsih et al. (2019). They stated that if the students have an unsupportive environment that creates difficulties in translating the texts, their translation products’ scores are negatively affected. Moreover, Sriwantaneeyakul (2018) shows a positive relationship between critical reading skills and translation ability, and students with high levels of critical reading tend to have better translation ability. Those findings reveal that various backgrounds and conditions influence students’ translation abilities.

Social factors shape EFL learners’ attitudes toward learning and determine their learning outcomes, while L2 acquisition only occurs when input is in the form of interaction with spoken or written sources (Ellis, 1994). The findings show that based on the students’ natural setting of their social factors, English served as their foreign language. Therefore, the foreign language classroom is classified as their educational setting. Additionally, positive interpersonal interactions with stakeholders and the high exposure to English from a multimodal perspective, specifically revealed in the results, clearly explain why the students have excellent translation abilities. It is appropriate with a theory from Ellis (1994) that the interactions can help the students be more adaptive and increase their ability to learn English. Understandably, to gain students’ learning outcomes, teachers should engage the students to interact with people and increase English exposure in the classroom.

EFL learners’ state of personal conditions also plays an influential factor. All participants are equipped with the innate ability to understand language through learning, which helps them process the information from English to Indonesian with the context. It is supported by Chomsky (2002), who stated that the Language Acquisitional Device is a crucial innate ability for processing foreign language in the activity of foreign-language learning. The findings also reflect the theory from Broughton et al. (2003) that LAD enables students to perceive language and systematically identify acceptable linguistic data. Lightbown & Spada (2013) argue that LAD allows learners to achieve total mastery of a foreign language with minimal effort. Positive attitude and habits toward language transfer manifested in translation activity also contribute to the students’ performance in learning English since habits in transferring language is known as facilitation, which is also part of positive-language-transfer manifestation (Ellis, 1994). According to Ellis (1994), the capability of accounting the mental process to work in
input and the capability of accounting the knowledge systems constructed and manifested in output are the accounts had by EFL learners in processing L2, which influence their ability. Ergo, this discussion suggests that EFL teachers optimize their ELT classroom with translation activities to develop a positive attitude and habits of transferring language in the context of the language in use.

CPH (Critical Period Hypothesis) identifies that before ten years old is the fixed span of years during which language learning can take place naturally and effortlessly and after which it is not possible to be entirely successful (Ellis, 1994). In line with that, the CPH from the majority of the students took a significant role in their English acquisition appeared in their translation ability. This research shows that the high sensitivity to English Grammar plays a role in the students’ excellency of translation ability. It agrees with DeKeyser (2006) that the sensitivity to the structure can influence the students’ grasp of English Grammar which is helpful for them to process the meaning of language. Motivation plays a significant role in the learning process as a complex construction involving learners’ reasons and goals that attribute to their attempts to learn L2 or EFL (Ellis, 2015). In this case, all English Club students in SMK N 2 Surakarta are internally and externally motivated to learn English. Lastly, learning strategy also influences the ability to learn English (Ellis, 1994) which automatically becomes the background of the students’ translation ability. The majority of the students naturally make use of translation as their strategy in EFL learning. This is in line with the understanding that translation plays a vital role in ELT, and teachers should include this activity in their TEFL practices.

Metacognitive strategy is used in identifying essential words for comprehending the target text in the target language and using various means to clarify the meaning of words (Ghazal, 2017). In a similar vein, the findings reveal that all students unintentionally apply metacognitive strategies in their learning process. Therefore, it gives them a good ability to identify words in SL and TL. Newmark (1988) often mentions that translation is part of the metacognitive process. The findings also highlight that the use of a direct teaching strategy is often performed by their English teachers, which Renandya (2013) states is good for the students in learning grammar to enhance the students’ learning outcome in English. Therefore, this factor influences the students’ grammar understanding which helps them to translate texts. It indicates that the strategy in teaching grammar also affects the English Club students’ translation ability. EFL teachers should consider this in their teaching strategy.
The participants showed a positive attitude toward the use of online tools for supporting their learning performance in translating texts, the fact that they utilized online dictionaries, machine translation (Google Translate), concordance (Thesaurus), and search engine (Google). It is in line with Lam & Lawrence (2002) and Gilakjani (2017) that the use of technology can assist learners in adjusting their learning process by accessing much information that the teacher does not provide, and it has great potential to change the existing language teaching methods (as cited in Ahmadi, 2018). Moreover, Manowong (2017) found that the internet is a crucial tool to enhance the EFL learners’ experience in learning English by assisting, motivating, and increasing their skills and creativity in educational settings. The four primary online tools used in language learning are online dictionaries, concordances, machine translation, and search engines (Wuttikrikunlaya et al., 2018). Finally, EFL teachers should not constrain online tools in classroom activity because they can help increase students’ English ability, skills, and mastery.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the students’ ability to learn English which appears in their translation ability in translating text, can be used to measure their learning outcomes. Translation is the fifth skill in language learning and its ability is the reflection of the second stage of students’ evolutionary continuum. In this case, the English Club students' ability in SMK Negeri 2 Surakarta in their debate class is good in translating the text from a digital source and excellent in translating the text from their English textbook. The students’ translation ability condition is also influenced by various factors, as seen from the educational perspective. EFL teachers strongly suggest paying massive attention to the influential factors in language learning to optimize the potential for better ELT practice. In addition, future researchers may conduct research in the scope of translation in TEFL to make the widespread translation in EFL education, moreover in the setting of English debate class, which requires students to understand debated cases both in English and Indonesian.
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