

A Study of Thai EFL Students' Attitudes in Using Google Translate

การศึกษาทัศนคติที่มีต่อการใช้ Google Translate

ของผู้เรียนชาวไทยที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ

Asama Tasanameelarp^{1*}

Tuna Girgin¹

Suchada Tipmontree¹

Faculty of Liberal Arts and Management Sciences,
Prince of Songkla University, Surat Thani Campus¹

*e-mail: asama.ta@psu.ac.th

อัสมา ทรรคนะมีลาภ¹

ทูน่า เกอร์กิน¹

สุชาดา ทิพย์มนตรี¹

คณะศิลปศาสตร์และวิทยาการจัดการ มหาวิทยาลัยสงขลานครินทร์ วิทยาเขตสุราษฎร์ธานี¹

Received: April 21, 2023, Revised: July 10, 2023, Accepted: July 25, 2023

Abstract

Google Translate (GT) is one of the popular machine translations used pervasively by foreign language learners for various purposes. This study investigated Thai EFL students' attitudes towards the use of GT as well as the problems and drawbacks of using Google Translate. A set of questionnaires were administered to the 3rd and 4th years of Thai EFL students majoring in English for Business Communication at a university in southern Thailand (N =310). Then, in order to gather more in-depth information, ten students from each student batch were randomly selected for in-depth interviews. The quantitative data from the questionnaire were analysed for percentage and mean scores, and the qualitative data were analysed by content analysis and presented in both percentage and a descriptive way. Based on the findings, the students showed overall positive attitudes toward using GT for their English language learning (\bar{X} =3.70). The results from the interviews about the problems and drawbacks of using GT showed that most students received inaccurate outputs from GT. The results of the in-depth interview reported the students admitted that they rarely learn new vocabulary or sentence structures using GT because they always copied the translation outputs for their assignment submission without even double-checking. In addition, the results also reported significant factors encouraging the use of GT among EFL students, including three main causes why the students had to use GT; their limited knowledge of English, excessive amount of assignments and activities, and the difficulty of assignments. The study concluded with the recommendations for administrators, EFL teachers, and students.

Keywords: Google Translate; Attitudes; Thai EFL Students

บทคัดย่อ

GT เป็นเครื่องมือการแปลชนิดหนึ่งที่มีความนิยมอย่างแพร่หลายจากผู้เรียนภาษาประเทศ ในการนำไปใช้เพื่อวัตถุประสงค์ที่หลากหลาย งานวิจัยชิ้นนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์หลักเพื่อศึกษาทัศนคติที่มีต่อการใช้ GT ของผู้เรียนชาวไทยที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศและปัญหาที่พบในการใช้เครื่องมือ GT คณะผู้วิจัยได้ส่งแบบสอบถามให้นักศึกษาชั้นปีที่ 3 และ 4 สาขาวิชาภาษาอังกฤษเพื่อการสื่อสารทางธุรกิจของมหาวิทยาลัยแห่งหนึ่งทางภาคใต้ของประเทศไทย (N=310) จากนั้นเพื่อให้ได้ข้อมูลเชิงลึกมากขึ้น นักศึกษาจำนวน 10 คน ของแต่ละชั้นปีได้ถูกเลือกเพื่อเข้าร่วมการสัมภาษณ์เชิงลึก ข้อมูลเชิงปริมาณจากการเก็บแบบสอบถามจะถูกนำมาวิเคราะห์เพื่อหาค่าร้อยละและค่าเฉลี่ย ข้อมูลเชิงคุณภาพจากการสัมภาษณ์จะนำมาวิเคราะห์เชิงเนื้อหาและนำเสนอทั้งค่าร้อยละและการบรรยาย ผลจากการวิจัย พบว่า ในภาพรวมผู้เรียนมีทัศนคติที่ดีต่อเครื่องมือ GT ในการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ ($\bar{X} = 3.70$) ผลจากการสัมภาษณ์เรื่องปัญหาการใช้ GT แสดงให้เห็นว่าผู้เรียนส่วนใหญ่พบปัญหาผลการแปลที่ได้ไม่ถูกต้อง นอกจากนี้ ผลการสัมภาษณ์เชิงลึก พบว่า ผู้เรียนยอมรับว่าแทบจะไม่ได้เรียนรู้คำศัพท์ใหม่หรือโครงสร้างทางภาษาจากการใช้เครื่องมือ GT เนื่องจากเวลาใช้จะคัดลอกและวางผลการแปลเพื่อส่งงานโดยไม่ได้ตรวจอีกทั้งนี้ ผลการวิจัยแสดงให้เห็นว่า ปัจจัยสำคัญสามประการที่เป็นสาเหตุทำให้ผู้เรียนต้องใช้เครื่องมือ GT ได้แก่ ความรู้ที่ไม่เพียงพอด้านภาษาอังกฤษ จำนวนการบ้านและกิจกรรมที่มาก และการขาดการแนะนำจากผู้สอน งานวิจัยครั้งนี้ยังได้ให้ข้อเสนอแนะซึ่งสรุปจากผลวิจัยเพื่อผู้บริหารผู้สอนภาษาอังกฤษและผู้เรียนได้นำไปใช้

คำสำคัญ: Google Translate ทัศนคติ ผู้เรียนชาวไทยที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ

Introduction

Over the last two decades, the Internet has had a profound impact on our everyday lives. Individuals worldwide utilize the Internet for a wide range of purposes, spanning from commerce to travel, leisure to learning. Consequently, a majority of people have recognized the need to enhance their technical abilities in order to adapt to the swift technological advancements in our global society (Aghaei et al., 2020). Personal computers, smartphones, and other technological advancements have significantly influenced practically every field of study, particularly education. Furthermore, in the current stage of the COVID-19 outbreak, the integration of technology into online language education has garnered significant focus. Despite the challenges associated with incorporating technology into language education and learning, the COVID-19 pandemic has expedited the process of merging technology in this field (Hakim, 2020).

According to Alsied, & Pathan (2013), Internet technology serves as a contemporary tool in language education, facilitating the acquisition of essential language skills by learners. Within the

realm of language instruction, Internet technology is regarded as a modern resource that can offer language learners valuable linguistic information. In today's globalized world, the Internet is widely acknowledged as an extensive repository of information available in multiple languages. It serves as a convenient and direct source of information accessible through electronic devices like mobile phones, computers, and tablets. Moreover, these devices empower learners to take charge of their own learning, irrespective of their location or the time of day (Aghaei, Rajabi, Lie, & Ajam, 2020).

As stated by Isisag (2012), the Internet has significant effects on learners' motivation. It contributes significantly to their autonomous learning, where they may actively practice and improve their language skills without relying solely on school-based learning resources. Consequently, traditional teaching and learning, in which knowledge is mostly gathered in the classroom, has fundamentally changed.

Several studies have found that English language learners widely use Internet technology since it helps students look for material to practice and improve their English language skills while

enhancing their linguistic understanding (Purcell et al., 2012). Furthermore, numerous studies have shown that most learners prefer using websites, mobile applications, and programs to address their language issues during their learning both inside and outside the classroom (Musk, & Cekalte, 2012).

Google Translate (GT) is highly favored by language learners due to its effectiveness in translating source material from one language to another. Its popularity stems from its user-friendly interface, which allows learners to easily input text and obtain translations with just a few clicks. Additionally, the platform offers translations in a wide array of languages, making it a versatile tool for learners seeking to explore various linguistic contexts (Alhaisoni, & Alhaysony, 2017). For some educators, using GT is more beneficial for language learners than a dictionary. One reason is that it is easily and available via numerous sorts of electronic devices at any time and from any location. Furthermore, it contains the most recent words, phrases, and collocations, so it not only helps language learners obtain fresh knowledge about different languages but is also used by learners to overcome language challenges (Lyons, 2016).

Despite its numerous advantages to language learners, however, GT has certain limitations in translation. As languages differ and there are so many lexical variations between languages in terms of syntax, sentence formation, grammar, and structure, English language learners should be aware that GT is not suitable for language learning (Somers, 2002). This can cause problems for language learners when they enter words, phrases or sentences for translation without knowing these disadvantages. Considering these facts, it would be fascinating to investigate how well GT supports and promotes English language learners in their language learning process. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to investigate Thai EFL students' attitudes towards using Google Translate. This study also investigated their perspectives and

issues with the usage of Google Translation in order to better understand how learners might use it most effectively in their language learning.

Research Objectives

To explore Thai EFL students' attitudes towards using GT as well as the problems and drawbacks of using Google Translate.

Literature Review

Google Translate, a widely used online translation resource, has been continuously developed and maintained for approximately thirteen years (Alhaisoni, & Alhaysony, 2017). GT is a free tool that provides instant translation of words, phrases, documents, and websites in over one hundred languages (Jabak, 2019). It operates as a translation memory program that improves with more translation jobs and corrections, enabling enhanced multilingual oral and written communication. The software swiftly generates translations (Alsalem, 2019) and is compatible with PC and smartphone operating systems, including Android and IOS. Notably, GT is capable of translating various forms of content, such as texts, touch screen scripts, speech, text screenshots, and even text scanning using a smartphone camera. It also offers offline translation without the need for a network connection. These remarkable features have contributed to the widespread popularity of GT among users (Alhaisoni, & Alhaysony, 2017).

According to Alsalem (2019), GT offers significant support to translators and language learners through its diverse range of functionalities, which include basic word meaning verification and comprehensive full-text translations. With a substantial user base comprising millions of daily users, GT is extensively utilized for both translation and language learning purposes. Moreover, GT possesses the potential to act as an effective facilitator within educational settings, aiding in the completion of students' assignments and tasks, thus resulting in notable time and effort savings. This characteristic has led

to GT being considered an indispensable tool by many individuals. Jabak (2019) further asserts that GT holds numerous advantages, particularly in the acquisition of new vocabulary, comprehension of short texts, and construction of sentences in foreign languages. As a result, GT is widely regarded as the most commonly employed program, especially among English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students, due to its user-friendly interface and ease of use.

Despite the high level of comprehensibility achieved in the translations produced by Google Translate, it is important to note that they often necessitate human refinement due to the program's tendency to generate contextually inappropriate, irrelevant, or illogical translations (Alsalem, 2019). Ducar, & Schocket (2018) conducted an extensive analysis of previous studies on the utilization of Google Translate, specifically examining the advantages and disadvantages of employing the tool and exploring its pedagogical implications within second language instruction. Their findings revealed that GT demonstrates proficiency in avoiding spelling errors, effectively correcting learners' spelling mistakes, promptly translating commonly used idioms, and accurately recognizing the proper capitalization of nouns. However, it is crucial for students and teachers to exercise caution as GT has been known to generate grammatically incorrect sentences in English.

Alhaisoni, & Alhaysony (2017) studied the attitudes of ninety-two Saudi EFL students majoring in English. In order to assess students' perceptions, they used a quantitative instrument and a questionnaire. They found that most participants used GT to determine the meaning of unfamiliar vocabulary, cope with their written assignments, and read in English. They found that "students had a positive attitude towards GT because it is free, easy to use, and rapidly translates texts; they had the perception that its translation was better than their own, and that it helped them learn vocabulary." (Alhaisoni, & Alhaysony, 2017).

Tsai (2019) investigated the views of EFL English Major students in Taiwan after they used GT for their writing assignments. The study examined the effects of using GT for English translation by three levels of major students (first-year students, sophomores, and seniors). Data were gathered from 84 students through written results and questionnaire responses. Students were instructed to translate one paragraph into English without using GT and another with the help of Google Translate. They found that texts generated by the students using GT included fewer grammatical and content mistakes. Students who struggled to express themselves in English felt the necessity to use GT and instantly translated their thoughts and ideas into the language since the GT texts gave them preliminary indications regarding word use and sentence patterns, which they later returned to and edited in their English works (Tsai, 2019).

Jin, & Deifell (2013) conducted research and found that, although GT is used as an additional tool by people for translation, it does not serve any grammatical function. In another study conducted by Bozorgian, & Azadmanesh (2015), it was discovered that GT is unable to recognize subject-verb agreement compared to a human translator because it lacks knowledge of the agreement rule. Additionally, GT has the issue of not translating in context. Medvedev (2016) suggested that using GT to translate words in context may result in misconceptions regarding word choice, and thus advised students to exercise caution while translating words in context using GT.

Research Methodology

Participants

To fully understand the students' attitudes, this study adopted a mixed-methods approach, which integrated both qualitative and quantitative data collection in response to the research questions. According to Lodico, Spaulding, & Voegtler (2006), a mixed methods study includes both quantitative and qualitative data, therefore, is vital to educational

research in that they provide more explanation of the research question or questions than either a quantitative or a qualitative approach alone could provide.

The study's initial population included 610 university students majoring in English for Business Communication from the 1st – the 4th year at one public university in southern Thailand. A non-probability and purposive sampling techniques were employed to select the samples to complete the questionnaire in the first phase. To ensure that the participants used GT to learn, the students were purposively selected based on two criteria: (1) registering in four mandatory English-language courses; and (2) having experience in studying English-Thai Translation or Thai-English courses. Thus, after the inclusion criterion was administered, there were 340 students: 3rd year students (N=190) and 4th year students (N=150).

In order to elicit in-depth information in the second phase of the study, ten of the students in each batch group were randomly selected to participate in semi-structured until no new information was forthcoming (data saturation). These selected students (N=20) were selected based on their responses to surveys about using GT in learning (reading, writing, listening, and translating) and all of them were interested to participate in the interviews.

For the participants' recruitment process, online notices regarding the research were issued to the participants by the English for Business Communication Department lecturers via the 3rd and 4th-year students' Facebook groups to recruit volunteers for the study. The research project's details, including the researcher's contact information, were shared with the students for communication purposes. The researchers provided interested students with an information sheet in Thai detailing the study's objectives and methodology. Participants were asked to confirm their voluntary consent by responding to the first questionnaire question. The final question inquired whether the students were willing to voluntarily participate in the interview.

Before the interview, verbal consent was obtained from participants to ensure their voluntary participation without pressure, allowing them to withdraw from the study at any time.

The participants were given one week period of time for the questionnaire. At the end of one week, 310 students (91.18%) completed and returned the questionnaire to the researchers; of these, 146 participants were 3rd-year students, and 164 were 4th-year students. All the participants had experience using Google Translate. In terms of gender, 274 of the participants were female (88.39%), 11 were male (3.55%), and 25 were unspecified (8.06%).

Research Instruments

Three types of data collection instruments were used in this research.

1. A questionnaire

Data were collected using a questionnaire with a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1=completely disagree to 5=completely agree. It is divided into four sections. The first section included demographic questions such as age, educational background, and time spent studying English in school. The second and third parts included questions about the students' attitudes and experiences while using GT for their learning. In the final section of the questionnaire, open-ended questions were answered to collect qualitative data that could supplement and expand the quantitative data. In order to overcome linguistic barriers and obtain content validity, the questionnaire was translated into Thai and validated by three experts in the field of English as a Foreign Language using Item-Objective Congruence Index (IOC). The IOC indexes of the questionnaire were 0.98, and the revised version was made based on IOC indexes and the comments from the experts.

2. Semi-structured interview

One week after completing the questionnaire, the semi-structured interview was performed individually in Thai with the study participants. The interview framework consisted of a series of questions aimed at eliciting information from the

participants in the following areas: their experiences and attitudes towards GT, the reasons for using GT, and the problems and drawbacks of using GT for their learning. The time spent interviewing each individual varies depending on the quantity of insufficient information on the questionnaire and ranges between 10-15 minutes. In order to obtain content validity, a set of interview questions was sent to three experts in the field of English as a Foreign Language using Item-Objective Congruence Index (IOC). The IOC indexes of the interview were 0.84, and the revised version was made based on IOC indexes and the comments from the experts.

Data Collection

The study was conducted at one public university in southern Thailand. The entire research procedure was divided into the following two phases:

Phase 1

To ensure compliance with research ethics, the research proposal was submitted to the Health Science Human Research Ethics Committee, Prince of Songkla University, Hatyai Campus. After approval by the Human Research Ethics Committee, the researchers requested permission from the Director of the University to collect data and use University facilities. Prior to data collection, all participants were informed of the purpose of the research and how the data would be collected. Subsequently, each participant was given a consent form with contact information for both the principal investigator and the chair of the Health Science Human Research Ethics Committee (HSc-HREC), Prince of Songkla University, Hatyai Campus. They were informed that their responses would be used for research purposes only and that their names would remain anonymous. Participants had one hour to complete the online questionnaire via Google Forms before returning it to the researchers.

Phase 2

In the second phase, 20 participants were randomly selected to participate in semi-structured interviews based on their responses to surveys about their use of GT in learning (reading, writing, listening, translating) and they provided their contact information in the survey to participate in the further interviews. Interviews were conducted one week after Phase 1. Each participant was contacted by the researcher and informed about the interview procedure. Participants who volunteered to participate in the second phase were asked about the time available to participate in the interviews. Before the interview date, each participant was sent the Zoom application password to ensure they were willing to participate in the interviews. In order to collect data from the respondents, a series of questions concerning their perceptions towards using GT was asked throughout the interviews. Then, the participants were asked to outline how they have recently used GT in learning, what problems they faced from using it, and the drawbacks of using GT.

Data Analysis

The questionnaire data were examined and interpreted using descriptive statistics. The mean and standard deviation of the respondents' replies to the closed-ended data from the questionnaire were calculated. The mean scores of all the results were interpreted based on the interval and Clason, & Dormordy (1994), which are as follows;

Table 1 The Criteria of the Interpretation

Range	Interpretation
4.21-5.00	very high
3.41-4.20	high
2.61-3.40	average
1.81-2.60	low
1.00-1.80	very low

The data obtained from the open-ended questions and interviews were analysed qualitatively by categorizing and quantifying through frequencies and percentages to examine the students' attitudes towards using GT and the drawbacks of using it. The frequencies and percentages were used to establish the most common problems encountered by the students in working with GT and the reasons for using Google Translate.

Findings

Based on the research objectives in terms of the attitudes, problems and drawbacks of Thai EFL students towards using Google Translate, the results from the questionnaire and the semi-structured interviews are presented below.

Table 2 Students' Attitudes using GT

No.	Attitudes towards using GT	N=310		Interpretation	Ranking
		Mean	SD		
1	GT is useful.	4.32	0.89	very high	4
2	GT translates better than I do.	4.48	0.73	very high	3
3	GT is reliable.	2.59	0.81	low	9
4	GT saves time.	4.57	0.88	very high	2
5	GT is easy to use.	4.19	0.86	high	5
6	GT translates TH-ENG accurately.	2.86	0.75	average	6
7	GT translates ENG-TH accurately.	2.83	0.81	average	7
8	GT helps me with my assignments.	4.66	0.48	very high	1
9	GT is useful for translation courses.	3.99	0.90	high	8
10	GT helps me improve my English skills.	2.52	0.81	low	10
Total		3.70	0.83	high	

Table 2 shows the overall mean and standard deviation of the student's responses to the questionnaire. The first three ranks of attitudes towards using GT, with which the students strongly agreed, were discussed as follows. The first rank of the questionnaire results shows that most students strongly agreed that GT could assist them in doing their assignments (\bar{X} =4.66). The second rank indicated that most students agreed that GT translated swiftly (\bar{X} =4.57). In addition, the students strongly agreed

that GT translated better than they did, ranking this notion third (\bar{X} =4.48). However, regarding reliability, most students agreed that GT accurately translated Thai to English and English to Thai (\bar{X} =2.86 and =2.83, respectively). The questionnaire results also showed that most students disagreed that GT was reliable (\bar{X} =2.59). Moreover, the students did not think that GT helped them improve their English skills (\bar{X} =2.52).

Table 3 Reason that Students used Google Translate

Reasons for using GT	No. of Respondents	Percentage
1. limited knowledge of English	20	100
2. excessive amount of assignments and activities	20	100
3. the difficulty of assignment	16	80
4. spend less time	14	70
5. convenience	11	55

Note: The students could answer more than one point.

As shown in Table 3, all the students reported using GT because they had limited knowledge of English (100%). Interestingly, all of them also stated that they used GT because they had a lot of assignments and activities. About 80% of the students

reported that they had to use GT to complete their work due to the difficulty of assigned tasks, more than half of the students thought that GT helped them to spend less time doing their assignments and that it was convenient to use it.

Table 4 Problems and Drawbacks of using Google Translate

Problems and drawbacks of using GT	No. of Respondents	Percentage
1. I received the inaccurate translations	20	100
2. I rarely learned new vocabulary or sentence structure	18	90
3. The teachers do not allow me to use GT	15	75
4. I received the incomprehensibility translations	14	70
5. I received the translations containing grammatical errors	9	45

Note: The students could answer more than one point

Concerning the problems and drawbacks of using GT, the results from Table 3 show that all the students had experiences receiving inaccurate translations from GT. About 90% of the responders admitted that they rarely learned new vocabulary or sentence structure from using GT. Moreover, about 75% of them used GT. Only nine students reported that they had received translations that contained grammatical errors.

Discussion

The questionnaire and semi-structured interview findings illustrated a broad general view of the undergraduate students' attitudes towards using GT in language learning. Overall, the students had positive opinions towards the use of GT at a high level because using GT saved the students' time when doing their assignments. These findings align

with the results of the study by Maulidiyah (2018), who discovered that the participants in her study strongly preferred using GT because it performed translations very fast and was easy to access.

Interestingly, although the findings from the questionnaires show that most of the students disagreed that the translations from GT were reliable, the students believed that GT performed translations better than they did. This indicates that the students trusted the translations from GT more than their translations (Alhaisoni, & Alhaysony, 2017). The data from the interviews further indicate that all the interviewees in this study used GT since they had limited vocabulary knowledge. Hence, GT could assist them in completing their assignments, especially concerning their writing tasks. The following are some reports from the students:

“My English is very bad. When I have got to do the writing assignments, I don’t know many English words. I use GT to translate my ideas from Thai to English. I think it can do better than I do.”

Student 6

“I know that the translations from GT have low quality but I still want to use it because I have limited vocabulary knowledge and my grammar is not good. GT can help me out of the problems.”

Student 15

Moreover, due to the number of tasks and activities assigned by the lectures, all of the students in this study reported that using GT helped them spend a shorter amount of time completing their work. These findings are congruent with the study by Chompurach (2021), who discovered that more than half of her participants used GT more than dictionary books in writing assignments because it took less time to complete them. Student 2 reported the following:

“We have got many tasks and we don’t have much time to check the grammar or review the lesson in order to do the homework. Most of us use GT because it helps us to complete each task quicker.”

Student 2

In addition, some students reported that some assignments were very difficult so they used GT to translate from Thai to English, as reported by Student 19:

“Writing research is more difficult than other types of assignments because we do not know the academic words...”

Student 19

Regarding the problems and drawbacks of using GT, most of the students reported that they received the inaccurate translation outputs. In the study by Tongpoon-Patanasorn, & Griffith (2020), it was mentioned that although the updated version of GT helped improve the quality of its translations, the accuracy of GT outputs was relatively low and still requires post-editing by a human.

In this study, the students further mentioned that using GT has negatively influenced their learning behaviours. They rarely learned new vocabulary or read the translations from GT since they copied the translation outputs and submitted them to the lecturers. This problem was also found in the study conducted by Maulidiyah (2018), in which her participants admitted that they became lazy to write by themselves. The following are some reports from the students:

“Hmm. I accept that sometimes I use GT because I am lazy to think about how to write in English.”

Student 4

“I just copy the translations from GT and paste to my file without editing so I learned nothing from using GT.”

Student 17

In addition, the students mentioned their lecturers’ resistance to using GT, which increased their anxiety because they had no idea how to accomplish the assignments. It can be presumed that some lecturers refuse GT to be used in the classroom rather than instructing students how to use it. The results agreed with the studies conducted by Chompurach (2021) and Maulidiyah (2018), in which most teachers completely disagreed with using GT in language learning.

Conclusions

This study attempted to investigate Thai EFL students’ attitudes towards using Google Translate. It also examined the problems and drawbacks of using Google Translate. It is clear from the results that the students had positive attitudes towards using GT since it helped them complete their assignments within a shorter amount of time. In addition, many of them reported that they thought that GT performed translations better than they did, which implies that they had low confidence in their English abilities.

The students also mentioned that the translations they received from GT were unreliable and inaccurate. Still, they used GT frequently when

trying to complete their assignments. In this regard, this research pointed out two primary reasons that led students to use GT: limited English proficiency and the excessive amount of assignments and activities. Hence, the students in this study used GT to complete the assignments only without learning from it.

There are, however, some limitations in this study that would be worth noting. The findings of this study relied on samples from only one university in Thailand, therefore, cannot be generalised to all Thai EFL students whose English proficiency and experiences in studying English differ. Hence, it is suggested that future research include larger-scale samples from various educational institutions and at all levels of education. Thus, the findings could be generalised to EFL students in Thailand.

Recommendations

Regarding pedagogical implications, the increasing use of GT among Thai ELF students is a fact that cannot be denied. For this reason, Administrators and EFL teachers should consider this issue carefully in terms of both the benefits and the drawbacks so that they may incorporate teaching on how to make good use of GT. Moreover, it is advised that lecturers reduce the number of assignments they assign to their students so that they would have more time to complete and benefit from them. One finding in this study showed that when students use GT more frequently for their assignments, they will less likely learn from them. Besides, since it is almost unavoidable to draw on technological advancements in this day and age of rapidly growing technology, Students should be taught how to use these online tools for language learning. As a result, analysing and modifying translation results through GT, when used within the right framework, may benefit Thai EFL students to enhance their English skills independently. This may also promote lifelong learning, one of the elements contributing to becoming successful language learners.

Acknowledgement

This research was financially supported by Prince of Songkla University, Surat Thani Campus, 2022 Grant No. ICS6503049S. The researchers would like to thank all the students who participated in this study.

References

- Aghaei, K., Rajabi, M., Lie, K. Y., & Ajam, F. (2020). Flipped learning as situated practice: a contrastive narrative inquiry in an EFL classroom. *Education Information Technologies*, 25, 1607–1623.
- Alsied, S. M., & Pathan, M. M. (2013). The use of computer technology in EFL classroom: advantages and implications. *International Journal of English Language & translation Studies*, 1(1), 44-51.
- Alhaisoni, E., & Alhaysony, M. (2017). An Investigation of Saudi EFL university students' attitudes towards the use of google translate. *International Journal of English Language Education*, 5(1), 72-82.
- Alsalem, R. (2019). The effects of the use of google translate on translation students' learning outcomes. *AWEJ for Translation & Literary Studies*, 3(4), 46-60.
- Bozorgian, M., & Azadmanesh, N. (2015). A survey on the subject-verb agreement in google machine translation. *Journal of Research Studies in Educational Technology*, 4(1), 51-62.
- Clason, D.L., & Dormody, T.J. (1994). Analyzing data measured by individual likert-type items. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 35, 31-35.
- Chompurach, W. (2021). Please let me use google translate: Thai EFL students' behavior and attitudes toward google translate use in English writing. *English Language Teaching*, 12(21), 23-35.

- Ducar, C., & Schocket, D. (2018). Machine translation and the L2 classroom: Pedagogical solutions for making peace with google translate. *Foreign Language Annals*, 51, 779-795.
- Hakim, B. (2020). Technology integrated online classrooms and the challenges faced by the EFL teachers in Saudi Arabia during the COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 9(5), 33-39.
- Isisag, K. U. (2012). The positive effects of integrating ICT in foreign language teaching. In *Proceedings of the 5th Edition of the International Conference "ICT for Language Learning"*, Florence, Italy. Gazi University (Turkey).
- Jabak, O. O. (2019). Assessment of Arabic-English translation produced by google translate. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation (IJLLT)*, 2(4), 238-247.
- Jin, L., & Deifell, E. (2013). Foreign language learners' use and perception of online dictionaries: A survey study. *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 9(4), 515-533.
- Lodico, M., Spaulding, D., & Voegtle, K. (2006). *Methods in Educational Research: From Theory to Practice* (8th Edition.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lyons, S. (2016). A survey of the use of mobile technology and translation tools by students at secondary school in Thailand. *PAYAP University Journal*, 26(1), 35-57.
- Maulidiyah, F. (2018). To use or not to use google translate. *Journal Linguistik Terapan*, 8(2), 1-6.
- Medvedev, G. (2016). Google translate in teaching English. *The Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, 4(1), 181-193.
- Musk, N., & Cekalte, A. (2012). *Mobilizing Memory Resources to Solve Language Problems in English Project Work*. An Abstract Presented at NORDISCO 2012. Linköping University.
- Purcell, K., Rainie, L., Heaps, A., Buchanan, J., Friedrich, L., & Jacklin, A. (2012). *How Teens Do Research in the Digital World*. USA: Pew Internet.
- Somers, H. (2002). Three Perspectives on MT in the Classroom. *Proceedings of the MT Summit VIII Workshop on Teaching Machine Translation* (35-43). Santiago de Compostela.
- Tongpoon-Patanasorn, A., & Griffith, K. (2020). Google translate and translation quality: a case of translating academic abstracts from Thai to English. *PASAA*, 60, 134-163.
- Tsai, S. (2019). Using google translate in EFL drafts: a preliminary investigation. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 32, 1-17.