



Supervisors' and Supervisees' Attitudes toward the Use of Google Translate in Thesis Writing by EFL Graduate Students

Zina Tahir Ghazi¹, Javad Gholami^{2*}

¹Ph.D. Candidate, Urmia University, Urmia, Iran

^{2*}Assistant Professor, Urmia University, Urmia, Iran

Received: January 31, 2024

Accepted: May 10, 2024

Abstract

Composing a thesis in the English language poses a formidable demand for the majority of postgraduate students. Several foreign students may receive support in formulating their theses. Google Translate (GT) is a frequently utilized tool for this objective. As far as we know, there has been no investigation into the perceptions of graduate students and their supervisors regarding the use of GT in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq. The objective of this study is to examine the perspectives of supervisors and supervisees on the utilization of Grounded Theory (GT) in the process of writing a thesis. Additionally, it takes into account the potential rationales and objectives of students' utilization of GT. Furthermore, it aims to comprehend the participants' perspectives regarding the advantages, disadvantages, and ethical aspects of employing GT in the process of producing theses. The researcher conducted a study using questionnaires and interviews to examine the perspectives of 49 PhD and master students from various fields and 18 supervisors from different universities in Iraqi Kurdistan. The findings indicated that students utilized GT for several purposes, including translating words and text to enhance reading comprehension, integrating it into their assignments, and even including it into their theses. Furthermore, while both students and teachers acknowledged GT as a useful tool, they expressed apprehension regarding its lack of accuracy and ethical implications. This study offers suggestions for the most effective employment of machine translation systems, such as Google Translate, in academic writing as a whole and specifically in thesis writing.

Keywords: EFL undergraduate students, Google Translate, Supervisor, Thesis writing

INTRODUCTION

According to Ahmadi and Reza (2018), technology has the potential to change the learning environment. Both technology and translation instruments have a significant influence on schooling. Consequently, technology has influenced translation tools, converting human translation into machine translation (MT). Translation originates from the necessity of persons to communicate, as language might hinder comprehension for those who are not proficient in it.

Google Translate (GT) is a highly renowned and esteemed translation software. The authors

Susanty et al. (2021) and Peters et al. (2022) have conducted studies on the topic. We choose GT over other MT technologies due to its extensive usage as an automatic translation tool. According to Shankland (2013), GT is presently available in 71 languages and is used by over 200 million people every day. It carries out billions of translations. This app possesses the capability to audibly articulate translations in a different language, convert text captured by the phone camera into translated text, and store language packs for use without an internet connection. According to Turovsky (2016), Google Translate has proven to be helpful in facilitating

*Corresponding Author's Email:

j.gholami@urmia.ac.ir



relationships and enhancing communication skills. With over 500 million users globally and translating over 100 billion words daily, Google Translate has played a significant role in supporting individuals in these areas. As of February 2020, Google Translate was available in 108 languages, with its capability recently expanded (Caswell & Liang, 2020).

According to Fredholm's (2015) research, learners used GT in ways that did not align with the tool's advantages. Consequently, users of Machine Translation (MT) must undergo training in strategic pedagogy. However, in general, students receive limited guidance. Google Translate recently added support for the Kurdish language. Despite the presence of significant issues with Google Translation is widely utilized and highly regarded by students for translating between Kurdish and other languages, which has caused apprehension among teachers. While a few instructors have encountered pupils utilizing different languages, particularly Arabic, for translation purposes, the majority of lecturers have not encountered kids excessively relying on Google Translate.

Moreover, thesis writing, which constitutes a substantial part of master's and PhD studies, is a scholarly aspect of language that requires supplementary guidance for its cultivation (Mohammadkarimi, 2022). Overall, the examination and evaluation of research on machine translation (MT) systems, namely Google Translate (GT), indicated that only a limited number of studies specifically investigated students' perceptions of GT. However, most of the studies examined and evaluated GT using an experimental approach. There is an increasing trend among students to rely on Google Translate. Moreover, a significant majority of college students, exceeding two-thirds, admit to participating in academic dishonesty, suggesting a growing prevalence of such unethical behavior among students (Robinson & Glanzer, 2017). Therefore, it is necessary to conduct study to examine the viewpoints of supervisors and students regarding the utilization of GT in thesis writing. This research aims to examine how often and why students use Google Translate, and to evaluate the effectiveness and ethical implications of using Google Translate in thesis

writing, from the viewpoints of both supervisors and students.

The findings of this study could provide valuable insights not only for thesis-writing students and their supervisors, but also for other students and teachers seeking to gain a deeper understanding of the benefits and drawbacks, as well as the ethical implications, of using Google Translate. In addition, it could offer FL supervisors fresh insights on how to address this matter.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Given the increasing need for machine translation (MT), it is essential to examine its possible benefits and its ability to aid students in language learning. The research conducted by Kol et al. (2018) concluded that machine translation has the potential to be a valuable tool for language learners at all proficiency levels, as it consistently improves the quality of translations.

Machine translation (MT) has the potential to enhance students' writing skills by enhancing their ability to use words and phrases fluently and accurately (Chen et al., 2015). Kazemzadeh and Fard Kashani (2014) found that the use of machine translation (MT) motivated learners to write at a faster pace and in a more natural manner, resulting in a reduction in errors related to sentence structure and spelling. MT is particularly beneficial in enabling learners to generate a greater range of unfamiliar vocabulary by broadening their lexical repertoire and providing them with the necessary tools to accomplish this. In addition to vocabulary, MT software also provides pupils with the correct spelling of a word.

Emotionally, MT creates a secure learning environment that diminishes language anxiety and enhances motivation and self-confidence (Ducar & Schocket, 2018; Lee, 2020; Wang & Zhan, 2020). Research has demonstrated that machine translation (MT) outperforms traditional dictionaries in terms of technical collocations, words, and jargon, as evidenced by studies conducted by Wang and Ma (2021) and Iswarya and Radha (2017). In a study conducted by Jin and Deifell (2013) that compared the use of printed dictionaries with online translation

tools, it was found that searching for terms in dictionaries actually decreased readers' comprehension of texts.

However, the speediness of online translation facilitated pupils' comprehension of the text's general significance. Research indicates that online translation has numerous benefits, but it also has certain drawbacks. Prior to utilizing it as a tool for language acquisition, users, particularly students, must be informed of its constraints. The main challenges of machine translation (MT) are sentences that are incorrect, contain inappropriate vocabulary, and have poor grammar. Consequently, the output necessitated post-editing (Akbari Motlaq & Mahadi, 2020).

Most research suggest that machine translation (MT) tools are not capable of facilitating complete translation between two languages that do not have a common language (Maier et al., 2022; Stoll et al., 2020). Hence, online translation encounters significant challenges when converting between English and languages that are non-Germanic or non-Roman, as well as languages with distinct syntactic structures from English (Groves & Mundt, 2021). To effectively identify and rectify errors, users must possess a minimum level of proficiency in language. Consequently, the product requires significant post-editing. The editor must identify every error during post-editing, in accordance with the criteria. Retyping is necessary for every structural and lexical modification (Shakir & Al-Ali, 2021).

Furthermore, Shei (2002) observed in her research that the presence of grammatical issues in machine translation outputs can be attributed to both inadequately constructed language input and a lack of proper machine translation grammar. Pre-editing involves the identification of potential flaws within the system, such as homographs in grammatical categories, embedded clauses, unfamiliar terms, and so on. The aim is to replace these problematic elements with less troublesome terms, phrases, or sentences. It may be necessary to rephrase the text or employ regulated language in machine translation (Shih, 2020). Hence, utilizing Machine Translation necessitates the user to possess expertise and consciousness regarding the idiosyncrasies

of the original language. The quality of the output is influenced by elements such as the type of text, the size of the language, the language pair, and the topic matter (Lee, 2020; Van Lieshout & Cardoso, 2022).

According to Abdurakhmonov (2017), machine translation (MT) lacks the ability to accurately translate complex verb tenses and moods. For instance, when translating from English to languages that use distinct auxiliary verbs, the translation could lack precision. Similarly, the utilization of gerunds as both verbs and nouns can result in confusion during transition, especially when they are used in isolation. Online translation proves inadequate in predicting the user's intended significance in this scenario. Moreover, machine translation (MT) lacks the ability to comprehend metaphorical language and idioms (Groves & Mundt, 2021). Idioms are linguistic expressions that are closely tied to the cultural aspects of a language. This is a challenge for machine translation (MT) systems, since they often struggle to handle idioms due to a limited grasp of the cultural context. Idioms may not always possess a direct equivalent in another language. Consequently, it is questionable if the software's algorithm would accurately understand idioms; instead, it is probable that it would translate each statement word-for-word. The efficacy of machine translation (MT) is significantly impacted by the user's level of technical comprehension of the system (Lee, 2023).

Previous studies have explored different aspects of academic writing and plagiarism. However, there is a requirement for a more detailed analysis of the perspectives and attitudes of both supervisors and supervisees towards the utilization of machine translation tools, such as Google Translate, in the process of writing graduate theses in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in Iraqi Kurdistan. The following questions are developed to examine the degree of usage and attitudes towards Google Translate, as well as the attitudes of supervisors about its effectiveness.

RQ1. *For what purposes and how often do TEFL graduate students use Google Translate to craft their theses in Iraqi Kurdistan?*

RQ2. *What are TEFL graduate students' attitudes regarding the effectiveness and ethicality of Google Translate in thesis writing?*

RQ3. *What are supervisors' attitudes regarding the effectiveness and ethicality of Google Translate in thesis writing?*

METHODOLOGY

The study employed semi-structured interviews and a questionnaire as distinct approaches for collecting data. The researcher employed a questionnaire to investigate the perspectives of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) supervisors and students regarding the utilization of Google Translate in the process of thesis composition. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that the researcher employed a semi-structured interview methodology. The researcher created two distinct sets of

interview questions for both supervisors and supervisees.

Participants

To achieve the goals of this study, two groups were chosen as participants. The initial cohort consisted of 49 students who were either currently working on their theses and dissertations or had completed them within the past two years. The group consisted of 30 master students and 19 doctorate students. The second group consisted of 18 supervisors who had at least three years of experience in supervision. The participants were selected using convenience sampling. The participants in both groups were selected from the field of TEFL or applied linguistics. Table 1 demonstrates that the students were from different universities in Iraqi Kurdistan and consisted of both males and females.

Table 1
Demographic information of Master's and PhD students (and recent graduates)

Program	Number	Educational Status	Gender
Master	30	Student: 16	Male: 17
		Graduate: 14	Female: 13
PhD	19	Student: 10	Male: 10
		Graduate: 9	Female: 9

Instruments

Questionnaire

A questionnaire was utilized to examine the perspectives of supervisors and supervisees regarding the utilization of Google Translate in thesis writing by EFL graduate students. This questionnaire was derived from Eriksson's (2021) work. Following some revisions, the questionnaire was then split into two distinct versions: one tailored for supervisors and another for students. The final versions underwent validation by experts in the field, and their dependability was assessed using the Alpha Coefficient of Cronbach, which yielded a value of approximately 0.90. The supervisors' questionnaire consisted of four sections and a total of 18 items. The initial segment included of three multiple-choice inquiries regarding the frequency at which managers utilize Google Translate. The second section was a pair of multiple-choice questions pertaining to the merits and drawbacks of Google Translate. Section three had a total of nine multiple-

choice inquiries pertaining to the perspectives of supervisors regarding Google Translate. The previous section consisted of a pair of multiple-choice questions and a pair of open-ended questions. The students' questionnaire had a comparable framework, with only variations in the content of certain questions, but maintaining an identical total number of questions.

Interview

The researcher designed two sets of semi-structured interviews based on the principal objectives of this study and an analytical examination of past studies. The interviews were initially conducted with two supervisors and three students. Based on their feedback, certain adjustments have been made to the interview questions. The primary topics covered in the interview questions were the extent of reliance on Google Translate and the pros and cons associated with its usage.

Procedure

The questionnaire was conducted with participants

over a duration of two weeks. In addition, the researcher devised a series of interview questions for students to achieve the desired objectives of the study. The researcher employed a semi-structured interview style and posed open-ended questions to foster discourse with the respondents, rather than simply engaging in a question and response format. A total of 23 students, consisting of 10 PhD students and 13 master's students, along with 12 supervisors, took part in the interviews. The student interviews had a duration of 20 to 25 minutes. Subsequently, the researcher recorded and transcribed the acquired data word for word. The interactions took place in person. The conclusive transcripts were distributed to the participants for examination and potential modifications. The researcher manually categorized and classified the emergent themes that reflected the students' perspectives on Google Translate. The researcher assigned each participant a pseudonym to facilitate the tracking of their individual contributions by readers. For example, the designation M1 refers to the first master's student, whereas P1 represents the first PhD student.

The data collected from the questionnaire is examined using exploratory factor analysis, and the findings are subsequently explained. The interview material that has been transcribed was analyzed using thematic analysis. The thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p.11) offers a comprehensive evaluation of a particular

component or a detailed portrayal of the dataset. The researcher thoroughly examined and reviewed the transcriptions of the data to identify primary codes using this analytical approach, so gaining a more profound comprehension of the collected data. The codes were subsequently categorized into probable themes. Upon reevaluation of the themes, designations were allocated to each of them. The results are displayed alongside quotations from the participants, in accordance with Braun and Clarke's (2006) approach.

RESULTS

Students' Questionnaire

As previously mentioned, the initial portion consisted of three multiple-choice questions regarding the supervisors' frequency of utilizing Google Translate. The second component consisted of two multiple-choice questions that focused on the pros and cons of Google Translate. Section three comprised a total of nine multiple-choice questions that inquired about the perspectives and opinions of supervisors regarding Google Translate. The previous section comprised of a pair of multiple-choice questions in addition to a pair of open-ended questions.

A) Section One: Use of GT

The first section of the students' questionnaire asked about the extent of use of GT by 49 students (30 master and 19 PhD students).

Table 2
Use of GT by students

No	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
49	1	10	18	16	4

According to the data in Table 2, 37% of the students (N= 18) acknowledged that they use Google Translate "Sometimes," while around one third (33%) of them reported using it "Often." In addition, approximately 20% (N= 10) of respondents stated that they use Google Translate "Rarely". The smallest proportions were found among those who reported using it "Always" and "Never", with 8% (N= 4) and 2%

(N= 1) respectively. Furthermore, significant differences in results were detected between PhD and master students. This chart displays the individual outcomes and percentages for each group. The majority of PhD students selected "Rarely" (42%) and "Sometimes" (42%) as their preferred choices. In contrast, master students frequently chose "Often" (47%) and "Sometimes" (33%) as their preferred options.

Table 3
Reasons for using GT

Items	Number (Percentage)
To read texts in English language	39 (80%)
To communicate with speakers of English language via chat or email	3 (6%)
As a draft to write in English language	40 (82%)
Personal interest	0 (0%)

The second question of the questionnaire asked about the reasons for using GT. According to Table 4, the items “As a draft to write in the English language” and “To read texts in English language,” with 82% and 80%, respectively, were the main reasons for using GT (students mostly chose more than one item). It should be mentioned that in some questions like this one student could choose more than one answer.

In the third question, 37 students (75.5%) admitted that they used GT when writing their theses and 24% claimed that they didn't used GT.

B) Section Two: Opinions about GT

There were two questions in the second section of the questionnaire about the advantages and disadvantages of using Google Translate for thesis writing.

Table 4
Advantages and disadvantages of using GT

Advantages of using GT	
It is easily-accessible	42 (86%)
Updates in real-time as you write	2 (4%)
Accuracy	5 (10%)
Multi-functional (oral and written functions)	15 (31%)
Increases students understanding of the language	12 (24%)
Disadvantages of using GT	
Inaccuracy	44 (90%)
Promotes lazy students	36 (73%)
Does not account for spelling errors, cultural context and grammatical differences between students' L1 and English	3 (6%)
Confuses students when results are not what expected	7 (14%)

Based on Table 4, students mostly (86%) believed that its main advantage was being easy and accessible. On the other hand, the primary disadvantages were “Inaccuracy” and “Promoting lazy students,” with 90% and 73%, respectively.

C) Section Three: Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Section three contained nine questions. It was a five-point Likert scale; however, for better summarizing the findings *Agree*, *Neutral*, and *Disagree* were used.

Table 5
Section three of students' questionnaire

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
6- GT is not accurate	44 (90%)	4 (8%)	1 (2%)
7- GT helps us when writing thesis	45 (92%)	1 (2%)	3 (6%)
8- I do not like to use GT	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	48 (98%)
9- Using GT hinders us from learning	4 (8%)	3 (6%)	42 (86%)
10- It's OK for us to use GT for single words	45 (92%)	4 (8%)	0 (0%)
11- If students use GT to write full sentences or longer texts, it is cheating	25 (51%)	7 (14%)	17 (35%)
12- Our professors show us how GT can be used to support learning	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	100%
13- Our professors know when we use GT in our writing	0 (0%)	2 (4%)	48 (96%)
14- GT is only useful once students have a good understanding of English grammar	44 (90%)	2 (4%)	3 (6%)

According to the data in Table 5, a majority of respondents (90%) expressed the view that Google Translate is not accurate. However, a significant proportion of them stated that Google Translate did not impede their learning (86%) and can actually assist them in thesis writing (92%). Additionally, a large majority of respondents (98%) had a positive attitude towards Google Translate. Remarkably, almost half of the students expressed disagreement with the statement "If students use GT to write full sentences or longer texts, it is cheating" (neutral = 14 and disagree = 35), indicating that these students do not perceive the usage of Google Translate as a kind of academic dishonesty. It is noteworthy that the responses of PhD and Master students differed statistically exclusively on this one issue. Specifically, the majority of PhD students (16 out of 19 respondents) regarded the utilization of Google Translate as an act of cheating, whereas just 9 out of 30 mas-

ter students viewed it as such. All students expressed unanimous disagreement (100%) about item 12, which states "Our professors demonstrate how GT can be utilized to enhance learning." Furthermore, it should be noted that there was no assertion made regarding the awareness of our lecturers regarding the employment of GT in our writing. Ultimately, 90% of respondents held the belief that "GT is only beneficial once students possess a solid comprehension of English grammar." The results indicate that students generally have favorable opinions towards Google Translate and perceive it as a valuable tool for learning and thesis writing. However, they did not receive any comments from their teachers on the use of Google Translate.

D) Section four: practices regarding Google Translat

This section consisted of two multiple-choice questions and two open-ended questions.

Table 6
Approving the use of GT

	Strongly approve	approve	disapprove	strongly disapprove
Approving the use of GT	21 (43%)	24 (49%)	4 (8%)	0 (0%)

According to Table 6, the results indicated that approximately 43% of participants expressed strong approval for the utilization of Google Trans

late, while 49% demonstrated general approval. In contrast, a mere 8% of respondents expressed disapproval towards the use of Google Translate.

Table 7
Incorporating GT in thesis writing

	As a dictionary for unfamiliar words	To translate sentences	To write full texts in L1 and translate into English
How do you incorporate the use of Google Translate in your Thesis writing?	4 (8%)	39 (80%)	36 (73%)

Based on the Table 7, in the next question, respondents claimed that they use Google Translate to translate sentences (80%) and full text (73%); however, the item "to translate words" was not statistically significant (8%).

Regarding the first open-ended question, which was other types of activities have they done with GT, the respondents mentioned that they used Google Translate in their assignment, homework, and theses writing.

M 2

"I use Google Translate when I have an assignment."

P 7

"When I work on my homework and I sometimes use it."

The second question was about issues of using Google Translate. Inaccuracy of the translation was the main theme of the students' responses.

M 31

"Google Translate sometimes does not translate a part of a sentence or sometimes adds one or two words at the end."

P 9

"It is not always accurate; for example, sometimes it provides unrelated words to the context".

A. 2. Supervisors' questionnaire

The supervisors' questionnaire had a similar structure to the students' questionnaire, and the only difference was that the contents of some questions were different, while the total number of questions was 18.

Section one: Use of Google Translate

Similar to the students' questionnaire the first

section was about the extent of use of GT by university professors.

Based on the results, since all of the university professors claimed that they used GT, the item "Never" was removed from the figure. The items "Rarely" and "Sometimes" constituted 49% and 31% of the responses, while "Often" and "Always" were 18% and 2%, respectively.

Table 8
Reasons for using GT

Items	Number (Percentage)
To read texts in English language	4 (22%)
To translate unknown words or sentences containing unfamiliar words	10 (56%)
As a draft to write in English language	5 (28%)
Personal interest	6 (33%)

As can be observed in Table 8, unlike students, more than half of university professors (56%) in the second question claimed they use GT to translate unknown words or sentences containing unfamiliar words. About 33% noted that they use it for "personal interests".

Regarding the third question, most of the university professors (67%) said that they used google translate when learning another language and 33% claimed that they did not use GT in learning another language.

Section Two: opinions about GT

Table 9
Advantages and disadvantages of using GT

Advantages of using GT	
It is easily-accessible	16 (89%)
Updates in real-time as you write	4 (22%)
Accuracy	0 (0%)
Multi-functional (oral and written functions)	5 (28%)
Increases students understanding of the language	1 (6%)
Disadvantages of using GT	
Inaccuracy	18 (100%)
Promotes lazy students	16 (89%)
Does not account for spelling errors, cultural context and grammatical differences between students' L1 and English	1 (6%)
Confuses students when results are not what expected	3 (17%)

In addition to student outcomes, university instructors (89%) also acknowledged that the main benefit of Google Translate lies in its user-friendly interface and widespread accessibility. Nevertheless, none of them identified accuracy as an advantage of GT. Nevertheless, university instructors have identified two primary issues with this approach: its inherent inaccuracies, which are present in every single

instance, and the possibility for it to cultivate indolence among students, a concern shared by 89% of professors.

Section Three: Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

In this section similar questions to those of students are asked from supervisors.

Table 10
Section three of supervisors` questionnaire

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
6- GT is not accurate	100%	0%	0%
7- GT helps students when writing thesis	86%	6%	8%
8- I do not like my students to use GT	92%	4%	4%
9- Using GT hinders my students from learning	90%	6%	4%
10- It's OK for students to use GT for single words	100%	0%	0%
11- If students use GT to write full sentences or longer texts, it is cheating	100%	0%	0%
12- I show my students how GT can be used to support learning	69%	6%	25%
13- I know when my students use GT in their writing	63%	10%	27%
14- GT is only useful once students have a good understanding of English grammar	100%	0%	0%

The results of this section indicate that supervisors and students held contrasting attitudes towards the use of GT, with supervisors generally expressing disapproval (Table 10). Every single university professor (100%) holds the belief that GT is not accurate. The majority of professors (92%) disapprove of students utilizing it as it impedes their learning (90%). However, it does assist students in their thesis writing (86%). Contrary to students, supervisors unanimously concur that utilizing GT to compose complete phrases or lengthier texts constitutes cheating, although employing GT for individual words is deemed acceptable. The statements "I demonstrate to my students the application of GT to enhance learning" and "I

can identify when my student's incorporate GT in their writing" sparked controversy due to the varying perspectives among teachers. Approximately 25% acknowledged that they did not include instruction on Google Translate in their classes. In addition, 27% of respondents indicated that they were unaware of the existence of Google Translate among their students, while 10% expressed uncertainty over their knowledge of it. Ultimately, teachers universally held the belief that "GT is only beneficial once students possess a solid comprehension of English grammar."

Section four: practices regarding GT

In this section, there were two multiple-choice questions as well as five open-ended questions.

Table 11
Approving the use of GT

	Strongly approve	approve	disapprove	strongly disapprove
Approving the use of GT	1 (6%)	4 (22%)	6 (33%)	7 (39%)

Based on Table 11, only 22% of supervisors approved and 6% strongly approved the use of

GT by students, whereas 33% disapproved and 39% strongly disapproved it.

Table 12
Incorporating GT in teaching

	Regularly	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
How often do you use GT in your English teaching?	0 (0%)	3 (17) %	5 (28%)	10 (55%)	0 (0%)

In the next multiple-choice question, as depicted in Table 12, around 55% of respondents indicated that they "rarely" incorporate the use of GT in their classes, while 28% reported doing so "occasionally" and 17% chose the option "frequently". Nevertheless, the options labeled

"Regularly" or "Never" were not selected by anyone.

Supervisors provided varied responses to the initial open-ended question regarding the integration of GT into teaching practice. The majority of individuals stated that there is no

distinct and exclusive lecture dedicated to the use of it; instead, they simply emphasize the precise and restricted usage of it. Additionally, they stressed the need of students possessing sufficient English proficiency to actively utilize the language, rather than relying solely on translation. Furthermore, they emphasized that translations should be seen as preliminary drafts that require further refinement.

Supervisor 6

"We usually don't have a lecture about Google Translate, but within our lectures, when we have related topics, we refer to it."

Supervisor 15

"I advise my students to limit the use of Google Translate and revise its translation."

In relation to the second open-ended question, supervisors held the belief that while GT had numerous benefits, they should exercise caution due to its downsides. They held the belief that GT is both cost-free and very efficient, enhancing students' grasp of vocabulary and translation, hence positively influencing the overall learning process. Nevertheless, they emphasized the need of recognizing that the tool should be utilized as an auxiliary aid only when absolutely necessary, rather than relying on it to complete all of their projects and tasks. University academics have identified several limits and downsides of utilizing GT. Firstly, GT fails to understand cultural and contextual distinctions, leading to potential inaccuracies in translations. Additionally, students may become overly reliant on GT, resulting in laziness and a lack of effort in their language learning.

Supervisor 12

"Google Translate is freely available, and it's very fast, but it does not recognize the difference between words in different contexts."

Supervisor 3

"It can help students improve their translation, but on the other hand, it can make them lazy, and they will be dependent on it."

Interviews

A total of 23 students, consisting of 10 PhD students and 13 master's students, along with 12 supervisors, took part in the interviews. The

student interviews had a duration of 20 to 25 minutes, after which the researcher recorded the data and transcribed it word for word. The interactions took place in person. The researcher manually categorized and classified the emergent themes that reflected the students' perspectives on GT. The researcher assigned each participant a pseudonym to facilitate tracking their individual contributions. For example, the designation M1 represents the initial master's student, while P1 signifies the first PhD student. This section contains representative replies provided by participants.

The interviews mostly focused on the research topics of the study. The initial interview inquired about the objective and regularity of employing Machine Translation (MT) and Glossary Translation (GT). Participants verified that they utilize the quizzes to translate sentences and occasionally text in their assignments, homework, and theses. Furthermore, the majority of students frequently used machine translation (MT) and Google Translate (GT), while most teachers rarely utilized these tools.

P2

"I sometimes use them for translating a sentence or a word in doing my assignments."

M 11

"I often use Google Translate for most of my homework and even for writing my thesis."

The second question posed during the interviews pertained to the students' perspectives on the efficacy and ethical implications of Grounded Theory (GT) in their thesis writing. The overwhelming majority of students claimed that GT was highly effective and greatly aided them in their academic endeavors. Approximately 50% of the students surveyed did not perceive the utilization of GT as a form of cheating. In the interviews, this percentage was even lower, with most students asserting that they did not directly replicate from GT, but rather used it as a source of inspiration for their translations. Nevertheless, a small number of students maintained the belief that it did not constitute academic dishonesty.

P 10

"I believe that Translation tools, specifically Google Translate are beneficial only if people use them in the right way. I mean, they have to

learn from them, not just use them for their work."

M 12

"I use Google Translate, among others; it has several advantages, such as being free and fast, but I don't simply copy and paste its translation; I try to get ideas on how to translate."

M 2

"I don't think that it is cheating because I use my own sentences or paragraphs and just use it to translate them."

In the latter section of the interviews, participants were asked about their thoughts on the effectiveness and ethical considerations of machine translation (MT) and genetic testing (GT). Significantly, the interviewing teachers reached a widespread consensus. Primarily, they expressed a belief in the efficacy of machine translation (MT) and gloss translation (GT); nevertheless, they also emphasized the issue that students using these tools could potentially engage in academic dishonesty.

Supervisor 4

"I think that it is an effective tool that can be very useful for students, but they should consider ethical considerations while using it."

Supervisor 9

"Our students do not try to learn from Machine and Google Translate; they just copy from it, and this is a kind of cheating."

DISCUSSION

The primary aim of this study was to investigate the attitudes of supervisors and supervisees towards the utilization of Grounded Theory (GT) in the process of thesis writing. This study especially examined the degree to which students utilize Grounded Theory (GT) in their theses. It also examined the factors influencing students' use of GT. Furthermore, it aimed to comprehend the participants' perspectives regarding the advantages, disadvantages, and ethical considerations of employing GT in the process of producing theses.

The study utilized a questionnaire and interview methodology to examine the utilization of Grounded Theory (GT) among two unique cohorts: master and PhD students, as well as their supervisors. The findings obtained from the

questionnaires and interviews provide insight into the widespread use of GT among students for various objectives.

Students utilized GT for various tasks, including translating words and text to enhance reading comprehension, integrating it into their assignments, and even putting it into their theses. These results are partially consistent with many previous investigations. For instance, Sukkhwan (2014), Alhaisoni & Alhaysony (2017), and Tsai (2019) discovered that students employed GT for vocabulary and writing tasks, but utilized it less frequently for translation purposes. This implies that students are utilizing GT as a means to enhance their language acquisition and writing skills, rather than as a substitute for conventional translation techniques. In addition, Lee (2020) conducted a study to investigate the views of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students towards the utilization of machine translation systems, such as Google Translate, for English writing assignments. The findings of this research align with the results of the current study, suggesting that students frequently utilize such tools for language-related tasks, but not for direct translations. This study also emphasized the students' perspectives on the efficacy of machine translation techniques.

The findings revealed a notable disparity in the frequency of usage between master's and PhD students. Master's students shown a greater propensity for utilizing GT, whilst PhD students indicated a lower frequency of usage, varying from irregular to infrequent instances. The findings emphasize the diverse patterns of GT utilization among the student participants at different academic levels. This aspect of the findings aligns with prior studies. According to Fredholm's (2015) research, there is a correlation between education level and the frequency of using online translation tools. Beginners tend to utilize these resources more often compared to more advanced learners. This is probably due to the fact that novices are still in the process of honing their language skills and may require more support in the area of translation. Furthermore, this aligns with the research conducted by Chen et al. (2023) and Tsai and Liao (2021), which discovered that undergraduate students utilized GT more often than graduate students.

Chang et al. (2022) discovered that students who utilized GT more frequently demonstrated a higher tendency to provide translations that were erroneous or deceptive. In contrast, Garcia and Pena (2011) discovered a contradictory outcome, indicating that proficient learners are more inclined to utilize online translation resources. This could be attributed to their greater familiarity with the tools and their heightened confidence in their proficiency to utilize them efficiently. However, Chung and Ahn (2022) discovered that students with varying levels of proficiency displayed very identical patterns and frequencies of usage.

The second research inquiry examined the students' perspectives on the efficacy and ethicality of employing GT. The findings indicated that while both PhD and master students concurred on its efficacy, they held significantly divergent perspectives on its ethicality. A minority of master students regarded the use of GT as unethical and academically dishonest, but a majority of PhD students found it to be unethical. The divergence in viewpoints may stem from the varying degrees of proficiency and knowledge that PhD and master students possess in the fields of translation and ethical deliberation. PhD students are more inclined to possess a profound comprehension of the intricacies of translation, and they may exhibit a heightened awareness of the possibility for GT to provide erroneous or deceptive translations. In contrast, master's students are more inclined to perceive GT as a convenient and user-friendly instrument, with less emphasis on concerns regarding accuracy or ethics. The findings were consistent with the studies conducted by Deng and Yu (2022) and Chung and Ahn (2022), where participants expressed confidence in the efficacy of machine translation (MT) while also recognizing the ethical concerns associated with its incorrect utilization.

Furthermore, the findings indicated that GT is not always precise and occasionally generates translations that are deceptive or incorrect. Hence, it is crucial to exercise prudence when employing GT and to authenticate the precision of all generated translations. The results align with the research conducted by Tsai (2019), where participants perceived GT as useful but expressed concerns regarding the translation's

correctness and potential unethical applications. Moreover, it is consistent with the conclusions of Li and Ke (2022), who discovered that both students and teachers generally saw GT as efficacious, but they also voiced reservations over its precision and ethical implications. Additionally, it was shown that students and teachers had a higher tendency to utilize GT for simpler activities, such as translating individual words and phrases, while demonstrating a lower inclination to employ GT for more intricate jobs, such as translating full publications.

The last research question presented identical inquiries to supervisors. The findings from the questionnaire and interviews indicated a significant level of agreement among supervisors in their responses. This indicates that supervisors possess a collective comprehension of the efficacy and moral nature of utilizing GT. The majority of individuals held the belief that while it is really efficient, one must exercise caution while employing it to prevent instances of academic dishonesty. This finding aligns with the research conducted by Andari et al. (2022) and Wirantaka and Fijanah (2021). These academics have determined in their investigations that despite the disadvantages and errors of GT, teachers have found it to be beneficial.

Generally, GT is a valuable instrument that can augment scholarly writing, but it is crucial to employ it appropriately and ethically (Chung & Ahn, 2022; Jolley & Maimone, 2022). Supervisors can have a significant impact on assisting students in utilizing GT in this manner.

CONCLUSION

The report indicates that a significant number of master and PhD students heavily rely on Machine and Google Translate. Consequently, it is imperative for universities and supervisors to be aware of and comprehend the potential impact of this phenomenon on the caliber and integrity of students' academic output.

The study additionally revealed that master's students employ machine translation (MT) and glossary translation (GT) with greater frequency compared to PhD students. This implies that the two groupings employ distinct methodologies when it comes to utilizing translation.

Universities should take into account these distinctions and provide appropriate guidance and support to each cohort of students.

Master and PhD students hold divergent views regarding the efficacy and ethical implications of employing Machine Translation (MT) and Genetic Translation (GT). They concur on its efficacy, although they hold divergent views regarding its ethicality. This disparity may arise due to the varying degrees of expertise and understanding between master students and PhD students. Universities should facilitate dialogues and provide mentorship to enhance students' comprehension of the ethical dimensions associated with the utilization of machine translation techniques.

The investigation moreover discovered that supervisors largely concur on the utilization of machine translation (MT) and glossary translation (GT). They comprehend the advantages of it, but also stress the importance of exercising caution to prevent any form of deceit. Supervisors have a crucial responsibility in providing guidance and counsel to students regarding the appropriate utilization of translation technologies.

The divergent perspectives regarding the ethical implications of employing Machine Translation (MT) and Glossary Translation (GT) among students and supervisors highlight the necessity for transparent dialogues and educational initiatives. Universities should establish a conducive atmosphere for open discussions between students and supervisors regarding academic integrity, ethical considerations, and responsible utilization of translation tools. This will enhance the comprehension of ethical limits associated with translation aid for all individuals.

The study unequivocally indicates that colleges should establish educational programs aimed at enhancing students' translation skills and instructing them on the proper utilization of translation resources. These programs will equip students with the expertise and abilities to proficiently assess and utilize machine translation systems, all while upholding academic honesty.

Finally, the research emphasizes the significance of acknowledging and addressing the prevalent utilization of machine translation

(MT) and ghostwriting (GT) among students. Universities ought to promote open dialogues, offer customized support to different student cohorts, and establish educational initiatives to foster responsible and ethical translation methods while upholding academic honesty.

To summarize, this study highlights the widespread use of machine translation (MT) and ghostwriting (GT) among master and PhD students, with varying opinions on the ethical implications of these practices among the two categories. It emphasizes the significance of promoting transparent conversations, offering direction, and executing instructional measures to guarantee conscientious and moral utilization of translation resources. Academic institutions must foster a conducive environment that actively fosters open discussions on academic integrity, ethical considerations, and the proper utilization of machine translation techniques. Future research should strive to investigate these concerns more extensively and span a wider array of fields and language situations to achieve a more comprehensive comprehension of the topic.

References

- Abdurakhmonov, N. (2017). Modeling analytic forms of verb in Uzbek as stage of morphological analysis in machine translation. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research*, 5(03), 89-100. <https://doi.org/10.24200/jsshr.vol5iss03pp89-100>
- Ahmadi, D., & Reza, M. (2018). The use of technology in English language learning: A literature review. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, 3(2), 115-125. <http://dx.doi.org/10.29252/ijree.3.2.115>
- Akbari Motlaq, M. D., & Mahadi, T. (2020). Advantages and disadvantages of using machine translation in translation pedagogy from the perspective of instructors and learners. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 8(4), 121-137. <https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2020.8414>
- 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.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijele.v5i1.10696>
- Andari, A. Z., Sofyan, R., & Yusuf, M. (2022). The The Teachers' Perception towards the Use of Google Translate as a Translation Tool. *RADIANT: Journal of Applied, Social, and Education Studies*, 3(1), 1-14.
<https://doi.org/10.52187/rdt.v3i1.85>
- Caswell, I., & Liang, B. (2020). *Recent advances in google translate*. Google AI Blog. <https://ai.google-blog.com/2020/06/recent-advances-in-google-translate.html>
- Chen, M., Huang, S., Chang, J., & Liou, H. (2015). Developing a corpus-based paraphrase tool to improve EFL learners' writing skills. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 28(1), 22-40.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2013.783873>
- Cheng, S. P. (2023). University Students' Perceived Benefits and Difficulties Related to Corpus-Assisted Translation. *Compilation & Translation Review*, 16(1), 81-132.
[https://doi.org/10.29912/CTR.202303_16\(1\).0004](https://doi.org/10.29912/CTR.202303_16(1).0004)
- Chung, E. S., & Ahn, S. (2022). The effect of using machine translation on linguistic features in L2 writing across proficiency levels and text genres. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 35(9), 2239-2264.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2020.1871029>
- Deng, X., & Yu, Z. (2022). A systematic review of machine-translation-assisted language learning for sustainable education. *Sustainability*, 14(13), 7598.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su14137598>
- Ducar, C., & Schocket, D. H. (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>
- Fredholm, K. (2015). Effects of online translation on morphosyntactic and lexical-pragmatic accuracy in essay writing in Spanish as a foreign language. In S. Jager, L. Bradley, E. J. Meima, & S. Thouesny (Eds), *CALL Design: Principles and Practice, Proceedings of the 2014 EUROCALL Conference, Groningen, The Netherlands* (pp. 96-101). Dublin: Research-publishing net.
<https://doi.org/10.14705/rpnet.2014.000201>
- Garcia, I., & Pena, M. I. (2011). Machine translation-assisted language learning: writing for beginners. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 24(5), 471-487.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2011.582687>
- Groves, M., & Mundt, K. (2021). A ghostwriter in the machine? Attitudes of academic staff towards machine translation use in internationalised Higher Education. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 50, 100957.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2021.100957>
- Iswarya, P., & Radha, V. (2017). Adapting hybrid machine translation techniques for cross-language text retrieval system. *Journal of Engineering Science and Technology*, 12(3), 648-666.
- Jin, L., & Deifell, E. (2013). Foreign language learners' use and perception of online dictionaries: A survey study. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 9(4), 515-533.
- Jolley, J. R., & Maimone, L. (2022). Thirty Years of Machine Translation in Language Teaching and Learning: A Review of the Literature. *L2 Journal*, 14(1), 26-44.
<https://doi.org/10.5070/L214151760>
- Kazemzadeh, A., & Fard Kashani, A. (2014). The effect of computer-assisted translation on L2 learners' mastery of writing. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, 3(3), 29-44.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5861/ijrsl.2013.396>
- Kol, S., Scholnik, M., & Spector-Cohen, E. (2018). Google Translate in academic

- writing courses?. *The EuroCALL Review*, 26(2), 50-57. <https://doi.org/10.4995/euro-call.2018.10140>
- Laird Eriksson, N. (2021). *Google Translate in English Language Learning: A Study of Teachers' Beliefs and Practices* [Master's thesis, Dalarna University]. Dalarna University. <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1554778/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
- Lee, S., M. (2020). The impact of using machine translation on EFL students' writing. *Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning*, 3(3), 157-175. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2018.1553186>
- Lee, S. M. (2023). The effectiveness of machine translation in foreign language education: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 36(1-2), 103-125. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2021.1901745>
- Li, X., & Ke, P. (2022). An empirical study of peer feedback in translation didactics: quality, response and student perceptions. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 47(8), 1231-1244. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2022.2044013>
- Maier, D., Baden, C., Stoltenberg, D., De Vries-Kedem, M., & Waldherr, A. (2022). Machine translation vs. multilingual dictionaries assessing two strategies for the topic modeling of multilingual text collections. *Communication Methods and Measures*, 16(1), 19-38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19312458.2021.1955845>
- Mohammadkarimi, E. (2022). Analytic assessment of TEFL undergraduate students' writings: Diagnosing areas of strength and weakness. *International Journal of Language Testing*, 12(2), 25-44. <https://doi.org/10.22034/ijlt.2022.157123>
- Peters, M. A., Rizvi, F., McCulloch, G., Gibbs, P., Gorur, R., Hong, M., & Misiaszek, L. (2022). Reimagining the new pedagogical possibilities for universities post-Covid-19: An EPAT Collective Project. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 54(6), 717-760. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2020.1777655>
- Robinson, J., & Glanzer, P. (2017). Understanding student purpose types and student perceptions of the influences shaping them. *Journal of College and Character*, 18(2), 83-96. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2194587X.2017.1300093>
- Shakir, M. F., & Al-Ali, K. K. (2021). Post-Editing as a Creative Tool in Improving the Quality of the Product of Translation Students. *Adab Al-Basrah*, 97(1), 1-30.
- Shankland, S. (2013). *Google Translate now serves 200 million people daily*. CNET. CBS Interactive Inc. <https://www.cnet.com/tech/services-and-software/google-translate-now-serves-200-million-people-daily/>
- Shei, C.-C. (2002). *Combining translation into the second language and second language learning: An integrated computational approach* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Edinburgh.
- Shih, C. L. (2020). Editing Taiwan divination Verses with controlled Language Strategies: Machine-Translation-Mediated Effective Communication. *Journal of Foreign Languages*, 8(2), 5-19. <https://doi.org/10.15640/jflcc.v8n2a2>
- Stoll, S., Camgoz, N. C., Hadfield, S., & Bowden, R. (2020). Text2Sign: towards sign language production using neural machine translation and generative adversarial networks. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 128(4), 891-908. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11263-019-01281-2>
- Sukhwan, A. (2014). *Students' attitudes and behaviors towards the use of google translate* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Prince of Songkla University.
- Susanty, L., Hartati, Z., Sholihin, R., Syahid, A., & Liriwati, F. Y. (2021). Why English teaching truth on digital trends as an effort for effective learning and evaluation: opportunities and challenges: analysis of teaching English. *Linguistics and*

- Culture Review*, 5(S1), 303-316.
<https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS1.1401>
- Tsai, S. C. (2019). Using google translate in EFL drafts: a preliminary investigation. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 32(5-6), 510-526.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2018.1527361>
- Tsai, P. S., & Liao, H. C. (2021). Students' progressive behavioral learning patterns in using machine translation systems—A structural equation modeling analysis. *System*, 101, 102594.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102594>
- Turovsky, B. (2016). *Found in translation: More accurate, fluent sentences in Google Translate*. Blog. Google. November, 15. <https://blog.google/products/translate/found-translation-more-accurate-fluent-sentences-google-translate/>
- Van Lieshout, C., & Cardoso, W. (2022). Google Translate as a tool for self-directed language learning. *Language Learning & Technology*, 26(1), 1-19.
<http://hdl.handle.net/10125/73460>
- Wang, Q., & Ma, X. (2021). Machine Translation Quality Assessment of Selected Works of Xiaoping Deng Supported by Digital Humanistic Method. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and Translation*, 7(2), 59-68.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.11648/j.ijalt.20210702.15>
- Wang, W., & Zhan, J. (2020). The relationship between English language learner characteristics and online self-regulation: A structural equation modeling approach. *Sustainability*, 12(7), 3009.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su12073009>
- Wirantaka, A., & Fijanah, M. S. (2021, December). Effective use of Google Translate in writing. In *International Conference on Sustainable Innovation Track Humanities Education and Social Sciences (ICSIHES 2021)* (pp. 15-23). Atlantis Press.

Biodata

Zina Tahir Ghazi is a Ph.D. candidate in Teaching English as a Foreign language (TEFL) at Urmia University, Iran. She is an experienced EFL and EAP teacher. Her research interests are language education policy, EFL, literature, gender, and culture. She is currently manager of Maad institute in Erbil, Iraq.
 Email: zinaharki92@gmail.com

Javad Gholami is an associate professor in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) from Urmia University, Urmia, Iran. His main publications have been on English for Medical Purposes (EMP), academic writing, task-based language teaching, teacher education, and convenience editing of research articles.

Email: j.gholami@urmia.ac.ir