

Effective Use of Google Translate in Writing

Andi Wirantaka^{1,*}, Mahdiana Syahri Fijanah²

¹English Language Education Department, Faculty of Language Education, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Indonesia

²English Language Education Department, Faculty of Language Education, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Indonesia

*Corresponding author. Email: andiwirantaka@umy.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This research aims to investigate teachers' perception of the effective use of Google Translate (GT) in students' writing. This research employs a qualitative approach, specifically descriptive qualitative design. The participants of this research were six teachers of an English Education Department of a private university in Yogyakarta. The data collection technique is an interview. This research revealed that teachers found GT effective to be used by the students in their writing activity. Furthermore, the teachers also stated the advantages of GT, which involve helping students find the information about the English language, increasing students' vocabulary and its use, becoming a spelling checker, becoming a pronunciation checker, and becoming a grammatical solution. In addition, this research also found four strategies for using effective GT: doing pre-editing, doing post-editing, translating a single word, and only using GT for checking. The findings imply that GT is beneficial in students' writing, and they should use it effectively.

Keywords: Google Translate (GT), writing, teachers' perception

1. INTRODUCTION

In the writing process, students sometimes need to find words meaning from one language into the other languages. They will need meaning references to find the words. For this purpose, students usually use the dictionary in their writing process. A kind of dictionary that is popular nowadays is machine translation. Machine translation (MT) is a computational linguistics (CL) or natural language processing (NLP) sub-field that investigates the use of software for translating text or speech from one natural language into the other (Qun & Xiaojun, 2015).

Among the most familiar MT is Google Translate (GT). According to Komeili, Hendavalan, and Rahimi (2011), GT became the most popular machine translation because it provides over than two hundred billion words. Besides that, GT also provides over than one hundred languages from the countries in the world. GT uses many languages such as Afrikaans, Albanian, Arabic, Bosnian, Indonesian, Japanese, Korean, Sundanese, and Zulu.

In writing activity, GT has several utilities for the students. Lee (2020) stated that GT helped English students at a university in Korea increase their English writing in terms of vocabulary, grammar, and expressions and positively impacted their writing strategies during revision.

Becoming the most popular machine translation, research on the issue of GT in language learning has gained much attention in recent years. One research that discusses GT is Bahri and Mahadi's (2016) research about GT as an additional tool in learning Malay. Another research that discusses GT is by van Rensburg, Snyman, and Lotz (2012), which discuss the influence of GT on the quality of African-

English and English-African writing of various levels of education. Besides that, the use of GT is also prevalent among students. Murtisari, Widiningrum, Branata, and Susanto (2019) stated that the students frequently use GT to translate short text or specific words on general use and their assignment (reading and writing). The students use it, especially in their writing activity, because GT is easy to use and inexpensive. This is in line with Valijärvi and Tarsoly (2012), who discovered that GT is easily used, quick, simple, and favorable for finding information about the target language.

GT is one of the most popular tools students use in an English Education Department of one private university in Yogyakarta. In using GT, students use this tool as a device to help them in their learning process. However, in reality, the lecturers through informal interview with the researcher stated that written product from the students who presumably used GT in their writing activity has low quality. So, the researcher is interested in conducting a study that the use of GT is found massively, but the students' writing products indicate that GT does not make their writing products good. It indicates that students do not have sufficient ability to use GT effectively. In other hand, students keep using the tool to help them write. This phenomenon arises issue whether GT is still effective for meaning reference tool in writing. Hence, the formulation of the research question is as follows.

1. What are the advantages of GT in students' writing based on the teachers' perception?
2. What are the effective strategies of using GT?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Writing could be defined as a mechanism that should be undertaken through various phases, including the writing phase, the editing phase, the preparation phase, and the final draft (Harmer, 2007). Similarly, Damiani, Alves, Frison, and Machado (2011) regarded the writing ability as the tool that calls for preparation, contemplation and organizing ideas. In addition, writing also became the requisite effort and attention that EFL students are invited to appreciate. Bell and Burnaby (1997), as cited in Belkhir and Benyelles (2017), considered the ability to write as a cognitive ability that writers are expected to master about the structure of the sentence, good choice of vocabulary elements, careful attention to spelling, and punctuation. They argued that learners have to master linguistic knowledge and also have the ability to coherently and cohesively incorporate information into written language.

Writing is used to develop the cognitive strategies of the students, especially in foreign language learning (Smetanová, 2013). She stated that writing could improve students' critical thinking, students' independent thinking, students' autonomous learning, and students' evaluation ability. On the other hand, writing could also be used as a medium of language transfer. The writers transfer the "similarities or differences" from the mother tongue to the target language during this activity. Besides, the writers transfer the context of the language from one language to another (Cumming, 2020).

Moreover, Pablo and Lasaten (2018) found that students have difficulties in vocabulary or word choice, language use, and reference during the writing activity. In terms of vocabulary, students frequently use incorrect word choices. Word choice points the students in choosing the word in their writing product for expressing their ideas. One of the best ways to convey the message to the reader is to choose the correct words when pouring the ideas into writing (Starkey, 2004). Besides the potential effect of their first language, linguistic issues with content, vocabulary, organization, norms, and intent are the difficulties that are also faced by authors (Okasha & Hamdi, 2014). On the other hand, Wirantaka (2016) found the difficulties faced by the students in their writing process, such as English words and word choice, grammar, development of the main idea, coherence and cohesiveness, ineffective sentence, and citation.

In this case, students had to find a tool that could help them in their writing process. By using MT like GT, students could re-checking their writing product and getting the best result (Clifford, Merschel, & Munné, 2013). While in terms of language use, students frequently use inappropriate sentences and make strange or incomplete sentences. The referencing system also became a problem for the student. Sometimes, there is no citation referencing that students used in their writing product, so their writing product could be indicated as plagiarism.

2.1. Translation Tools

In language learning, students crave to use a translation tool. This translation tool could be used in the process of listening, reading, speaking, and writing. Especially in the writing

process, the translation tool is used as a meaning reference for the students. Meaning reference is a tool the students use to discover the meaning of a language from the mother tongue to the target language or vice versa.

Students usually use the dictionary to help them in the learning process. The dictionary could be defined as an alphabetical list of grammatical terms that explains the meanings of these terms in brief (Bergenholtz, 2012). Macmillan (n.d), as cited in Rundell (2014), defined the dictionary as a resource of reference that offers the word or vocabulary with its meaning, usage, and pronunciation. Dictionary could be published as a digital (electronic) or printed version and available in monolingual, bilingual, or multilingual.

The electronic dictionary is not much different from a printed dictionary. The electronic dictionary is available online and offline. The most familiar electronic dictionary is a dictionary that using a "PC or smartphone system" (Alhaisoni & Alhasyony, 2017, p. 73) to translate a language from one to others and is known as Machine Translation (MT).

2.2. Google Translate (GT)

GT is a machine translation provided by Google to translate one language to another language. This tool is used to guide students' writing skills, reading skills, and vocabulary. As the modern machine translation, GT provides over 100 languages from around the world. From a computer or smartphone, google translate could easily be accessed. Moreover, the feature also provides online and offline machine translation to be used in every situation. This machine provides translation such as typing, talk, snap, see, write, and offline to facilitate the users. Using typing, the users could quickly type the word or sentences which would be translated. If the users are would like to translate a conversation, the feature "talk" is the best way to use it. Furthermore, the users could be steady if they would like to translate a text into a picture because the features snap and see are the best way to use (Google Translate, n.d).

Students showed a positive attitude toward using this tool in the Bahasa Malay learning process (Bahri & Mahadi, 2016). According to Seljan, Brkić, and Kučič (2011), Google Translate is one of the most effective online machine translations to translate language, especially English, into Croatian and vice versa.

2.3. Google Translate (GT) in Language Learning

GT is one of the popular learning tools that helps students in their learning activities. Maulidiyah (2018) studied the students from English Education of Politeknik Negeri Malang and found that almost all students used GT in their learning process. They usually used GT to assist in translating, writing, learning new vocabulary, and reading comprehension. They use GT because GT is free and offers fast results for them. In the writing process, Chandra and Yuyun (2018) stated that students used GT in three aspects which are vocabulary, spelling, and grammar. They used GT to translate the idioms or new words they did not know, check

the spelling and diction, and find new vocabulary. Because GT usage is popular among the students, the previous studies found several advantages and disadvantages of GT in language learning.

Valijärvi and Tarsoly (2012) stated that GT is effective because it could help the students finding information about the target language in their writing process. Using GT, students increase their new knowledge of the studied language (Khatimah, Rahmawati, Rachman, and Puspita, 2019). GT is effective to use because its features help students in their writing activities. As O'Neill (2012) stated, Online Translation is good to help students because it could check spelling and reduce spelling errors. Gianetti (2016) states that GT minimizes errors in syntax and semantics in student writing. Meanwhile, according to Garcia & Pena (2011), GT helps students with low proficiency levels to be able to make longer texts. Similarly, Kazemzadeh & Fard Kashani (2013) also stated that GT affects students with low proficiency levels to create text using more complex words. Meanwhile, according to Fredholm (2019), the use of GT could make students find more varied words to use in their writing. Therefore, GT could be said as an effective system to be used in language learning.

2.4. GT Strategies in Language Learning

In using GT, students could use several strategies that make GT more effective. As Shih (2017) stated, to use GT effectively, students had to do pre-editing of the text to translate into the target language. Pre-editing could be done by correcting the source language before translating it into the target language. One of the strategies of doing pre-editing is by observing the structure of the source language. If the text structure from the source language is similar to the target language, the translation product from GT will be pretty good (Hwang, Finch, and Sataki, 2007).

Garcia and Pena (2011) added that doing post-editing is also essential to improve students' writing product quality after they use GT in their writing activity. Post-editing could be done by ensuring the result produced by GT. The students could re-examination the result to know whether the context is similar or not. Another research from van Rensburg, Snyman, and Lotz (2012) also stated that using GT as a translator tool still requires post-editing to get quality translation results.

On the other hand, Alhaisoni and Alhaysony (2017) found that using GT effectively is if the student translates individual word. This way could make the students found the worthy translation from GT. Alhaisoni and Alhaysony are also similar to Chandra and Yuyun (2018), who stated that GT is more effective if used to translate a single word. Chandra and Yuyun also added that GT could be effective if the product that had been translated has been re-checked by the students.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

This present study employed a qualitative research design. It aimed to find teachers' perceptions of the effective use of GT in students' writing. A descriptive qualitative design was suitable for the study, exploring experiences, opinions, and perceptions (Creswell, 2002). Hence, the current study employs a descriptive qualitative design to delve deeply into teachers' perceptions of the effective use of GT in students' writing.

3.2. Research Participants

The participants of the study were six teachers of an English Education Department in a university in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. The six teachers were selected as participants of the study as they experienced the use of GT by the students they taught.

3.3. Data Collection Method

The method for data collection was an interview. The current study employed an in-depth interview as it was assumed to be suitable for the current study since it allows the researcher and participants to investigate deeper on real-life experiences and specific matter points of view (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011). The interview protocol was also used, comprising general interview questions related to the teacher's students' experience with WCF. Despite the use of interview protocol, unstructured responses were employed to accommodate the participants' feelings, opinions, or situations.

3.4. Data Analysis

To begin the data analysis process, the researcher transcribed the data of the interview. The transcripts were coded to find the themes of the data based on pre-determined themes or emergent ones. Member checking was used to obtain the credibility of the data to maintain trustworthiness. Member checking was conducted by consulting the coding to the participants to see whether the objection has proceeded.

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section provides findings and discussion based on the data taken from the interview conducted by the researcher. The finding is based on the participants' perception followed by discussion and supported by several literatures.

4.1. Advantages of GT

Based on the data taken from the interview with the teachers, there are several findings related to the advantages of GT. From the data, there are six participants who stated the advantages of GT during the interview session. The finding showed that GT is helping students find the information about

the English language, increasing students' vocabulary and its use, becoming a spelling checker, and becoming a pronunciation checker.

4.1.1. Helping Students Find the Information about the English Language

The first advantage is that GT help students find information about the English language. This thing became an advantage of GT based on the teachers' perception. There was one participant who mentioned this statement. The findings related to the participant statement are stated in the following paragraph.

There was only one participant who stated this advantage. This advantage appeared because by using GT, students learned a new thing in the target language being studied. Eca said, "...besides was used on the context of the full sentences or paragraph, Google Translate could be used to help us find the meaning of the vocabulary from the target language that we forgot, or we don't know." From Eca's statement, she explained that students found new vocabulary, its context, the example of how to use that vocabulary, the synonym, and the antonym only by clicking on GT. There are several features that GT offers for the users, and these features facilitate the users when they use GT. Moreover, this activity was a kind of learning process that students experienced when they used GT.

Related to the finding from the current research, some previous researchers found similar findings. Valijärvi and Tarsoly (2012), the previous researcher who conducted similar research about GT, also obtained a similar result with the current research. Their research obtained similar information, which stated that GT help students to finding new information about the target language. Moreover, GT as part of MT also assisted the students dealing with linguistic differences (Lin & Chien, 2009), getting information and accessing new knowledge of the target language.

4.1.2. Increasing Students' Vocabulary and Its Use

The second statement from the participants claimed that GT increased the vocabulary and its use from the language being studied. Four participants stated about this finding. The data from the participants' statements are explained in the following paragraph.

This statement was mentioned by Ella, Rian, and Mira. Rian said, "I think that Google Translate could increase students' knowledge about that, because as we know that Google Translate could find the meaning like a dictionary. For example, sometimes I search the meaning of a word in Hindi, using Google Translate, and I think Google Translate could help." GT as the translation machine could be used as a dictionary for the students. The version of this dictionary provides many features and many languages that ease the students to learning a language. When students used GT, they could use GT to search the meaning of one word and understand it based on the context. By doing this activity, students could increase their knowledge of new vocabulary in the target language. Mira added, "It is like, if we find a new thing, Google Translate has function as a dictionary, it could

find equivalent meaning from mother tongue with the target language. Google Translate could facilitate and accelerate students to learn." Thus, GT was similar to a dictionary which became a meaning reference for the students. Using GT, students were expected to be more curious to learn English and use GT to help them learn English. Then Ella gave an example, "For the example, (we) discuss in the classroom, using English, the student does not use the kind of specific vocabulary. However, in the writing product, this vocabulary appears, and I think she/he used Google Translate." On the other hand, Ella mentioned before that GT enabled students to use new vocabulary that they never used before when they wrote using assistance from GT. She gave an example of the impact of GT use.

By using GT, the students' curiosity may be increased indirectly because they constantly embroiled with new vocabulary from the target language. This activity also improved students' knowledge and made them learn a new thing whenever they use GT. Those statements were in line with the previous study from Khatimah et al. (2019), who mentioned GT was helpful for the students to improve their knowledge. Students did not rely on the teachers, and they became independent learners. Bernardini (2016) said that by using GT, students could become independent learners and acquire the skill of independence related to language learning.

4.1.3. Becoming a Spelling Checker

GT also could help students to check whether the spelling of their writing product was correct or not. From the interview session, there is one participant who stated about this finding. The data from the participant are delivered in the following statement.

However, this aspect depends on the student self. This aspect would not be affected if the students were only doing copy-paste with their writing product. This aspect was mentioned by Ella, who said, "I think, (Google Translate) could help in spelling a word, but it depends. If the students want to learn, Google Translate could help. However, several students only did copy-paste, which means that they did not learn from Google Translate." The statement from Ella showed that GT could be used to check the spelling of students' writing, but the aspect that Ella said depended on the students' personality. If the students wanted to learn, this aspect appeared, but if the students did not have a desire to learn, this aspect did not appear.

This is in line with O'neill (2012). O'Neill, in his research, found GT as part of Online Translation could be good to check the spelling. By asking his participant related with the result, the participant in O'neill's research stated that she used GT to check the spelling of some vocabulary that she was unsure about. Participant checked the spelling of the word that had a similar sound or spelling to make sure which one was correct and suitable with the context. Moreover, Chandra and Yuyun (2018) also stated that students sometimes use GT to check the spelling of several words during their writing activity. Although Chandra and Yuyun's (2018) research only found six students from one hundred and nineteen students who used GT for checking the spelling, the result still showed that GT had been used for this activity.

4.1.4. *Becoming a Pronunciation Checker*

The following finding related to the advantages of GT is that GT could become a pronunciation checker for the students. There was one lecturer who stated this finding. The statement mentioned by the participant related to the finding is explained in the following paragraph.

The teacher delivered that GT could become a pronunciation checker for the students. Eca came with this statement and said, "Google Translate could be used for the pronunciation because we can click the audio on Google Translate." Students' understanding of the target language will improve when students do writing activities, and they use this feature to check their pronunciation. In GT, there is a feature with the speaker symbol, and when we click on that feature, the sound of a word that we type in GT will appear. This feature helped students during their writing process because they could know the pronunciation of a word that they wrote.

According to Yu-ping (2005), by listening to short speech in English, students' ability will be increased. So, GT is a good system that students could use when they want to increase their ability in English. In their research, Garcia and Pena (2011) mentioned that the students used GT to become a pronunciation system to pronounce words and phrases. From the current research data, the finding from previous research by Yu-ping (2005), Garcia and Pena (2011) was similar to the current research.

4.1.5. *Becoming Grammar Solution*

The last finding of the advantage of GT is that GT could be a grammatical solution for the students. The finding was stated by two lecturers who stated that GT could become a grammatical solution. The statements in the following paragraph represented the finding of the current research.

During the interview session, two participants stated that GT could become a grammatical solution. Rian and Eric were the participants who mentioned that statement. Rian stated, "In my opinion, Google Translate could give a grammatical solution. Because Google Translate has been generated with the machine in the database, so there is fixed grammar. For example, if the subject is singular, the verb will also be singular so that it will minimize the mistake compared with the students with low English proficiency level." The argument from Rian indicated that GT as artificial intelligence could facilitate the students with low proficiency level by giving a system with fixed grammar. So that students could minimize the error from their writing product. Furthermore, Eric also argued that GT could become a grammatical solution as long as students translate the standard language. He stated, "I can say Google Translate could help students because the result is good when I try to translate standard language in Bahasa using Google Translate. Moreover, I think that Google Translate could give better word choices compared with students' word choices." Eric believed that GT could give better results than students' results with the requirement the students have to use standard

language when they translate in GT. Then Rian added, "Google Translate could be used to translate simple sentences." After that, Rian gave the additional statement about why GT is effective because it could translate simple sentences and gave good results for the students.

However, the previous study from Josefsson (2011) was not in line with this current result. Josefsson stated that GT did not effectively become a grammatical solution. Moreover, Okpor (2014) mentioned that GT could not translate idioms based on the context, so students had to know the context of the idiom itself. Lee (2019) supported that GT gave several ungrammatical sentences for the writing product produced by the students. This statement is supported by (Lee, 2014) who also mentioned that lexical and grammatical errors made students difficult to write their writing product. All of the statements from the previous researches were not in line with the current research, which stated that GT could become the grammatical solution.

4.2. *Effective Strategies of Using GT*

In this part, the researcher explained the effective strategies of using GT based on the teachers' perception. In the researcher's interview session, the participants stated four aspects that students have to know how to use GT effectively to help them in the writing process. The strategies of effective use of GT involved doing pre-editing, post-editing, using GT for partial translation, and using GT as a checker tool.

4.2.1. *Doing Pre-editing*

The first aspect which became the strategy of effective use of GT is doing pre-editing. Four participants stated about this finding. From the interview session with the participants, the data have been collected in the following statement.

Ella mentioned the first statement. Ella stated that "Firstly, we have to ensure that the sentences are grammatically correct in Bahasa." The statement from Ella is similar to the statement of Rian, who stated that students have to pay attention to the grammar of the mother tongue so that it is equivalent to the target language. Besides, Eric stated that "Google Translate could produce good translation if the grammar from source language is good." Pre-editing is a kind of activity that students have to do when they use GT. Pre-editing that students have to do when they use GT for helping them in their learning process was by ensuring that the source language has used standard language. In this case, the source language that students have to edit was the Indonesian language. They have to ensure that the sentences from the source language have correct grammar. This aspect is important because, as Mifta said, "Google Translate is a machine, artificial intelligence, this is set based algorithm, the algorithm is set based on the standard language, so if the source language that we use is incorrect, the product produces by Google Translate will also incorrect." Students have to understand the standard language from the source language that they use. Thus, they can obtain good a result from GT. Then Mira also said, "We have to correct the source language.

Subject + verb. If subject + verb in the source language is correct, then the target language will also correct." Mira argued that students have to notice subject and verb because, in writing activity, subject and verb became the foundation of the full sentences that students made. Moreover, Eric added the statement that "We could use several variations of words so that our writing product will not be boring." The suggestion from Eric indicated that students could use a variety of words in the source language during their writing activity so that their writing product be more attractive.

According to Shih (2017), before translating the written product from the source language to the target language, students had to do pre-editing of their written product. Hwang et al. (2007) also added that if the source language students made has good structure; the result will also be good. These statements were similar to the finding that the researcher found during the research.

4.2.2. *Doing Post-editing*

The second aspect that became the effective strategy of using GT is doing post-editing. From the interview session, five participants mentioned this aspect to become the effective strategies of using GT. The statement of each participant is mentioned in the following paragraph.

The participants from this research gave their argument related to this aspect. As Ella said, "They could use Google Translate to become a learning media. It is not only a helper and uses Google Translate products without any revision. They have to do editing." The statement from Ella showed that GT is a tool to be a learning medium for the students. They did not allow to rely on GT because GT is only a machine. A machine could not know the feeling that humans want to share, so students have to be aware. Editing was necessary because students have to check their writing product. They have to ensure the result of their writing product. Eca said, "We have to proofread, and we have to know what kind of translation we want. We have to know the grammar; if not, it could be fatal." Then the students have to ensure the result from GT. They have to check the grammar and the vocabulary that they use. Eca added that students had to know the context of the word that they wanted. So, they will obtain a good result of their writing product.

Moreover, Rian, Mira, and Eric also had a similar statement with Ella and Eca. Rian said, "After using Google Translate if we want to get a good result, we have to re-check the grammar, vocabulary choice because Google Translate is a machine, so it could not know if there is an expression; with strong feeling." As we know that GT is a machine, this machine could not know the feeling that wanted to be delivered by the writer. Therefore, students have to be proficient in choosing the suitable vocabulary and the correct grammar from their writing product. For example, students could switch the result of their writing product from Indonesian to English, and vice versa, so they knew whether their writing product was correct or not. Mira added, "After that, editing. Like cooking, we have to know how to prepare the ingredients and make it to be the product that we want."

Writing has several phases. Like cooking, every phase has to be noticed because every phase will affect the final result. In the writing activity, after finishing every phase, students have to re-check their writing product. If the writing product that they write does not fit their feeling, they can add some seasoning so that their writing product is good. This activity has to be passed by the students to obtain a good result from GT. Several things that could be done in this phase are checking the vocabulary used in the writing product, checking the grammar, and checking the context of the word students used in their writing product. After that, Eric added that editing could be done by the student self or ask the expert.

Based on the findings, post-editing was also important when students used GT during their writing activity. The students must do this phase to make a good writing product. The findings are in line with Garcia and Pena (2011), which mentioned that post-editing is essential because it could improve students writing product quality. Van Rensburg (2012) also mentioned that post-editing must be done to obtain the best result of the writing product.

4.2.3. *Using GT for Partial Translation*

The researcher also found the third aspect of the use of GT in an effective way. Besides doing pre-editing and post-editing, students could use GT for partial translation. This statement was mentioned by Rian, Ella, and Mifta. The statements from Rian, Ella, and Mifta are presented in the following paragraph.

The first statement from Rian was, "That will help to translate a single word. Google Translate help with the diction and word choice. However, it will be difficult because some words have their context. So it will be only meaningful if that word puts on the sentences. For example, the word "ibu" could be defined as a person who gave birth to us, but it could be different if we use the word "ibu" to describe women who have a child and a husband." From Rian's statement, GT may be challenging to be used for translating a single word. Because Rian stated that several words would be only meaningful if that word puts on the sentences, like the example, the word "ibu" could be defined as a person who gave birth to us, but it could be different if we used the word "ibu" to describe women who had a child and a husband, so the students must be aware with the context of the word that they use. Even though Rian stated that GT was difficult to translate a single word because some words have their context, GT may help students with the diction and word choice. On the other hand, Ella and Mifta had a similar statement on using GT to translate a single word. Ella stated that "If it (Google Translate) uses to translate one word, it works." Mifta also stated that "You can use Google Translate, but only for searching a word, do not make it to create sentences." Besides being used to translate a single word, a partial translation could also be defined as using GT to translate phrases or clauses. By using GT for partial translation, students will be passing the indirect learning phase during this activity. They will learn how to use the word to become a sentence, and they will also learn how to understand the words based on their context.

From the previous research, Alhaisoni and Alhaysony (2017) had a similar result with the finding from the current research. Alhaisoni and Alhaysony also mention that an effective strategy to use GT is by translating the single word. On the other hand, Chandra and Yuyun (2018) had a similar statement from Alhaisoni and Alhaysony. By using GT for translating the single word, the product of GT will be better than if students used to translate whole sentences.

4.2.4. Using GT as a Checker Tool

The fourth aspect that became the effective strategy of using GT is using GT as a checker tool. From the interview session, there was one participant who stated this aspect. The statement from that participant is delivered in the following paragraph.

One out of six teachers became the participant said this statement. Mifta said, "Google Translate could be used to check our writing product. For example, students had made sentences by themselves; they could input their sentences to Google Translate and check whether their sentences were correct or incorrect. So, there is a learning process during that activity." This way felt more effective because sometimes the translation product of GT did not appropriate. By using GT only for checking, students could compare their translation result with a GT result. In this case, students are indirectly learning new things, and they will know that GT could not be believable 100%. The target language that was meant in this case was English.

In the previous research, Bin Dahmash (2019) found the result, which stated that students used GT to check the word during their writing activity. The seven participants of his research in focus groups, semi-structured interviews, observations, informal interviews, and an online log said they used GT in two ways: checking the target language and checking the source language. This activity was similar to the participant's suggestion in current research and could be one of the effective strategies in using GT to support the writing activity.

5. CONCLUSION

Based on the result and discussion above, conclusion is withdrawn that the advantages of GT involve helping students find the information about the English language, increasing students' vocabulary and its use, becoming a spelling checker, becoming a pronunciation checker, and becoming a grammatical solution. In addition, strategies of effective GT use are doing pre-editing, doing post-editing, using GT to translate partial translation, and using GT as a checker tool. These findings show that GT is actually effective only for certain purposes, and not all writing processes require its use. Moreover, the findings also show that paragraph translation or text translation is both not suggested for GT to be used.

The result of the current study implies that GT is still beneficial for students as a machine translation. Hence, the teacher should encourage students to use GT effectively in the

process of writing and also teach them how to use GT effectively.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta for funding the research. We also thank the committee of ICOSI and ICoeltics, colleagues, friends, and family for the support.

REFERENCES

- 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. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijele.v5i1.10696>
- Alsohybe, N. T., Dahan, N. A., & Ba-Alwi, F. M. (2017). Machine-Translation History and Evolution: Survey for Arabic-English Translations. *Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology*, 23(4), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.9734/cjast/2017/36124>
- Arifanita, D., Nurkamto, J., & Suparno, S. (2019). Investigating the Writing Difficulties on Indonesian Second Language Students in Learning English. *Proceedings of the 3rd English Language and Literature International Conference, ELLiC, 27th April 2019, Semarang, Indonesia*. <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.27-4-2019.2285348>
- Bahri, H., & Mahadi, T. S. T. (2016). Google Translate as a Supplementary Tool for Learning Malay: A Case Study at Universiti Sains Malaysia. (2016). *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 7(3), 161-167. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v7n.3p.161>
- Bergenholtz, H. (2012). Concepts for monofunctional accounting dictionaries. *Terminology. International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Issues in Specialized Communication*, 18(2), 243-263. <https://doi.org/10.1075/term.18.2.05ber>
- Belkhir, A., & Benyelles, R. (2017). Identifying EFL learners essay writing difficulties and sources: a move towards a solution the case of the second year EFL learners at Tlemcen University. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 16(6), 80-88.
- Bernardini, S. (2016). Discovery learning in the language-for-translation classroom: corpora as learning aids. *Cadernos De Tradução*, 36(1), 14. <https://doi.org/10.5007/2175-7968.2016v36nesp1p14>
- Bin Dahmash, N. (2019). Approaches to Crafting English as a Second Language on Social Media: An Ethnographic Case Study from Saudi Arabia. *Arab World English Journal*, 10(2), 136-150. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol10no2.12>
- Cachia, M., & Millward, L. (2011). The telephone medium and semi-structured interviews: a complementary fit. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, 6(3), 265-277. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17465641111188420>

- Chakraverty, A., & Gautum, K. K. (2000). Dynamics of Writing. In Forum (Vol. 38, No. 3, p. n3). <http://exchanges.state.gov/forum/>.
- Chandra, S. O., & Yuyun, I. (2018). The use of google translate in EFL essay writing. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 21(2), 228-238.
- Clifford, J., Merschel, L., & Munné, J. (2013). Surveying the landscape: what is the role of machine translation in language learning? @tic. *revista d'innovació educativa*, 10, 108-121. Retrieved from <https://ojs.uv.es/index.php/attic/article/view/2228/2171>
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011) *Research methods in education*. 7th ed. London: Routledge
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education*. 8th ed. London: Routledge
- Cook, V., & Singleton, D. (2014). *Key topics in second language acquisition* (Vol. 10). Multilingual matters.
- Cumming, A. (2020). L2 writing and L2 learning. *Writing and Language Learning: Advancing research agendas*, 56, 29.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach*. Fifth edition. Los Angeles: SAGE
- Damiani, M. F., Alves, C. V. P., Frison, L. M. B., & Machado, R. F. (2011). Diagnosis and analysis of academic writing problems of students of pedagogy. *Language and Teaching Journal*, 14(2), 455-478.
- Darwish, S., & Sadeqi, A. A. (2016). Reasons for College Students to Plagiarize in EFL Writing: Students' Motivation to Pass. *International Education Studies*, 9(9), 99-110.
- Dickins, J., Higgins, I., & Hervey, S. (2002). *Thinking Arabic Translation: Tutor's Handbook* (Vol. 2). Psychology Press.
- Din, M. (2019). Use of mobile dictionary in university students' class: A study of teachers' perspective in Pakistan. *Education and Linguistics Research*, 5(2), 147-158. <https://doi.org/10.5296/elr.v5i2.15839>
- Donough, J. M., Shaw, C., & Masuhara, H. (2013). Materials and methods in ELT: a teacher's guide.
- Fredholm, K. (2019). Effects of Google translate on lexical diversity: vocabulary development among learners of Spanish as a foreign language. *Revista Nebrija*, 13(26), 98-117.
- Garcia, I. (2011). Translating by post-editing: is it the way forward? *Machine Translation*, 25(3), 217-237. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10590-011-9115-8>
- Garcia, I., & Pena, M. I. (2011). Machine translation-assisted language learning: writing for beginners. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 24(5), 471-487. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2011.582687>
- Giannetti, T. R. (2016). Google Translate as a Resource for Writing.
- Google Translate. (n.d.). About Google Translate. <https://translate.google.com/about/?hl=id>.
- Graneheim, U. H., & Lundman, B. (2004). Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: concepts, procedures, and measures to achieve trustworthiness. *Nurse Education Today*, 24(2), 105-112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2003.10.001>
- Halliday, M., & Hasan, R. (1998). *Language, context, and text: aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective*. Deakin Univ. Press.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching*. Harlow: Pearson Longman.
- Hinkel, E. (2003). *Teaching academic ESL writing: Practical techniques in vocabulary and grammar*. Routledge.
- Hutchins, W. J., & Somers, H. L. (1992). *An introduction to machine translation* (Vol. 362). London: Academic Press.
- Hwang, Y.-S., Finch, A., & Sasaki, Y. (2007). Improving statistical machine translation using shallow linguistic knowledge. *Computer Speech & Language*, 21(2), 350-372. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csl.2006.06.007>
- Johns, A. M. (1986). Coherence and Academic Writing: Some Definitions and Suggestions for Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20(2), 247-265. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586543>
- Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. B. (2008). *Educational research: quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches*. 3rd ed. SAGE
- Josefsson, E. (2011). Contemporary Approaches to Translation in the Classroom: A study of students' Attitudes and Strategies.
- Kazemzadeh, A. A. (2013). The effect of computer-assisted translation on L2 learners' mastery of writing. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, 3(3). <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrsl.2013.396>
- Khatimah, K., Rahmawati, Y., Rachman, D., & Puspita, R. H. (2019). The Usage of Online Dictionary and Translation among Student in University. *International Journal of Engineering & Technology*, 8(1.1), 158-164.
- Kol, S., Schcolnik, M., & Spector-Cohen, E. (2018). Google Translate in Academic Writing Courses? *The EuroCALL Review*, 26(2), 50-57. <https://doi.org/10.4995/eurocall.2018.10140>
- Komeili, Z., Hendavalan, J. Allah, & Rahimi, A. (2011). An investigation of the translation problems incurred by English-to-Persian machine translations: "Padideh, Pars, and Google Softwares." *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 28, 1079-1082. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.195>
- Lambert, V. A., & Lambert, C. E. (2012) Descriptive research: An acceptable design. *Pacific Rim International Journal of Nursing Research*. 16(4), 225-256.
- Lee, S.-M. (2019). The impact of using machine translation on EFL students' writing. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 33(3), 157-175. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2018.1553186>
- Lee, S.-M. (2014). Grammatical error patterns in EFL students' writing across different language proficiency levels. *Foreign Languages Education*, 21(2), 1-28. doi:10.15334/FLE.2014.21.2.1
- Lee, S.-M. (2020). The impact of using machine translation on EFL students' writing. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 33(3), 157-175.
- Lin, G. H. C., & Chien, P. S. C. (2009). Machine Translation for Academic Purposes. *Online Submission*.
- Macketanz, V., Avramidis, E., Burchardt, A., Helcl, J., & Srivastava, A. (2017). Machine translation: phrase-

- based, rule-based, and neural approaches with linguistic evaluation. *Cybernetics and Information Technologies*, 17(2), 28–43. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cait-2017-0014>
- Maulidiyah, F. (2018). To use or not to use google translate. *Jurnal Linguistik Terapan*, 8(2), 1-6.
- McDonough, J., Shaw, C., Masuhara, H., & Prowse, P. (2013). *Materials and methods in ELT: a teacher's guide*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Medvedev, G. (2016). Google translate in teaching English. *Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, 4(1), 181-193.
- Murtisari, E. T., Widiningrum, R., Branata, J., & Susanto, R. D. (2019). Google Translate in Language Learning: Indonesian EFL Students' Attitudes. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 16(3), 978–986. <https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2019.16.3.14.978>
- Niño, A. (2009). Machine translation in foreign language learning: language learners' and tutors' perceptions of its advantages and disadvantages. *ReCALL*, 21(2), 241–258. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0958344009000172>
- Okasha, M. A., & Hamdi, S. A. (2014). Using Strategic Writing Techniques for Promoting EFL Writing Skills and Attitudes. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5(3). <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.5.3.674-681>
- O'Neill, E. (2012). *The effect of online translators on L2 writing in French* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign).
- Okpor, M. D. (2014). Machine translation approaches issues and challenges. *International Journal of Computer Science Issues (IJCSI)*, 11(5), 159.
- Pablo, J. C. I., & Lasaten, R. C. S. (2018). Writing difficulties and quality of academic essays of senior high school students. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 6(4), 46-57.
- Qun, L., & Xiaojun, Z. (2015) Machine translation: General. *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Technology*. (C. Sin-wai, ed). Routledge.
- Rundell, M. (2014). Macmillan English Dictionary: The End of Print?. *Slovenščina 2.0: empirical, applied and interdisciplinary research*, 2(2), 1-14.
- Salem, M. S. A. S. (2007). The effect of journal writing on written performance, writing apprehension, and attitudes of Egyptian English majors.
- Seljan, S., Brkić, M., & Kučič, V. (2011). Evaluation of free online machine translations for Croatian-English and English-Croatian language pairs.
- Sha, G. (2010). Using Google as a super corpus to drive written language learning: A comparison with the British National Corpus. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 23(5), 377–393. doi:10.1080/09588221.2010.514576
- Shih, C.-ling. (2017). Machine translation and its effective application. *The Routledge Handbook of Chinese Translation*, 506–521. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315675725-30>
- Smetanová, E. (2013). Writing as Part of Foreign Language Acquisition. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 106, 3375–3380. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.390>
- Stapleton, P., & Leung Ka Kin, B. (2019). Assessing the accuracy and teachers' impressions of Google Translate: A study of primary L2 writers in Hong Kong. *English for Specific Purposes*, 56, 18–34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2019.07.001>
- Starkey, L. B. (2004). *How to write great essays*. Learning Express.
- Sukkwan, A. (2014). Students' Attitudes and Behaviors towards the Use of Google Translate: A Thesis.
- Tsai, S.-C. (2019). Using google translate in EFL drafts: a preliminary investigation. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 32(5-6), 510–526. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2018.1527361>
- Tyers, F. M., Sánchez-Martínez, F., & Forcada, M. L. (2012). Flexible finite-state lexical selection for rule-based machine translation.
- Valijärvi, R. L., & Tarsoly, E. (2012). Translating Google Translate to the Language Classroom. Pilot Study. Presentation. In *LLAS Conference on Language Futures: Languages in Higher Education*.
- van Rensburg, A., Snyman, C., & Lotz, S. (2012). Applying Google Translate in a higher education environment: Translation products assessed. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 30(4), 511–524. <https://doi.org/10.2989/16073614.2012.750824>
- Wirantaka, A. (2016). Paragraph Writing of Academic Texts in an EFL Context. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Learning*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.18196/ftl.1212>
- Yoon, C. (2016). Concordancers and dictionaries as problem-solving tools for ESL academic writing. *Language Learning & Technology*, 20(1), 209–229. Retrieved from <https://www.lltjournal.org/item/2939>
- Yu-Ping, L. (2005). One more, two more, or no more? The effects of repetition on listening comprehension tests. In *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Teaching of Language, Linguistics, and Literature* (p. 103).