

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION, LIMITATION, AND RECOMMENDATION

This chapter is composed of three sections. Section 5.1 presents the conclusion of the study, section 5.2 discusses limitations of the study, and section 5.3 puts forward some suggestions for future study that also serves as the last part of the report paper.

5.1 Conclusion

This study mainly seeks to investigate whether the use of Translation Memory software, namely Wordfast Classic (WFC), can improve the students' translation quality and to explore students' views on this computer software use during the translation course. To achieve these purposes, quantitative and qualitative approach were employed. The improvement of the students' translation quality was measured quantitatively, and qualitative analyses was applied to the students' views on the application of WFC in the translation course.

The results of this study indicate that students assigned to the experimental group who used WFC to complete their translation works made a statistically significant improvement in their translation quality; however, it is not safe to draw a conclusion that this improvement was made because of the use of WFC given students assigned to the control group who did not use the software also made an improvement in their translation quality. Phrased another way, those who use WFC did not do any better than those who did not. The improvement is unlikely to be triggered by the medium they used during the course, but is likely as a result of the teaching and learning process.

This aforementioned finding doesn't seem to support DeCasaris's (1995) suggestion that TM software has a potential to improve students' translation quality. Even so, generally, students viewed the classroom use of Wordfast Classic positively as follows:

1. Wordfast Classic provides a comfortable working environment
Segmentation featured by WFC provides a comfortable working environment by parsing the text into smaller units and by keeping the source and target text in the same page, so students did not need to open two different documents while working.
2. Wordfast Classic avoids skipping text and makes revision easy
Segmentation also helps students not skip text and make the editing or revising process easy.
3. Wordfast Classic helps students maintain terminological and phraseological consistency
Students felt that Glossary database and concordance search featured by WFC helps them maintain the terminological and phraseological consistency.
4. Wordfast Classic makes workgroup activities easy
Translation Memory and Glossary sharing allows workgroups to share translations that were previously done by their partners, making group activities easy.
5. WFC leaves the text layout unchanged, no need to do DTP (desktop publishing)
One of time consuming processes is desktop publishing (rearranging the target text layout). When translating electronic text, students often accidentally change the layout. That did not happen when they used Wordfast Classic as it kept the original format of the ST.

These five views, which were reported in their journals and interviews, seem to justify the claims made by Champollion (2012a; 2012b) about the benefits of using Wordfast Classic for the translators. In addition, students also seem to agree

with some scholars who suggest that computer technology should be included into translation course (e.g., Clark, 1994; Lewis, 1997; Somer, 2003b; Wältermann, 1994).

6. Wordfast Classic should be used in translation classroom

As students are facing the age of computerization, they thought that TM software should be introduced in translation course and that their institution was responsible for providing sufficient computer facilities.

However, the last one is worthy of further consideration.

7. Wordfast Classic interface is confusing

The students felt that there were too many commands and shortcuts they had to remember. They thought the interface was confusing. However, they felt that this happened because they didn't get used to it yet.

This view indicates that students' computer literacy becomes a challenge when adopting TM software into a classroom environment.

5.2 Limitation of the Study

The findings of the study may lead to conclusion that students who used Translation Memory software did not do any better than those who did not and that generally students viewed the classroom use of this type of computer software in a positive manner; however, generalization cannot be made on the basis of what has been found in this study. This is particularly due to the fact that this study is context-specific and entails some limitations.

One of the major limitations is that this study only measured the quality of students' translation works, but not the quantity. The quantity measurement was actually important since TM software is reported by professional translators (e.g., Indarta, 2012, see appendix one) to have improved their productivity. However, time constraints made it hard to do everything. In addition, the quality

measurement was also not problem-free. There was a potential loss of reliability because students' translation works were assessed by a single scorer. It was really hard to find and ask for help from volunteer translation instructors to involve in the scoring process.

During the course of the study, the researcher actively involved in the process of teaching and assessing students' works so that a potential loss of objectivity is very possible to take place in every stage of the research conduct. Another limitation is that students' journals that were only collected at the end of study may result in data that would otherwise be richer provided that they were collected after each session of the teaching and learning process.

The decision of taking out some students of the interview stage was also only upon the researcher's interpretation of students' journals, where he himself was to decide who was and who was not necessary to be interviewed. This might have left out some necessary information.

Furthermore, the relationships between students and the researcher also may have influenced the results of this study. There is a risk for the students to try to please the researcher who served as an instructor by giving bias information during the interview and in the journals they wrote.

5.3 Recommendation

Although the study has found that students who used WFC did not any better than those who did not, it is still recommended that TM be gradually introduced to students at university level given the need for promoting computer literacy among them as Hatim and Munday (2004) suggest that "translation is no longer the preserve of human translators but ... increasingly a process and product that marries computing power and the computerized analysis" (p.4). Furthermore, the finding of this study also suggests that students found it interesting to work with TM software, so they may be motivated to learn translation.

However, it should be well noted that computer is no more than teaching and learning aid; if a similar program this study has implemented is to be replicated, the focal point of the teaching process should still be on how to build students' translation competence, and it should be better to be tried out in various contexts and levels of education to see the effectiveness of using TM software to improve students' translation competence and quality from different perspectives and possibilities.

It is also recommended that a similar study measure the students' productivity improvement and, if possible, involve at the very least one fellow researcher in the assessment process. This may reduce the potential loss of assessment reliability and validity.

It is expected that this study may offer some new insights regarding the practice of teaching and learning translation.