

CHAPTER 4 RESULTS

This chapter provided statistical information on the students' results and their scores in each of the three types of translation as follows:

- 1) Students
 - Number of Students
 - English proficiency
- 2) Test Scores
 - TM Translation
 - ≠TM Translation
 - Short Passage
 - Rates of Scores
 - Correlations Between Scores and Types of Translation
 - Correlations Between Scores and Proficiency Levels

1. STUDENTS

1.1 Number of Students

The subjects of this study were 75 first-year students studying in the Southeast Asian Studies Program. As part of their curriculum they also studied the English course EL 172 for the 2001 academic year at the Language Institute. The background information including the number of participants and the mean English proficiency of each class is presented in Tables 1 and 2.

TABLE 3 Number of Students

Students	Number	%
Class 1	26	34.7
Class 2	27	36.0
Class 3	22	29.3
Total	75	100.0

From Table 3, the total number of students from the three classes is 75. Class 2 has the highest number of students (27 students of 36.0%). The runners up

are Class 1 and Class 3 which have the number of students of 26 (34.7%) and 22 (29.3%), respectively.

1.2 English Proficiency

TABLE 4 The Students' Grades in EL 171

Grades	Students					
	Class 1		Class2		Class3	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
1	0	0	3	11.11	2	9.10
2	1	3.85	6	22.22	3	13.63
3	6	23.08	11	40.74	6	27.27
4	19	73.07	7	25.93	11	50.00
Total	26	100.00	27	100.00	22	100.00
$\bar{x} = \frac{\sum fx}{n}$	$\frac{96}{36} = 3.69$		$\frac{76}{27} = 2.81$		$\frac{70}{22} = 3.18$	
$\bar{x} = \frac{\sum fx}{n} = \frac{242}{75} = 3.23$						

* $p \leq 0.05$

Table 4 shows the students' previous grades in EL 171 from the first semester. The grades range from 1 to 4 with the mean of 3.23. Students in Class 1 have the highest proficiency in English ($\bar{x} = 3.69$). Students in Class 3 have the second highest proficiency ($\bar{x} = 3.18$), while students in Class 2 have the lowest proficiency ($\bar{x} = 2.81$).

2. TEST SCORES

To meet the objectives of this study, students were assigned the task of translating 8 Thai sentences, 4 with time markers (TM), and 4 without time markers (\neq TM), and a short passage into English. Their scores are presented in Tables 5, 6, and 7.

2.1 TM Translation

TABLE 5 Scores in TM Translation

Scores	Number of Students	%
1 mark	17	22.7
2 marks	28	37.3
3 marks	29	38.7
4 marks	1	1.3
Total	75	100.0

As seen in Table 5, most students got 3 or 2 marks which is equivalent to 38.7% and 37.3% of the total number of participants. A smaller proportion of students (22.7%) got 1 mark, while the smallest proportion (1.3%) or only one student got a full score of 4 marks.

2.2 ≠TM Translation

TABLE 6 Scores in ≠TM Translation

Scores	Number of Students	%
0 mark	10	13.3
1 marks	11	14.7
2 marks	40	53.3
3 marks	11	14.7
4 marks	3	4.0
Total	75	100.0

Table 6 shows that when translating sentences without time markers, most students (40 or 53.3%) got 2 marks. 11 students (14.7%) got 1 mark and another 11 students (14.7%) got 3 marks, respectively. Like TM translation, only 3 students (4.0%) got a full score of 4 marks.

2.3 Short Passage Translation

TABLE 7 Scores in Short Passage Translation

Scores	Number of Students	%
2 marks	5	6.7
3 marks	11	14.7
4 marks	14	18.7
5 marks	20	26.7
6 marks	12	16.0
7 marks	8	10.7
8 marks	5	6.7
Total	75	100.0

It can be seen from Table 7 that when completing a short passage translation, 20 students received 5 marks. This is equivalent to 26.7%. A smaller percentage of students, 18.7%, 16.0%, 14.7%, and 10.7% got 4, 6, 3, and 7 marks, respectively. On each end of the spectrum 6.7% of students who got either 2 or 8 marks.

2.4 Rates of Scores

2.4.1 Overall Scores

TABLE 8 Rates of Overall Scores

Rates	Number of Students	%
Low	20	26.7
Middle	36	48.0
High	19	25.3
Total	75	100.0

Table 8 shows the rates of overall scores. 48.0% of students received middle scores. While the low and high scores were almost the same proportion at 26.7% and 25.3%, respectively.

2.4.2 Scores in Each Type of Translation

TABLE 9 Number of Students in the Performance of Each Type of Translation

Rates	Translation					
	= TM		≠TM		Short Passage	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Low	45	60.60	21	28.0	30	40.0
Middle	29	38.7	40	53.3	32	42.7
High	1	1.3	14	18.7	13	17.3
Total	75	100.00	75	100.00	75	100.00

Table 9 compares the score rates for each type of translation. It is found that in TM translation, most students (60.60%) got low scores, while in ≠TM and the short passage translation most students got middle scores. This is equivalent to 53.3% and 42.7%, respectively.

It is obvious that in all types of translation only a very small percentage of students got high scores.

Based on the students' English proficiency and the test scores, the next part of this chapter will investigate whether there is a relationship between these two results.

2.5 Mean Differences Between Scores and Types of Translation

Tables 10 – 11 present differences between the scores and the various types of translation.

TABLE 10 Mean Differences Between Scores and Types of Translation

Correlations	df	SS	MS	F	Sig.F
Between-group differences	2	403.44	201.72	150.561	0.000*
Within-group differences	222	297.44	1.34		

* $p < 0.001$

Table 10 presents the mean differences between scores and the type of translation. After using ANOVA, it is found that there is indeed a significant difference between the scores and the types of translation, $F = 150.561$, $p < 0.001$. In order to find out in what way the scores vary with the different types of translation, LSD test was applied. The results are presented in Table 11.

TABLE 11 Different Scores According to Types of Translation

Types of Translation	\bar{x}	S.D.	Scores		
			Class 1	Class 2	Class 3
TM	2.26	0.72	-	*	*
≠TM	1.81	0.98	*	-	*
Short Passage	4.85	1.59	*	*	-

* $p \leq 0.05$

Table 11 indicates that students got higher scores in the short passage translation ($\bar{x} = 4.85$) than in TM ($\bar{x} = 2.26$) and ≠TM ($\bar{x} = 1.81$) translation. In this instance, the students performed better in TM translation than in ≠TM translation.

In order to find out the correlation pattern between ≠TM translation and the short passage translation, Simple Linear Regression is used. The results are shown in Table 12.

TABLE 12 Correlations of Scores in TM Translation with Scores in Short Passage Translation

Variables	B	Beta	T	Sig.t
≠TM	0.218	0.357	3.222	0.002*
Constant	1.12			
R	0.13			
Adj. R ²	0.11			
F	5.546			
Sig.F	0.006			

* $p \leq 0.05$

Table 12 provides the correlation of scores in ≠TM translation and short passage translation. It is found that scores in ≠TM translation significantly correlates with scores in short passage translation, Sig.t = 0.002, $p \leq 0.05$. In addition,

such correlation is positive $B = 0.218$. That is, students who got high scores in \neq TM translation also got high scores in short passage translation.

The three classes of students each have a different mean level of English proficiency. In the following section the relationship between the test scores and the proficiency is examined. Class 1, 2 and 3 are referred to as having High, Low and Middle levels of proficiency, respectively.

2.6 Mean Differences Between Scores and Proficiency Levels

Tables 13 show the mean differences between the test scores and the established proficiency levels of each class.

TABLE 13 Mean Differences Between Scores and Proficiency Levels

	df	SS	MS	F	Sig.F
1. Overall					
Between-group differences	2	70.44	35.02	7.570	0.001*
Within-group differences	72	333.10	4.62		
2. TM					
Between-group differences	2	2.31	1.15	1.849	0.165
Within-group differences	72	45.07	0.62		
3. \neq TM					
Between-group differences	2	24.21	12.10	18.470	0.000*
Within-group differences	72	47.18	0.65		
4. Short Passage					
Between-group differences	2	11.36	5.68	2.275	0.110
Within-group differences	72	179.78	2.49		

* $p \leq 0.05$

Table 13 reveals the mean differences between the scores and the three established proficiency levels. It is found that there are differences between the overall scores and the levels, $\text{Sig.F} = 0.001$, $p \leq 0.05$. In addition, There are differences between the three levels and scores in \neq TM translation, $\text{Sig.F} = 0.000$, $p \leq$

0.05. In order to find out the correlation pattern of these differences, LSD test was applied. The results are provided in Tables 14 and 15.

TABLE 14 A Comparison of the Overall Scores of the Students in the Three Proficiency Levels

Proficiency Levels	\bar{X}	S.D.	Overall Scores		
			1	2	3
High	10.03	1.61	-	*	-
Low	7.74	2.59	*	-	-
Middle	8.95	2.10	-	-	-

* $p \leq 0.05$

From Table 14, which compares the overall scores of students in the three proficiency levels, it is found that students in the High level class did indeed get higher scores ($\bar{X} = 10.03$) than students in the Low level class ($\bar{X} = 7.74$).

Table 15 A Comparison of Scores in \neq TM Translation of the Students in the Three Proficiency Levels

Proficiency Levels	\bar{X}	S.D.	Overall Scores		
			1	2	3
High	2.50	0.76	-	*	*
Low	1.14	0.90	*	-	*
Middle	1.81	0.73	*	*	-

* $p \leq 0.05$

Table 15 compares scores in \neq TM translation of the students in the three proficiency levels. It is found that scores in \neq TM translation of students of the High level ($\bar{X} = 2.50$) are higher than those of students of the Low level ($\bar{X} = 1.14$) and students of the Middle level ($\bar{X} = 1.81$). In the same manner, scores of the students of the Middle level are higher than those of the students of the Low level.

The statistical information presented in this chapter provides answers to the research questions: "Does proficiency in English affect the use of English tenses by university students as measured by their performance?" and "Do the three proficiency levels of students perform differently on each translation type?" Proficiency in English does affect the students' use of English tenses. Good evidence is overall and \neq TM types scores. Students who had higher English proficiency got

higher scores than those who had lower English proficiency. Furthermore, regarding different performances of students in the three proficiency levels, a significant difference can be seen only in \neq TM translation. How types of translation and English proficiency affect the use of English tense by these university students is analyzed in Chapter 5.

