Macrothink Institute™

Journal of Educational Issues
ISSN 2377-2263
2025, Vol. 11, No. 2

EFL University Students' Purposes, Attitudes and Behaviors towards the Use of Google Translate

Pornchai Pornwiriyakit

Department of English for International Communication

Rajamangala University of Technology Tawan-Ok, Thailand

E-mail: ajarnpornchai@gmail.com

Boontarika Koonwimon (Corresponding author)

Department of English for International Communication

Rajamangala University of Technology Tawan-Ok, Thailand

E-mail: boontarika_ko@rmutto.ac.th

Received: November 7, 2025 Accepted: December 10, 2025
Published: December 22, 2025

doi:10.5296/jei.v11i2.23341 URL: https://doi.org/10.5296/jei.v11i2.23341

Abstract

The objectives of this study were (1) to investigate the purposes of using Google Translate for translation of students majoring in English for International Communication at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, and (2) to explore their behaviors, and attitudes towards the use of Google Translate (GT). The sample in this study was 132 students, which was conducted the Purposive Sampling method for selecting the sample. A five-point Likert-scale questionnaire was used to collect data. Descriptive statistics, including percentage, standard deviation, and mean were implemented to perform a quantitative analysis. The findings revealed that the purposes of using Google Translate (GT) was at the average level (66.28%, $\bar{x}$ = 3.31, S.D. = 1.68), and the behaviors towards using Google Translate presented a high level (77.97%, $\bar{x}$ = 3.90, S.D. = 1.14) whereas the attitudes towards using Google Translate was overall positive at the high level (70.52%, $\bar{x}$ = 3.53, S.D. = 1.13).

Keywords: Google Translate, Purposes, Attitudes, Behaviors

1. Introduction

1.1 Introduce the Problem

The progression of information technology has caused rapid changes in the world and significantly impacted human life, leading to essential transformations in society that are crucial across various fields, particularly in the economy, industry, social services, environment, and education (Kittitanachai, 2012). Kaewnarin (2016), and Sheppard (2011, cited in Chompurach, 2021) states that applying technology to coordinate the classroom teaching in order to enhance the learning experience of learners, the use of Google Translate is becoming more and more popular and is not only used in English classes but also for translation in general. This online translation assistant is free to use and can be translated into up to 90 languages. They can also speak, visualize, and write for translation. Moreover, it creates convenience for users because it has a quick and easy method. For this reason, it has led to the widespread use of translation equipment (Kanittasen, 2017), and with the convenience of using this machine translation program, many students have turned to online tools to solve problems caused by learning a second language (Gaspari, 2007, cited in Kate-phan & Sripetpun, 2016).

Google Translate was originally just a website for searching for information on the Internet. Later, the creators of the website added a translation service, Google Translate, to help users translate their search information into their preferred language as a free service. Google Translate is also very convenient and quick to use, which makes it widely popular. However, the program Google Translate is unable to accurately translate text or sentences that are complex at different levels of words or grammar in each language and are appropriate for the style of each language (Phuongthong, 2015).

Based on Dechanarin (2004, cited in Kate-phan & Sripetpun, 2016) said that the use of Google Translate, which is a machine translation (MT), still has a number of limitations, such as the differences in the grammatical system and translation of some language pairs have not been developed as much as it should be because the machine translation process has not been developed to resemble the human translation process that requires understanding and interpretation in the context before translating it into the destination language by translating words with connotations, cultural interpretation, or translation in a manner that has differences in the language structure of the source and destination languages, which can lead to errors due to the limitations of machine translation and may cause confusion to the translator. Beer (2011, cited in Kate-phan & Sripetpun, 2016) summarized three problems caused by machine translation (MT): 1) The amount of data between some language pairs in GT may be small, making the translation in that language pair incomplete, and 2) cultural issues: each country has its own language. The structure of each language is not the same, and 3) there is a different kind of terminology; for example, in the industry, many new words or acronyms have been created, so the translator does not have a database.

In order to improve multilingual engagement and learning, Google Translate is an important educational and communication tool. While technology cannot fulfill the role of human translators, it has proven useful as a tool that improves understanding of the world and makes

information accessible in many different languages. Students' use of Google Translate in the context of language learning demonstrates a variety of behaviors that are typical of the growing approaches employed in the digital age. Students commonly employ Google Translate (GT) to help them with reading English articles, composing essays, writing reports, or learning new vocabulary (Alhaisoni & Alhaysony, 2017; Bari & Mahadi, 2016). Therefore, using this tool helps learners gain confidence in learning the language and have access to more international resources. However, in some cases, learners may rely too much on this tool. This leads to a lack of training in thinking, analyzing, and creating sentences on their own (Deng & Yu, 2022; Saksittanupab, 2024).

Consequently, the researcher recognizes both the significance and issues arising from users' behaviors and attitudes towards Google Translate (GT) of students majoring in English for International Communication at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences use Google Translate. Moreover, the results of this study will be developed into a guideline for teaching and learning in translation subject, as well as to deal with the problem of translation caused by the use of translation tools in the future.

1.2 Research Objectives

(1) To study the purposes of using Google Translate for translation of students majoring in English for International Communication, faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences.

(2) To study the behaviors and attitudes towards the use of Google Translate for translation of students majoring in English for International Communication, faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences.

2. Literature Reviews

2.1 What is "Google Translate"?

Google Translate (GT) is a multilingual translation service with a statistical machine translation developed by Google Inc. (Kate-phan & Sripetpun, 2016), which first launched in April 2006 (Bin Dahmash, 2020; Google Research Blog, 2016b). The purpose is to provide the translation services at the word level, phrase level, sentence level, as well as in multiple languages, and consequently language learners have been drawn to it to help them learn a particular language and navigate any obstacles they encounter while doing so (Bin Dahmash, 2020).

Google has currently developed support for Thai and many other languages around the world. The service is free and can even pronounce translated words. The Google Translate (GT) functions as a translation assistant that relies on large-scale statistical models by adding a large amount of information to the program in both the same language and the target language. It also adds examples of human-translated translations using statistical techniques to the principal reference program. A group of words that humans want to translate (Mindphp, 2017; Techsauce Team, 2017).

Nowadays, it is recognized that Google Translate (GT) is more effective in mimicking the Neural Machine Translation (NMT) system, making translations from English to Thai or from

Thai to English translate better than before with neural system technology developed from machine learning under the framework of the A.I. (Artificial Intelligence) system. GT builds a system to better understand what people are asking and what users are looking for (Techsauce Team, 2017).

Google can also sort the data in all systems so that as many users as possible can access it. The computer will understand it and find its pattern in its work without the programmer having to enter data at every step. It also draws on the specialty of matching more than two languages by training machine learning to translate language pairs in a zero-shot translation model, which is called the Multilingual Model. This new model uses the concept that languages are similar to create layered translations in many languages immediately. For instance, it can translate Japanese into English and English into Korean at the same time because they are in the same characteristics, more accurate data is created (Techsauce Team, 2017).

2.2 The Advancements of Google Translate (GT) from 2006 to the Present

Google Translate has been available online and as mobile applications since its first release in April 2006 (Google Research Blog, 2016b). The enhancements to the system arise from advancements in machine translation technology and the building of extensive language models. Parallel translated documents from large institutional data sources, such as United Nations proceedings and European Parliament transcripts, facilitate the rapid adoption of new language pairings into statistical machine translation systems.

Statistical machine translation models may acquire probable mapping between different languages due to multilingual databases, which provide consistent and accurately translated texts (Koehn, 2005; Ziemski et al., 2016). But Statistical Machine Translation (SMT) systems often give translations that are incorrect because they don't understand the context well enough; they simply look at sentence-level probabilities (Brown et al., 1993). You could make mistakes when you only look at local statistical trends and don't model discourse-level. This issue is especially true in languages with complex morphology or when long-distance interdependence is needed to keep meaning.

According to Wu et al. (2016), this method is often overly literal or unnatural due to insufficient consideration of the broader context of the sentence. With the introduction of Google Neural Machine Translation (GNMT) in 2016, statistical machine translation based on phrases has been replaced by a neural architecture that can handle all sentences at once. According to an official Google Research press release, GNMT improves translation accuracy and fluency by continuously using deep neural networks for learning and focusing mechanisms.

In 2016, Google first implemented Google Neural Machine Translation (GNMT) for major world languages. In 2017 and the years after that, GNMT was slowly improved and added to until it replaced the prior phrase-based SMT system in almost all supported languages. The GNMT documentation says that this change made translation far more fluent, natural, and idiomatic, all without having to create new language rules by hand (Wu et al., 2016; Google Research Blog, 2016a).

These advancements were particularly important in improving the availability of low-resource languages, which typically lack enough language databases for effective training (Google AI Blog, 2017). Independent academic assessments conducted over this timeframe indicate significant enhancements in translation fluency, syntactic precision, and inter-sentence cohesiveness within neural machine translation systems (Vaswani et al., 2017; Xue et al., 2021). Nevertheless, academics also recognize persistent difficulties in translating morphologically complex languages, specialized or technical terminologies, and context-sensitive semantic distinctions (Xue et al., 2021). Moreover, these improvements were in line with more significant changes in natural language processing, such as the rise of transformer-based architectures and training models that can work with more than one language at a time. All of these things made the models better at using what they learned on other language families (Vaswani et al., 2017; Xue et al., 2021).

In June 2024, Google made a big announcement: they were adding 110 additional languages to Google Translate. The company said that these new features were the largest growth in the service's history. Google believes that the update was feasible in part because of the Pathways Language Model 2 or "PaLM 2" big language model. It added around 614 million new speakers, which means that Translate now supports 243 languages. Google also stressed that the new languages include a mix of widely spoken, regional, indigenous, and endangered varieties (Google Blog, 2024). Reports confirmed the announcement and highlighted how large multilingual models help translate languages that don't have many resources available, showing that PaLM-class models can learn language patterns from different types of data, allowing for broader language support. Regional reporting and analysis also revealed Google's focus on underrepresented African and other languages, they said they will collaborate with linguists as well as individuals in the area to acquire training data and enhance the models for languages that are mostly spoken (Le Monde, 2024; Google Blog, 2024).

By 2025, Google Translate will be one of the largest and most popular machine translation systems in the world. This is because it stopped using probabilistic matching for phrases and started using modern neural and big-model-driven structures. This progress is similar to bigger advances in computer science, like advanced training and learning on an extensive basis for many languages and attempts to keep different languages alive and well (Wu et al., 2016; Xue et al., 2021). Google's public updates and research show that things are still getting better. Language translations are getting better and better; more and more people can speak different languages, and being able to talk to people in more than one language is still very important. This fact implies that a lot of people throughout the world use Google Translate to converse with each other online (Google Research Blog, 2016a; Google Blog, 2024; Xue et al., 2021).

2.3 Attitude

The word "attitude" means "a feeling or opinion toward a thing or person, or a behavior that occurs" (Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary & Thesaurus, 2020). Behavioral scholars define the term "attitude" as "expressing the feelings and experiences of individuals who

evaluate situations, environments, people, or things in some way, such as evaluating satisfaction, likes, and dissatisfaction, dislikes." (Robbins & Judge, 2003, quoted in Poomarin et al., 2020).

In addition, in the psychology of learning, "attitudes" are also relevant to learners because each learner determines their own beliefs and then expresses their behavior according to the influence of that belief. If the learner believes something positively, he will act accordingly; if negatively, he will act negatively.

In general, "attitude" refers to the thoughts or ideas of a person who uses their feelings to judge the object or person around them. These ideas relate to the actions and interpretations of both positive and negative situations (Poomarin et al., 2020).

2.4 Behavior

When talking about "behavior", we often think of the actions of a particular person towards something. While the Longman Dictionary (2023) defines "the things that a person or animal does." as well as the Royal Academy of Sciences Dictionary (2023) defines "the actions or symptoms that are expressed through muscles, thoughts, and feelings in response to stimuli."

In the above, "behavior" refers to the action of a person who acts on something. In this research, it refers to "the actions on the use of the Google Translate program."

2. Method

2.1 Subjects

The researcher conducted the selection of the sample using a purposive sampling method by designating the samples from students majoring in English for International Communication, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, in the second to fourth years, which was 108 out of a population of 150 compared to the table by Krejcie and Morgan (1970). This study excluded first-year students because they had not yet taken subjects that relied on translation, and their English skills were mostly different from those of other students.

2.2 Instruments

The researcher designed a five-point Likert-scale questionnaire adapted from Kate-phan and Sripetpun's (2016) as a research tool for data collection. The first part included demographic questions such as academic year and sex. The second part is divided into 3 sections, including questions about the purposes of using Google Translate, behaviors towards the use of Google Translate, and lastly attitudes towards the use of Google Translate. This questionnaire is validated by three experts in the field of English language, using Item-Objective Congruence Index (IOC). It was tested at the level of 0.882 which is considered to be of good quality and can be used, which meets the criteria of Fraenkel and Wallen (2006, cited in Petcharat, 2022).

2.3 Data Collection

The process of data collection was followed by three main steps. Firstly, the researcher developed a questionnaire under the concepts of these current research objectives and then

conducted a pilot test to ensure its clarity, reliability, and overall effectiveness. Then, the researcher contributed a questionnaire to participants through a Google Form, allowing for convenient and efficient online participation. Finally, all responses were collected and organized for later data analysis in order to answer the research objectives.

2.4 Data Analysis

The data analysis used to evaluate the purposes, behaviors, and attitudes towards the use of Google Translate (GT) are followed by 3 steps. Firstly, all results from online questionnaires were checked and prepared for analyzing. All obtained responses were then systematically encoded to convert into a suitable format for calculation. Thirdly, the encoded data were processed and analyzed the data by using the scores obtained for statistical analysis, including percentage, mean, and standard deviation—to identify patterns, summarize participant tendencies, and interpret overall trends related to Google Translate usage. Finally, the research conducted a summary and discussed the results on the purposes, behaviors and attitudes towards the use of Google Translate (GT).

In terms of interpretation of the score level in the questionnaire, the average of the score results is used as an indicator according to the criteria for analysis according to the concept of Best (1997, cited in Kate-phan & Sripetpun, 2016) as follows:

Table 1. The indicators according to the criteria for analysis under the concept of Best (1997, cited in Kate-phan & Sripetpun, 2016)

Mean Score	**Interpretation**
4.50-5.00	Very High/Very Frequently/Strongly Agree
3.50-4.49	High/Frequently/Agree Very Much
2.50-3.49	Average/Occasionally/Agree
1.50-2.49	Low/Disagree
1.00-1.49	Very Low/Strongly Disagree

3. Results

In this research, the researcher has identified 108 participants, but when the data collection is completed, it is found that the number of participants is 132 participants, which is more than the prescribed number. They are divided into 39 males, or 29.55 percent, and 93 females, or 70.45 percent. The researcher collected data from the questionnaire to address the purpose of the study as follows:

The first objective: to study the purposes of using Google Translate for translation of students majoring in English for International Communication, faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences.

Table 2. Purposes of using Google Translate

Item.	Purposes of using GT	Percentage	S.D.	Mean	Interpretation
1.	To discover unknown meanings, words, or grammatical structures	79.55	0.95	3.98	Very high
2.	To locate a specific name	62.27	1.78	3.11	Average
3.	To translate information on foreign websites	68.18	1.14	3.41	High
4.	To translate songs	62.42	1.47	3.12	Average
5.	To translate idioms/proverbs	60.45	1.84	3.02	Average
6.	To read for comprehension	78.18	1.08	3.91	High
7.	To translate quotes	57.27	1.56	2.86	Average
8.	To verify grammar accuracy	59.55	1.83	2.98	Average
9.	To apply in writing	68.64	1.53	3.43	High
	Total	**66.28**	**1.61**	**3.31**	**Average**

Based on Table 2, it was indicated that overall, the participants had an average level of purpose for using GT (66.28%, $\bar{x}$ = 3.31, S.D. = 1.61). When considering each factor, most of students (79.55%) used the Google Translate (GT) program to discover unknown meanings, words, or grammatical structures (item 1) with an average of 3.98 at the very high level when comparing with other purposes. 78.18% of them used GT to read for comprehension with an average of 3.91 at the high level. They used GT to apply in writing (68.64%) with an average of 3.43 at the high level. 68.18% of them used GT to translate information on foreign websites with an average of 3.41 at the high level. Besides, 62.42 % used GT to translate songs with an average of 3.12, while 62.47% for locating a specific name with an average of 3.11 at the average level. 60.45% of them used GT to translate idioms/proverbs with an average of 3.02 at the average level. Then, they used GT to verify grammar accuracy (59.55%) and to translate quotes (57.27%) at the average level respectively.

The second objective: to study the behaviors and attitudes towards the use of Google Translate for translation of students majoring in English for International Communication, faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences.

Table 3. Behaviors towards the use of Google Translate

Behaviors towards the use of GT	Percentage	S.D.	Mean	Interpretation
1. Adjust translations after using GT.	82.12	0.75	4.11	High
2. Choose the meaning of the word for yourself.	77.12	0.97	3.86	High
3. Read the text before using GT.	82.73	0.98	4.14	High
4. Use GT with other translation aids.	81.21	1.15	4.06	High
5. Stop using GT immediately when mistranslated.	66.67	1.39	3.33	Average
Total	**77.97**	**1.14**	**3.90**	**High**

Based on Table 3, the findings on the behaviors towards the use of GT of students majoring in English for International Communication revealed that they overall had a positive behavior on using GT. (77.97%, $\bar{x}$ = 3.90, S.D. = 1.14). When considering each behavior, they mostly used GT to read the text before using GT (82.73%, $\bar{x}$ = 4.14, S.D. = 0.98) at the high level. Secondly, they used GT to adjust translations after using GT (82.12%, $\bar{x}$ = 4.11, S.D. = 0.75) at the high level. Then, using GT with other translation aids (81.21%, $\bar{x}$ = 4.06, S.D. = 1.15) at the high level. Next, 77.12% for choosing the meaning of the word for yourself ($\bar{x}$ = 3.86, S.D. = 0.97). Finally, the students stopped using GT immediately when mistranslated, with at the average level (66.67%, $\bar{x}$ = 3.33, S.D. = 1.39) respectively.

Table 4. Attitudes towards the use of Google Translate

Attitudes towards the use of GT	Percentage	S.D.	Mean	Interpretation
1. Intend to improve my translation skills to reduce my future dependence on using GT.	84.09	0.63	4.20	High
2. Translation adjustments or verifications of the language obtained by using GT are still necessary.	79.09	1.00	3.95	High
3. GT helps save time and ensures work is completed on schedule.	80.00	0.95	4.00	High
4. GT makes translation problems on the issue of specifying tenses.	73.03	0.91	3.65	High
5. GT has translation problems with the issue of choosing synonyms or homographs.	73.79	0.82	3.69	High
6. GT has translation problems with the issue of choosing verbs.	73.03	0.79	3.65	High
7. GT is important for translation today.	75.00	0.88	3.75	High
8. The translation results obtained from GT are fully meaningful and understandable according to the target language.	60.30	0.86	3.02	Average
9. The translation results obtained from GT are meaningful, complete, and understandable according to the source language.	61.06	1.02	3.05	Average
10. The language obtained from translation using GT is smooth and compatible with the cultural context of the target language.	57.73	1.06	2.89	Average
11. GT can completely replace human translation in the future.	58.64	1.25	2.93	Average
Total	**70.52**	**1.13**	**3.53**	**High**

As can be seen from Table 4, overall, students majoring in English for International Communication had the positive attitudes towards the use of GT at the high level (70.52%, $\bar{x}$ = 3.53, S.D. = 1.13). When individually considered, they intended to improve their translation skills to reduce their future dependence on using GT. (84.09%, $\bar{x}$ = 4.20), at the high level. 80.00% of them agreed that GT helped save time and ensure work is completed on schedule (item 3), at the high level ($\bar{x}$ = 4.00), while (item 2) Translation adjustments or verifications of the language obtained by using GT are still necessary was at the high level (79.09%, $\bar{x}$ = 3.95). Then, (item 7) GT is important for translation today (75.00%, $\bar{x}$ = 3.75), at the high level. GT had translation problems with the issue of choosing synonyms or homographs (item 5) was at the high level. (73.79%, $\bar{x}$ = 3.69). Surprisingly, the item 4: GT that made translation problems on the issue of specifying tenses and the item 6: making the problem on

choosing verbs were equally at the high level. (73.03%, $\bar{x} = 3.65$). 61.06% of them revealed that the translation results obtained from GT are meaningful, complete, and understandable according to the source language, which was at the average level, while 60.30% of them showed the translation results obtained from GT were fully meaningful and understandable according to the target language. Some of them agreed that GT can completely replace human translation in the future. (58.64%, $\bar{x} = 2.93$). Finally, 57.73% of the students agreed that the language obtained from translation using GT is smooth and compatible with the cultural context of the target language, which was at the average level.

4. Discussion

4.1 The Purposes of Using Google Translate for Translation of Students Majoring in English for International Communication, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

As we seen the result in Table 2 shows that students use Google Translate (GT) for a lot of different purposes. Firstly, this shows that the GT is helpful when it comes to helping people learn English as a foreign language (EFL). This aligns with the findings of Kate-phan and Sripetpun (2016). Moreover, Google Translate (GT) is a quick way to look up words and phrases that learners don't know, which helps them understand messages (Rahman & Unsiah, 2025). Similar studies show that students often use GT as a quick dictionary choice, which makes it easy to check vocabulary and grammar (Jin & Deifell, 2013; Groves & Mundt, 2015). As well as, Google Translate (GT) assists students in comprehending academic texts, online resources, and classroom readings (Abimbola, 2023; Van Nguyen, 2024). Previous studies have also shown that machine translation tools help students understand difficult texts by making it easier for them to read and breaking down language barriers (Kumnoed, 2018; Nordin & Aziz, 2025). GT's ability to translate whole sentences or passages will probably help students understand more than just looking up words. The next significant objectives are related to apply GT for writing and translating information from foreign websites. These show learners rely on GT for both reflexive and creative tasks, as well as these indicate that students rely on GT for both receptive and productive tasks, too. Many students utilize GT to create a draft or to improve grammar and vocabulary before submitting assignments. This is supported by Santosa et al. (2024), and Cancina and Panes (2021), who noticed that GT could improve writing quality by helping learners in evaluating accuracy and improving topics. Some scholars, however, claim that excessive relying on GT could reduce learners' opportunities of engaging in their own language production (Ducar & Schocket, 2018). In this study, students seem to see GT as a helpful tool for writing rather than an effort to replace their language skills. The average-level of using Google Translation has been found for song translation, identifying specific names, and translating idioms or proverbs. So, they indicate that learners also employ Google Translate (GT) for casual or recreational activities. This result shows that creative translation frequently meets difficulties with figurative language, including idioms and cultural expressions, in accordance with Tsaqiila (2023). Regarding this limitation, students continue to use Google Translate (GT) as an easy tool for approximating meanings despite the lack of certain accuracy. Finally, students reported utilizing GT regularly for grammatical verification and quote translation. These tasks involve assessing accuracy and verification, indicating that learners use GT as a means to evaluate their language choices

rather than as a tool for translation. This aligns with Stritar Kučuk (2024)'s findings, showing that numerous students employ GT to verify their grammar and phrasing, despite the tool rarely offering perfect grammatical structures. Moreover, the results also show that GT is used for both educational as well as other purposes. Students use GT as a flexible language support tool to help them with their vocabulary, understanding, writing, entertainment, and proficiency as well as these results support the idea that GT is now an important digital tool for language learners. However, it is important to get the appropriate instruction in order to make sure it is used effectively and seriously (Ducar & Schocket, 2018).

4.2 The Behaviors towards the Use of Google Translate (GT) for Translation of Students Majoring in English for International Communication, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

The data seen in Table 3 indicates that behaviors of students mainly employ Google Translate (GT) effectively. Most participants (82.73%) read the text before employing GT, which show that they attempt to comprehend the information individually before seeking technological support. Likewise, some of students (82.12%) return and improve the translations provided by GT rather than simply copying and pasting. This type of post-editing is important because Vieira (2019) emphasizes that it can be improved translation quality and be improved students' understanding about grammatical knowledge. Additionally, 81.21% of participants combine GT with other translation tools, indicating that students take a multi-tool approach. Meanwhile, participants of 77.12% select word meanings themselves, demonstrating that students maintain control over their translations and actively make critical decisions (Ningrum & Dewi, 2024). Nevertheless, basically two-thirds (66.67%) indicate they stop using GT when identifying a mistranslation, implying that some learners could keep going in utilizing GT despite errors, showing weaknesses in tool mistakes and correction. This finding is consistent with research indicating that learners frequently encounter difficulties in recognizing errors in machine translation and may excessively depend on the tool without sufficient verification (Loock & Léchauguette, 2021). In general, learners show good behaviors like pre-reading, post-editing, tool-stacking, and choosing their own meaning. However, they still need specific training in error monitoring and assessing GT output to enhance their machine translation abilities.

4.3 The Attitudes towards the Use of Google Translate (GT) for Translation of Students Majoring in English for International Communication, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

The data as shown in Table 4, the students majoring in English for International Communication demonstrated a positive attitude towards using GT, with an overall percentage of 70.52 ($\bar{x}$ = 3.53, S.D. = 1.13). Remarkably, 84.09% of them agreed with the statement, "I intend to improve my translation skills to reduce my future dependence on GT" ($\bar{x}$ = 4.20, S.D. = 0.63), in accordance with González-Pastor (2021), and Tasanameelarp, Girgin, and Tipmontree (2024), showing that learners often use GT as a supportive tool to strengthen their own translation abilities. Some of 80.00% agreed that GT helps save time and ensures work is completed on schedule ($\bar{x}$ = 4.00, S.D. = 0.95). In addition, some of

79.09% ($\bar{x}$ = 3.95) agreed that translation adjustments or verifications of the language obtained by using GT are still necessary, which is consistent with Tasanameelarp, Girgin, and Tipmontree (2024), showing that learners frequently rely on post-editing to correct grammatical, lexical, and contextual inaccuracies in GT output. These figures show that while students value GT's efficiency and utility, they also recognize that their own input remains important (González-Pastor, 2021; Tasanameelarp, Girgin, & Tipmontree, 2024). At the same time, students are clearly aware of the limitations of GT: for example, 73.79% ($\bar{x}$ = 3.69, S.D. = 0.82) agreed that GT has problems choosing synonyms or homographs; 73.03% ($\bar{x}$ = 3.65, S.D. = 0.79) agreed that GT struggles with specifying correct tenses and choosing verbs. These findings align with studies of González-Pastor (2021) revealed that students have positive views of MT/GT tools, also express concerns about output quality and professional issues. Finally, it was found for items concerning completeness and cultural appropriateness of GT output—61.06% of participants believed the translation tasks obtained from Google Translate (GT) were meaningful, complete, and understandable in terms of the source language; 60.30% of participants felt the output was fully meaningful for the target language; and only 58.64% ($\bar{x}$ = 2.93, S.D. = 1.25) agreed that GT can completely replace human translation in the future. Only 57.73% agreed that the language obtained from translation using GT is smooth and culturally compatible. This indicates that students included GT as a helpful tool but do not regard it as a full substitute for human translators—consistent with findings that students may view MT as beneficial yet remain cautious about its reliability and professional implications (Liu et al., 2022).

5. Conclusion

The findings of this study reveal that students majoring in English for International Communication at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences use Google Translate (GT) for various purposes, ranging from understanding unknown words and grammatical structures to supporting reading comprehension, writing, and information translation. Google Translate (GT) is mainly employed as a supplement tool for learning new words, reading comprehension, and writing assignments, whereas it is less commonly applied for idiomatic expressions, songs, or quotations. The results indicate that GT serves as a versatile tool in both academic and informal contexts, providing quick, available language support while requiring critical engagement from learners. According to behaviors and attitudes, students reveal strategic use of Google Translate, including pre-reading, post-editing, and combining it with other translation aids. They hold a positive attitude towards GT, appreciating its efficiency in saving time and aiding translation, but they are also aware of its limitations, such as issues with tenses, synonyms, verbs, and cultural appropriateness. Overall, Students consider Google Translate (GT) as a useful supplement to their education, rather than a replacement for human translation, indicating a smart and practical approach to using automated translation into learning a new language.

References

Abimbola, L. I. (2023). The Impact of Machine Translation on Vocabulary Acquisition and Reading Comprehension in ESL Learners. *Pulchra Lingua: A Journal of Language Study,*

Literature & Linguistics, 2(2), 80-93. https://doi.org/10.58989/plj.v2i2.27

Alhaisoni, E., & Alhaysony, M. (2017). An investigation of Saudi EFL university students' attitudes towards the use of Google Translate. *International Journal of English Language Education, 5*(1), 72-82. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijele.v5i1.10696

Bahri, H., & Mahadi, T. S. T. (2016). Google Translate as a supplementary tool for learning Malay: A Case Study at Universiti Sains Malaysia. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 19*(2), 161-167. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.7n.3p.161

Bin Dahmash, N. (2020). "I Can't Live Without Google Translate": A Close Look at the Use of Google Translate App by Second Language Learners in Saudi Arabia. *Arab World English Journal, 11*(3), 226-240. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol11no3.14

Brown, P. F., Pietra, S. A. D., Pietra, V. J. D., & Mercer, R. L. (1993). The mathematics of statistical machine translation: Parameter estimation. *Computational Linguistics, 19*(2), 263-311. Retrieved from https://aclanthology.org/J93-2003

Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary & Thesaurus. (2020). *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary & Thesaurus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cancino, M., & Panes, J. (2021). The impact of Google Translate on L2 writing quality measures: Evidence from Chilean EFL high school learners. *System, 98*, Article 102464. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102464

Chompurach, W. (2021). "Please Let me Use Google Translate": Thai EFL Students' Behavior and Attitudes toward Google Translate Use in English Writing. *English Language Teaching, 14*(12), 23-34. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v14n12p23

Deng, X., & Yu, Z. (2022). A Systematic Review of Machine-Translation-Assisted Language Learning for Sustainable Education. *Sustainability, 14*(13), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14137598

Ducar, C., & Schocket, D. (2018). Machine translation and the L2 classroom: Pedagogical solutions for making peace with Google Translate. *Foreign Language Annals, 51*(4), 779-795. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12366

González-Pastor, D. (2021). Introducing Machine Translation in the Translation Classroom: A Survey on Students' Attitudes and Perceptions. *Revista Tradumàtica, 19*, 47-65. https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/tradumatica.273

Google AI Blog. (2017). *Zero-shot translation with Google's multilingual neural machine translation system*. Google. Retrieved from https://ai.googleblog.com/2016/11/zero-shot-translation-with-googles.html

Google Blog. (2024). *Google Translate adds 110 new languages in its biggest expansion yet*. Google. Retrieved from https://blog.google/products/translate/google-translate-new-languages-2024

Google Research Blog. (2016a). *A neural network for machine translation, at production*

scale. Google. Retrieved from https://research.googleblog.com/2016/09/a-neural-network-for-machine.html

Google Research Blog. (2016b). *Ten years of Google Translate*. Google.

Groves, M., & Mundt, K. (2015). Friend or foe? Google Translate in language for academic-purposes. *English for Specific Purposes, 37*, 112-121. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2014.09.001

Jin, L., & Deifell, E. (2013). Foreign Language Learners' Use and Perception of Online Dictionaries: A Survey Study. *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching, 9(*4), 515-533. Retrieved from https://jolt.merlot.org/vol9no4/jin_1213.pdf

Kaewnarin, C. (2016). The Result of Using Google Translate with English Learning to Enhance Listening and Pronunciation Skill for Pratomsuksa 6. *Academic Journal Uttaradit Rajabhat University, 11*(1), 62-70.

Kanittasen, P. (2017). The creation of the sentences structures exercises for the students who use the translation`s applications on the webpages for their self-studies. *Proceeding in 10th National Conference on Technical Education* (pp. 218-223) https://doi.org/10.14416/c.fte.2017.11.035

Kate-Phan, K., & Sripetpun, W. (2016). Attitudes, Behaviors and problems of English Major Students in using "Google Translate." *Journal of Liberal Arts Prince of Songkha University, 8*(1), 79-96.

Kittithanachai, A. (2012). *Behavior of using information technology related to the performance of students at Srinakharinwirot University Demonstration School, Prasarnmit* (Secondary Department, Education Technology Srinakharinwirot University Prasarnmit).

Koehn, P. (2005). Europarl: A parallel corpus for statistical machine translation. *Proceedings of the Tenth Machine Translation Summit* (pp. 79-86). Asia-Pacific Association for Machine Translation. Retrieved from https://aclanthology.org/2005.mtsummit-papers.11?utm_source=chatgpt.com

Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30*(3), 607-610. https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447003000308

Kumnoed, P. (2018). An Analysis of English Reading Comprehension and Reading Strategies through Google Translator of Loei Rajabhat University Students. *Proceedings of the Asian Conference on Language Learning*.

Le Monde. (2024). *Google bets on African languages, including Dyula, Wolof, Baoulé and Tamazight.* Retrieved from https://www.lemonde.fr/en/economy/article/2024/07/07/google-bets-on-african-languages-including-dyula-wolof-baoule-and-tamazight_6676960_19.html?utm_source=chatgpt.com

Liu, K., Kwok, H. L., Liu, J., & Cheung, A. K. (2022). Sustainability and Influence of

Machine Translation: Perceptions and Attitudes of Translation Instructors and Learners in Hong Kong. *Sustainability, 14*, 6399. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14116399

Loock, R., & Léchauguette, S. (2021). Machine Translation Literacy and Undergraduate Students in Applied Languages: Report on an Exploratory Study. *Revista Tradumàtica, 19*, 204-225. https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/tradumatica.281

Mindphp. (2017). *What is Google Translate?—Explains GT's use of statistical methods, large data, and human-translated examples*.

Ningrum, A., & Dewi, U. (2024). The Use of Google Translate and U-Dictionary as Machine Translation for EFL College Students' Preference and Perceptions. *Eternal: English, Teaching Journal, 15*(1), 167-179. https://doi.org/10.26877/eternal.v15i1.373

Nordin, N. H. B., & Aziz, A. A. (2025). UKM ESL Undergraduate Students' Perceptions of Using Google Translate when Reading English Academic Text: Values and Challenges. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development, 14*(2), 2036-2053. https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v14-i2/25561

Pearson Education. (2023). *Longman dictionary of contemporary English* (2023 ed.). Pearson.

Petcharat, S., Plongoon, K., Sridam, S., Methanai, C., & Rorbkorb, N. (2022). The expectation and the actual condition of consumers toward parcel delivery service in Hat Yai District, Songkhla Province. *Journal of Social Science and Buddhistic Anthropology, 7*(11), 18-30.

Phuoungthong, C. (2015). *Effectiveness of using the Google Translate website for English to Thai translation for students majoring in English for International Communication, Faculty of Liberal Arts, Rajamangala University of Technology Suwanabhumi*.

Poomarin, W., Meeprom, B., Teptong, N., Sittironnarit, S., Worakul, K., Chinsri, Ch., & Tapin, J. (2020). Impact of Learning Attitudes on Learning Behavior of Students in Rajamangala University of Technology Thanyaburi. *Journal of liberal Arts Rangsit University, 15*(2), 29-42.

Rahman, A. S., & Unsiah, F. (2025). Students' perceptions of Google Translate use in English learning: Vocational High School Context. *Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies, 12*(2), 561-584. https://doi.org/10.30762/jeels.v12i2.5000

Santosa, M. H., Trisna Yanti, G. A. M., & Adnyani, L. D. S. (2024). The integration of Google Translate as a machine translation tool in EFL students' thesis writing. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Learning, 27*(1), 214-229. https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v27i1.3734

Stritar Kučuk, M. (2024). Investigating the usage of machine translation in L2 learning and its impact on writing proficiency. *Lidil, 70*, 1-23. https://doi.org/10.4000/12lmd

Tasanameelarp, A., Girgin, T., & Tipmontree, S. (2024). A Study of Thai EFL Students'

Attitudes in Using Google Translate. *Journal of Southern Technology, 17*(1), 140-150. Retrieved from https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/journal_sct/article/view/264853

Techsauce Team. (2017). *"Deep dive into the work of "Neural Machine Translation": the latest technology that Google Translate uses mimics the thinking system from the human brain*. Retrieved from https://techsauce.co/news/google-translate-neural-machine-learning?utm_source=chatgpt.com

The Royal Society of Thailand. (2023). *The Royal Institute dictionary* (2023 ed.). The Royal Society of Thailand.

Tsaqiila, T. Q. (2023). *The Translatability of Emotive Language through Google Translate* (pp.1-14). Retrieved from http://eprints.unram.ac.id/id/eprint/43027

Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., … Polosukhin, I. (2017). *Attention is all you need*. arXiv. Retrieved from https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.03762

Vieira, L. N. (2019). Post-Editing of Machine Translation. In M. O'Hagan (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Technology* (pp. 319-335). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315311258

Wu, Y., Schuster, M., Chen, Z., Le, Q. V., Norouzi, M., Macherey, W., … Dean, J. (2016). *Google's Neural Machine Translation System: Bridging the Gap between Human and Machine Translation*. arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1609.08144

Xue, L., Constant, N., Roberts, A., Kale, M., Al-Rfou, R., Siddhant, A., ... Raffel, C. (2021, June). mT5: A massively multilingual pre-trained text-to-text transformer. *Proceedings of the 2021 conference of the North American chapter of the association for computational linguistics: Human language technologies* (pp. 483-498). https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.naacl-main.41

Ziemski, M., Junczys-Dowmunt, M., & Pouliquen, B. (2016). The United Nations Parallel Corpus v1.0. *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2016)* (pp. 3530-3534). European Language Resources Association. Retrieved from https://aclanthology.org/L16-1561

Acknowledgments

We thank the participants, co-researcher, and staffs of Rajamangala University of Technology Tawan-Ok who help us to conduct this study.

Authors Contributions

Not applicable.

Funding

Not applicable.

Competing Interests

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Informed Consent

Obtained.

Ethics Approval

The Publication Ethics Committee of the Macrothink Institute.

The journal's policies adhere to the Core Practices established by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

Provenance and Peer Review

Not commissioned; externally double-blind peer reviewed.

Data Availability Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

Data Sharing Statement

No additional data are available.

Open Access

Copyrights