



Students' Attitudes and Behaviors towards the Use of Google Translate

Arissara Sukkhwan

**A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Master
of Arts Degree in Teaching English as an International Language**

Prince of Songkla University

2014

Copyright of Prince of Songkla University

Thesis Title Students' Attitudes and Behaviors towards the Use of Google Translate

Author Ms. Arissara Sukkhwan

Major Program Teaching English as an International Language

Major Advisor :

Examining Committee :

.....
 (Asst. Prof. Dr. Waraporn Sripetpun)

.....Chairperson
 (Dr. Pittayatorn Kaewkong)

.....
 (Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nisakorn Charumanee)

.....
 (Asst. Prof. Dr. Waraporn Sripetpun)

The Graduate School, Prince of Songkla University, has approved this thesis as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts Degree in Teaching English as an International Language

.....
 (Assoc. Prof. Dr. Teerapol Srichana)
 Dean of Graduate School

This is to certify that the work here submitted is the result of the candidate's own investigations. Due acknowledgement has been made of any assistance received.

.....Signature

(Asst. Prof. Dr. Waraporn Sripetpun)

Major Advisor

.....Signature

(Ms. Arissara Sukkhwan)

Candidate

I hereby certify that this work has not been accepted in substance for any degree, and is not being currently submitted in candidature for any degree.

.....Signature

(Ms. Arissara Sukkhwan)

Candidate

ชื่อวิทยานิพนธ์	ทัศนคติและพฤติกรรมของนักศึกษาในการใช้โปรแกรม Google Translate
ผู้เขียน	นางสาวอริศรา สุขขวัญ
สาขาวิชา	การสอนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษานานาชาติ
ปีการศึกษา	2556

บทคัดย่อ

งานวิจัยนี้มุ่งสำรวจวัตถุประสงค์ในการใช้ ทัศนคติ และพฤติกรรมในการใช้โปรแกรม Google Translate (GT) เพื่อช่วยในการเรียนรู้ภาษาอังกฤษของนักศึกษา ตลอดจนข้อดี ข้อเสีย และปัญหาในการใช้โปรแกรม GT รวมถึงวิธีการจัดการกับปัญหา กลุ่มตัวอย่างคือนักศึกษาชั้นปีที่ 1 มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏสงขลา ซึ่งไม่ได้เรียนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นวิชาเอก จำนวน 125 คน เครื่องมือวิจัยประกอบด้วยแบบสอบถามมาตราส่วนประมาณค่า 5 ระดับ (5-point Rating Scale) แบบสอบถามตรวจสอบรายการ (Checklist) และแบบฝึกหัดแปล (อังกฤษ-ไทย และไทย-อังกฤษ) สถิติที่ใช้ในการวิจัยได้แก่ ค่าเฉลี่ย ส่วนเบี่ยงเบนมาตรฐาน ความถี่ ร้อยละ การทดสอบค่าที และค่าสัมประสิทธิ์สหสัมพันธ์ของเพียร์สัน ผลการวิจัยพบว่า จำนวนนักศึกษาเกือบทั้งหมดใช้ GT แต่มีความถี่ของการใช้ค่อนข้างต่ำ โดยมีวัตถุประสงค์ในการใช้ GT เพื่อหาความหมายคำศัพท์ทั่วไปมากที่สุด เพื่อทำแบบฝึกหัดการเขียนในวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ เพื่ออ่านหนังสือเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ และเพื่อแปลสำนวนและสุภาษิต ตามลำดับ จากการศึกษาพบว่านักศึกษามีทัศนคติในทางบวกต่อ GT แม้จะยอมรับว่า GT มีข้อเสียก็ตาม จากการสำรวจพฤติกรรมการใช้ GT พบพฤติกรรมที่ใช้มากที่สุด 4 พฤติกรรม ได้แก่ การอ่านประโยคและข้อความก่อนการแปลด้วย GT การแปลครั้งละหนึ่งประโยค การเลือกใช้คำที่เหมาะสมกว่าคำที่แปลโดย GT และการแก้ไขผลการแปลหลังจากใช้ GT ทั้งนี้พบว่าพฤติกรรมการเลือกใช้คำที่เหมาะสมกว่าคำที่แปลโดย GT นั้นมีผลต่อคุณภาพการแปลของนักศึกษากลุ่มที่มีความถี่ในการใช้ GT สูง ในการแปลภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาไทย แต่ไม่มีผลต่อการแปลภาษาไทยเป็นภาษาอังกฤษ จากผลการทดสอบค่าที ไม่พบความแตกต่างระหว่างคะแนนการแปลของกลุ่มนักศึกษาที่มีความถี่ของการใช้ GT สูงและกลุ่มนักศึกษาที่มีความถี่ของการใช้ GT ต่ำ ผลการศึกษาไม่พบความสัมพันธ์ที่มีนัยสำคัญทางสถิติระหว่างพฤติกรรมการใช้ GT กับคะแนนการแปลของนักศึกษา

Thesis Title	Students' Attitudes and Behaviors towards the Use of Google Translate
Author	Ms. Arissara Sukkhwan
Major Program	Teaching English as an International Language
Academic Year	2013

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to explore the students' purposes of use, attitudes and behaviors on the use of Google Translate (GT) for assisting their English learning. Benefits, drawbacks, problems in GT use and solutions were investigated. The participants were 125 non-English major first year students of Songkhla Rajabhat University. A five-point rating scale questionnaire, a checklist and a translation assignment (English-Thai and Thai-English) were used as research instruments. Data was analyzed for mean, standard deviation, frequency, percentage, t-test, and Pearson's correlation coefficient. Results showed that almost all students used GT but at a low level of frequency. Students used GT most frequently for getting meanings of words; writing exercises or assignments in an English course; reading an English textbook; and translating idioms and proverbs. Students had positive attitudes towards GT even though it had some drawbacks. The four most-frequent behaviors performed by the students were reading sentences and texts before translating them with GT, translating one sentence at a time, replacing words translated by GT with the more suitable words given in GT Word Function, and editing GT output. Interestingly, the behavior of replacing the translated words with the more appropriate words available in GT Word Function was found significantly related to scores of frequent GT users in English-to-Thai translation but not in Thai-to-English translation. The t-test revealed that no differences were found between translation scores of non-frequent and frequent GT users; and there was no significant relationship between students' behaviors and their translation scores.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
LIST OF TABLES	x
LIST OF PAPERS	xii
LETTERS OF ACCEPTANCE	xiii
A SYNTHESIS REPORT	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY	2
2.1 Research Questions.....	3
3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	3
3.1 Participants	3
3.2 Research Instruments.....	3
3.2.1 Questionnaire on Purposes and Attitudes in Using GT	4
3.2.2 Self-Observation Checklist	4
3.2.3 Translation Assignment.....	5
3.3 Data Collection.....	5
3.4 Data Analysis.....	6
4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	7
4.1 Students' Frequency and Purposes in Using GT.....	7
4.2 Students' Attitudes towards Using GT for English Learning Purposes.....	8
4.3 Benefits, Drawbacks, Problems and Solutions in Using GT.....	8
4.4 Students' Behaviors in Using GT.....	9
4.4.1 English-to-Thai translation.....	10
4.4.2 Thai-to-English translation.....	11
4.5 Differences between scores of frequent and non-frequent GT users.....	13
4.6 Relationships between Students' Behaviors and Quality of Their Translation.....	14

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

4.6.1 English-to-Thai translation	14
4.6.2 Thai-to-English translation.....	15
5. IMPLICATIONS	17
6. CONCLUDING REMARKS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES.....	18
REFERENCES.....	21
 APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A.....	23
Students' frequency of GT use.....	24
Students' frequency of GT use for English learning purposes.....	24
Students' attitudes about GT use.....	25
APPENDIX B.....	27
Questionnaire on Purposes and Attitudes in Using GT	28
APPENDIX C.....	38
Self-Observation Checklist.....	39
APPENDIX D.....	43
Translation Assignment.....	44
APPENDIX E.....	48
Scoring criteria.....	49
 ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT	
PAPER 1 Use of Google Translate: An Investigation on English Learners' Behaviors.....	51
PAPER 2 Use of Google Translate: A Survey of Songkhla Rajabhat University Student.....	71
VITAE.....	89

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE

A SYNTHESIS REPORT

1:	Students' behaviors in doing English-to-Thai translation.....	10
2:	Students' behaviors in doing Thai-to-English translation.....	11
3:	English-to-Thai translation scores of non-frequent GT users and frequent GT users.....	13
4:	Thai-to-English translation scores of non-frequent GT users and frequent GT users.....	13
5:	Relationships between students' behaviors in using GT for EN-TH translation and scores of the translation assignment.....	14
6:	Relationships between students' behaviors in using GT for TH-EN translation and scores of the translation assignment.....	15

PAPER 1

1:	Students' behaviors in doing English-to-Thai translation.....	59
2:	Students' behaviors while doing Thai-to-English translation	60
3:	English-to-Thai translation scores of non-frequent GT users and frequent GT users.....	61
4:	Thai-to-English translation scores of non-frequent GT users and frequent GT users.....	62
5:	Relationships between students' behaviors in using GT for EN-TH translation and scores of the translation assignment.....	63
6:	Relationships between students' behaviors in using GT for TH-EN translation and scores of the translation assignment.....	64

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)**PAPER 2**

1:	Students' frequency of GT use.....	75
2:	Students' frequency of GT use for English learning purposes.....	77
3:	Students' attitudes about GT use.....	79

1. INTRODUCTION

Many computer applications have been continuously developed through technological advances. They provide opportunities in work, life, communication and learning in the 21st century (Hawisher & Selfe, 1991 cited in Madhavaiah, Nagaraju & Peter, 2013). Machine Translation (MT) is one among those technological facilities. MT is computer software used to translate texts from one language to another. It is used to translate source texts to target texts (Yamamoto, n.d. cited in Munpru & Wuttikrikunlaya, 2013). Using this software, content in foreign language can be easily understood by non-native speakers. Not only facilitating professional translators for publication and helping readers to understand the ideas in foreign languages (Hutchins, 1995, 2009), MT is also applied to language learning in assisting language learners to deal with linguistic differences (Lin & Chien, 2009), to get information, and to access new knowledge in another language.

At present, various online MT services are available for internet users and language learners such as Google Translate (GT), Bing Translator, and Yahoo Babelfish. Among the most popular MT services, GT is well accepted and placed in the top ranking. Ability of GT in containing over two hundred billion words and providing users with the most versatility of words and phrases (Komeili, Hendavalan, & Rahimi, 2011) makes it popular among EFL learners. According to Google Translator's survey on the topic of "For what purpose(s) did you use Google Translator today?", the responses obtained from language learners showed that Google Translate (GT) was used for the purposes of getting and learning foreign words and short phrases; for reading webpages, emails, and articles; and for learning to write and pronounce words or phrases (Garcia & Pena, 2011 cited in Munpru & Wuttikrikunlaya, 2013). According to Niño (2005), the two most common purposes of MT use were for reading comprehension and for writing in a foreign language. Kumar (2012) surveyed the perceptions of 60 EFL Arabic speaking students majoring in Business and IT on their dependence on MT in learning English. Results indicated that all students used MT services and over 75 percent of them used GT mostly to understand the concepts taught in ELT classrooms. Students admitted that MT provided them academic and scientific terms for writing assignments. Moreover, MT

was found very helpful for their reading comprehension; and it could help improve their English skills. MT, however, could not provide translation outcomes at a linguistic accuracy level for academic assignments and reports; therefore students did not rely completely on its translation outcomes. However, students strongly agreed that MT had assisted them in learning English. In addition, Josefsson (2011) found that students in his study realized both advantages and disadvantages of Google Translate (GT). Ninety percent of them used GT as a dictionary in the classroom; whether the teacher agreed or not, because it is fast and easy to use. Most of them used it for better comprehension of an English text in their mother tongue. Besides, GT was found to be more helpful than a dictionary in terms of providing the currently updated technical terms, phrases, and collocations for these students. Even though GT can be used as a learning tool, learners should be carefully aware of using it because it is not generally designed for language learners (Somers, 2001). GT has some limitations in translation. For examples, grammatical differences and literal translation in some pairs of source and target languages have not yet been well developed. It may cause problems when students put words, phrases, and full texts into the software without being aware of these drawbacks (McCarthy, 2004 cited in Somers et al., 2006).

As GT has been widely used among language learners and there is no formal study into the use of GT and its usefulness for language learning, the present study aimed to investigate purposes, attitudes, and behaviors on GT use for English learning of Songkhla Rajabhat University (SKRU) students. Benefits, drawbacks, problems and solutions in using GT were also investigated. Finally, students' behaviors in GT use were examined to determine whether they affected the quality of the students' assignments.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To investigate the students' frequency of GT use for different English learning purposes
2. To explore their attitudes toward the use of GT for English learning purposes
3. To identify benefits and drawbacks of GT and how the students cope with translation problems caused by GT.

4. To study students' behaviors in using GT
5. To examine differences between translation scores of frequent GT users and non-frequent GT users
6. To investigate relationships between students' behaviors and quality of their translation work assisted by GT.

2.1 Research Questions

1. What is the students' frequency of GT use for different English learning purposes?
2. What are their attitudes toward the use of GT for English learning purposes?
3. What are benefits and drawbacks of GT and how do the students cope with translation problems caused by GT? What are students' behaviors in using GT?
4. Are there any differences between translation scores of frequent GT users and non-frequent GT users?
5. Are there any relationships between students' behaviors and quality of their translation work assisted by GT?

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Participants

The participants of the study were 125 first year students studying an English compulsory course at Songkhla Rajabhat University in the 1st semester of 2013 academic year.

3.2 Research Instruments

In order to respond to all the research questions, the researcher used a five-point rating scale questionnaire, a checklist questionnaire, and a translation assignment (English-to-Thai and Thai-to-English). The details of each instrument are outlined as follows.

3.2.1 Questionnaire on Purposes and Attitudes in Using GT

(See Appendix B)

A five-point rating scale questionnaire was designed to investigate students' purposes of GT use for English learning, attitudes, benefits and drawbacks, and problems and solutions in using GT. Questionnaire items were created based on literature review, related studies, and an informal interview with 10 students who frequently use GT and were not the participants of this study. The questionnaire contained five sections: general information of the participants, purposes of GT use for English learning of GT users, attitudes towards the use of GT, general comments for benefits and drawbacks of GT, and problems and solutions in using GT. General comments about benefits, drawbacks, problems and solutions in the use of GT were open-ended questions. Index of Item-Objective Congruence (IOC) which was evaluated by the advisory committee was 0.964. The questionnaire was tested with 30 English major first year students; the reliability (Cronbach's Alpha) of the questionnaire was 0.927.

3.2.2 Self-Observation Checklist (See Appendix C)

The Self-Observation Checklist was designed to investigate students' behaviors in using GT for completing their translation assignment. Questionnaire items were obtained based on an informal interview with 10 GT users who did not participate in the study, comments of general GT users posted on weblogs and websites, and the researcher's own experience in using GT. The questionnaire contained three sections: general information of the participants; behaviors on English-to-Thai translation; and those on Thai-to-English translation. Questionnaire items stating behaviors on the use of GT were ticked (√) in order to identify how students use GT to complete their translation assignment. The IOC of the questionnaire was 0.957.

3.2.3 Translation Assignment (See Appendix D)

The translation assignment was designed to investigate relationships between quality (scores) of students' translation work and their behaviors performed in using GT to help complete their assignment. Two sets of 10 sentences and one short paragraph of no more than 100 words were assigned for the English-to-Thai and Thai-to-English translation. All the sentences and paragraphs were reviewed and approved by one native speaker of English and one Thai native teacher teaching a translation course. The scoring criteria for the translation assignment (See Appendix E) were adapted from Framework for Standardized Error Marking provided by the American Translators Association (ATA). The criteria consider four aspects (1) comprehension—considering mistranslation, omission, over-translation, and distorted meaning of the target language from the meaning of original text (2) grammar—considering grammatical mistakes including subject and verb agreements, incorrect verb tenses or verb forms, etc.; (3) syntax—considering a problem of word order which is commonly found in GT output and (4) appropriateness of word use—considering the use of the most appropriate word among several words that have similar meanings including wrong vocabulary word use. In each aspect, the translation assignment was scored by examining sentence for sentence, using a two point rating scale (2, 1, and 0). Any incomprehensible translated sentences which failed to convey understandable meaning would not be graded in the other three criteria. The IOC of the scoring criteria was 0.767.

3.3 Data Collection

The data collecting procedure was divided into two main steps. In the first step, the 125 participants completed questionnaires asking about their use of GT focusing on purposes, attitudes, benefits and drawbacks, and problems and solutions in the use of GT. Fifteen minutes were taken to complete the questionnaire. In the second step, in order to examine differences between the quality of a translation assignment of frequent and non-frequent GT users, 15 frequent GT users and 15 non-frequent GT users (based on students' responses in the Questionnaire on Purposes and Attitudes in Using GT on their frequency of GT use within a week) were selected as participants in a 150-minute translation session which was conducted in a computer

laboratory at the Language Center of Songkhla Rajabhat University. All 30 participants were assigned to complete a translation assignment using GT as an assisting tool. Immediately after the translation task, the Self-Observation Checklist on the students' behaviors in using GT to complete their translation assignment was done by the participants. The students ticked (\surd) on statements that were relevant to their own translation behaviors and (X) if they did not perform the behaviors. Students' assignment was marked by two raters, the researcher and an English lecturer of the Department of Western Languages, the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Prince of Songkla University, Pattani Campus. The inter-rater reliability in all four parts of the assignment were $r_1=0.991$, $r_2=0.845$, $r_3=0.989$, and $r_4=0.820$, respectively.


3.4 Data Analysis

The data obtained from students' responses in the Questionnaire on Purposes and Attitudes in Using GT was analyzed for means and standard deviations. To divide students into frequent GT users and non-frequent GT users, the frequency of GT use was ranged based on students' frequency of GT use within a week. The frequency of GT use in this study was ranged from 0, 1-2, 3-4, 5-6, and more than six times a week. The 15 non-frequent GT users were students who used GT once or twice a week and 15 frequent GT users were those who used GT ranged from three to more than six times a week. In order to investigate what behaviors in using GT were mostly performed in doing the translation assignment, the data obtained from the Self-Observation Checklist was analyzed for frequency and percentage. Next, the differences between scores of frequent and non-frequent GT users were investigated using the t-test. Lastly, to examine relationships between students' behaviors and their scores of the translation assignment, the data was analyzed for Pearson's Correlation Coefficient.

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Students' Frequency and Purposes in Using GT

The results showed that almost all SKRU students (93.6 %) used GT. Most of these GT users (60%) averagely used GT once to twice a week; whereas there was only a small number (4.80%) used it over six times a week. These findings indicate that although a large number of students used GT in learning English, they did not use it very often within a week. (See Appendix A, Table 1).

The purposes for which students most frequently used GT were vocabulary learning, writing, reading, and translation, ranged in order. For vocabulary learning, students used GT most frequently to get general word meanings ($\bar{X} = 4.20$, S.D. = 1.10), followed by technical terms ($\bar{X} = 2.73$, S.D. = 0.98). However, a talk bubble button [] was hardly used to learn vocabulary ($\bar{X} = 2.46$, S.D. = 0.92). For writing, students used GT mostly to complete their English exercises and assignments ($\bar{X} = 3.14$, S.D. = 1.16), followed by choosing words for online communication, such as writing comments on Facebook and Twitter ($\bar{X} = 2.98$, S.D. = 1.16). For reading, the students used GT particularly to help them understand English sentences and texts in an English textbook ($\bar{X} = 3.30$, S.D. = 1.08) including those on a website ($\bar{X} = 2.93$, S.D. = 1.05). For translation, the students used GT especially to translate idioms and proverbs ($\bar{X} = 2.68$, S.D. = 1.05), followed by passages or articles ($\bar{X} = 2.60$, S.D. = 1.00). (See Appendix A, Table 2).

According to the results, students used GT mostly to learn vocabulary and also used it to facilitate their writing and reading. These findings are in line with Niño (2005) stating that students used MT mostly for the purposes of writing and reading comprehension in foreign languages. The findings also correspond to Kumar (2012) who found that students used MT for the purpose of their English learning. They used GT mostly to understand concepts taught in the classroom and used it most frequently when writing assignments, projects and reports.

4.2 Students' Attitudes towards Using GT for English Learning Purposes

Students were in favor of GT at a high level because it was free of charge and easily accessible ($\bar{X} = 4.17$, S.D. = 0.82); it could perform the translation tasks quickly ($\bar{X} = 3.99$, S.D. = 0.79); it provided more advantages than disadvantages ($\bar{X} = 3.60$, S.D. = 0.72); the quality of translated texts was better than their translation ($\bar{X} = 3.60$, S.D. = 0.84); it helped both students with poor and good English competency ($\bar{X} = 3.55$, S.D. = 0.80); and it helped them learn more vocabulary ($\bar{X} = 3.52$, S.D. = 0.86). However, some students admitted that GT had negative effects on their learning habits in some ways. With an assistance of GT, they did not attempt to read an English text by themselves ($\bar{X} = 3.25$, S.D. = 0.90), did not remember or guess the meaning of new vocabulary words ($\bar{X} = 3.13$, S.D. = 1.01), and did not write English with their own effort ($\bar{X} = 3.09$, S.D. = 1.00). (See Appendix A, Table 3).

According to the study, the findings showed that students realized that GT had both benefits and drawbacks. They had positive attitudes towards GT as it was convenient to use and it was helpful for all students in learning English especially learning new vocabulary. The findings support some researchers stating that learners' positive attitudes are encouraged when computers are used for language learning (Fujieda, 1999, Levine, Ferenz, & Reves, 2000 cited in Lin, 2003). However, the students admitted that their attempt in reading and writing English were reduced and the problem of vocabulary retention occurred when they used GT. These findings correspond to Kumar (2012) who found that students viewed GT as helpful but they could not learn English well because it affected their ability to think.

4.3 Benefits, Drawbacks, Problems and Solutions in Using GT

By investigating 125 students' views, 91 students reported that GT was a convenient and fast tool for translating texts. Fifty one students mentioned that they gained a lot of vocabulary knowledge in using GT, particularly for poor English learners. Twenty four students stated that they could easily understand English sentences because GT could translate the whole sentence at one time. Meanwhile 22

students admitted that GT output was more reliable than their own translation. Thirteen students reported that a speaker button was beneficial for pronunciation practice.

However, some disadvantages were reported. Sixty three students reported that GT could not contextually and accurately translate all the words in a paragraph. For long sentences or long texts, 31 students perceived that GT sometimes produced inaccurate or inappropriate meanings. Twenty eight students admitted that students could not remember new vocabulary because when they used GT they hardly tried to learn English by themselves. In addition, 14 students reported that GT had a problem of word order when Thai was translated in English. Fourteen students accepted that they rechecked some words given in GT output with a dictionary.

Dealing with problems found in using GT, 55 students reported that they confirmed word meanings by rechecking them with a dictionary, while seven students asked for teachers and friends' help. For the problem of word order, 17 students translated word for word or sentence for sentence and then edited the GT output by reordering words within sentences by themselves. Only three students tried to look for mistakes in the source texts and edited them before using GT. They thought that mistakes in the source texts might cause errors in GT output.

In conclusion, students realized that GT could help their English learning. They viewed GT as a good learning tool, but it could be problematic for their study because it sometimes produced inaccurate or inappropriate meanings of words. Also, students accepted that they were not aware of learning the language when using GT. They used GT to get the meaning of the text, but they did not pay much attention on knowledge of new vocabulary, so they could not retain the knowledge of new words for a long time. However, students still believe that GT is more favorable and beneficial than disadvantageous.

4.4 Students' Behaviors in Using GT

Based on responses of all 125 students in the Questionnaire on Purposes and Attitudes in Using GT, 30 students were selected, based on their frequency of GT use within a week, as participants in a 150-minute translation session. In this study, 15 students were identified as non-frequent GT users (used GT

once or twice a week) and the other 15 students were frequent GT users (used GT three to more than six times a week). All 30 students did a translation assignment with the assistance of GT. After finishing the translation task, their behaviors were immediately checked through the Self-Observation Checklist. Students' behaviors in using GT for both English-to-Thai and Thai-to-English translation are presented in Table 1 and Table 2.

4.4.1 English-to-Thai Translation

As presented in Table 1, most students looked for and replaced more appropriate words provided by GT (80%). Over half of them read sentences and text before using GT (66.6%), edited the GT output after finishing the translation work (66.6%), translated one sentence at a time (63.3%), asked for friends' help (60%), and compared their own work with friends' work (60%), respectively. Nearly half of them used GT only for word meanings (40%).

Table 1 Students' behaviors in doing English-to-Thai translation

Behaviors (English-to-Thai translation)	NF (n=15)		F (n=15)		Total (n=30)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
1. When I was not sure about word meanings translated by GT, I clicked on those words to see other possible meanings and chose the most appropriate ones.	14	46.6	10	33.3	24	80
2. I read English sentences and text before using GT.	12	40	8	26.6	20	66.6
3. I edited the GT output when I finished the translation task.	12	40	8	26.6	20	66.6
4. I used GT to translate one sentence at a time.	10	33.3	9	30	19	63.3
5. When I was not sure about word meanings translated by GT, I asked for other students' help.	9	30	9	30	18	60
6. I compared my work with other students' before submission.	9	30	9	30	18	60
7. I used GT only for meanings of unknown vocabulary words and translated the rest by myself.	7	23.3	5	16.6	12	40

NF = non-frequent GT users

F = frequent GT users

Comparing between the NF and the F groups, five behaviors were performed by the NF group at a higher percentage than those performed by the F group. These were the behaviors of looking for and replacing more appropriate words provided by GT Word Function, reading sentences and texts before using GT, editing the GT output after finishing the translation work, translating one sentence at a time, and using GT only for word meanings.

4.4.2 Thai-to-English Translation

As presented in Table 2, most students read sentences and text before using GT (86.6%), looking for and replacing more appropriate words from GT Word Function (80%), and used GT to translate one sentence at a time (70%), respectively. Over half of them edited GT output after completing the translation task (66.6%), asked for friends' assistance (56.6%), and compared their work with other students' work (53.3%). Nearly half of them used GT only for meanings of unknown vocabulary words (40%).

Table 2 Students' behaviors in doing Thai-to-English translation

Behaviors (Thai-to-English translation)	NF (n=15)		F (n=15)		Total (n=30)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
1. I read Thai sentences and text before using GT.	12	40	14	46.6	26	86.6
2. When I was not sure about word meanings translated by GT, I clicked on those words to see other possible meanings and chose the most appropriate ones.	13	43.3	11	36.6	24	80
3. I used GT to translate one sentence at a time	10	33.3	11	36.6	21	70
4. I edited the GT output when I finished the translation task.	11	36.6	9	30	20	66.6
5. When I was not sure about word meanings translated by GT, I asked for other students' help.	9	30	8	26.6	17	56.6
6. I compared my work with other students' before submission.	6	20	10	33.3	16	53.3
7. I used GT only for meanings of unknown vocabulary words and translated the rest by myself.	6	20	6	20	12	40

NF = non-frequent GT users

F = frequent GT users

Comparing between the NF and the F groups, three behaviors were performed by the NF group at a higher percentage than those performed by the F group. These included looking for and replacing more appropriate words from GT Word Function, editing GT output after completing the translation task, and asking for friends' assistance. On the other hand, the other three behaviors were performed by the NF group at a lower percentage than those performed by the F group: reading sentences and texts before using GT, using GT to translate one sentence at a time, and comparing their work with other students' work before submission. For the behavior of using GT only for meanings of vocabulary words, the percentage of the NF group was exactly the same as that of the F group.

The findings indicated that four behaviors were most frequently performed in both English-to-Thai and Thai-to-English translation. These were the behaviors of reading sentences and texts before using GT, translating one sentence at a time, looking for and replacing more suitable words from GT Word Function, and editing the GT output. These four behaviors were performed by most students (over 60% of 30 students), pointing to the fact that most of them knew how to use GT effectively and appropriately. They were aware of errors produced by GT and tried not to make those errors in their translation work by performing these four behaviors. Noticeably, most behaviors in English-to-Thai translation were performed by the NF group at a higher percentage than those performed by the F group. These findings seemed to imply that the NF group might have more awareness of GT limitations especially in English-to-Thai translation. They were aware of errors that could be produced by GT. The more awareness of GT use students had, the more they might perform behaviors that possibly helped prevent mistakes in their work. However, two behaviors that were performed at a higher percentage by the NF group in both English-to-Thai and Thai-to-English translation were the behaviors of looking and replacing more suitable words from GT Word Function and editing the GT output. These findings indicated that these two behaviors were similarly performed by both groups of students in both English-to-Thai and Thai-to-English translation

4.5 Differences between scores of frequent and non-frequent GT users

Table 3 English-to-Thai translation scores of non-frequent GT users and frequent GT users

EN-TH translation	NF		F		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.			
Part 1	26.53	15.69	23.43	12.20	0.604	28	0.55
Part 2	23.17	5.09	20.93	5.41	1.164	28	0.25
Part 1+2	49.70	17.92	44.37	13.96	0.909	28	0.37

NF = non-frequent GT users F = frequent GT users

Table 4 Thai-to-English translation scores of non-frequent GT users and frequent GT users

TH - EN translation	NF		F		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.			
Part 3	25.43	3.84	28.83	7.23	-1.609	21.32	0.12
Part 4	17.93	1.18	18.13	2.42	-0.287	28	0.78
Part 3+4	43.37	3.40	46.97	6.62	-1.873	20.92	0.08

NF = non-frequent GT users F = frequent GT users

To examine whether frequency in using GT influences the quality of students' translating scores, the t-test was performed. Results, as presented in Table 3 and Table 4, showed that there was no significant difference between the scores of students in the NF and the F groups ($p > 0.05$) for both English-to-Thai and Thai-to-English translation. There might be some other factors that affected translation scores of both the NF and the F groups such as awareness of GT drawbacks, language background knowledge, and behaviors in using GT.

4.6 Relationships between Students' Behaviors and Quality of Their Translation

4.6.1 English-to-Thai Translation

Table 5 Relationships between students' behaviors in using GT for EN-TH translation and scores of the translation assignment

Behaviors (English-to-Thai translation)	Total scores of EN-TH translation					
	All (N=30)		NF (N=15)		F (N=15)	
	r	Sig.	r	Sig.	r	Sig.
1. Read sentences and text before using GT.	0.02	0.47	-0.43	0.06	0.35	0.10
2. Used GT only for word meanings	0.04	0.41	0.00	0.50	0.05	0.43
3. Used GT to translate one sentence at a time	0.25	0.09	0.37	0.08	0.09	0.38
4. Looked at other possible words in a target language from GT function to check and choose more appropriate words	0.29	0.06	-0.03	0.46	0.46*	0.04
5. Asked for other students' help when feeling uncertain about word meanings	-0.05	0.40	0.13	0.32	-0.26	0.17
6. Edited the GT output when finishing the translation task	-0.03	0.44	-0.10	0.37	-0.07	0.40
7. Compared the work with other students' before submission	-0.17	0.18	0.12	0.34	-0.57**	0.01

*Significant at 0.05 **Significant at 0.01

As presented in Table 5, no significant relationships between students' scores and their behaviors were found both in the whole subject group and in the NF group. For the F group, the significant and positive correlation ($r = 0.46^*$) was found between students' scores and the behavior of looking for and replacing more appropriate words from GT Word Function. Students significantly got high scores when they performed this behavior. However, the significant and negative relationship ($r = -0.57^{**}$) was found between their scores and the behavior of comparing the work with other students' work before submission, meaning that comparing translation work with that of classmates did not help increase the quality of their work.

4.6.2 Thai-to-English Translation

Table 6 Relationships between students' behaviors in using GT for TH-EN translation and scores of the translation assignment

Behaviors (Thai-to-English translation)	Total scores of TH-EN translation					
	All (N=30)		NF (N=15)		F (N=15)	
	r	Sig.	r	Sig.	r	Sig.
1. Read sentences and text before using GT.	0.17	0.19	0.06	0.42	0.19	0.25
2. Used GT only for word meanings	-0.28	0.07	-0.28	0.16	-0.33	0.12
3. Used GT to translate one sentence at a time	-0.08	0.34	0.06	0.42	-0.22	0.22
4. Looked at other possible words in a target language from GT function to check and choose more appropriate words	-0.33*	0.04	0.22	0.21	-0.51*	0.03
5. Asked for other students' help when feeling uncertain about word meanings	-0.05	0.39	0.13	0.32	-0.12	0.34
6. Edited the GT output when finishing the translation task	0.04	0.41	-0.39	0.07	0.33	0.12
7. Compared the work with other students' before submission	-0.18	0.17	-0.36	0.09	-0.29	0.15

*Significant at 0.05 **Significant at 0.01



As presented in Table 6, no significant and positive relationships were found in a whole subject group and also in the NF and the F groups. On the other hand, a significant and negative relationship ($r = -0.33^*$) was found between students' scores of the whole subject group and the behavior of looking for and replacing more appropriate words provided by GT Word Function, meaning that this behavior did not help the students to perform better quality translation. They might not have adequate vocabulary knowledge to do so effectively.

According to the findings in Table 5 and Table 6, no significant and positive correlations were found between overall students' behaviors of GT use and scores of their translation assignment. These findings suggested that students' behaviors of GT use in the present study did not support quality of their translation work. However, the significant relationship between the behavior of looking for and replacing more suitable words from GT Word Function had effects on quality of students' translation assignment. This behavior was an effective technique that might assist students to have better quality of English-to-Thai translation work. The findings are in line with Josefsson (2011) who found that an inappropriate interpretation

sometimes was produced by GT such as some words that did not conform very well to L1 meaning. Therefore, trying to look for and replace GT output with more appropriate words seemed significantly helpful to students. This behavior, although, seemed beneficial in English-to-Thai translation in the present study, it seemed ineffective in Thai-to-English translation. These findings implied that non-English major students might have little experience in translating from the mother tongue (Thai) to the target language (English). And possibly having little vocabulary knowledge, these students might have a problem in selecting more appropriate words than those provided by GT and could not improve the quality of their assignment.

Although all behaviors in this study were not found to support quality of students' translation work, the behavior of looking for and replacing more appropriate words from GT Word Function was found to support students' scores in the F group for English-to-Thai translation. In addition, the behavior of using GT to translate one sentence at a time, although having a weak positive correlation with students' scores in all groups, seemed to support all students in English-to-Thai translation. These findings correspond to McCarthy (2004 cited in Somers et al., 2006) who indicated that when language learners attempted to understand texts in a foreign language, problems would occur if they put words, phrases, or even very long texts into the MT software. Similarly, even though weak relationships were found, the behavior of reading sentences and texts before doing the assignment seemed to be another helpful behavior that might support students in Thai-to-English translation. Reading the source text before translating could help students to do better in their translation. Consequently, these three behaviors: looking for and replacing more appropriate words from GT Word Function; using GT to translate one sentence at a time; and reading the source text before translating it, may also be good techniques that help students to deal better with translation work assisted by GT.

5. IMPLICATIONS

Since GT is a favorable translation tool, even it has some deficiencies, using GT as an English learning tool should be supported in ELT both in a classroom, and for autonomous learning. Findings obtained from the first research question asking about students' purposes, attitudes, benefits and drawbacks, and problems and solutions on the use of GT, showed that students used GT mostly for vocabulary learning. However, most students used GT as a dictionary for word to word meaning. They rarely learn vocabulary from other GT functions. Despite the fact that students reported that they learned a lot of vocabulary from using GT, not many students used other GT word functions available in the program. Therefore in order to take full advantage of vocabulary knowledge, students should be trained how to learn vocabulary from other useful word functions available for vocabulary learning in GT software. For example, teachers should advise students to learn pronunciation and word stress from the speaker button (), learn how to use a vocabulary word in a sample sentence from the talk bubble button (), and learn parts of speech and synonyms or words with similar meanings provided by GT software. In addition, GT can be a good English learning source; it can be used as an English learning material in an English classroom. Due to some limitations in translating accurate grammar from one source language to another target language, grammatical mistakes resulting from these limitations can be used for learning English grammar, sentence structure, and writing. In addition to learning from mistakes caused by GT, teachers can create their own audio materials (audio files can be downloaded from the speaker button) for teaching pronunciation and use them to develop students' listening skill in a word, sentence, and paragraph levels.

It is hoped that the findings in this study can shed light on how GT can be beneficial for ELT. The findings are advantageous not only for learners but also language teachers. The study uncovered how much GT was influential for learning English among SKRU students and for which purposes GT was used in learning English. Also, students' behaviors performed in using GT would reflect students' autonomous learning so that students who had ineffective learning autonomy would be supported by the teachers' advice. Problems reported by students would make

teachers and students realize the limitations of GT, so teachers can train how to use GT appropriately and effectively, and students can learn and improve their English competence in using GT.

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES

Results of the present study showed that students frequently used GT for vocabulary learning, writing, reading, and translation respectively. For vocabulary, the majority of students used GT for getting word meanings and for benefits of reading and writing assignments in an English course as well as for communication purposes, such as online chatting. The students had highly positive attitudes towards GT: it is free and easy to use; translate texts quickly; GT translation is better than their own translation; and GT is helpful for learning vocabulary. Some drawbacks were also reported, however. Students pointed that GT cannot translate all words correctly and it sometimes gives inappropriate word meanings so they needed to recheck word meanings from dictionaries or ask for teachers and friends' help. For the problem of wrong word order, students rearranged words within a sentence to make it more understandable. Besides, students found that GT reduced their attempt to learn English by themselves. Most of the time they did not attempt to read a text in the target language but had it translated at once by GT. Although GT has some weaknesses, students still believe it is more advantageous than disadvantageous for their English learning. Using GT for learning English contributes to productive results when some behaviors of GT use are performed. According to the study, most students realized that GT could produce some mistakes in vocabulary word use, word order and some tenses, so they avoided these mistakes in their work by performing these four behaviors: reading sentences and texts before using GT, translating one sentence at a time, looking for and replacing more suitable words from GT Word Function, and editing the GT output. Among these four behaviors, all behaviors were performed at a higher percentage by the NF group than those performed by the F group in English-to-Thai translation. The behaviors of looking for and replacing more suitable words from GT Word Function and editing the GT output were the two behaviors that were

similarly performed by both groups of students in both English-to-Thai and Thai-to-English translation. Based on the t-test, however, there was no significant difference between scores of the NF group and those of the F group. Awareness of GT limitations, background of language knowledge, and different behaviors in using GT might be important factors affecting scores of students in both groups. Regarding the relationship between all behaviors of GT use and translation quality, a significant correlation was not found. The significant effect on students' scores appeared when the F group performed the behavior of looking for and replacing more appropriate words from the GT Word Function. They got high scores when performing this behavior in English-to-Thai translation but not in Thai-to-English translation. Having less experience in translating from L1 to L2 and less vocabulary proficiency may be the problems of these non-English major students. However translating sentence for sentence and reading sentences and texts before doing the assignment seemed to be good techniques for learning English from GT software.

However, this present study has some limitations which could be improved and investigated in further studies. Recommendations for further studies are suggested as follows.

1. The present study was restricted in an investigation of GT use. Further studies should survey the use of other MTs or other online tools in order to find alternative software or programs that support students' language learning.
2. The subjects of the present study were non-English major students having different background knowledge; therefore, the same study should be done with English major students to compare GT use, attitudes, and behaviors with those of non-English majors. Also, the study can be done to compare GT use between students who have high and low English proficiency.
3. The present study investigated students' perceptions on the use of GT using questionnaire and self-observation checklist. Further studies should be done with other research instruments such as the researcher's observation or students' behaviors recorded (video record) when they use GT.

4. Students' behaviors in the present study were investigated in translating at a sentence and a paragraph levels. For further studies, students' behaviors in using GT for translation should also be investigated at a word level.
5. Further studies should be extensively done in surveying learners' behaviors and their success in translating using GT or other MTs in translating Thai to English and English to Thai for the sakes of both language learning and translation of Thai learners.

REFERENCES

- Hutchins, J. (1995). Machine Translation: A Brief History. In E.F.K. Koerner & R.E. Asher (Eds.), *Concise history of the language sciences: from the Sumerians to the cognitivists* (pp. 431-445). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Hutchins, J. (2009). Machine Translation and controlled language. *Multiple Uses of Machine Translation and Computerised Translation Tools*. Retrieved February 15, 2013 from <http://hutchinsweb.me.uk/Besancon-2009.pdf>
- Josefsson, E. (2011). Contemporary Approaches to Translation in the Classroom: A study of Students' Attitudes and Strategies, 1-32. Retrieved January, 9, 2014 from <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:519125/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
- Komeili, Z., Hendavalan, J. F., & 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. Retrieved February, 15, 2013 from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042811026346>
- Kumar, A. (2012). Machine Translation in Arabic-Speaking ELT Classrooms: Applications and Implications. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 2(6), 442-445. doi: 10.7763/IJSSH.2012.V2.142
- Lin, G., & Chien, P. (2009). Machine Translation for Academic Purposes. *Proceedings of the International Conference on TESOL and Translation 2009*, 133-148. Retrieved March, 24, 2014 from <http://ir.cmu.edu.tw/ir/bitstream/310903500/42147/1/ED513879.pdf>
- Lin, A. (2003). An Initial Study on EFL Learners' Attitudes towards Multimedia Applications in Language Learning. Retrieved March, 29, 2014 from http://www.tewtjournal.org/VOL%203/ISSUE%202/01_ANINITIALSTUDY.pdf

- Madhavaiah, G., Nagaraju, C., & Peter, S. (2013). Importance of Technology in Teaching and Learning English Language. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Reviews*, 2(3), 146-154. Retrieved March, 24, 2014 from http://www.ijssr.org/down_225.php
- Munpru, S., & Wuttikrikunlaya, P. (2013). A Survey of Online Tools Used in English-Thai and Thai-English Translation by Thai Students. *Proceedings of the 3rd Foreign Language Learning and Teaching (FLLT) 2013*, Thailand: Thammasat University.
- Niño, A. (2005). Machine translation in the foreign language classroom: a double-edged sword. Retrieved February 10, 2013 from <http://www.ub.es/filhis/culturele/nino.html>
- Somer, H. (2001). Three Perspectives on MT in the Classroom. *MT Summit VIII Workshop on Teaching Machine Translation, Santiago de Compostela, 25-29*. Retrieved February, 17, 2013 from <http://www.dlsi.ua.es/tmt/docum/TMT4.pdf>
- Somer, H., Gaspari, F., & Niño, A. (2006). Detecting Inappropriate Use of Free Online Machine Translation by Language Students: A Special Case of Plagiarism Detection. Retrieved February 17, 2013 from <http://mt-archive.info/EAMT-2006-Somers.pdf>

APPENDIX A

Students' frequency of GT use

Students' frequency of GT use for English learning purposes



Students' attitudes about GT use

Table 1 Students' frequency of GT use

General information	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Do you use Google Translate (GT)?	117	93.6	8	6.4

Objectives	Frequency (%) (times/week)					\bar{X}	Sd.	Levels
	0	1-2	3-4	5-6	> 6			
How often do you use GT?	6.4	60	22.4	6.4	4.8	2.43	0.89	low

Table 2 Students' frequency of GT use for English learning purposes

Vocabulary learning	\bar{X}	Sd.	Levels
1. General words	4.20	1.10	high
2. Technical terms	2.73	0.98	moderate
3. Names of places or institutes	2.63	1.03	moderate
4. Pronunciation and word stress from the "speaker" button []	2.57	0.98	moderate
5. Part of speech	2.54	0.99	moderate
6. Vocabulary in sample sentences appearing when clicking on a "talk bubble button" []	2.46	0.92	low
Total	2.85	1.00	moderate

Writing	\bar{X}	Sd.	Levels
1. English sentences or texts in exercises or assignments in an English course	3.14	1.16	moderate
2. English words and messages or comments on blogs, Facebook, twitter, etc.	2.98	1.16	moderate
3. English poems or messages in greeting cards	2.71	1.06	moderate
4. English-written emails	2.22	0.99	low
5. Live chat with foreign friends on a social network	2.20	1.15	low
Total	2.65	1.10	moderate

Reading comprehension	\bar{X}	Sd.	Levels
1. English sentences and texts in an English textbook.	3.30	1.08	moderate
2. English sentences and texts on a website.	2.93	1.05	moderate
3. Epigrams or morals	2.90	1.03	moderate
4. Advertisements	2.43	0.97	low
5. Signs	2.42	1.00	low
6. Product labels	2.27	0.96	low
7. English news	2.26	1.05	low
8. Novels or tales	2.21	0.94	low
9. Magazines	2.13	0.81	low
Total	2.53	0.98	moderate
Translation	\bar{X}	Sd.	Levels
1. Idioms or proverbs	2.68	1.05	moderate
2. Passages or articles	2.60	1.00	moderate
3. Abstract of academic articles	2.42	1.01	low
4. External reading books	2.26	0.96	low
5. Official documents	2.03	0.97	low
Total	2.39	0.99	low

Table 3 Students' attitudes about GT use

Attitudes	\bar{X}	Sd.	Levels
1. GT is free and easy to access.	4.17	0.82	high
2. GT can translate texts quickly.	3.99	0.79	high
3. GT gives me more advantages than disadvantages.	3.60	0.72	high
4. The quality of texts translated by GT is better than by my translation.	3.60	0.84	high
5. GT is equally helpful and effective for both students with low and high English competency.	3.55	0.80	high
6. I gained a lot of vocabulary knowledge when I use GT.	3.52	0.86	high
7. Poor students depend more on GT in learning English	3.50	0.81	moderate



rather than average and good students.			
8. GT is more helpful and effective for students with low English competency than those with high English competency.	3.39	0.84	moderate
9. I feel more confident when using GT for English writing.	3.29	0.80	moderate
10. I can write English sentences better with the assistance of GT.	3.29	0.80	moderate
11. I can rely on the accuracy of texts translated by GT (Thai-to-English translation).	3.29	0.82	moderate
12. I gain translation skills from using GT.	3.26	0.81	moderate
13. I understand an English passage better with assistance of GT.	3.26	0.83	moderate
14. GT makes me lazy to think and to use my effort in reading.	3.25	0.90	moderate
15. I can rely on the accuracy of texts translated by GT (English-to-Thai translation).	3.24	0.84	moderate
16. I learn English grammar and structure from using GT.	3.18	0.82	moderate
17. Using GT, I don't need to remember new vocabulary or guess meanings of words.	3.13	1.01	moderate
18. GT makes me lazy to think and to use my effort in writing.	3.09	1.00	moderate

APPENDIX B

Questionnaire on Purposes and Attitudes in Using GT

Part 2 Purposes and frequency of GT use

No	Purposes	Frequency (times/week)				
		5	4	3	2	1
		Always	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
6.	How often do you use GT?times/week (specify)					
7.	READING					
	7.1 Novels or tales					
	7.2 Magazines					
	7.3 English news					
	7.4 Product labels					
	7.5 Advertisements					
	7.6 Signs					
	7.7 Epigrams and proverbs					
	7.8 English sentences and texts on a website					
	7.9 English sentences and texts in an English textbook					
	7.10 Others (specify)					
8.	WRITING					
	8.1 English poems or messages in greeting cards					
	8.2 English-written emails					
	8.3 English sentences or texts in exercises or assignments in an English course					
	8.4 English words and messages or comments on blogs, Facebook, twitter, etc.					
	8.5 Live chat with foreign friends on a social network					
	8.6 Others (specify)					
9.	VOCABULARY LEARNING					
	9.1 General words					
	9.2 Technical terms					
	9.3 Names of places or institutes					

No	Purposes	Frequency (times/week)				
		5	4	3	2	1
		Always	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
	9.4 Part of speech					
	9.5 Vocabulary in sample sentences appearing when clicking on a “talk bubble button” []					
	9.6 Pronunciation and word stress from the “speaker” button []					
	9.7 Others (specify)					
10.	TRANSLATION					
	10.1 Abstract of academic articles					
	10.2 Passages or articles					
	10.3 External reading books					
	10.4 Official documents					
	10.5 Idioms or proverbs					
	10.6 Others (specify)					

Part 3 Attitudes towards using GT

No	Attitudes	Scale				
		Strongly agree	Agree	Fairly agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
		5	4	3	2	1
11.	GT gives me more advantages than disadvantages.					
12.	GT is free and easy to access.					
13.	GT can translate texts quickly.					
14.	The quality of texts translated by GT is better than by my translation.					

No	Attitudes	Scale				
		Strongly agree	Agree	Fairly agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
		5	4	3	2	1
15.	I can rely on the accuracy of texts translated by GT (English to Thai translation).					
16.	I can rely on the accuracy of texts translated by GT (Thai to English translation).					
17.	I gained a lot of vocabulary knowledge when I use GT.					
18.	I learn English grammar and structure from using GT.					
19.	I understand an English passage better with the assistance of GT.					
20.	Using GT, I don't need to remember new vocabulary or guess meanings of words.					
21.	I feel more confident when using GT for English writing.					
22.	I can write English sentences better with the assistance of GT.					
23.	GT makes me lazy to think and to use my effort in reading.					
24.	GT makes me lazy to think and to use my effort in writing.					
25.	I gain translation skills from using GT.					
26.	GT is more helpful and effective for students with low English competency than those with high English competency.					
27.	GT is equally helpful and effective for both students with low and high English competency.					
28.	Poor students depend more on GT in learning English rather than average and good students.					

Part 4 General comments about GT

Advantages

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

Disadvantages

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

Part 5 Problems found when using GT and solutions

- 1.
Solutions.....
- 2.
Solutions
- 3.
Solutions
- 4.
Solutions

» Thank you very much «

ตอนที่ 2 วัตถุประสงค์และความถี่ในการใช้โปรแกรมแปลภาษา กูเกิลทรานสเลท (GT)

ข้อ	วัตถุประสงค์	ความถี่ (ครั้ง/สัปดาห์)				
		5	4	3	2	1
		ใช้บ่อยมาก	ใช้บ่อย	ใช้บางครั้ง	ไม่เคยใช้	ไม่เคยใช้เลย
6.	คุณใช้ GTครั้ง / สัปดาห์ (โปรดระบุ)					
7.	คุณใช้ GT เพื่อวัตถุประสงค์ในการอ่านสิ่งต่อไปนี้บ่อยเพียงใด					
	7.1 นิยาย นิทาน					
	7.2 นิตยสาร					
	7.3 ข่าวภาษาอังกฤษ					
	7.4 ฉลากสินค้า					
	7.5 โฆษณา					
	7.6 ป้ายต่างๆ					
	7.7 คำคม หรือคติสอนใจภาษาอังกฤษ					
	7.8 ประโยค และข้อความภาษาอังกฤษบนเว็บไซต์					
	7.9 ประโยค และข้อความภาษาอังกฤษในหนังสือเรียน					
	7.10 อื่นๆ (ระบุ)					
8.	คุณใช้ GT เพื่อวัตถุประสงค์ในการเขียนสิ่งต่อไปนี้บ่อยเพียงใด					
	8.1 บทกลอน หรือข้อความภาษาอังกฤษในการ์ดอวยพร					
	8.2 จดหมายอิเล็กทรอนิกส์ (emails) เป็นภาษาอังกฤษ					
	8.3 ประโยค หรือข้อความภาษาอังกฤษในแบบฝึกหัด หรือ ชิ้นงานที่ อาจารย์มอบหมาย					
	8.4 คำ และ ข้อความ หรือความคิดเห็น (comments) ภาษาอังกฤษ ในบล็อก เฟสบุ๊ก ทวิตเตอร์ ฯลฯ					
	8.5 บทสนทนาสด (live chat) กับเพื่อนชาวต่างชาติ บน เครือข่ายอินเทอร์เน็ต					
	8.6 อื่นๆ (ระบุ)					
9.	คุณใช้ GT เพื่อวัตถุประสงค์ในการเรียนรู้คำศัพท์ต่างๆต่อไปนี้ บ่อยเพียงใด					
	9.1 คำศัพท์ทั่วไป					
	9.2 คำศัพท์เฉพาะทาง (technical terms)					

ข้อ	วัตถุประสงค์	ความถี่ (ครั้ง/สัปดาห์)				
		5	4	3	2	1
		ใช้บ่อยมาก	ใช้บ่อย	ใช้บางครั้ง	ไม่เคยใช้	ไม่เคยใช้เลย
	9.3 คำศัพท์ชื่อเฉพาะของสถานที่หรือหน่วยงาน					
	9.4 หน้าที่ของคำศัพท์ (part of speech)					
	9.5 การใช้คำศัพท์ในประโยคตัวอย่าง ซึ่งจะปรากฏขึ้นเมื่อคลิกปุ่ม “กล่องคำพูด” [🗨]					
	9.6 การออกเสียง (pronunciation) และการเน้นเสียง (stress) ของ คำศัพท์จากปุ่ม “ลำโพง” [🔊]					
	9.7 อื่นๆ (ระบุ)					
10.	คุณใช้ GT เพื่อวัตถุประสงค์ในการแปลสิ่งต่อไปนี้บ่อยเพียงใด					
	10.1 บทคัดย่อ					
	10.2 บทความ					
	10.3 หนังสืออ่านนอกเวลา					
	10.4 เอกสารทางราชการ (official documents)					
	10.5 สำนวน (idioms) สุภาษิต (proverbs)					
	10.6 อื่นๆ (ระบุ)					

ตอนที่ 3 ทักษะคิดของผู้ตอบแบบสอบถามต่อการใช้โปรแกรมแปลภาษา กูเกิลทรานสเลท (Google Translate)

ข้อ	ทัศนคติ	ระดับความเห็นด้วย				
		เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง	เห็นด้วย	เห็นด้วยปานกลาง	ไม่เห็นด้วย	ไม่เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง
		5	4	3	2	1
11.	GT มีข้อดีมากกว่าข้อเสีย					
12.	GT ไม่มีค่าบริการและสามารถเข้าใช้บริการได้ง่าย					
13.	GT แปลข้อความได้รวดเร็ว					
14.	GT แปลข้อความได้มีคุณภาพมากกว่าที่ฉันแปลเอง					

ข้อ	ทัศนคติ	ระดับความเห็นด้วย				
		เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง	เห็นด้วย	เห็นด้วยปานกลาง	ไม่เห็นด้วย	ไม่เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง
		5	4	3	2	1
15.	GT แปลข้อความภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาไทยได้ถูกต้อง และเชื่อถือได้					
16.	GT แปลข้อความภาษาไทยเป็นภาษาอังกฤษได้ถูกต้อง และเชื่อถือได้					
17.	ฉันได้ความรู้ด้านคำศัพท์เป็นจำนวนมากเมื่อใช้ GT					
18.	ฉันเรียนรู้ไวยากรณ์และโครงสร้างภาษาอังกฤษจากการใช้ GT					
19.	ฉันอ่านบทความภาษาอังกฤษเข้าใจมากขึ้นเมื่อใช้ GT ช่วย					
20.	เมื่อฉันใช้ GT ฉันไม่จำเป็นต้องจำหรือเดาคำศัพท์					
21.	ฉันรู้สึกมั่นใจมากขึ้น เมื่อเขียนภาษาอังกฤษโดยใช้ GT ช่วย					
22.	ฉันเขียนประโยคภาษาอังกฤษได้ดีขึ้นเมื่อใช้ GT ช่วย					
23.	การใช้ GT ทำให้ฉันไม่พยายามทำความเข้าใจจากการอ่านภาษาอังกฤษด้วยตนเอง					
24.	การใช้ GT ทำให้ฉันไม่พยายามเขียนภาษาอังกฤษด้วยตนเอง					
25.	ฉันได้ทักษะการแปลจากการใช้ GT					
26.	GT มีประโยชน์และมีประสิทธิภาพต่อนักเรียนที่อ่อนภาษาอังกฤษมากกว่านักเรียนที่เก่งภาษาอังกฤษ					
27.	GT มีประโยชน์และมีประสิทธิภาพต่อทั้งนักเรียนที่อ่อนและเก่งภาษาอังกฤษ					
28.	นักเรียนที่อ่อนภาษาอังกฤษจะพึ่งพา GT ในการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ มากกว่านักเรียนที่อยู่ในระดับกลางและเก่ง					

ตอนที่ 4 ข้อคิดเห็นทั่วไปเกี่ยวกับการใช้โปรแกรมแปลภาษา กูเกิลทรานสเลท (Google Translate)

ข้อดี

1.
2.
3.
4.

ข้อเสีย

1.
2.
3.
4.

ตอนที่ 5 ปัญหาจากการใช้โปรแกรมแปลภาษา กูเกิลทรานสเลท (Google Translate) และวิธีการจัดการกับ

ปัญหาดังกล่าว

ปัญหา

1.
การแก้ไข.....
2.
การแก้ไข.....
3.
การแก้ไข.....
4.
การแก้ไข.....

» ขอขอบคุณอย่างยิ่งในการให้ความร่วมมือตอบแบบสอบถาม «

APPENDIX C
Self-Observation Checklist

Self-Observation Checklist

This self-observation form is designed to find out behaviors and problems of Google Translate use among first year students of Songkhla Rajabhat University in 2013 academic year. The form consists of 3 sections.

Part 1 General information

Part 2 Behaviors on English to Thai translation

Part 3 Behaviors on Thai to English translation

Instructions: Please tick if the sentences are true and tick if they are not true for you when using GT to complete the translation assignment. Please make sure you complete all items. Thank you.

Part 1 General information

1. Gender: male female
2. Faculty: Major:

Part 2 Behaviors of English-to-Thai translation

- 1. I read English sentences and text before using GT.
- 2. I used GT only for meanings of unknown vocabulary words and translated the rest by myself.
- 3. I used GT to translate one sentence at a time.
- 4. When I was not sure about word meanings translated by GT, I clicked on those words to see other possible meanings and chose the most appropriate ones.
- 5. When I was not sure about word meanings translated by GT, I asked for other students' help.
- 6. I edited the GT output when I finished the translation task.
- 7. I compared my work with other students' before submission.

Part 3 Behaviors of Thai -to-English translation

- 1. I read Thai sentences and text before using GT.
- 2. I used GT only for meanings of unknown vocabulary words and translated the rest by myself.
- 3. I used GT to translate one sentence at a time.
- 4. When I was not sure about word meanings translated by GT, I clicked on those words to see other possible meanings and chose the most appropriate ones.
- 5. When I was not sure about word meanings translated by GT, I asked for other students' help.
- 6. I edited the GT output when I finished the translation task.
- 7. I compared my work with other students' before submission.

แบบสังเกตตนเอง

แบบสังเกตตนเอง ฉบับนี้ มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อสำรวจพฤติกรรมและปัญหาจากการใช้โปรแกรมแปลภาษา กูเกิลทรานสเลท (Google Translat: GT) ของนักศึกษาชั้นปีที่ 1 มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏสงขลา ปีการศึกษา 2556 โดยแบบสอบถามแบ่งเป็น 4 ตอนดังต่อไปนี้

- ตอนที่ 1 ข้อมูลทั่วไปของผู้ตอบแบบสอบถาม
 ตอนที่ 2 พฤติกรรมการแปลข้อความจากภาษาอังกฤษเป็นไทย
 ตอนที่ 3 พฤติกรรมการแปลข้อความจากภาษาไทยเป็นอังกฤษ

คำชี้แจง: โปรดตอบแบบสอบถามให้ครบถ้วนตามความเป็นจริง โดยทำเครื่องหมาย ในช่องสี่เหลี่ยมเมื่อ นักศึกษาทำกิจกรรมนั้น และทำเครื่องหมาย เมื่อนักศึกษาไม่ได้ทำกิจกรรมนั้น

ตอนที่ 1 ข้อมูลทั่วไปของผู้ตอบแบบสอบถาม

1. เพศ: ชาย หญิง
2. คณะ: วิชาเอก:

ตอนที่ 2 พฤติกรรมการแปลประโยคและข้อความจากภาษาอังกฤษเป็นไทย

1. ฉันอ่านประโยคและข้อความภาษาอังกฤษก่อนแปลด้วย GT
2. ฉันใช้ GT เพื่อหาความหมายของคำศัพท์เท่านั้น ส่วนอื่นๆฉันแปลด้วยตนเอง
3. ฉันใช้ GT แปลประโยคภาษาอังกฤษครั้งละ 1 ประโยค
4. เมื่อฉันไม่แน่ใจว่าคำที่แปลโดย GT ถูกต้องหรือไม่ ฉันคลิกที่คำคำนั้น (แถบสีเหลือง) เพื่อดู และเลือกใช้คำแปลอื่นๆที่เหมาะสมกว่า
5. ฉันถามเพื่อนเมื่อฉันไม่แน่ใจว่าคำที่แปลโดย GT ถูกต้องหรือไม่
6. หลังจากแปลเสร็จ ฉันแก้ไขผลการแปลที่แปลโดย GT
7. ฉันเปรียบเทียบงานของฉันกับงานของเพื่อนก่อนส่งอาจารย์

ตอนที่ 3 พฤติกรรมการแปลประโยคและข้อความจากภาษาไทยเป็นอังกฤษ

- 1. ฉันอ่านประโยคและข้อความภาษาไทยก่อนก่อนแปลด้วย GT
- 2. ฉันใช้ GT เพื่อหาความหมายของคำศัพท์เท่านั้น ส่วนอื่นๆฉันแปลด้วยตนเอง
- 3. ฉันใช้ GT แปลประโยคภาษาอังกฤษครั้งละ 1 ประโยค
- 4. เมื่อฉันไม่แน่ใจว่าคำที่แปลโดย GT ถูกต้องหรือไม่ ฉันคลิกที่คำคำนั้น (แถบสีเหลือง) เพื่อดูและเลือกใช้คำแปลอื่นๆที่เหมาะสมกว่า
- 5. ฉันถามเพื่อนเมื่อฉันไม่แน่ใจว่าคำที่แปลโดย GT ถูกต้องหรือไม่
- 6. หลังจากแปลเสร็จ ฉันแก้ไขผลการแปลที่แปลโดย GT
- 7. ฉันเปรียบเทียบงานของฉันกับงานของเพื่อนก่อนส่งอาจารย์

APPENDIX D
Translation Assignment

Translation Assignments

Instructions: Translate the following sentences and texts using Google Translate (GT). After finishing the translation assignment, please immediately complete the observation checklist.

Part 1: English to Thai Translation (10 sentences)

1. You have my phone number, so give me a ring whenever you arrive.
คุณมีหมายเลขโทรศัพท์ของฉัน ดังนั้นโทรหาฉันเมื่อคุณมาถึง
2. The surgeon is performing a minor operation on her hand.
ศัลยแพทย์กำลังผ่าตัดเล็กที่มือของเธอ
3. Mr. Pakorn will see my boss tomorrow at the office.
คุณปรกรณ์จะเข้าพบเจ้านายของฉันในวันพรุ่งนี้ที่สำนักงาน
4. He lost face since he did not get a promotion.
เขาเสียหน้าเพราะเขาไม่ได้เลื่อนตำแหน่ง (เลื่อนขั้น)
5. Parichart hasn't finished her housework yet.
ปาริชาติยังทำงานบ้านไม่เสร็จ
6. Kantima doesn't want to brush up on her knowledge of French before she goes to Paris.
กันทิมาไม่ต้องการฟื้นฟูความรู้ภาษาฝรั่งเศสของเธอก่อนที่จะ她去ปารีส
7. Students aren't reading but they are talking to their friends at the moment.
นักเรียนไม่ได้กำลังอ่านหนังสือแต่พวกเขา กำลังคุยกับเพื่อนๆ ในขณะนี้
8. Does she behave like a man?
เธอประพฤติตัวราวกับผู้ชายหรือไม่
9. Has she missed the last bus?
เธอพลาดรถคันสุดท้ายหรือไม่
10. Did you give your dear niece a birthday gift?
คุณให้ของขวัญวันเกิดแก่หลานสาวที่รักของคุณหรือไม่

Part 2: English to Thai Translation (Text A)

Ninja Akasaka is a popular restaurant in Tokyo. A ninja in dark clothes greets guests at the door and takes them through the dark hallways of the ninja house to their tables. The waiters also dress as ninja. Ninja Akasaka has over a hundred delicious dishes to choose from. There's also a branch of the restaurant in Manhattan—Ninja New York. (61 words)

Source: Four Corners Student's Book 2, page 102, Cambridge
University Press 2012

นินจา อะคาซากะ เป็นร้านอาหารยอดนิยมในโตเกียว นินจาในชุดสีดำทักทายแขกที่ประตูและพาแขก
เดินผ่านทางเดินมืดของบ้านนินจาไปยังโต๊ะของพวกเขา บริการก็แต่งตัวด้วยชุดนินจาเช่นกัน นินจา อะคาซากะมี
อาหารอร่อยมากกว่าหนึ่งร้อยรายการให้เลือก และยังมีสาขาในแมนแฮตตันอีกด้วย ชื่อว่า นินจานิวยอร์ก

Part 3: Thai to English Translation (10 sentences)

1. มะลิเชื่อว่าหล่อนไม่มีอำนาจควบคุมชีวิตของตนได้

Mali believes that she has no control over her life.

2. นิตยากำลังออกกำลังกายเพื่อปรับปรุงรูปร่างของหล่อน

Nittaya is exercising to improve her shape.

3. การฆาตกรรมนั้นเกิดขึ้นในห้องจัดเลี้ยงของโรงแรม

The murder took place in the hotel's banquet hall.

4. งานกาชาดจะจัดขึ้นในเดือนหน้า

The Red Cross fair will be held next month.

5. โสพิศไม่ดูถูกยิวดีที่มีเงินน้อย

Sopit doesn't look down on Yuwadee because she has little money.

6. เลขของเขายังไม่ได้เตือนเขาเรื่องการนัดหมายในตอนเย็น

His secretary hasn't reminded him of his appointment in the evening.

7. เขาจะไม่พูดลับหลังเพื่อนของเขา

He will not talk behind his friends back.

8. สามีคุณกำลังทำอะไรอยู่ในสวน

What is your husband doing in the garden?

9. คุณเคยถูกจับฐานขับรถเร็วไหม

Have you ever got arrested for speeding?

10. ใครทำแก้วแตก

Who broke the glass?

Part 4: Thai to English Translation (Text B)

แพทย์ชี้ให้เห็นว่าการใช้คอมพิวเตอร์มากเกินไปจะส่งผลเสียต่อพัฒนาการของเด็ก โดยผลเสียทางร่างกายอาจทำให้ถึงขั้นพิการได้ เพราะกระดูกและกล้ามเนื้อไม่ได้รับการพัฒนาอย่างเต็มที่ ส่วนผลเสียทางด้านจิตใจคือ เด็กมีความก้าวร้าวและขาดทักษะทางสังคม เพราะพวกเขาจะสร้างโลกส่วนตัวขึ้นมา และจะอยู่แต่ในโลกของตัวเองมากเกินไปจนไม่สนใจผู้อื่น ซึ่งผลเสียดังกล่าวเกิดขึ้นได้เช่นเดียวกับเด็กที่ติดโทรทัศน์ (82 คำ)

Adapted from <http://karn.tv/ห้องสมุด/บทความวิชาการ/830>

Doctors point out that computer overuse affects child development. The effects can cause physical disability since bones and muscles are not fully developed. In terms of mental effects, children are aggressive and they lack social skills because they set up their own world and spend too much time in their world rather than spending time with other people. These bad effects can also happen to those who are addicted to TV.

APPENDIX E

Scoring criteria

Scoring criteria for translation assignments

Assessment topics	scores			Scores received
	2	1	0	
Understanding	the meaning of the translated text is clearly understandable.	the meaning of the translated text is ambiguous or incomplete (some words are missing)	the meaning of the translated text is not understandable.	
Grammar	good grammatical accuracy (no mistakes)	reasonable grammatical accuracy (1-2 mistakes)	poor grammatical accuracy (more than 2 mistakes)	
Word order in sentences	no mistakes	a few mistakes (1-2 mistakes)	some mistakes (more than 2 mistakes)	
Appropriate use of word equivalents	use all appropriate words which correctly convey the meaning of a sentence.	use any words which have similar meanings but not exactly convey the correct meaning of a sentence.	use any wrong words which make the whole meaning distorted or unable to understand	
	Total scores =			

Adapted from Framework for Standardized Error Marking provided by the American Translators Association (ATA)

เกณฑ์การให้คะแนนงานแปล

หัวข้อประเมิน	ระดับคะแนน			คะแนนที่ได้
	2	1	0	
เนื้อความ	ข้อความที่แปลได้สื่อความหมายชัดเจน สามารถเข้าใจได้	ข้อความที่แปลได้สื่อความหมายไม่ชัดเจน หรือ ไม่สมบูรณ์ (บางคำหายไป)	ไม่สามารถเข้าใจความหมายของข้อความที่แปลได้	
ไวยากรณ์	ไวยากรณ์ถูกต้องในระดับดี (ไม่มีข้อผิดพลาด)	ไวยากรณ์ถูกต้องในระดับปานกลาง (ผิด 1-2 จุด/ประโยค)	ไวยากรณ์ถูกต้องในระดับต่ำ (ผิด มากกว่า 2 จุด/ประโยค)	
การเรียงคำในประโยค	ไม่มีข้อผิดพลาด	มีข้อผิดพลาดเล็กน้อย (ผิด 1-2 จุด/ประโยค)	มีข้อผิดพลาดมาก (ผิด มากกว่า 2 จุด/ประโยค)	
การใช้คำที่เหมาะสม	ใช้คำได้เหมาะสม สื่อความหมายได้อย่างถูกต้อง	ใช้คำที่มีความหมายคล้ายคลึงแต่ไม่สามารถสื่อความหมายที่ถูกต้องได้	ใช้คำผิด ทำให้ความหมายโดยรวมผิดเพี้ยนหรืออ่านไม่เข้าใจ	
				คะแนนรวม =

Adapted from Framework for Standardized Error Marking provided by the American Translators Association (ATA)

PAPER 1

Use of Google Translate: An Investigation on English Learners' Behaviors

การใช้กูเกิ้ลทรานสเลท: การศึกษาพฤติกรรมของผู้เรียนภาษาอังกฤษ

Arissara Sukkhan¹

อริศรา สุขขวัญ

Waraporn Sripetpun²

วราภรณ์ ศรีเพชรพันธุ์

บทคัดย่อ

งานวิจัยนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อศึกษา 1) พฤติกรรมการใช้โปรแกรม Google Translate (GT) ของนักศึกษา 2) ความแตกต่างระหว่างคะแนนการแปลของนักศึกษาที่มีความถนัดในการใช้ GT สูง และนักศึกษามีความถนัดในการใช้ GT ต่ำ และ 3) ความสัมพันธ์ระหว่างพฤติกรรมการใช้ GT กับคุณภาพของงานแปล กลุ่มตัวอย่างคือนักศึกษาชั้นปีที่ 1 มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏสงขลา จำนวน 30 คน ซึ่งทั้งหมดเป็นผู้ใช้ GT เครื่องมือวิจัยประกอบด้วย แบบสอบถามตรวจสอบรายการ (Checklist) เกี่ยวกับพฤติกรรมการใช้ GT และแบบฝึกหัดแปล (อังกฤษ-ไทย และ ไทย-อังกฤษ) นักศึกษาทั้งหมดทำแบบฝึกหัดแปล และตอบแบบสอบถามทันทีหลังจากทำแบบฝึกหัดแปลเสร็จ สถิติที่ใช้ในการวิจัยได้แก่ ความถี่ ร้อยละ การทดสอบค่าที และค่าสัมประสิทธิ์สหสัมพันธ์ของเพียร์สัน ผลการวิจัยพบว่า พฤติกรรมที่ใช้มากที่สุด 4 พฤติกรรม ได้แก่ การอ่านประโยคและข้อความก่อนการแปลด้วย GT การแปลครั้งละหนึ่งประโยค การเลือกใช้คำที่เหมาะสมกว่าคำที่แปลโดย GT และการแก้ไขผลการแปลหลังจากใช้ GT ทั้งนี้พบว่าพฤติกรรมการเลือกใช้คำที่เหมาะสมกว่าคำที่แปลโดย GT มีผลต่อคุณภาพการแปลของนักศึกษาที่มีความถนัดในการใช้ GT สูง ในการแปลภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาไทย แต่ไม่มีผลต่อการแปลภาษาไทยเป็นภาษาอังกฤษ

¹M.A. student (Teaching English as an International Language) Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Hat Yai Campus

นักศึกษาปริญญาโท (สาขาการสอนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษานานาชาติ) คณะศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัย สงขลานครินทร์ วิทยาเขตหาดใหญ่

²Assistant Professor, Ph.D, Department of Languages and Linguistics, Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Hat Yai Campus

ผู้ช่วยศาสตราจารย์ ดร. อาจารย์ประจำภาควิชาภาษาและภาษาศาสตร์ คณะศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัย สงขลานครินทร์ วิทยาเขตหาดใหญ่

จากผลการทดสอบค่าที่ไม่พบความแตกต่างระหว่างคะแนนการแปลของกลุ่มนักศึกษาที่มีความถี่ของการใช้ GT สูง และกลุ่มนักศึกษาที่มีความถี่ของการใช้ GT ต่ำ ผลการศึกษาไม่พบความสัมพันธ์ ที่มีนัยสำคัญทางสถิติระหว่างพฤติกรรมการใช้ GT กับคะแนนการแปลของนักศึกษา

คำสำคัญ: โปรแกรม Google Translate (GT) พฤติกรรม คุณภาพของการแปล

Use of Google Translate: An Investigation on English Learners' Behaviors

*Arissara Sukkhwan*¹

*Waraporn Sripetpun*²

Abstract

The purposes of this study were to investigate 1) students' behaviors in using GT; 2) differences between translation scores of frequent and non-frequent GT users and 3) relationships between students' behaviors in using GT and quality of their translation work. The subjects were 30 non-English major first-year students at Songkhla Rajabhat University; all of them were GT users. A checklist questionnaire asking about students' behaviors in using GT and a translation assignment (English-Thai and Thai-English) were used as research instruments. All 30 students participated in the translation session. Immediately, after finishing the translation task, they were given a questionnaire. Data was analyzed for frequency, percentage, t-test, and Pearson's Correlation Coefficient. Results showed that the four most-performed behaviors were reading sentences and texts before translating them with GT, translating one sentence at a time, looking for and replacing more suitable words provided by GT Word Function, and editing GT output. Interestingly, the behavior of looking for and replacing more appropriate words available in GT Word Function significantly related to scores of frequent GT users in English-to-Thai translation but not in Thai-to-English translation. The t-test revealed that no differences were found between translation scores of non-frequent and frequent GT users; and there was no significant relationship between students' behaviors and their translation scores.

Key words: Google Translate, behaviors, quality of translation

Introduction

Information Technology has provided computer applications that help make life easier. It is an influential tool creating opportunities for people to better suit work, life, communication, and learning in the 21st century (Hawisher & Selfe, 1991 cited in Madhavaiah, Nagaraju & Peter, 2013). Machine Translation (MT) is computer software used to translate texts from one language to another (Hutchins, 1995). MT history began in July 1949 when Warren Weaver published the memorandum on the topic "Translation" which referred to using computers to translate. For at least 40 years, MTs have been used in two ways: 1) dissemination—using MTs to translate but requiring human editing for publication; and 2) assimilation—using MTs for creating rough drafts to facilitate readers to get the ideas of texts (Hutchins, 2009). As the world becomes more internationally connected, Internet users will not use only English in online communication but they also use other languages (ElShiekh, 2012). MTs have been progressively improved for better quality of translation. The availability of MTs has expanded for online services such as Google Translate (GT), Bing Translator, Yahoo Babelfish, Duolingo (www.duolingo.com), Tradukka (www.tradukka.com), and Gabbleon (www.gabbleon.com) (Garcia & Cabot, 2012). Therefore, today, millions of people widely use MTs as their translators. MT service was reportedly used 50 million times daily (TAUS, 2009, cited in Garcia & Pena, 2011). Some MT users are professional translators and some are language learners (Garcia & Pena, 2011).

For L2 learning, MT software can be used as a learning tool. Many studies on MTs have revealed its potentials in a language classroom. Niño (2005) concluded that the most common use of MTs were for the purposes of reading comprehension and writing in a new language. However, learners need to have some knowledge and experience in using MT software because it was not generally designed for language learners (Somers, 2001). Putting words, phrases or full texts to get the ideas in another language may cause problems to language learners and teachers (McCarthy, 2004 cited in Somers et al., 2006). Many students use GT for their English assignments but neglect some drawbacks and limitations of the tool. In recent years, many researchers

have evaluated the translation quality of online MTs and found some limitations. Aiken and Balan (2011) investigated the translation accuracy of GT system using 2,550 language-pair combinations (51 languages x 50 passages of text). Results showed that the accuracies provided by GT were very different. The analysis of the study indicated that GT was usually good in translating European languages. In contrast, the quality of translated texts written in Asian languages is not yet satisfactory. As GT is one of the most popular MT with its efficiency, containing over two hundred billion words and providing users versatility of words and phrases (Komeili, Hendavalan, & Rahimi, 2011) so it is widely used among Thai EFL learners for their English learning purposes. However, how these students use and learn from GT use has not yet been explored. This present study was designed to investigate students' behaviors in using GT for their translation assignment. The study also investigated differences between students' translating scores of frequent and non-frequent GT users and examined relationships between students' behaviors in using GT and the quality of their translation work

Purposes of the Study

1. To study students' behaviors in using GT
2. To examine differences between translation scores of frequent GT users and non-frequent GT users
3. To investigate relationships between students' behaviors and quality of their translation work assisted by GT

Research Questions

1. What are students' behaviors in using GT?
2. Are there any differences between translation scores of frequent GT users and non-frequent GT users?
3. Are there any relationships between students' behaviors and quality of their translation work assisted by GT?

Definitions of terms

1. **Behaviors** refer to what students do while using GT as the assisting tool to complete the translation assignment.
2. **Translation quality** refers to the total scores obtained from students' translation work.
3. **Frequent GT users** refer to the students who use GT from three to more than six times a week.
4. **Non-frequent GT users** refer to the students who use GT once to twice a week.
5. **Students** refer to non-English major first year students of Songkhla Rajabhat University who studied the English compulsory course in the 1st semester of 2013 academic year.

Research methodology

1. Participants

Thirty non-English major first students (15 frequent GT users and 15 non-frequent GT users) at Songkhla Rajabhat University were selected as research participants, based on their frequency of GT use within a week.

2. Research Instruments

In order to respond to all the research questions, the researcher used a Self-Observation Checklist and a translation assignment (English-to-Thai and Thai-to-English). The details of each instrument are outlined as follows.

2.1 Self-Observation Checklist

The Self-Observation Checklist was designed to investigate students' behaviors when using GT for completing their translation assignment. Questionnaire items were obtained based on an informal interview with 10 GT users who were not involved in this study, GT users' feedbacks posted on weblogs and websites, and the researcher's own experience in using GT. The questionnaire contained three sections: (1) general information of respondents; (2) behaviors on English-to-Thai translation; and (3) behaviors of Thai-to-English translation. Questionnaire items stating behaviors on the

use of GT were ticked (✓) in order to identify how students use GT in completing their translation assignment. The IOC of the questionnaire was 0.957.

2.2 Translation Assignment

The assignment was designed to investigate relationship between quality of students' translation work and their behaviors performed when using GT to help translate their assignment. Two sets of 10 sentences and one short paragraph of no more than 100 words were assigned for the English-to-Thai and Thai-to-English translation. All the sentences and paragraphs were reviewed and approved by one native speaker of English and one Thai native teacher teaching a translation course. Scoring criteria for a translation assignment were adapted from Framework for Standardized Error Marking provided by the American Translators Association (ATA). The criteria focused on four aspects: (1) comprehension—considering mistranslation, omission, over-translation, and distorted meaning of the target language from the meaning of original text; (2) grammar—considering grammatical mistakes including subject and verb agreements, incorrect verb tenses or verb forms, etc.; (3) syntax—considering a problem of word order which is commonly found in GT outputs and (4) appropriateness of word use (terminology)—considering the most appropriate word among several words that have similar meanings including wrong vocabulary word use. In each aspect, the translation assignment was scored by examining sentence for sentence, using a tow point rating scale (2, 1, and 0). However, any incomprehensible translated sentences which failed to convey understandable meanings would not be graded in the other three criteria. The IOC of the scoring criteria was 0.767.

3. Data Collection

All 30 students (15 frequent GT users and 15 non-frequent GT users) were selected as participants in a 150-minute translation session which was conducted in a computer laboratory at the Language Center of Songkhla Rajabhat University. All 30 participants did their assignment at the same time. Immediately after the translation session, the Self-Observation Checklist on the students' behaviors in using GT was done by the participants. The students ticked (✓) on statements that were relevant to their own translation behaviors and (X) if they did not perform the behaviors. Students' assignment was marked by two raters, the researcher and an English lecturer of Department of Western Languages, the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Prince of Songkla University, Pattani Campus. The inter-rater reliability in all four parts of assignment were $r_1=0.991$, $r_2=0.845$, $r_3=0.989$, $r_4=0.820$, respectively.

4. Data Analysis

In order to divide students into frequent GT and non-frequent GT users, the frequency of GT use was ranged based on their frequency of GT use within a week. The frequency of GT use in the present study was ranged from 0, 1-2, 3-4, 5-6, and more than six times a week. The 15 students who used GT once or twice a week were identified as non-frequent GT users and the other 15 of those who used GT ranged from three to more than six times a week were identified as frequent GT users. In order to investigate what behaviors in using GT were mostly performed in doing the translation assignment, the data obtained from the Self-Observation Checklist was analyzed for frequency and percentage. Afterwards, the t-test was used to investigate differences between scores of frequent and non-frequent GT users. Finally, to examine relationships between students' behaviors and their scores of the translation assignment, the data was analyzed for Pearson's Correlation Coefficient.

Results

To answer Research Question 1, asking about students' behaviors in using GT as an assisting tool for their translation assignment, the results were shown in Table 1 and Table 2.

Table 1 Students' behaviors in doing English-to-Thai translation

Behaviors (English-to-Thai translation)	NF		F		Total	
	(n=15)		(n=15)		(n=30)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
1. When I was not sure about word meanings translated by GT, I clicked on those words to see other possible meanings and chose the most appropriate ones.	14	46.6	10	33.3	24	80
2. I read English sentences and text before using GT.	12	40	8	26.6	20	66.6
3. I edited the GT output when I finished the translation task.	12	40	8	26.6	20	66.6
4. I used GT to translate one sentence at a time.	10	33.3	9	30	19	63.3
5. When I was not sure about word meanings translated by GT, I asked for other students' help.	9	30	9	30	18	60
6. I compared my work with other students' before submission.	9	30	9	30	18	60
7. I used GT only for meanings of unknown vocabulary words and translated the rest by myself.	7	23.3	5	16.6	12	40

NF = non-frequent GT users

F = frequent GT users

Table 1 shows percentages of students' behaviors in using GT for English-to-Thai translation. The results indicated that most students looked for and replaced more appropriate words provided by GT (80%). Over half of them read sentences and text before using GT (66.6%), edited the GT output after finishing the translation work (66.6%), translated one sentence at a time (63.3%), asked for friends' help (60%), and

compared their own work with friends' work (60%), respectively. Nearly half of them used GT only for word meanings (40%).

Comparing between the NF and the F groups; however, five behaviors were performed by the NF group at a higher percentage than those performed by the F group. These were the behaviors of looking for and replacing more appropriate words provided by GT Word Function, reading sentences and texts before using GT, editing the GT output after finishing the translation work, translating one sentence at a time, and using GT only for word meanings.

Table 2 Students' behaviors while doing Thai-to-English translation

Behaviors (Thai-to-English translation)	NF (15)		F (15)		Total (30)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
1. I read Thai sentences and text before using GT.	12	40	14	46.6	26	86.6
2. When I was not sure about word meanings translated by GT, I clicked on those words to see other possible meanings and chose the most appropriate ones.	13	43.3	11	36.6	24	80
3. I used GT to translate one sentence at a time	10	33.3	11	36.6	21	70
4. I edited the GT output when I finished the translation task.	11	36.6	9	30	20	66.6
5. When I was not sure about word meanings translated by GT, I asked for other students' help.	9	30	8	26.6	17	56.6
6. I compared my work with other students' before submission.	6	20	10	33.3	16	53.3
7. I used GT only for meanings of unknown vocabulary words and translated the rest by myself.	6	20	6	20	12	40

NF = non-frequent GT users

F = frequent GT users

Table 2 presents percentages of students' behaviors in using GT for Thai-to-English translation. The results showed that most students read sentences and text before using GT (86.6%), looking for and replacing more appropriate words from GT Word Function (80%), and used GT to translate one sentence at a time (70%), respectively. Over half of them edited GT output after completing the translation task (66.6%), asked for friends' assistance (56.6%), and compared their work with other students' work (53.3%). Nearly half of them used GT only for meanings of unknown vocabulary words (40%).

Comparing between the NF and the F groups, three behaviors were performed by the NF group at a higher percentage than those performed by the F group. These included looking for and replacing more appropriate words from GT Word Function, editing GT output after completing the translation task, and asking for friends' assistance. On the other hand, the other three behaviors were performed by the NF group at a lower percentage than those performed by the F group: reading sentences and texts before using GT, using GT to translate one sentence at a time, and comparing their work with other students' work before submission. For the behavior of using GT only for meanings of vocabulary words, the percentage of the NF group was exactly the same as that of the F group.

To answer Research Question 2 asking about differences between scores of frequent GT users and non-frequent GT users, Independent-Samples t-test was performed and results were presented in Table 3 and Table 4.

Table 3 English-to-Thai translation scores of non-frequent GT users and frequent GT users

EN-TH translation	NF		F		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.			
Part 1	26.53	15.69	23.43	12.20	0.604	28	0.55
Part 2	23.17	5.09	20.93	5.41	1.164	28	0.25
Part 1+2	49.70	17.92	44.37	13.96	0.909	28	0.37

NF = non-frequent GT users

F = frequent GT users

Table 4 Thai-to-English translation scores of non-frequent GT users and frequent GT users

TH - EN translation	NF		F		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.			
Part 3	25.43	3.84	28.83	7.23	-1.609	21.32	0.12
Part 4	17.93	1.18	18.13	2.42	-0.287	28	0.78
Part 3+4	43.37	3.40	46.97	6.62	-1.873	20.92	0.08

NF = non-frequent GT users F = frequent GT users

The results of the t-test in Table 3 and Table 4 showed that there was no significant difference between the scores of students in the NF and the F groups ($p > 0.05$) for both English-to-Thai and Thai-to-English translation. However, the findings suggested that there might be some other factors that affected translation scores of both the NF and the F groups such as awareness of GT drawbacks, language background knowledge, and behaviors in using GT.

To answer Research Question 3, asking if there are any relationships between students' behaviors and quality of their translation work assisted by GT, a series of correlation test, Pearson's Product Moment Coefficient, was performed. The results were shown in Tables 5 and Table 6.

Table 5 Relationships between students' behaviors in using GT for EN-TH translation and scores of the translation assignment

Behaviors (English-to-Thai translation)	Total scores of EN-TH translation					
	All (N=30)		NF (N=15)		F (N=15)	
	r	Sig.	r	Sig.	r	Sig.
1. Read sentences and text before using GT.	0.02	0.47	-0.43	0.06	0.35	0.10
2. Used GT only for word meanings	0.04	0.41	0.00	0.50	0.05	0.43
3. Used GT to translate one sentence at a time	0.25	0.09	0.37	0.08	0.09	0.38
4. Looked at other possible words in a target language from GT function to check and choose more appropriate words	0.29	0.06	-0.03	0.46	0.46*	0.04
5. Asked for other students' help when feeling uncertain about word meanings	-0.05	0.40	0.13	0.32	-0.26	0.17
6. Edited the GT output when finishing the translation task	-0.03	0.44	-0.10	0.37	-0.07	0.40
7. Compared the work with other students' before submission	-0.17	0.18	0.12	0.34	-0.57**	0.01

*Significant at 0.05 **Significant at 0.01

Table 5 presents the relationships between learners' behaviors and their scores in using GT for assisting their English-to-Thai translation assignments. The results showed that no significant relationships between students' scores and their behaviors were found both in the whole subject group and in the NF group. For the F group, the significant and positive correlation ($r = 0.46^*$) was found between students' scores and the behavior of looking for and replacing more appropriate words from GT Word Function. Students significantly got high scores when they performed this behavior. However, the significant and negative relationship ($r = -0.57^{**}$) was found between their scores and the behavior of comparing the work with other students' work before submission, meaning that comparing translation work with that of classmates did not help increase the quality of their work.

Table 6 Relationships between students' behaviors in using GT for TH-EN translation and scores of the translation assignment

Behaviors (Thai-to-English translation)	Total scores of TH-EN translation					
	All (N=30)		NF (N=15)		F (N=15)	
	r	Sig.	r	r	Sig.	r
1. Read sentences and text before using GT.	0.17	0.19	0.06	0.42	0.19	0.25
2. Used GT only for word meanings	-0.28	0.07	-0.28	0.16	-0.33	0.12
3. Used GT to translate one sentence at a time	-0.08	0.34	0.06	0.42	-0.22	0.22
4. Looked at other possible words in a target language from GT function to check and choose more appropriate words	-0.33*	0.04	0.22	0.21	-0.51*	0.03
5. Asked for other students' help when feeling uncertain about word meanings	-0.05	0.39	0.13	0.32	-0.12	0.34
6. Edited the GT output when finishing the translation task	0.04	0.41	-0.39	0.07	0.33	0.12
7. Compared the work with other students' before submission	-0.18	0.17	-0.36	0.09	-0.29	0.15

*Significant at 0.05 **Significant at 0.01

As presented in Table 6, no significant and positive relationships were found in a whole subject group and also in the NF and the F groups. On the other hand, a significant and negative relationship ($r = -0.33^*$) was found between students' scores of the whole subject group and the behavior of looking for and replacing more appropriate words provided by GT Word Function, meaning that this behavior did not help the students to perform better quality translation. They might not have adequate vocabulary knowledge to do so effectively.

Discussions

Based on the results of the study, the four most frequently-performed behaviors in both English-to-Thai and Thai-to-English translation were the behaviors of reading sentences and texts before using GT, translating one sentence at a time, looking for and replacing more suitable words from GT Word Function, and editing the GT output. These four behaviors were performed by most students (over 60% of 30 students), indicating that most of them knew how to use GT effectively and appropriately. They were aware of errors produced by GT and tried not to make those errors in their translation work by performing these four behaviors. Obviously, most behaviors in English-to-Thai translation were performed by the NF group at a higher percentage than those performed by the F group. These findings seemed to imply that the NF group might have more awareness of GT limitations especially in English-to-Thai translation. They were aware of errors that could be produced by GT. The more awareness of GT use students had, the more they might perform behaviors that possibly helped prevent mistakes in their work. However, two behaviors that were performed at a higher percentage by the NF group in both English-to-Thai and Thai-to-English translation were the behaviors of looking and replacing more suitable words from GT Word Function and editing the GT output. These findings indicated that these two behaviors were similarly performed by both groups of students in both English-to-Thai and Thai-to-English translation.

Concerning a relationship between students' behaviors in using GT and their translation scores, no significant and positive correlations were found between overall students' behaviors of GT use and scores of their translation assignment. These findings suggested that students' behaviors of GT use in the present study did not support quality of their translation work. However, the significant relationship between the behavior of looking for and replacing more suitable words from GT Word Function had effects on quality of students' translation assignment. This behavior was an effective technique that might assist students to have better quality of English-to-Thai translation work. The findings are in line with Josefsson (2011) who found that an inappropriate interpretation sometimes was produced by GT such as some words that did not conform

very well to L1 meaning. Therefore, trying to look for and replace GT output with more appropriate words seemed significantly helpful to students. This behavior, although, seemed beneficial in English-to-Thai translation in the present study, it seemed ineffective in Thai-to-English translation. These findings implied that non-English major students might have little experience in translating from the mother tongue (Thai) to the target language (English). And possibly having little vocabulary knowledge, these students might have a problem in selecting more appropriate words than those provided by GT and could not improve the quality of their assignment.

Although all behaviors in this study were not found to support quality of students' translation assignment, the behavior of looking for and replacing more appropriate words from GT Word Function was found to support students' scores in the F group for English-to-Thai translation. In addition, the behavior of using GT to translate one sentence at a time, although having a weak positive correlation with students' scores in all groups, seemed to support all students in English-to-Thai translation. These findings correspond to McCarthy (2004 cited in Somers et al., 2006) who indicated that when language learners attempted to understand texts in a foreign language, problems would occur if they put words, phrases, or even very long texts into the MT software. Similarly, even though weak relationships were found, the behavior of reading sentences and texts before doing the assignment seemed to be another helpful behavior that might support students in Thai-to-English translation. Reading the source text before translating could help students to do better in their translation. Consequently, these three behaviors: looking for and replacing more appropriate words from GT Word Function; using GT to translate one sentence at a time; and reading the source text before translating it, may also be good techniques that help students to deal better with translation work assisted by GT.

It was hoped that students would recognize their own behaviors when using GT in learning English and realized what behaviors in using GT supported their English learning. The study would also encourage students to have some awareness towards GT's limitations so that students use GT properly and effectively and teachers could

help train students how to use and take full advantages of GT despite the fact that it has some deficiencies.

Concluding remarks and Recommendations for further studies

According to the study, most students realized that GT could produce some mistakes in vocabulary word use, word order and some tenses, so they avoided these mistakes in their work by performing these four behaviors: reading sentences and texts before using GT, translating one sentence at a time, looking for and replacing more suitable words from GT Word Function, and editing the GT output. Among these four behaviors, all behaviors were performed at a higher percentage by the NF group than those performed by the F group in English-to-Thai translation. The behaviors of looking for and replacing more suitable words from GT Word Function and editing the GT output were the two behaviors that were similarly performed by both groups of students in both English-to-Thai and Thai-to-English translation. Based on the t-test, however, there was no significant difference between scores of the NF group and those of the F group. Awareness of GT limitations, background of language knowledge, and different behaviors in using GT might be important factors affecting scores of students in both groups. Regarding the relationship between all behaviors of GT use and translation quality, a significant correlation was not found. The significant effect on students' scores appeared when the F group performed the behavior of looking for and replacing more appropriate words from the GT Word Function. They got high scores when performing this behavior in English-to-Thai translation but not in Thai-to-English translation. Having less experience in translating from L1 to L2 and less vocabulary proficiency may be the problems of these non-English major students. However translating sentence for sentence and reading sentences and texts before doing the assignment seemed to be good techniques for learning English from GT software.

However, this present study has some limitations which could be addressed and investigated in further studies. Recommendations for further studies are suggested as follows.

1. The present study was restricted in an investigation of GT use. Further studies should survey the use of other MTs or other online tools in order to find alternative software or programs that support students' language learning.
2. The subjects of the present study were non-English major students having different background knowledge; therefore, the same study should be done with English major students to compare their behaviors in using GT with those of non-English majors. Also, the study can compare between behaviors in using GT of students who have high and low English proficiency.
3. The present study investigated students' perceptions on the use of GT using a self-observation checklist. Further studies should be done with the other research instruments such as the researcher's observation or students' behaviors recorded (video record) when they use GT.
4. Students' behaviors in the present study were investigated in translating at a sentence and a paragraph levels. For further studies, students' behaviors in using GT for translation should also be investigated at a word level.
5. Further studies should be extensively done in surveying learners' behaviors and their success in translating using GT or other MTs in translating Thai to English and English to Thai for the sakes of both language learning and translation of Thai learners.

References

- Aiken, M., & Balan, S. (2011). An analysis of Google Translate accuracy. *Translation Journal*. Retrieved February 19, 2013, from <http://www.translationdirectory.com/articles/article2302.php>
- ElShiekh, A. (2012). Google Translate Service: Transfer of Meaning, Distortion or Simply a New Creation? *An Investigation into the Translation Process & Problems at Google*, 2(1), 56-68. Retrieved February 19, 2013, from <http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/ells/article/download/15230/10299>
- Garcia, I., & Cabot, C. (2012). Does Machine Translation Support Language Learning? *4th International Conference on Education and New Learning Technologies*. Retrieved February 18, 2013, from <http://library.iated.org/view/GACIA2012DOE>
- Garcia, I., & Pena, M. I. (2011). Writing for Beginners Computer Assisted Language Learning. *Machine Translation-Assisted Language Learning*, 24(5), 471-487. Retrieved February, 17, 2013 from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09588221.2011.582687>
- Hutchins, J. (1995). Machine Translation: A Brief History. In E.F.K. Koerner & R.E. Asher (Eds.), *Concise history of the language sciences: from the Sumerians to the cognitivists* (pp. 431-445). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Hutchins, J. (2009). Machine Translation and controlled language. *Multiple Uses of Machine Translation and Computerised Translation Tools*. Retrieved February 15, 2013 from <http://hutchinsweb.me.uk/Besancon-2009.pdf>
- Josefsson, E. (2011). Contemporary Approaches to Translation in the Classroom: A study of Students' Attitudes and Strategies, 1-32. Retrieved January, 9, 2014 from <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:519125/FULLTEXT01.pdf>

- Komeili, Z., Hendavalan, J. F., & 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. Retrieved February, 15, 2013 from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042811026346>
- Madhavaiah, G., Nagaraju, C., & Peter, S. (2013). Importance of Technology in Teaching and Learning English Language. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Reviews*, 2(3), 146-154. Retrieved March, 24, 2014 from http://www.ijssr.org/down_225.php
- Niño, A. (2005). Machine translation in the foreign language classroom: a double-edged sword. Retrieved February 10, 2013 from <http://www.ub.es/filhis/culturele/nino.html>
- Somer, H. (2001). Three Perspectives on MT in the Classroom. *MT Summit VIII Workshop on Teaching Machine Translation, Santiago de Compostela, 25-29*. Retrieved February, 17, 2013 from <http://www.dlsi.ua.es/tmt/docum/TMT4.pdf>
- Somer, H., Gaspari, F., & Niño, A. (2006). *Detecting Inappropriate Use of Free Online Machine Translation by Language Students: A Special Case of Plagiarism Detection*. Retrieved February, 17, 2013 from <http://mt-archive.info/EAMT-2006-Somers.pdf>

PAPER 2

Use of Google Translate: A Survey of Songkhla Rajabhat University Students

Use of Google Translate: A survey of Songkhla Rajabhat University Students

*Arissara Sukkhan*¹

*Waraporn Sripetpun*²

Abstract

This study aimed to explore the students' use and attitudes towards using Google Translate (GT) for aiding their English learning and problems in using GT and ways employed by the students for solutions were investigated. Questionnaires, focusing on purposes of GT use; attitudes; and students' problems and solutions, were used as the instruments. The participants were 125 non-English major first year students of Songkhla Rajabhat University.

Results showed that almost all students used GT but at a low level of frequency. Vocabulary learning, writing, and reading were the three most frequent purposes for which students used GT, whereas translation was the least frequently used. Considering each learning purpose, the students most frequently used GT for getting meanings of words; writing exercises or assignments in an English course; reading an English textbook; and translating idioms and proverbs, respectively. Additionally, the students viewed GT more beneficial than disadvantageous. It is free and easily accessible. It provides fast translation with better quality when compared with students own translation. Usefulness and comments about problems of using GT were also described. Finally, possibilities of GT use for learning English are discussed.

Keywords: Google Translate, machine translation, attitudes, purposes of GT use, English language learning

¹M.A. student (Teaching English as an International Language), Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Hat Yai Campus

²Assistant Professor, Ph.D., Department of Languages and Linguistics, Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Hat Yai Campus

Introduction

In the past, language learners used a dictionary to get meanings of unknown words in another language. This might be time consuming and learners might find it was hard to interpret the meanings, particularly, when they translate a whole text. However, new technologies now have been developed to facilitate language learners to get information and access new knowledge in another language.

Machine Translation (MT) is computer software used to translate texts from one natural language to another (Hutchin, 1995). Today, millions of people use MT as a translator. MT service was used 50 million times daily (TAUS, 2009, cited in Garcia & Pena, 2011). Some MT users are professional translators and some are language learners (Garcia & Pena, 2011).

Nowadays, there are various online MT services available for internet users and language learners such as Babelfish, Translator Online, Foreign Word, Web Trance, Prompt, Verbalis, and Google Translate (GT) (Hampshire & Salvia, 2010). GT is one of the most popular MTs with its efficiency, containing over two hundred billion words and providing users with the most versatile words and phrases (Komeili, Hendavalan, & Rahimi, 2011), and it is reasonably acceptable; being placed in the top ranking.

However, the availability of online MTs for language learners may cause problems to language teachers. Teaching of translation is negatively impacted when students put words, phrases or full texts into automatic software to get the ideas of texts written in another language (McCarthy, 2004 cited in Somers et al., 2006). Although many language teachers do not accept MT in a classroom, MT is widely used among language learners.

Kumar (2012) surveyed the perceptions of EFL Arabic speaking students in ELT classrooms on their dependence on MT in learning English. 60 first year students majoring in Business and IT of Majan College were given questionnaires. Results indicated that all students used MTs. Over 75 percent of them used GT mostly to understand the concepts taught in ELT classrooms. MT provided them academic and scientific terms for writing assignments. Moreover, MT was very helpful for translation, reading comprehension, and English improvement. MT, however, could not provide translation outcome at a linguistic accuracy level for academic assignments and reports; therefore students did not rely completely on its translation outcomes. But, students strongly agreed that MT had assisted them in learning English.

GT is widely used among Thai University students. There are, however, no formal studies into how it is used and whether it is beneficial to this group of language learners. Therefore, the present study aimed to investigate the frequency of GT use of the 1st year Songkhla Rajabhat University students for their English learning purposes, their attitudes toward using GT, and advantages and disadvantages of GT including their solutions for problems caused by GT.

Significance of the study

It is hoped that the findings are beneficial for both teachers and students. Teachers would gain more insights into how much GT influences SKRU students and for which purposes they used GT in learning English so that teachers can help and support students in developing their learning autonomy using GT. Students would report what problems they have and teachers would know students' problems and would be aware of the issues so that they could prepare to train their students how to make full use of GT.

Research questions (RQs)

1. What is the students' frequency of use of GT for different English learning purposes?
2. What are their attitudes toward using GT for English learning purposes?
3. What are benefits and drawbacks of GT and how do the students cope with translation problems caused by GT?

Research methodology

1. Participants

The subjects, using a convenience sampling method, were 125 non-English major students of Songkhla Rajabhat University who studied the course of English for Communication 1 (four-skill integrated course compulsory for all students to graduate) in the 1st semester of 2013 academic year.

2. Research instruments

The questionnaire was designed to investigate students' use and attitudes towards GT for learning purposes. Questionnaire items were contributed from literature review, related studies, and an informal interview with some students about purposes of use, attitudes and problems they often face when using GT.

The questionnaire consisted of five parts: general background information, purposes of GT use, attitudes towards using GT, general comments and problems with solutions in using GT (open-ended questions).

The content validity of the questionnaire was evaluated by the advisory committee using IOC. The IOC was 0.964. The reliability of the questionnaire was 0.927

3. Procedure

Data collection was conducted on the 12th week (of 16-week semester) with 125 SKRU students. 15 minutes were taken to complete the questionnaire. Data was then analyzed for means and standard deviations.

Results

To answer the RQ1 asking for the students' frequency and purposes in using GT, it was found that almost all students (93.6 %) depended on GT and used it as an English learning tool, while few of them (6.40%) did not use GT as shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Students' frequency of GT use

General information	Yes		No					
	N	%	N	%				
Do you use Google Translate (GT)?	117	93.6	8	6.4				
Objectives	Frequency (%) (times/week)					\bar{X}	Sd.	Levels
	0	1-2	3-4	5-6	> 6			
How often do you use GT?	6.4	60	22.4	6.4	4.8	2.43	0.89	low

For frequency of use, most students averagely used GT once to twice a week, while only a few (4.80%) used it over six times a week, indicating that although a large number of students used GT in learning English, they did not use it very often within a week.

Concerning purposes of use, the findings revealed that in total the students used GT at a moderate level for vocabulary learning, writing, and reading, respectively. GT was used for translation at a low level as presented in Table 2.

Table 2 Students' frequency of GT use for English learning purposes

Vocabulary learning			
	\bar{X}	Sd.	Levels
1. General words	4.20	1.10	high
2. Technical terms	2.73	0.98	moderate
3. Names of places or institutes	2.63	1.03	moderate
4. Pronunciation and word stress from the "speaker" button [🗣]	2.57	0.98	moderate
5. Part of speech	2.54	0.99	moderate
6. Vocabulary in sample sentences appearing when clicking on a "talk bubble button" [🗣]	2.46	0.92	low
Total	2.85	1.00	moderate
Writing			
	\bar{X}	Sd.	Levels
1. English sentences or texts in exercises or assignments in an English course	3.14	1.16	moderate
2. English words and messages or comments on blogs, Facebook, twitter, etc.	2.98	1.16	moderate
3. English poems or messages in greeting cards	2.71	1.06	moderate
4. English-written emails	2.22	0.99	low
5. Live chat with foreign friends on a social network	2.20	1.15	low
Total	2.65	1.10	moderate
Reading comprehension			
	\bar{X}	Sd.	Levels
1. English sentences and texts in an English textbook.	3.30	1.08	moderate
2. English sentences and texts on a website.	2.93	1.05	moderate
3. Epigrams or morals	2.90	1.03	moderate
4. Advertisements	2.43	0.97	low
5. Signs	2.42	1.00	low
6. Product labels	2.27	0.96	low
7. English news	2.26	1.05	low
8. novels or tales	2.21	0.94	low
9. Magazines	2.13	0.81	low
Total	2.53	0.98	moderate

Translation	\bar{X}	Sd.	Levels
1. idioms or proverbs	2.68	1.05	moderate
2. passages or articles	2.60	1.00	moderate
3. Abstract of academic articles	2.42	1.01	low
4. External reading books	2.26	0.96	low
5. official documents	2.03	0.97	low
Total	2.39	0.99	low

Vocabulary learning

The learners particularly used GT for getting general word meanings at a high level. However, the learners rarely learn vocabulary from a talk bubble button.

Writing

The students used GT especially to choose words for writing English exercises or assignments at a moderate level, followed by selecting words for communicating online. However, the students used GT at a low level when communicating via email and live chatting with foreigners on social networks.

Reading

The students used GT to assist their reading at a moderate level especially to understand English sentences and texts in an English textbook, followed by understanding English sentences and texts on a website.

Translation

The total mean of GT use was at a low level of frequency. The students used GT to translate idioms and proverbs in particular, followed by passages or articles at a moderate level.

In conclusion, students frequently used GT for vocabulary learning, writing, reading, and translation, respectively. For vocabulary, they mostly used GT to look up meanings of vocabulary words. For writing, GT was most frequently used to write exercises or assignments. For reading, students particularly used it for reading an English textbook. Finally, for translation, they used it to translate idioms or proverbs.

To answer RQ2 which investigated students' attitudes on using GT for English learning, the findings showed that students were in favor of GT ranging from a moderate to a high level as shown in Table 3.

Table 3 Students' attitudes about GT use

Attitudes	\bar{X}	Sd.	Levels
1. GT is free and easy to access.	4.17	0.82	high
2. GT can translate texts quickly.	3.99	0.79	high
3. GT gives me more advantages than disadvantages.	3.60	0.72	high
4. The quality of texts translated by GT is better than by my translation.	3.60	0.84	high
5. GT is equally helpful and effective for both students with low and high English competency.	3.55	0.80	high
6. I gained a lot of vocabulary knowledge when I use GT.	3.52	0.86	high
7. Poor students depend more on GT in learning English rather than average and good students.	3.50	0.81	moderate
8. GT is more helpful and effective for students with low English competency than those with high English competency.	3.39	0.84	moderate
9. I feel more confident when using GT for English writing.	3.29	0.80	moderate
10. I can write English sentences better with the assistance of GT.	3.29	0.80	moderate
11. I can rely on the accuracy of texts translated by GT (Thai-to-English translation).	3.29	0.82	moderate
12. I gain translation skills from using GT.	3.26	0.81	moderate
13. I understand an English passage better with assistance of GT.	3.26	0.83	moderate
14. GT makes me lazy to think and to use my effort in reading.	3.25	0.90	moderate
15. I can rely on the accuracy of texts translated by GT (English-to-Thai translation).	3.24	0.84	moderate
16. I learn English grammar and structure from using GT.	3.18	0.82	moderate
17. Using GT, I don't need to remember new vocabulary or guess meanings of words.	3.13	1.01	moderate
18. GT makes me lazy to think and to use my effort in writing.	3.09	1.00	moderate

Students liked to use GT at a high level because GT is free and easy to access; it can perform the translation tasks quickly; it gives more advantages than disadvantages; the quality of translated texts is better than their translation; it helps both students with poor and good English competency; and it helps them learn more vocabulary.

However, the students believed at a moderate level that poor students depend on GT the most when compared with good and average students; and GT is more helpful for struggling learners than those who have higher English competency. Moreover, students admitted that they feel more confident when using GT for writing in English, and they can write English sentences better with GT's assistance.

Nevertheless, some students admitted that GT had negative effects on their learning habits in some ways. With a dependence on GT, they do not attempt in reading an English text by themselves, do not remember or guess the meaning of new vocabulary words, and do not write English with their own effort.

To answer RQ3 asking for students' opinions about pros and cons of GT, most of the comments given in open-ended questions showed that students perceived GT as convenient and fast to use (72.8%). Students viewed that they gained more vocabulary knowledge from using GT and it is helpful to learners with limited command of English (40.8%). Besides, GT can translate the whole sentence at a time; making English sentences more understandable to them (19.2%). Furthermore, GT provides more reliable translation output than their own (17.6%). Moreover, students can practice pronunciation from a speaker button (10.4%).

Some drawbacks reported by the students are that GT cannot contextually and accurately translate all the words in a paragraph (50.4%). GT sometimes produces incorrect or inappropriate meanings especially for long sentences or long texts (24.8%). Students also realized that too much dependence on GT makes them unable to try by themselves to learn English, so they cannot remember new vocabulary (22.4%). In addition, GT has a problem of word order; students have to correct word order to make the sentences more understandable (11.2%). Finally, some words need error-rechecking from a dictionary (11.2%). These findings suggested that students are aware not only of benefits but also incompetence of GT in translating Thai-English language pair. Students also reported the solutions they took when they confronted problems while using GT.

Most students used a dictionary or other resources after using GT in order to confirm word meanings. Some asked for teachers and friends' help. For word order, students use GT to translate word for word or sentence for sentence and edited the GT outputs by reordering words within sentences by themselves. A few of them find mistakes in the source texts which may cause errors in GT outcomes.

Discussion

Students not only learn vocabulary through GT but they also use it for getting word meanings to facilitate their writing and reading. These findings correspond to Niño (2005) that students' most common use of MTs is for the purpose of writing and reading comprehension in foreign languages. The findings were similar to the study of Kumar (2012) which found that students used MT mostly to understand the concepts taught in the classroom and they frequently used MT for writing their assignments, projects and reports.

For vocabulary learning, most students used GT as a dictionary for word to word meaning. They hardly take advantage of vocabulary knowledge from other GT functions. These findings correspond to Josefsson (2011) who found that 90 percent of students used GT as a dictionary for looking up words on their mobile phones. Although the students reported that they most frequently used GT in learning vocabulary and they gained a lot of vocabulary knowledge, a small number of students who used a speaker and talk bubble buttons pointed that students might not know all potentialities for learning vocabulary through the buttons available for GT users. Therefore, they need teachers' help and suggestions for effective vocabulary learning through various functions provided by GT.

However, the students admitted that GT reduces their attempt in reading and writing English, and it also causes the problem of vocabulary retention. Results of this study suggest that students realize GT is a good English learning tool, but sometimes it is also bad for their study because it sometimes produces inaccurate or inappropriate meanings of words, and students pay less attention on learning English when using GT. Students agreed that they get the meaning of the text, but they did not pay much attention on knowledge of new words, so they cannot retain the knowledge of new vocabulary for a long time. These drawbacks of GT, although affecting students' English learning, they still believed that GT gives them more advantages than drawbacks.

Concluding remarks and recommendations for further studies

Based on the findings of this study, GT was used mainly for learning purposes. Students used GT for getting word meanings and for benefits of reading and writing assignments in an English course. They also used GT for communication purposes. They used GT for online chatting. Therefore, teachers should support students to use GT as a tool for English learning both in a classroom, and as self-study outside the classroom. Teachers can advise and train them to learn vocabulary by using buttons provided by GT such as learning pronunciation and word stress from the speaker button (🔊), learning how to use a vocabulary word in a sample sentence from the talk bubble button (🗨), and learning parts of speech and synonyms or words with similar meanings presented under the GT translation box. Additionally, English sentences with errors produced by GT can possibly be a source for learning and practicing grammar, sentence structure, writing, and translation.

Further studies should be extensively conducted in other areas of MT or GT uses:

1. A study should survey the use of other MTs or other online tools in order to find out alternative software or programs that support students' language learning.
2. The subjects of the study should include all four years of students majoring in English who have more experience in English than non-English major students, or the subjects should be representatives from all faculties in order to compare differences in GT use and attitudes towards GT among different groups of students.
3. A study should be done between students with high and low English proficiency to compare their GT use and attitudes towards GT.
4. A study should be done to investigate if there is a relationship between students' behaviors while using GT and the quality of their work assisted by GT.

References

- Garcia, I., & Pena, M. I. (2011). Writing for Beginners Computer Assisted Language Learning. *Machine Translation-Assisted Language Learning*, 24(5), 471-487. Retrieved February, 17, 2013 from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09588221.2011.582687>
- Hampshire, S., & Salvia, C. P. (2010). *Translation and the Internet: Evaluating the Quality of Free Online Machine Translators*, 197-209. Retrieved February, 17, 2013 from <http://www.raco.cat/index.php/quadernstraduccio/article/viewFile/194256/260430>
- Hutchins, J. (1995). Machine Translation: A Brief History. In E.F.K. Koerner & R.E. Asher (Eds.), *Concise history of the language sciences: from the Sumerians to the cognitivists* (pp. 431-445). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Josefsson, E. (2011). Contemporary Approaches to Translation in the Classroom: A study of Students' Attitudes and Strategies, 1-32. Retrieved January, 9, 2014 from <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:519125/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
- Komeili, Z., Hendavalan, J. F., & 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. Retrieved February, 15, 2013 from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042811026346>
- Kumar, A. (2012). Machine Translation in Arabic-Speaking ELT Classrooms: Applications and Implications. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 2(6), 442-445. doi: 10.7763/IJSSH.2012.V2.142
- Niño, A. (2005). Machine translation in the foreign language classroom: a double-edged sword. Retrieved February 10, 2013 from <http://www.ub.es/filhis/culturele/nino.html>
- Shei, C. C. (2002). *Teaching MT Through Pre-editing: Three Cases Studies*. Retrieved February, 25, 2013 from <http://mt-archive.info/EAMT-2002-Shei.pdf>
- Somer, H., Gaspari, F., & Niño, A. (2006). *Detecting Inappropriate Use of Free Online Machine Translation by Language Students: A Special Case of Plagiarism Detection*. Retrieved February, 17, 2013 from <http://mt-archive.info/EAMT-2006-Somers.pdf>

Appendices

Appendix A

แบบสอบถามการใช้โปรแกรมแปลภาษากูเกิลทรานสเลท (Google Translate: GT)

แบบสอบถามนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อสำรวจข้อมูลเกี่ยวกับการใช้โปรแกรมแปลภาษา กูเกิลทรานสเลท (Google Translate: GT) เพื่อการเรียนรู้ภาษาอังกฤษของนักศึกษาชั้นปีที่ 1 มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏสงขลา ปีการศึกษา 2556 โดยแบบสอบถามแบ่งเป็น 5 ตอนดังต่อไปนี้

- | | |
|----------|--|
| ตอนที่ 1 | ข้อมูลทั่วไปของผู้ตอบแบบสอบถาม |
| ตอนที่ 2 | วัตถุประสงค์และความถี่ของการใช้โปรแกรมแปลภาษา กูเกิลทรานสเลท |
| ตอนที่ 3 | ทัศนคติของผู้ตอบแบบสอบถามต่อการใช้โปรแกรมแปลภาษา กูเกิลทรานสเลท |
| ตอนที่ 4 | ข้อคิดเห็นทั่วไปเกี่ยวกับการใช้โปรแกรมแปลภาษา กูเกิลทรานสเลท |
| ตอนที่ 5 | ปัญหาจากการใช้โปรแกรมแปลภาษา กูเกิลทรานสเลท และวิธีการจัดการกับปัญหาดังกล่าว |

คำชี้แจง: โปรดทำเครื่องหมาย ในช่องสี่เหลี่ยม และ ในตาราง หรือ เติมข้อความให้ครบถ้วนตามความเป็นจริง

ตอนที่ 1 ข้อมูลทั่วไปของผู้ตอบแบบสอบถาม

1. เพศ: ชาย หญิง
2. คณะ: วิชาเอก:
3. คุณชอบเรียนภาษาอังกฤษหรือไม่ ชอบ ไม่ชอบ
4. คุณใช้โปรแกรมแปลภาษากูเกิลทรานสเลท หรือไม่
 ใช่ ไม่ใช่
5. คุณใช้เครื่องช่วยแปลอื่นหรือไม่ นอกเหนือจาก โปรแกรมแปลภาษากูเกิลทรานสเลท
 ใช่ (ระบุ) ไม่ใช่

ตอนที่ 2 วัดอุปสงค์และความถี่ ในการใช้โปรแกรมแปลภาษา กูเกิลทรานสเลท(GT)

ข้อ	วัดอุปสงค์	ความถี่ (ครั้ง/สัปดาห์)				
		5	4	3	2	1
		ใช้บ่อยมาก	ใช้บ่อย	ใช้บ้าง	ไม่ค่อยใช้	ไม่เลย
6.	คุณใช้ GTครั้ง / สัปดาห์ (โปรดระบุ)					
7.	คุณใช้ GT เพื่อวัดอุปสงค์ในการอ่านสิ่งต่อไปนี้บ่อยเพียงใด					
	7.1 นิตยสาร นิตาน					
	7.2 นิตยสาร					
	7.3 ข่าวภาษาอังกฤษ					
	7.4 ลากสินค้า					
	7.5 โฆษณา					
	7.6 ป้ายต่างๆ					
	7.7 คำคม หรือคติสอนใจภาษาอังกฤษ					
	7.8 ประโยค และข้อความภาษาอังกฤษบนเว็บไซต์					
	7.9 ประโยค และข้อความภาษาอังกฤษในหนังสือเรียน					
	7.10 อื่นๆ (ระบุ)					
8.	คุณใช้ GT เพื่อวัดอุปสงค์ในการเขียนสิ่งต่อไปนี้บ่อยเพียงใด					
	8.1 บทกลอน หรือข้อความภาษาอังกฤษในการ์ตูนอวพร					
	8.2 จดหมายอิเล็กทรอนิกส์(emails) เป็นภาษาอังกฤษ					
	8.3 ประโยค หรือข้อความภาษาอังกฤษในแบบฝึกหัด หรือชิ้นงานที่อาจารย์มอบหมาย					
	8.4 คำ และ ข้อความ หรือความคิดเห็น (comments) ภาษาอังกฤษในบล็อกเฟสบุ๊คทวิตเตอร์ ฯลฯ					
	8.5 บทสนทนาสด (live chat) กับเพื่อนชาวต่างชาติ บนเครือข่ายอินเทอร์เน็ต					
	8.6 อื่นๆ (ระบุ)					
9.	คุณใช้ GT เพื่อวัดอุปสงค์ในการเรียนรู้คำศัพท์ต่างๆต่อไปนี้บ่อยเพียงใด					
	9.1 คำศัพท์ทั่วไป					
	9.2 คำศัพท์เฉพาะทาง (technical terms)					
	9.3 คำศัพท์ชื่อเฉพาะของสถานที่หรือหน่วยงาน					
	9.4 หน้าที่ของคำศัพท์ (part of speech)					

ข้อ	วัตถุประสงค์	ความถี่ (ครั้ง/สัปดาห์)				
		5	4	3	2	1
		ใช้บ่อยมาก	ใช้บ่อย	ใช้บางครั้ง	ไม่ค่อยใช้	ไม่เลย
	9.5 การใช้คำศัพท์ในประโยคตัวอย่าง ซึ่งจะปรากฏขึ้นเมื่อคลิกปุ่ม “กล่องคำพูด” [🗨]					
	9.6 การออกเสียง (pronunciation) และการเน้นเสียง (stress) ของคำศัพท์จากปุ่ม “ลำโพง” [🔊]					
	9.7 อื่นๆ (ระบุ)					
10.	คุณใช้ GT เพื่อวัตถุประสงค์ในการเปลี่ยนต่อไปที่บ่อยเพียงใด					
	10.1 บทคัดย่อ					
	10.2 บทความ					
	10.3 หนังสืออ่านนอกเวลา					
	10.4เอกสารทางราชการ (official documents)					
	10.5 สำนวน (idioms) สุภาษิต (proverbs)					
	10.6 อื่นๆ (ระบุ)					

ตอนที่ 3 ทักษะคิดของผู้ตอบแบบสอบถามต่อการใช้โปรแกรมแปลภาษา กูเกิลทรานสเลท (Google Translate)

ข้อ	ทัศนคติ	ระดับความเห็นด้วย				
		เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง	เห็นด้วย	เห็นด้วยปานกลาง	ไม่เห็นด้วย	ไม่เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง
		5	4	3	2	1
11.	GT มีข้อดีมากกว่าข้อเสีย					
12.	GT ไม่มีค่าบริการและสามารถเข้าใช้บริการได้ง่าย					
13.	GT แปลข้อความได้รวดเร็ว					
14.	GT แปลข้อความได้มีคุณภาพมากกว่าที่ฉันแปลเอง					
15.	GT แปลข้อความภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาไทยได้ถูกต้อง และเชื่อถือได้					
16.	GT แปลข้อความภาษาไทยเป็นภาษาอังกฤษได้ถูกต้อง และเชื่อถือได้					
17.	ฉันได้ความรู้ด้านคำศัพท์เป็นจำนวนมากเมื่อใช้ GT					
18.	ฉันเรียนรู้ไวยากรณ์และโครงสร้างภาษาอังกฤษจากการใช้ GT					
19.	ฉันอ่านบทความภาษาอังกฤษเข้าใจมากขึ้นเมื่อใช้ GT ช่วย					
20.	เมื่อฉันใช้ GT ฉันไม่จำเป็นต้องจำหรือเดาคำศัพท์					
21.	ฉันรู้สึกมั่นใจมากขึ้น เมื่อเขียนภาษาอังกฤษโดยใช้ GT ช่วย					
22.	ฉันเขียนประโยคภาษาอังกฤษได้ดีขึ้นเมื่อใช้ GT ช่วย					
23.	การใช้ GT ทำให้ฉันไม่พยายามทำความเข้าใจจากการอ่านภาษาอังกฤษด้วยตนเอง					
24.	การใช้ GT ทำให้ฉันไม่พยายามเขียนภาษาอังกฤษด้วยตนเอง					
25.	ฉันได้ทักษะการแปลจากการใช้ GT					
26.	GT มีประโยชน์และมีประสิทธิภาพต่อนักเรียนที่อ่อนภาษาอังกฤษมากกว่านักเรียนที่เก่งภาษาอังกฤษ					
27.	GT มีประโยชน์และมีประสิทธิภาพต่อนักเรียนที่อ่อนและเก่งภาษาอังกฤษ					
28.	นักเรียนที่อ่อนภาษาอังกฤษจะพึ่งพา GT ในการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ มากกว่านักเรียนที่อยู่ในระดับกลางและเก่ง					

ตอนที่ 4 ข้อคิดเห็นทั่วไปเกี่ยวกับการใช้โปรแกรมแปลภาษา กูเกิลทรานสเลท (Google Translate)

ข้อดี

1.
2.
3.
4.

ข้อเสีย

1.
2.
3.
4.

ตอนที่ 5 ปัญหาจากการใช้โปรแกรมแปลภาษา กูเกิลทรานสเลท (Google Translate) และวิธีการจัดการกับปัญหาดังกล่าว

ปัญหา

1.
การแก้ไข.....
2.
การแก้ไข.....
3.
การแก้ไข.....
4.
การแก้ไข.....

» ขอขอบคุณอย่างยิ่งในการให้ความร่วมมือตอบแบบสอบถาม «

VITAE

Name Ms. Arissara Sukkhwan

Student ID 5511121091

Educational Attainment

Degree	Name of Institution	Year of Graduate
Bachelor of Arts (English)	Thaksin University	2008

List of Publications

Sukkhwan, A., & Sripetpun, W. (2014). Use of Google Translate: A Survey of Songkhla Rajabhat University Students. *International Proceedings of L-SA Workshop and Colloquium 2014: "Speaking" for ASEAN*, Thailand: Prince of Songkla University, 88-104.