Yemeni Students Utilization of Google Translate for Learning English Language: Use, Advantages, and Disadvantages

Dr. Othman Saleh Mahdy Mohammed [1, *]

[1] Assistant Professor of Translation - English Department - Faculty of Arts and Humanities- University of Saba Region - Yemen.
* Corresponding author. E-mail: othmanwosabi924@gmail.com

Yemeni Students Utilization of Google Translate for Learning English Language: Use, Advantages, and Disadvantages

Abstract:

A significant number of students use instant apps to translate documents to facilitate a successful learning process. The study aims to investigate the extent of utilization of GT by Yemeni students, examine their perceptions of using GT in their studies, and scrutinize the advantages and disadvantages of GT from their perspectives. This study employs a mixed method- quantitative and qualitative. The tools for data collection are a questionnaire and a semi-structured interview. The questionnaire is administered to 283 participants. The interview is presented to 20 students. A thematic analysis is used to analyse the obtained data. The study found that Yemeni students use GT at a low level (neutral) to learn the English language but they appreciate its bilingual speed. They also suggested combining machine and human translation for accurate and high-quality results. The study revealed no gender impact utilization of GT for learning the English language. It was noticed that diploma and bachelor's students have positive attitudes towards GT, while master's and PhD students are neutral. The responses of the participants showed the advantages of GT outperformed the disadvantages of GT. English language teachers should emphasize how to do MTPE and analyze GT defects. The research emphasized directing Yemeni EFL learners to machine translation's limitations, MT opportunities, types of texts to be translated, the difficulty of translating the implied meaning and potential inaccuracies.

استخدام الطلاب اليمنيين لجوجل ترجمه في تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية:

الاستخدام، المزايا، والعيوب

د. عثمان صالح مهدي محمد [1،*]

الملخص:

يستخدم عدد كبير من الطلبة تطبيقات الترجمة لترجمة المستندات، لتسهل في إنجاح عملية التعلم. تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى التحقق من مدى استخدام الطلاب اليمنيين لمترجم جوجل، ودراسة تصوراتهم حول استخدام جوجل ترجمه في دراستهم، والتدقيق في مزايا وعيوب لجوجل ترجمه من وجهة نظرهم. استخدمت هذه الدراسة منهجية البحث المختلط (الكمي والنوعي). وكانت أدوات جمع البيانات هي الإستبانة والمقابلة شبه المنظمة. حيث تم توزيع الإستبانة على 283 مشاركاً. تم عرض المقابلة على 20 طالباً. تم استخدام التحليل الموضوعي لتحليل البيانات التي تم الحصول عليها. توصلت الدراسة بأن الطلاب اليمنيين يستخدمون جوجل ترجمه بمستوى منخفض (محايد) لتعلم اللغة الإنجليزية لكنهم يُقدِرون سرعتها ثنائية اللغة. واقترحوا أيضاً الجمع بين الترجمة الآلية والبشرية للحصول على نتائج دقيقة وعالية الجودة. كما كشفت الدراسة عن عدم وجود تأثير على استخدام جوجل ترجمه لتعلم اللغة الإنجليزية من ناحية متغير الجنس. وقد لوحظ أن طلبة الدبلوم والبكالوريوس لديهم اتجاهات إيجابية نحو جوجل ترجمه، بينما كان طلبة الماجستير والدكتوراه محايدين. وأظهرت ردود المشاركين أن مزايا جوجل ترجمه تفوق سلبياتها. وفقا لذلك يتوجب على معلمي اللغة الإنجليزية التأكيد على كيفية إجراء المراجعة و التحرير لترجمة جوجل وتحليل عيوبها. وشددت الدراسة على توجيه متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية -كلغة أجنبية- اليمنيين إلى محدودية الترجمة الآلية، وفرصها ، وأنواع النصوص المراد ترجمتها ، وصعوبة ترجمة المعنى الضمني والأخطاء المحتملة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: المزايا ، التحرير، ترجمة جوجل، الإدراك، التدقيق اللغوي، الاستخدام.

---

1. Introduction:

English is an international language that has almost been recommended to be learned, especially for those who want to travel to study in English-speaking countries (Ly, 2023). There are several reasons why learning English can be beneficial in such situations. First, English serves as a lingua franca in many parts of the world. It is spoken by 1.5 billion people worldwide who speak English either natively or as a second language (Statista, 2023, August, 1) making it easier to communicate with individuals from different countries and cultural backgrounds. Second, many of the top universities and educational institutions in the world use English as the medium of instruction. By having a strong command of the language, students can access a broader range of academic opportunities and resources. Third, English proficiency is often a prerequisite for many job positions, particularly in multinational companies or industries with an international focus. It can open up a wider range of employment opportunities and enhance your prospects for career advancement.

Yemeni students are studying in universities and using English as a lingua franca are required to learn English. Many students travel to countries without proper English education, making it challenging for them to adapt to the new language. Many Yemeni students come to India to specialize in fields like English, physics, chemistry, mathematics, and zoology. To fill this gap, they use Google Translate (GT) to translate words, sentences, passages, and assignments. GT can be a valuable tool for novice students in acquiring foreign languages like English. With the rise of desktops, laptops, palmtop computers, and mobile phones, students can easily share, download, and read, utilizing technology to facilitate their learning experience.

GT, an automated translation service by Google, has gained popularity for its convenience and accessibility. However, it's important to note that GT is not a substitute for human translation or language proficiency. Its limitation should be acknowledged, and caution should be exercised when relying solely on its translations, especially in important or professional settings.

Technology has significantly influenced language learning, with websites and applications like Wikipedia, Google Scholar, Grammarly, online dictionaries, and translators becoming valuable tools for students and educators (Abdelhalim, 2022; Wang, 2023). These platforms offer vast repositories of information, allowing students to enhance their language skills. Mobile phone applications like Duolingo, Babbel, Rosetta Stone, and Memrise have gained popularity as interactive language learning platforms, offering structured lessons, vocabulary practice, grammar exercises, and speaking or listening exercises to improve language proficiency. Online translation tools like GT have become go-to resources for quick translations. Overall, technology has significantly impacted language learning and has become an essential tool for students and educators.

The translation is defined as ". . . the changing of an original text written in the original verbal language into a written text in a different verbal language" (Munday, 2001, p. 5). Translation is the process of converting an original text written in one language into a written text in another language while preserving its meaning. It involves transferring the information and ideas expressed in the source language (the original language) into the target language (the language being translated into). The goal of translation is to convey the content, style, tone and intended message of the source text as accurately and faithfully as possible. Translation requires not only linguistic proficiency in both the source and target languages but

also a deep understanding of the cultural, social, and historical contexts in which the text is situated. Translators often need to make decisions about word choice, idiomatic expressions, cultural references, and other nuances to ensure the translation resonates with the target audience. Translation is a complex and multifaceted process that requires a combination of language proficiency, cultural understanding, and effective communication skills to bridge the gap between different languages and cultures. Translation can be facilitated by using technology.

Yemeni students (studying in India) are obliged to utilize English well. Almost all students found that the most challenging obstacle to pursue their academic career is the language (Muthanna, 2016; Humied, 2023) and Yemeni students are no exception. They use many ways to overcome this difficulty, some are enrolled in institutes, and others implement self-study techniques. They must use dictionaries in their study to translate from English into Arabic or vice versa. In addition to the implementation of GT in academic affairs, they use GT in their daily lives issues; they go shopping, and interact with their Indian and other nationalities friends, so they need the English language to interact and communicate with the people they meet. Furthermore, Yemeni students manipulate GT to translate from Hindi, Marti and Urdu to Arabic and vice versa for those who do not speak English language.

Several studies reported that machine translation (MT) could enable novice learners to interact better (Garcia & Pena, 2011; Naif, 2014). These studies found that machine translation could enable novice learners to interact better. Machine translation has the potential to facilitate interactions and improve communication for novice language learners. Novice learners often struggle with understanding texts or conversations in the target language. MT can help them quickly grasp the general meaning of a text or conversation by providing instant translations. This can enhance their comprehension and allow them to engage more effectively in language interactions. In addition, MT can assist novice learners in expanding their vocabulary. When encountering unfamiliar words or phrases, learners can use machine translation to obtain immediate translations, helping them to bridge the gap in their knowledge and build their vocabulary repertoire. However, it's important to note that MT has limitations and should be used judiciously. While it can provide quick translations, it may not always capture the nuances, idiomatic expressions, or cultural subtleties of a language. Relying solely on machine translation without actively engaging in language learning and practice may hinder the development of essential language skills, such as grammar, syntax, and cultural fluency.

The current study aims to investigate the extent of utilization of GT by Yemeni students, it also tends to scrutinise the Yemeni students' perceptions of using GT in their studies and to explore the advantages and disadvantages of GT from Yemeni students' perspectives.

1.1. The Significance of the Study

Many Yemeni scholars heavily use GT in writing their theses and research papers. Certainly, the exploration of the utilization of GT by Yemeni students is still limited. Having pondered this purpose, the researcher decided to conduct this study to explore the use, advantages, and disadvantages of GT from students' perspectives. The study is limited to exploring the attitude of Yemeni EFL learners studying in India. It also aims to check how advantageous GT is. To address this gap the following are the objectives of the study.

1.2. Research questions

RQ1. To what extent do Yemeni students utilize GT?

RQ2. Do Yemeni students think that GT is advantageous for them?

RQ3 Are there differences among groups concerning using GT_advantages, and the disadvantages?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW
2.1.   Translation and language learning

Language learners are obliged to translate words, texts, passages or even essays to understand the meaning. Translation plays a fundamental role in facilitating the acquisition of knowledge. Using translation in language learning can be a beneficial tool for learners at various stages of proficiency. Translation allows learners to bridge the gap between their native language and the target language, facilitating vocabulary acquisition, grammar understanding, and reading comprehension (Chang et al., 2022; Khoshnood & Kafipour, 2023). By translating texts, learners can explore different linguistic structures, idiomatic expressions, and cultural nuances. It promotes critical thinking skills as learners make decisions about word choices and sentence structure. Translation exercises also provide opportunities for writing practice and help learners develop their ability to express ideas accurately and coherently (Schmidt & Strasser, 2022). However, while translation is a valuable tool, it should be used in conjunction with other language-learning activities to foster a well-rounded language proficiency that encompasses listening, speaking, and communicative skills.

2.2.   Google Translate (GT)

GT is a powerful tool that allows users to translate text, speech, and even images from one language to another (Pham et al., (2022). Many Yemeni students use GT despite their weak English language level, they are not aware of the drawbacks of GT. Yemeni students may acquire the wrong translation from GT. GT can work offline and online, but when it is online, it translates better, so when the user wants to use GT must be ensured that can have access to the internet so that the translation cannot be interpreted. GT is a free multilingual statistical and neural machine translation service developed by Google.

Using GT in language learning has great benefits but is sometimes risky when blindly used. Many scholars have investigated the utilisation of GT and MT in the field of learning languages (Garcia & Pena, 2011; Yulianto & Setiawan, 2018). Google's survey in 2010 revealed that language learners utilized GT to understand foreign words, write an email or article, learn how to write and speak in a foreign language and ensure the correctness of text they have written in a foreign language (Garcia & Pena, 2011). In the same vein, translation is a supporting factor in language learning to improve students' target language. Students employ translation to memorize and retrieve English words to make up for their deficiencies in the English language. (Karimian & Talebinejad, 2013). Implementing GT in teaching and learning a language may stimulate students' autonomy in learning a language (Bahri & Mahadi, 2016). On the contrary, such negative concerns have arisen from using MT (such as GT)

through Auto-didacticism; the claim is that MT harms students' language learning. Heavy dependence on MT may lead to fraudulent learning. Manipulating translation software in language learning is dangerous; it reinforces or even introduces incorrect language habits on the part of the learners. Learners do not have thorough knowledge to identify whether the outcome of MT is correct or not. Furthermore, it exposes learners to poor target language models (Somers, 2003). Studies have shown that MT, including GT, is inaccurate (Groves & Mundt, 2015); students must be aware when using MT. They must know when to use an MT service to avoid doing their tasks. Unfortunately, when students use an MT, they lose a valuable chance to learn how the language functions; MT makes students dependent on it and is inaccurate. (Harris, 2010).

2.3. Advantages of GT

GT offers several advantages that contribute to its popularity as a tool for multilingual communication. First, GT is widely accessible and available for free. It can be accessed through its website or mobile app, making it convenient for anyone with an internet connection to use it whenever needed (Alhaisoni & Alhaysony, 2017). Second, GT supports a vast number of languages, allowing users to translate text between various language pairs. It covers a wide range of commonly spoken languages as well as less commonly spoken ones, which makes it versatile for users around the world. Third, GT provides instant translations, enabling users to quickly understand the general meaning of a text or conversation. This feature makes it valuable for situations that require prompt communication or when time is limited. Fourth, GT continues to improve its translation quality over time through machine learning and data analysis. With regular updates and refinements, the accuracy and reliability of translations provided by Google Translate have shown significant advancements (Almahasees et al., 2021). Fifth, GT offers voice translation capabilities, allowing users to speak or dictate phrases or sentences in one language and have them translated into another language in real-time situations. This feature facilitates spoken communication in multilingual settings.

2.4. Limitations of GT

While GT has these advantages, it is important to note that it also has limitations. Accuracy varies depending on the complexity of the text, the language pair, and the context. It may struggle with idiomatic expressions, nuanced language, or cultural-specific references. Additionally, the translations may not always capture the intended meaning accurately. Also, GT often struggles with understanding the context of a text. It may provide translations based solely on individual words or phrases, without considering the broader context (Ducar & Schocket, 2018). This can result in mistranslations or awkwardly worded sentences. In relation to this notion, Jibreel (2023) tested five MTs' efficiency in translating fixed expressions, he concluded that MTs mistranslate the implied meaning, generate weakly structured and wrongly ordered sentences and distort the meaning of the proverb. In addition, GT may not accurately capture the grammar, syntax, and sentence structure of a language. Translations can be grammatically incorrect or produce unnatural-sounding sentences, requiring additional editing or revision. Another limitation is based on cultural differences between languages. GT may not fully grasp cultural nuances or idiomatic expressions. It may translate idiomatic phrases word-for-word, leading to nonsensical or misleading translations.

2.5. Previous studies

Many studies dealt with translators' uses and perceptions of MT, such as (Kumar, 2012; Bahri & Mahadi, 2016; Yanti & Meka, 2019; Mahdy, 2020; Setiawan & Axelina, 2023), etc. They investigated students' attitudes toward MT and its implementations. GT can be used as a supplementary tool for language learning, as Bahri and Mahadi (2016) examined the use of GT for Language learners at the School of Languages, Literacies, and Translation. They found that most international students at USM recognize GT as an effective supplementary tool for learning vocabulary, writing, and reading. Students reported that they benefited from their self-learning if they were assisted in using GT effectively.

Yanti and Meka (2019) found that using GT in classroom tasks can encourage independent study and improve language-learning strategies. Students are cautious about the outcome of GT and use it cautiously for specific tasks. Kumar (2012) investigated the use of MT systems, including GT, among Arabic-speaking students in business and IT. They use GT to understand concepts, questions, and topics, but their dependency on GT can lead to a lack of creativity in learning English. Almost all students use GT frequently for doing their projects and tasks. Alhaisoni and Alhaysony (2017) investigated the attitudes of Saudi EFL university students toward using GT. The results revealed that students use GT for these most frequent purposes - vocabulary, writing, and reading, whereas translation was the least frequently used. The results also showed that GT is frequently used to understand unknown words, write assignments, and read an English textbook. Orfan (2023) examined the implementation of GT by Afghani students. He surveyed 132 students at a public university using a questionnaire. The study found that participants had positive attitudes towards GT. They were aware of GT's drawbacks and used it for various reasons, including lack of confidence in their own translation. GT was used for general and technical words, idioms, collocations, and translation. The study suggests instructors in Afghanistan to adopt GT in their classes and encourage critical use.

Margiana and Syafryadin (2023) investigated students' perception of GT as an aid for learning English. They used questionnaires to gather data from 43 full-time students. The results showed that students use GT for tasks like translation, diction, synonyms, and pronunciation. Most students have a positive opinion of GT as a tool for learning English.

Ganjalikhani (2014) found that GT struggled with correct Persian sentence structures in English translations due to insufficient programming. While GT can save time and energy, it requires post-edition and pre-edition, which may be unavoidable. Cancino and Panes (2021) found that introducing GT to students enhanced their accuracy scores. They emphasized the need for learners to receive adequate instruction on how to utilize GT.

On the other hand, it was argued that Google Translate has no advantages in the learning process and presents several reasons to support this perspective (Murtisari et al., 2019). Students' reliance on GT might hamper their advancement as independent language learners. The precision of the translations provided by GT is not always accurate and can lead to misunderstandings. Depending on GT might limit students' language creativity and discourage them from exploring different methods of expressing ideas. There might be pitfalls of depending on GT when trying to learn a new language.

The main weakness in the previous studies- in the Yemeni context, is that they did not attempt to discuss the issue of using of GT in learning English language and almost all the previous studies discussed the issues of MT from a translation error perspective. From these

controversial issues, the current study tries to clarify the use of GT by Yemeni EFL learners in learning English and clearly states the advantages and disadvantages of using GT. By identifying these issues, the users, let them be EFL learners or ordinary people, can be directed to when and how to use GT in particular and MT applications in general.

3. METHODOLOGY

This study used a mixed-method design. The data was gathered by conducting a questionnaire as well as an interview. The questionnaire was composed of two main sections – demographic information of the participants and the constructs. The constructs section contained three dimensions: the use of GT, the advantages of GT, and the disadvantages of GT. There are eight statements for the use of the GT dimension, nine statements for the advantage of GT dimension and there are four statements for the disadvantage of GT dimension. The interview was conducted to verify the answers gained from the questionnaire and to explore the other aspects that were not deeply investigated by the questionnaire items as it gave the respondents the liberty to add some ideas related to the use, advantages and disadvantages of GT. 20 participants are considered as appropriate number according to Bernard (2013) as cited in Bekele and Ago (2022) who stated that 10-20 participants "are enough to uncover and understand the major issues in any study of lived experience"(p. 48).

3.1. Validity and reliability of the tools

The questionnaire

Five translation professors evaluated the questionnaire to ensure the items' validity and relevancy. Based on the evaluation of these professors, some statements were modified. The questionnaire was designed by using Google Forms. The questionnaire link was sent to the target participants via WhatsApp groups and Facebook pages. Those groups belong to Yemeni students studying in India. The link was sent to those groups accompanied by a message requesting them to fill up the questionnaire. The questionnaire was piloted to 37 participants to ensure the reliability and validity of the questionnaire. Table 1 shows the score of reliability.

Table 1: Reliability of the questionnaire

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
0.880	0.873	21

As shown in Table 1, the Alpha Cronbach was 0.88 which indicated a good degree of reliability. After ensuring the reliability of the questionnaire, the link was sent to the participants. It was sent to 350 students, but only 283 who were interested in the research topic participated.

3.2. The interview

Another tool was the interview. It was administered to 20 participants who also participated in the questionnaire. The interview questions were sent to five professors to check their suitability and clarity. It was also based on Aberra's (2016) study. Their interviews

were recorded and then transcribed. The interviewees were assigned to numbers to conceal their identities and they were given the codes P1 to P20.

4. DATA ANALYSIS

The collected data were analysed using Statistics software (SPSS) version 22 for descriptive statistics. The data analysis is divided into two sections. The first section discussed the participants' demographic information and the participant's responses to the three dimensions. The second section discussed the responses of the participants to the interview. The scale used for the correction and analysis is shown in Table 2.

Table 2: The levels of means and scale of questionnaire responses.

scale	Length of means	Agreement direction
1	1.00 to 1.80	Strongly Disagree
2	1.81 to 2.60	Disagree
3	2.61- to 3.40	Neutral
4	3.41 to 4.20	Agree
5	4.21 to 5	Strongly Agree

4.1. Participants

The participants of this study were 283 students enrolled in Indian universities. The participant's details are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Participants' demographic information:

	Details	N	%
Gender	Male	263	92.9
	Female	20	7.1
Specialization	English	59	20.8
	Commerce	29	10.2
	Accounting	17	6.0
	Computer Science	39	13.8
	Management	17	6.0
	Science	39	13.8
	Business Administration	24	8.5
	Others	59	20.8
Degree	Diploma	4	1.4
	Bachelor	62	21.9
	Master's	71	25.1
	Ph.D.	146	51.6

Table 3 showed the participants' demographic information, as it can be seen that the majority of respondents were males, as they constitute 92.9%. Yemeni society imposes some restrictions on women travelling abroad; thus Yemeni female students prefer getting inside scholarships. So most participants were male because female students have almost separate social media groups for social and cultural considerations. These scholars are considered the elites and most successful students at their universities. Also in India, many factors might affect the utilization of GT such as the internet service -speed and cost, the academic

environment, and using English in their study. So the results of this study might not be generalized to students who stayed inside Yemen, due to the different environment.

Regarding the specialization, the respondents were from different specializations and the participants covered almost all specializations that Yemeni students study abroad. Selecting almost all specialization is to check whether specialization affects the utilization of GT or not. The majority of the participants were postgraduate students (i.e., Master's and PhD). This strengthens the data collected, as the majority of the participants were postgraduate 25.1% were Master's students and 51.6% were PhD scholars.

5. RESULTS

RQ 1. To what extent do Yemeni students utilize GT?

The participants in the current study responded to the questionnaire items about Yemeni EFL learners' Usage of Google Translate. The mean and the percentage for each item were analysed as shown in Table 4.

Table 4: The Usage of GT

No	Item	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	Category
1	I use GT to check the meaning of unknown words only.	0.4	10.7	7.8	53.0	28.1	3.98	Agree
2	I use GT to translate a paragraph.	5.7	12.8	12.8	52.7	16.0	3.60	Agree
3	I use GT to translate an essay or paper from English into Arabic to enable me to understand the meaning.	11.7	24.2	11.7	35.6	16.7	3.21	Neutral
4	It is easier for me to read texts in Arabic, so I resort to using GT to translate texts from English into Arabic	12.5	23.1	19.2	35.2	10.0	3.07	Neutral
5	My English is weak in writing, so I need to use Google Translate.	16.0	24.6	18.1	28.1	13.2	2.98	Neutral
6	My English is weak in reading, so I need to use Google Translate.	17.8	31.0	19.2	24.2	7.8	2.73	Neutral
7	I use GT to translate an essay, article or paper from Arabic into English to submit it to the teacher.	22.4	31.7	18.9	22.4	4.6	2.55	disagree
8	I write assignments/ papers in Arabic and then translate them into English using GT.	25.3	34.9	15.3	20.6	3.9	2.43	disagree
	Total	13.9	24.1	15.38	33.98	12.54	3.07	Neutral

As can be seen from Table 4, the total mean of the responses was neutral, this indicated that the participants utilized GT cautiously. As four statements happened to be in the 'neutral' category and the last two were under the 'disagree' category only the first two statements occurred in the 'agree' category. The statements in Table 4 were arranged from the highest mean to the lowest. The statement that scored the highest mean was 'I use GT to

check the meaning of unknown words only.' followed by 'I use GT to translate a paragraph', these two statements occurred under the ' agree' category', while the statements that scored the least means were 'I use GT to translate an essay, article or paper from Arabic into English to submit it to the teacher' and 'I write assignments/papers in Arabic and then translate them into English using GT' with means of 2.55 and 2.43 respectively, and they were under ' disagree' category. This finding can be attributed to the idea that GT does not provide accurate results (Hisan et al., 2020). The overall responses to this dimension were unexpectedly 'neutral' as the total mean of all statements was 3.07 'neutral' this means that the utilization of GT was very low. Turning now to the other dimension the advantage of GT from the point view of the Yemeni scholars at Indian Universities, the next section illustrates some of the main advantages of GT.

RQ 2. Do Yemeni students think that GT is advantageous for them?

The advantages of using GT are numerous and make it an essential tool for anyone who needs to communicate in different languages quickly and to some extent accurately. The main features of the advantages of GT are considered by using the percentage and the mean for each item and the total mean of the construct.

Table 5: The advantage of GT

No	Item	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	Category
1	GT needs less proofreading and editing by English language experts	.7	.7	5.3	35.9	57.3	4.48	Strongly Agree
2	GT saves my time	2.5	3.2	16.0	59.4	18.9	3.89	Agree
3	The advantages of GT are far more than the disadvantages	2.1	9.6	23.5	51.6	13.2	3.64	Agree
4	GT is suitable for translating English into Arabic	3.6	11.4	22.8	53.0	9.3	3.53	agree
5	I use GT to improve my English language by translating different types of texts	6.8	19.2	20.3	43.8	10.0	3.31	Neutral
6	GT is suitable for translating Arabic into English	4.3	19.6	32.7	39.1	4.3	3.20	Neutral
7	GT is suitable for translating documents related to my field.	7.8	24.2	28.1	34.5	5.3	3.05	Neutral
8	GT's translation is acceptable in terms of the assignment/paper that I deliver to my teacher/guide	12.8	33.1	29.2	21.7	3.2	2.69	Neutral
9	I am satisfied with the outcome of the GT	17.1	35.6	20.6	20.3	6.4	2.63	Neutral
	Total	6.41	17.40	22.06	39.92	14.21	3.38	Neutral

Results shown in Table 5 indicated that the participants felt that GT had some advantages. However, they had some reservations. The statement that states 'GT needs less proofreading and editing by English language experts' got the highest rank and it received the 'strongly agree 'category. Furthermore, these participants think that the advantages of GT are

far more than the disadvantages. On the opposite end, the two last statements, 'GT's translation is acceptable in terms of the assignment/paper that I deliver to my teacher/guide' and 'I am satisfied with the outcome of GT, scored the least means 2.69 and 2.63 respectively, this means that these statements occur under 'Neutral' category. The total mean of items computed for this dimension was 3.38, which occurs, in the 'neutral' category. However, GT also has several drawbacks, it is vitally important to have such an account of the disadvantages of GT from the point of view of the Yemeni scholars studying at Indian universities. The next section illustrates some of the main disadvantages of GT.

The dependency on GT might cause a shortcoming instead of learning a new language properly (Ismail Omar, 2021). Kumar (2012) went furthermore claiming that "the use and dependency on MT has led to the loose in touch with English language and vocabulary"(p. 444). While it may be tempting to rely on translation tools instead of putting in the effort to learn a new language, this approach ultimately limits one's ability to communicate effectively with people from other cultures. The following table discusses the most important disadvantages of GT.

Table 6: The Disadvantage of GT

No	Item	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	Category
1	GT makes me lazy	1.4	16.0	27.0	38.4	17.1	3.54	Agree
2	GT makes me dependent on it	2.8	16.7	21.4	44.8	14.2	3.51	Agree
3	GT provides a bad language structure	1.4	16.4	33.8	33.1	15.3	3.44	Agree
4	I am dependent on GT for everything related to my study	10.3	24.6	39.5	23.5	2.1	2.83	Neutral
	Total	3.97	18.42	30.42	34.95	12.18	3.33	Neutral

Table 6 depicts the responses gained from the participants regarding the disadvantages of GT. The results indicated that the participants estimated that GT is more advantageous as the total mean of the advantages of GT was 3.38 'Neutral' while the mean of the disadvantages was 3.33 'Neutral'. Going further to analyse each item separately. Making the users of GT lazy and dependent on GT are among the most disadvantages of GT. The statements related to these notions scored the highest values, and they occur in the 'agree' category. Strong evidence from the data revealed that almost all Yemeni students think that GT provides a bad language structure. Regarding the dependency on GT for everything related to the participants' activities, it was found that the item that was related to this notion scored the least mean. Interestingly, the total mean of items computed for this dimension was 3.33, which occurs, in the 'neutral' category. Data from this table can be compared with the data in Table 2 which showed that the participants' perception towards the disadvantages of GT was least among the dimensions of the current study. Using the questionnaire to investigate the perception of the participants towards the use, advantages and disadvantages of GT seems to be not sufficient, so it was paramount to consider the demographic background of the participants and its effects on the three dimensions.

RQ 3. Are there differences among groups concerning using GT, advantages, and the disadvantages?

A descriptive analysis was performed to find out the effect of gender, degree, and specialization of the participants on the use, advantages and disadvantages of GT dimensions. The results are shown in Table 7.

Table 7: The means responses of the participants for each dimension

		Disadvantages	Sig	Advantages	Sig	Use	Sig	Total mean
Gender	Male	3.34	0.56	3.38	0.782	3.06	0.687	3.26
	Female	3.13		3.38		3.13		3.21
	Total	3.32		3.38		3.07		3.26
Degree	Diploma	3.44	0.802	3.94	0.048	3.53	0.005	3.64
	Bachelor	3.22		3.46		3.28		3.32
	Master	3.28		3.49		3.20		3.32
	PhD	3.29		3.31		2.89		3.16
	Total	3.28		3.40		3.06		3.25
Specialization	English	3.14	0.076	2.98	000	2.41	000	2.84
	Commerce	3.48		3.69		3.49		3.55
	Accounting	3.33		3.64		3.50		3.49
	Computer Science	3.16		3.60		3.30		3.36
	Management	3.04		3.41		2.90		3.12
	Science	3.41		3.55		3.20		3.39
	business Administration	3.36		3.37		3.05		3.26
	Others	3.30		3.36		3.16		3.27
	Total	3.27		3.39		3.06		3.24

In response to the study research question 3, the results in Table 7 showed that there was no significant difference between male and female students in their perception of disadvantages, advantages and use of GT. All the means of male and female responses for these constructs were clustered around neutral categories.

Regarding the differences between groups according to their degrees (i.e., Bachelor, Master, PhD students the results revealed that there was a significant difference among the groups related to advantages (*P-Value*=0.048) and use (*P-Value*=0.005). The mean for advantages was 3.94, 3.46, 3.49 for diploma, bachelor, and master's respectively which indicated agreement. However, it was neutral at 3.31 for PhD students. The mean for GT use was 3.53 which indicated agreement for diploma students. However, it was neutral (3.28, 3.20, 2.89) for Bachelor, Master's, and PhD respectively. Regarding the disadvantages category, the results show no significant difference according to the degree (*P-Value*=0.80).

Regarding the differences between groups according to their specialization, the results revealed that there were no significant differences between the groups related to disadvantages (*P-Value*=0.07). The total mean for disadvantages was 3.27 which indicated neutral. However, the mean was 3.48 and 3.41 for commerce and science students respectively, which indicated

agreement category. The means for other specializations were clustered around the neutral category. On the other hand, there were significant differences between the groups regarding advantages and use (*P-Value*=0.00). The total means indicated agreement for both constructs 3.39 for advantages and 3.06 for use.

Results from the interviews about students' perceptions of GT

To elicit the students' perceptions about GT, 20 participants were selected randomly for the interview. Their responses were analysed using thematic analysis. Similar responses were categorised together. These interviewees claimed that GT was used to check new English words, Participants P3, P4 and P15 assumed that "GT was used in translating intricate English sentences". Participants P1, P2, P5 and P8 reported that: "GT was a good tool to support them specifically in writing their homework, as it translates quickly and conveniently". Only two participants P.17 and P20 used GT in writing essays. P13 claimed that "GT has disadvantages more than advantages because it makes me always compose my ideas first in Arabic, this kills my creativity in English ". The majority of participants' perceptions about the implementation of GT in their writing research, assignments and translations were moderate as the participants P3, P7, P9, P10 and P12 assumed, "they use GT with a rate between 55% to 60%", While p19 unexpectedly reported that he uses GT with a rate between 90% to 95 % when doing his academic works.

As expected, these participants reported that "GT had some errors regarding structure and semantics- connotations and denotation". P7 also added, "when I write my assignment, my teacher almost replied to me stating that my writing lacks accurateness and clarity". One of very good notion by P6 who claimed that " GT is not bad, but I do not usually use it due to the accuracy, I always find that the outcome of GT makes me make double efforts, I need to understand the outcome, then I do paraphrasing to make my writing academically acceptable". P14 and P17 reported that GT saved them time.

P18 reported that his perception of GT is bad, he stated, "It is bad, I do not use GT in writing my articles but rarely I use it for some passages but not all types of passages". P11 clearly stated that "in the past decades, GT was useless. It only gave one meaning. But now GT has advanced drastically, it gives many meanings, and I use the most suitable. I always use GT because I discovered that it is very helpful." P16 claimed that he uses GT due to his bad English as he said "I use GT because my English language is weak. So I write the assignment in Arabic then I translate it by using GT".

6. DISCUSSION

The current study aims to investigate the extent to which Yemeni students use Google Translate (GT). The findings from the questionnaire responses revealed that the participants' utilization of GT was for words and sentences, but when it comes to longer passages such as easy and papers their utilization becomes less, this finding goes in the same vein as that of Chompurach(2021) who found that "all participants mostly used GT in word-level because they believed that GT cannot render longer sentences and grammar correctly"(p.26). This suggests that the participants did not heavily rely on GT for their language translation needs, this finding goes with what was found by Alhaisoni and Alhaysony (2017) who found that students did

not heavily rely on GT, this might be ascribed that these students who travelled abroad have a good background about English, as it was noticed that the more qualified in English the less utilized of GT this goes with the finding of Pham et al., (2022) who found that "students who had inadequate English skills were becoming increasingly reliant on GT" (p.82), on the contrary, the finding of the current study goes against the finding of Kumar(2012) who stated that some students feel that without GT they cannot learn English.

The second research question was about the advantages of using GT as reported by the participants. The findings indicate that GT offers numerous advantages (Briggs 2018), making it an essential tool for individuals who need to communicate in different languages quickly and, to some extent, accurately. The results demonstrated that the participants recognized several advantages associated with GT. However, it is important to note that they also had some reservations. They stated that the translation of GT can be easily edited and proofread to amend the defects of GT. This suggests that the participants acknowledged the need for human intervention in editing and proofreading the translations produced by GT. This finding highlights the participants' awareness that GT should not be solely relied upon for producing flawless translations. These findings align with previous research of Nadhianti (2016) and Van Rensburg et al.(2012) which emphasized the need for MTPE and the potential limitations of machine translation tools like GT.

The third research question seeks to explore the impact of gender, academic degree, and specialization on the perception and usage of GT, as well as its advantages and disadvantages. The results concluded with interesting findings about these factors. Firstly, in terms of gender, the analysis revealed no significant difference between male and female students in their perception of the advantages, disadvantages, and usage of GT. Both male and female participants showed similar responses, with means clustered around the neutral category. This suggests that gender does not play a significant role in shaping attitudes and behaviours towards GT usage among the participants in this study the finding of this study is not consistent with the finding of Jin and Deifell (2013) who found that almost all FL had a positive attitude with a range of 75%.

Moving on to the influence of academic degree, a significant difference was observed among the groups concerning the advantages and usage of GT. Specifically, the means for the advantages dimension indicated agreement for diploma and bachelor's degree students, whereas it was neutral for master's and Ph.D. students. Similarly, the mean for GT usage was in the agreement category for diploma students but neutral for bachelor's, master's, and PhD students. This suggests that diploma students were more likely to perceive and utilize GT's advantages compared to students with higher degrees this finding was supported by Jin and Deifell (2013) who found the respondent's perceptions neutral about online dictionaries and are better perceived by beginners. The reasons behind this difference could be further explored in future research.

Regarding specialization differences, the results revealed a significant difference among the groups concerning the disadvantages of GT. The total means for disadvantages indicated a neutral stance. However, when examining specific specializations, commerce and science students showed agreement with the disadvantages. In contrast, other specializations had means clustered around the neutral category. This suggests that commerce and science students may perceive more disadvantages associated with GT compared to students in other

specializations. Further investigation could be conducted to understand the underlying reasons behind these differences and the specific concerns raised by commerce and science students.

Regarding the data obtained from the interview, it was found that the student's perception of using GT clustered about checking new English words, translating intricate sentences, and supporting homework writing. Most participants used GT for research, assignments, and translations, with a moderate rate of 55% to 60%. However, some participants reported errors in structure and semantics, and their writing lacked accuracy and clarity. Some participants found GT helpful, but others found it time-consuming. This finding is consistent with the finding of Korosec (2011) who reported that professional translators claim that MTPE requires more time than translating from scratch, nevertheless, Benhima et al., (2021) and Pham, et al (2022) found the opposite as they stated that GT saves students' time to learn vocabulary. Some participants felt that GT was useful for certain passages but not all types of passages. Some participants believed that GT was useful for improving their English language skills, while others used it due to their weak English. Overall, the study highlights the potential benefits and drawbacks of using GT in various aspects of writing, research, and academic work.

All in all, the findings demonstrate that while gender did not significantly impact perceptions and usage of GT, there were notable differences based on degree and specialization. Diploma and bachelor's degree students were more likely to perceive and utilize the advantages of GT, while master's and PhD students were more neutral in their attitudes. Furthermore, commerce and science students expressed more concerns and disadvantages related to GT compared to students in other specializations. These findings provide insights into the varying perspectives and behaviours towards GT usage based on degree and field of study. Future research can further explore the underlying factors influencing these differences and investigate strategies to address any concerns or limitations identified by specific student groups.

7. CONCLUSION

This study examined the extent of Yemeni students' usage of GT and explored its advantages and disadvantages. The findings revealed that the participants' utilization of GT was moderate (neutral), indicating that they did not heavily rely on it for language learning. The participants acknowledged several advantages of GT, including its ability to facilitate quick communication in different contexts. While GT offers convenience and speed, its usage should be accompanied by further editing and proofreading to ensure translation quality. The study highlighted the need to strike a balance between the convenience of machine translation and the expertise of human translators to achieve accurate and high-quality translations.

Furthermore, the study explored the impact of gender, academic degree, and specialization on perceptions and usage of GT. It was found no significant differences according to gender variables. However, academic degrees and specializations have influenced participants' perceptions and usage of such degrees. Students with diplomas and bachelor's degrees showed greater agreement with the advantages of GT, while master's and PhD students had a more neutral stance. Commerce and science students expressed more concerns and disadvantages related to GT compared to other specializations.

The study also revealed that most students use GT for research, assignments, and translations, at a moderate rate. However, some participants found that GT suffers from errors in structure and semantics, and their writing lacked accuracy and clarity. Some find GT helpful, while others find it time-consuming. Some use GT for improving English language skills, while others use it due to their low level of English.

These findings provide valuable insights into the factors that shape Yemeni students' perceptions and behaviours towards GT. Understanding these factors can help in forming effective strategies to address concerns and limitations associated with GT usage in different educational contexts.

The pedagogical implication can be raised in the article that it is important to teach students about the limitations and potential inaccuracies of GT in particular and machine translation in general. Educators should emphasize the need for human MTPE and proofreading GT-generated translations to ensure translation quality. This can be done by incorporating activities that involve comparing GT translations with human translations, discussing the potential errors and inaccuracies of GT, and providing guidance on how to effectively edit and proofread machine-generated translations, informing them that GT faces difficulty in translating the implied meaning and potential inaccuracies. By doing so, students will develop a critical understanding of GT and be better equipped to use it as a tool in their language-learning journey. Future research could delve deeper into the specific concerns raised by different student groups and investigate approaches to enhance the integration of machine translation tools like GT within language learning and translation processes. Future research can delve deeper into the specific reservations and concerns that participants have regarding GT to further enhance our understanding of its role in language communication.

Acknowledgements

Declaration of conflicting interests

The author declared no potential conflicts of interest concerning the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Ethics statement

All participants were informed that their participation would be confidential and be used for research purposes. Their consent was taken verbally.

Availability of data and material

The datasets generated are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

REFERENCES

Abdelhalim, S. M. (2022). An investigation into English majors' self-regulated writing strategies in an online learning context. *Language Teaching Research*, https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688221100296

Aberra, M. (2016). A Study on the Implementation of the Process Approach to the Teaching/Learning of the Course Basic Writing Skills: The Case of Hawassa University. *International Journal of Linguistics and Literature (IJLL)*, *5*, 17-34.

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:10.5296/ijele.v5i1.10696

Almahasees, Z., Meqdadi, S., & Albudairi, Y. (2021). Evaluation of Google Translate in rendering English COVID-19 texts into Arabic. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *17*(4), 2065-2080. https://doi.org/10.52462/jlls.149

Bahri, H., & Mahadi, T. S. T. (2016). Google Translate as a Supplementary Tool for Learning Malay: A Case Study at Universiti Sains Malaysia. A*dvances in Language and Literary Studies, 7*(3), 161-167. http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.7n.3p.161

Bekele, W. B., & Ago, F. Y. (2022). Sample size for interview in qualitative research in social sciences: A guide to novice researchers. *Research in Educational Policy and Management*, *4*(1), 42-50. https://doi.org/10.46303/repam.2022.3

Benhima, M., Tilwani, S. A., & Asif, M. (2021). English language learners' use of translation and attitudes towards learning vocabulary. *TESOL International Journal*, *16*(4.3), 157-175.

Briggs, N. (2018). Neural Machine Translation Tools in the Language Learning Classroom: Students' Use, Perceptions, and Analyses. *Jalt call journal*, *14*(1), 2-24. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1177331.pdf

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

Chang, P., Chen, P. J., & Lai, L. L. (2022). Recursive editing with Google Translate: the impact on writing and error correction. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1-26. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2022.2147192

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), 23-35. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v14n12p23

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

Ganjalikhani, M. K. (2014, June). An investigation of Google Translate machine in rendering English sentence structures into Persian. In *Proceeding of the Global Conference On Language Practice & Information Technology (GLIT 2014)* (pp. 9-10).

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

Hisan, M. H. M., Weerasinghe, A. R., & Pushpananda, B. H. R. (2020). Cross-language information retrieval for accessing the English web in Sinhala. In *2020 20th International Conference on Advances in ICT for Emerging Regions (ICTer)* (pp. 244-249). IEEE.

Humied, I. A. H. (2023). Key determinants and strategies for cybersecurity education in Yemen. *Journal of Digital Educational Technology, 3*(2),https://doi.org/10.30935/jdet/13178

Ismail Omar, L. (2021). The use and abuse of machine translation in vocabulary acquisition among L2 Arabic-speaking learners. *AWEJ for Translation & Literary Studies*, *5*(1).

Jibreel, I. (2023). Online Machine Translation Efficiency in Translating Fixed Expressions Between English and Arabic (Proverbs as a Case-in-Point). *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *13*(5), 1148-1158. Doi: https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1305.07

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.

Karimian, Z., & Talebinejad, M. R. (2013). Students' Use of Translation as a Learning Strategy in EFL Classroom. *Journal of Language Teaching & Research*, *4*(3).

Khoshnood, A., & Kafipour, R. (2023). The Effect of Mother Tongue Translation on Iranian Extroverted and Introverted EFL Learners' Vocabulary Learning. *Education Research International*, 2023,*1-10*. https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/2255400

Korosec, M. K. (2011). The Internet, Google Translate and Google Translator Toolkit-nuisance or necessity in translator training. *Retrieved from: Auditorium Du Cnrs, Paris le*, *3*.

Kumar, A. (2012). Machine translation in Arabic-speaking ELT classrooms: Applications and implications. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, *2*(6), 442.

Ly, C. K. (2023). English as a global language: An exploration of EFL learners' beliefs in Vietnam. *International Journal of TESOL & Education*, *3*(1), 19-33. https://doi.org/10.54855/ijte.23312

Mahdy, O. S. M., Samad, S. S., & Mahdi, H. S. (2020). The attitudes of professional translators and translation students towards computer-assisted translation tools in Yemen. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *16*(2), 1084-1095.

Margiana, M., & Syafryadin, S. (2023). Students' Perception of the Use Google Translate in English Learning. *Jadila: Journal of Development and Innovation in Language and Literature Education*, *3*(2), 171-182. https://doi.org/10.52690/jadila.v3i2.414

Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. London and New York: Routledge, 1st edition.

Murtisari, E. T., Widiningrum, R., Branata, J., & Susanto, R. D. (2019). Google Translate in Language Learning: Indonesian EFL Students' Attitudes. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, *16*(3), 978.

Muthanna, A. (2016). Teaching and learning EFL writing at Yemeni Universities: A review of current practices. *Teaching EFL writing in the 21st century Arab World: Realities and challenges*, 221-243. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-46726-3_9

Nadhianti, M. (2016). An analysis of accuracy level of Google Translate in English-bahasa Indonesia and Bahasa Indonesia-English translations. *Sastra Inggris-Quill*, *5*(4), 296-303.

Naif, M. (2014). Integrating Translation and Writing Processes in Translator Training Programs to Match Real World Practices. *American Journal of Translation Studies*, *6*(2), 1-43.

Orfan, S. N. (2023). Undergraduate English Students' Use of Google Translate in Afghanistan: A Case Study. *International Journal of Web-Based Learning and Teaching Technologies (IJWLTT)*, *18*(1), 1-14. https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4584-1965

Pham, A. T., Nguyen, Y. N. N., Tran, L. T., Huynh, K. D., Le, N. T. K., & Huynh, P. T. (2022). University students' perceptions on the use of Google Translate: Problems and solutions. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (Online)*, *17*(4), 79. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v17i04.28179

Pham, A., Nguyen, Y., Tran, L., Huynh, K., Le, N., & Huynh, P. (2022). University students' perceptions on the use of Google Translate: Problems and solutions. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (iJET)*, *17*(4), 79-94.

Schmidt, T. O. R. B. E. N., & Strasser, T. H. O. M. A. S. (2022). Artificial intelligence in foreign language learning and teaching: a CALL for intelligent practice. *Anglistik: International Journal of English Studies*, *33*(1), 165-184. https://doi.org/10.33675/ANGL/2022/1/14

Setiawan, A., & Axelina, M. (2023). The English Students' Perception in Using Google Translate and U–Dictionary at Translation Class. *International Social Sciences and Humanities*, *2*(1), 1-6.

Statista. (2023, August,1). The most spoken languages worldwide in 2023. Retrieved from Statista: https://www.statista.com/statistics/266808/the-most-spoken-languages-worldwide/

Van Rensburg, A., Snyman, C., & Lotz, S. (2012). Applying Google Translate in a higher education environment: Translation products assessed. *Southern African linguistics and applied language studies*, *30*(4), 511-524. https://doi.org/10.2989/16073614.2012.750824

Wang, Y. (2023). Artificial Intelligence Technologies in College English Translation Teaching. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-023-09960-5

Yanti, M., & Meka, L. M. C. (2019). The students' perception in using Google Translate as a media in translation class. In *Proceedings of INACELT (International Conference on English Language Teaching)* (Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 128-146).

Yulianto, I. D., & Setiawan, T. (2018). Translation Assisted Language Learning: Translation as A Media in Language Teaching. *Proceedings of the International Conference of Communication Science Research (ICCSR 2018)*, 258–261. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2991/iccsr-18.2018.56