

Article History:

Submitted:  
24-01-2024  
Accepted:  
02-02-2024  
Published:  
09-02-2024



## THE USE OF TRANSLATION TOOL IN ARGUMENTATIVE WRITING PROCESS

Elsya Ayu Fadhillah<sup>1</sup>, Tatik Irawati<sup>2</sup>  
<sup>1,2</sup>, PGRI Jombang University, Indonesia

Email: <sup>1</sup>[elsyaaf10@gmail.com](mailto:elsyaaf10@gmail.com)  
<sup>2</sup>[tatik.stkipjb@gmail.com](mailto:tatik.stkipjb@gmail.com)

URL: <https://ejournal.stkipjb.ac.id/index.php/jeel/article/view/3500>  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32682/jeell.v10i2.3500>

### Abstract

The purpose of this research to find out how English students use translation tools in the process of argumentative writing. This research was conducted qualitative method by using audio-visual materials in the form of screen recordings of students' writing and questionnaires in the form of a combination of closed and open-ended questionnaires. The results showed the planning stage, students used Google Translate to check the meaning of unknown words, translate phrases, translate clauses and translate sentences. Then, students use *DeepL Translator* to check the meaning of unknown words, translate phrases and translate sentences, also use Microsoft Word Translator to check the meaning of unknown words, translate phrases, translate clauses and translate sentences. At the drafting stage, students use Google Translate to translate clauses, sentences and paragraphs. In addition, students use *DeepL Translator* to translate sentences and paragraphs. At the editing stage, students use Google Translate to check the meaning of unknown words and translate clauses. Finally, at the final draft stage, students have finished writing, so they no longer use translators at this stage.

**Keyword:** *Translation Tool, Argumentative Writing Process, English Students*

### Abstrak

Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui bagaimana mahasiswa bahasa Inggris menggunakan alat penerjemahan dalam proses penulisan argumentatif. Penelitian ini dilakukan dengan metode kualitatif dengan menggunakan materi audio-visual berupa rekaman layar tulisan mahasiswa dan kuesioner berupa kombinasi kuesioner tertutup dan terbuka. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan tahap perencanaan, siswa menggunakan *Google Translate* untuk memeriksa arti kata yang tidak diketahui, menerjemahkan frasa, menerjemahkan klausa, dan menerjemahkan kalimat. Kemudian, mahasiswa menggunakan *DeepL Translator* untuk mengecek arti kata yang tidak diketahui, menerjemahkan frasa dan menerjemahkan kalimat, serta menggunakan *Microsoft Word Translator* untuk mengecek arti kata yang tidak diketahui, menerjemahkan frasa, menerjemahkan klausa dan menerjemahkan kalimat. Pada tahap penyusunan, siswa menggunakan *Google Translate* untuk menerjemahkan klausa, kalimat, dan paragraf. Selain itu, siswa menggunakan *DeepL Translator* untuk menerjemahkan kalimat dan paragraf. Pada tahap penyuntingan, siswa menggunakan *Google Translate* untuk memeriksa arti kata-kata yang tidak diketahui dan menerjemahkan klausa. Terakhir, pada tahap draf akhir, siswa telah selesai menulis, sehingga mereka tidak lagi menggunakan penerjemah pada tahap ini.

**Kata kunci:** *Alat penerjemah, proses menulis argumentatif, siswa bahasa Inggris*

### Introduction

Writing is considered challenging by EFL learners. According to Bangun and Mustafa (2021), EFL learners experience weaknesses in transferring ideas naturally from their language to English due to sometimes inappropriate word choice or context. This is triggered by the low English vocabulary mastered by them. Nevertheless, EFL learners need to be able to write English texts well so that it can be easily accepted and understood by others (Ariyanti, 2016). Therefore, translation becomes important for EFL learners to achieve the target language.

In this modern age, language translation is not a difficult thing to do. Technological advances have created translation tools that facilitate the process of language translation. According to Odacioglu and Kokturk (2015), technological integration has changed rapidly from 1980 to the present and translation software has been created. Especially since the rapid development of

artificial intelligence (AI), translation tools have gained popularity in recent years (Deng and Yu, 2022). Translation tool is a software that can predict translation words from one language to another (Mahardika, 2017). It is a communication technology engine that can help readers to understand foreign language texts (Pym, 2011). In addition, it helps users to know the meaning of words, phrases and clauses (Marito & Ashari, 2017).

In this 21st century era, there has been a lot of integration of translation tools in education (Deng and Yu, 2022). The integration of the tools has received academic attention in language teaching and learning. In terms of educational necessity, translation allows the pedagogical system to enhance its effectiveness and helps English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners to improve their awareness and utilization of the target language (Kim, 2011). Now, there are so many online translation tools with differences languages, newer and more complete service features freely available on the Internet, such as Google Translate, Bing Translator, Yandex Translator and others (Fitria, 2021). Besides that, there are several other translation tools available, including Microsoft Language Portal, SmartCAT, Memsorce, The Free Dictionary, Fluency Now, and the most commonly used one is Google Translate (Bangun and Mustafa, 2021).

Therefore, the use of translation tools will make it easier for EFL learners when writing into English language quickly. Kroll (1990) states that writing is a similar process for both L1 and L2 writers due to its complexity and creativity. People write in their second languages in much the same way that they do in their mother tongues. More proficient second language writers tend to plan (either before or while writing), revise and edit their writing more effectively and extensively (Cumming, 2001). It is the same for EFL learners, they are transferring ideas from their mother tongue into English as a target language when they write. They need to use the right vocabulary and pay close attention to the extent of their planning in writing. Therefore, EFL learners go through several processes that are necessary when writing English and they also use the help of translation tools to help them complete their writing.

In this regard, some previous studies on the utilization of translation tools by EFL students in writing classes have been conducted by previous researchers. Like the study conducted by Chandra and Yuyun (2018), they investigated the use of Google Translate in essay writing and its role in language learning. It showed students' use of GT including vocabulary, grammar and spelling. In addition, GT is also considered as a dictionary as most students use it to

understand vocabulary. The same was done by Inderawati et al., (2023). They investigated how English students use Google Translate when writing argumentative essays. The results showed that GT enriched students' vocabulary and improved their writing skills. Students used the tool to find words, synonyms, fast results and correct pronunciation. The two studies used qualitative approach and focused on the use of Google Translate by students in EFL writing.

Another study was conducted by Murtisari et al. (2019) on the EFL students' attitudes towards the use of Google Translate for general use and in reading and writing tasks. It found that GT enriched vocabulary, but the tool was found to encourage avoidance of the target language when EFL students translated longer texts. Their use of GT was based on convenience, lower language proficiency and lack of awareness of the ethics of its use. The same research was also conducted by Mulyani and Afina (2021) who investigated the attitudes of EFL students towards the performance of Google Translate. The results students used GT to check the meaning of words and to translate sentences, GT very helpful in the teaching and learning process, regardless of how it was used, and students respond positively to GT. The two studies used qualitative approaches and had a similarity on the students' attitudes towards the use of Google Translate.

Based on this case, researcher found that there are previous studies about the utilization of translation tools by EFL learners the use of Google Translate in EFL writing and students' attitude towards the use of Google Translate. However, here researcher found a gap in the research conducted by Chandra and Yuyun (2018), Inderawati et al. (2023), Murtisari et al. (2019), and Mulyani and Afina (2021) regarding the use of Google Translate in EFL writing. In those studies, it was explained that only Google Translate was examined as a translation tool used by students in writing and the results showed that overall students used Google Translate to increase their vocabulary. These studies did not investigate how students used Google Translate as a translation tool to find vocabulary at each stage of writing. So, the novelty of this study is interested in investigating whether there are other translation tools besides Google Translate that students use when writing, considering that currently different types of translation tools have been developed, and how students use these translation tools when writing argumentative, from the pre-writing stage to the final writing

stage. Therefore, researcher conduct a study to know how English students at PGRI Jombang university use translation tools in argumentative writing process.

## **Research Methods**

In this study, researcher used qualitative approach to investigate the phenomenon that occurred in the field about how English student at PGRI Jombang university used translation tools in argumentative writing process by using descriptive case study. The subject of the research were students of the fourth semester of English Language Department B class. The instrument of the research was audio-visual material was obtained from screen recordings of the participants while they were writing using Bandicam and OBS Studio application. Meanwhile, the second data taken from questionnaire used combination of open and close ended questionnaire, adapted from Susanto (2017).

## **Results and Discussion**

### ***Results***

The argumentative writing process was divided into 4 namely the planning stage, the drafting stage, the editing stage, and the final draft stage. From the data collected, English students carried out argumentative writing assignments by choosing one of the topics provided, including “(1) *should boarding schools still exist as a way to let students communicate and live in a restricted learning environment?* (2) *mobile phone makes people anti -social,* (3) *is it ok for parents to physically discipline their child?* and (4) *do you think that abortion should be made illegal?”* with a minimum writing limit of 700 words. In doing argumentative writing, researcher found that students used the help of translation tools including Google Translate, DeepL Translator, and Microsoft Word Translator. The following was detailed explanation:

#### **a. Students Used Translation Tool in Students’ Planning Stage**

In the planning stage, English students started working on argumentative writing by choosing one of several topics to be developed in their writing, then they made a thesis statement related to the chosen topic, then they made a brainstorming consisting of several pro, contrasts, and refutations arguments of the thesis statement already made. After that, students developed the brainstorming into an outline started from compiling an introduction, body, and conclusion as a basis for compiling an essay draft.

The following was detailed explanation of how students did argumentative writing in the planning stage:

**Student 1** choose topic *"Mobile phones makes people anti-social"* used Google Translate. In data 1 with code 1PW2, student 1 translated the word *"Mengancam"* from Indonesia language into *"Threaten"* to know the meaning of the word in English. In data 2 with code 1PF3, student 1 translated the phrase *"Sudah terbiasa"* from Indonesian language to *"Already accustomed"* in English language. In data 3 with code 1PS6, student 1 translated sentences *"Sebagai pengguna, kita harus pandai menggunakan mobile phone, mana yang penting dan mana yang tidak. Ada kalanya kita lebih memperhatikan hubungan sosial kita daripada sekadar hubungan daring."* from Indonesian language into English language became *"As users, we must be good at using mobile phones, which ones are important and which are not. There are times when we pay more attention to our social relationships than just online relationships"*. Based on this, it could be explained that in the planning stage, student 1 used Google Translate in various ways, namely to check the meaning of unknown words, translated phrases, and translated sentences.

**Student 2** choose topic *"Is it ok for a parent to physically his child?"* used Google Translate. In data 1 with code 2PC10, student 2 translated Indonesian clause *"Menyebabkan anak menjadi kurang percaya diri, pemalu, dan sedih karena takut salah"* into English clause *"Causing children to be less confident, shy, and sad because they are afraid of guilt"*. Whereas in data 2 with code 2PS21, student 2 translates sentences from Indonesian language *"Peran orang tua dalam mendidik anak sangat penting guna untuk mendukung tumbuh kembang seorang anak."* became English sentence *"The role of parents in educating children is very important in order to support the growth and development of a child"*. From this, it could be explained that student 2 did not had better English skills than student 1 because student 2 used Google Translate directly to translate clauses and sentences.

**Student 3** choose topic *"Mobile phones makes people anti-social"* also used Google Translate. In data 1 with code 3PC30, student 3 translated clauses from Indonesian language *"Mengurangi interaksi tatap muka dengan orang"* into English clause *"Reduce face-to-face interactions with people"*. Then in data 2 with code 3PS44, student 3 translated sentences from Indonesian language *"Penggunaan handphone tidak hanya menimbulkan dampak negatif seperti anti sosial, namun kenyataannya ada juga dampak positif dari handphone seperti menambah teman dan relasi maupun ilmu dari keteknologian."* Into English sentence *"The use of cellphones does not only have*

*negative impacts such as being anti-social, but in fact there are also positive impacts from cellphones such as adding friends and relationships as well as knowledge from technology*". Based upon this, it could be explained that student 3 had the same English skills as student 2 and did not had better English skills than student 1, because student 3 used Google translate directly to translate clauses and translate sentences.

**Student 4** choose topic *"Is it ok for parent to physically his child?"* also used Google Translate at the planning stage. In data 1 with code 4PC48 it was found that student 4 translated the Indonesian clause *"Anak akan menjadi berani kepada orang tuanya"* became English clause *"Children will be brave to their parents"*. In data 2 with code 4PS53, student 4 translated sentences *"Anak-anak akan berani membentak orang tuanya karena seiring berjalannya waktu sikap anak akan menjadi mengerti dan itu yang menyebabkan anak menjadi berani kepada orang tua saat merasakan sakit dan mereka tidak menerima hal tersebut."* from Indonesian language into English language *"Children will dare to yell at their parents because over time the child's attitude will become more understanding and that is what causes children to be brave to their parents when they feel pain and they don't accept it."*. In addition, in data 3 with code 4PW57 it was found that student 4 translated word from English *"Fourth"* became *"Keempat"* to know the meaning in Indonesian language. Derived from this, it could be explained that student 4 also did not had better English skills than student 1 because apart from using Google Translate to check the meaning of words in English to Indonesian, student 4 was the same as students 2 and 3 used Google Translate directly to translate clauses and sentences.

**Student 5** choose topic *"Mobile phones makes people anti-social"* also used Google Translate at the planning stage. In data 1 with code 5PC70, student 5 translated clauses from Indonesian language *"Setelah dewasa akan muncul sikap seperti selalu menyalahkan orang lain, menganggap orang lain selalu salah dan ia selalu benar."* Into English clause *"After becoming adult, they attitudes such as always blaming others, assuming other people are always wrong and they are always right is going to appear"*. In data 2 with code 5PS60, student 5 translated Indonesian sentence *"Kebanyakan orang tua tidak sadar bahwa pendisiplinan dengan ketat maka akan berdampak cukup buruk bagi perkembangan anak. Bisa saja anak akan merasa tertekan dengan cara pendisiplinan orang tuanya"* into English sentence *"Most parents are not aware that strictly disciplining them will have a bad impact on*

children's development. It is possible that the child will feel pressured by the way of disciplining his parents". Based on this, it could be explained that student 5 had the same English skills as student 2, student 3, and student 4 because student 5 used Google Translate directly to translate clauses and sentences.

**Student 6** choose topic "*Mobile phones makes people anti-social*" used DeepL Translator at the planning stage. In data 1 with code 6PF82, student 6 translated Indonesian phrases "*Terhibur ketika waktu luang*" into English phrase "*Entertained during free time*". In data 2 with code 6PC94, student 5 translated clause from Indonesian language "*Dengan handphone, manusia dapat menyampaikan informasi penting tanpa memakan waktu lama*" became English clause "*With a mobile phone, humans can convey important information without taking a long time*". Then in data 3 with code 6PS97, student 6 translated sentences from Indonesian language "*Mobile phone dapat digunakan untuk mencari informasi yang sulit ditemukan di buku pelajaran.*" Became English sentence "*Mobile phones can be used to find information that is difficult to find in textbooks*". This could be explained that student 6 had better English skills when compared to student 2, student 3, student 4, and student 5, because student 6 used DeepL Translator to translate phrases, clauses, and sentences.

**Student 7** choose topic "*Do you think that abortion should be made illegal?*" used Microsoft Word Translator at the planning stage. In data 1 with code 7PW102 it was found that student 7 translated word in English language "*Fetuses*" to know the meaning of the word in Indonesian language "*Janin*". Data 2 with code 7PF104 found that student 7 translated Indonesian phrase "*Berani untuk mengambil*" into English phrase "*Dare to take*". Data 3 with code 7PC112 found that student 7 translated clause from Indonesian language "*Sometimes with circumstances that are very forced to have an abortion.*" became English clause "*Terkadang dengan keadaan yang sangat terpaksa harus melakukan aborsi*". Furthermore, in data 4 with code 7PS103, student 7 translated sentences in English "*Abortion is necessary in cases of rape or incest*" into Indonesian sentence "*Aborsi diperlukan dalam kasus pemerkosaan atau inses*". Based on this, it could be explained that student 7 had better English skills when compared to student 2, student 3, student 4, student 5, and student 6, because student 7 used Microsoft Word Translator with a variety including to check the meaning of unknown word, translate phrases, translate clauses, and translate sentences.



**Student 8** choose topic *“Do you think that abortion should be made illegal?”* used Google Translate at the planning stage. Data 1 with code 8PC132 found that student 8 translated clauses in Indonesian language *“Untuk itu, seseorang tidak bisa menilai keputusan seorang ibu untuk melakukan aborsi”* into English clause *“For this reason, someone can't judge a mother's decision to have an abortion”*. Then in data 2 with code 8PS133 it was found that student 8 translated sentences in Indonesian language *“Aborsi yang tidak aman merupakan salah satu faktor utama yang mempengaruhi kesehatan perempuan di negara berkembang.”* became English sentence *“Unsafe abortion is one of the principal factors affecting women's health in developing regions”*. Based on this, it could be explained that student 8 had the same English skills as student 2, student 3, student 4, and student 5 because student 8 used Google Translate to translate clauses and translate sentences.

#### **b. Students Used Translation Tool in Students' Drafting Stage**

In the drafting stage, students developed what they written in the outline that was made in the previous stage, namely the planning stage. Here students wrote long drafts of argumentative writing consisting of several paragraphs with a minimum writing rule of 700 words. Related to how students did argumentative writing in the drafting stage was explained as follows:

**Student 1** choose topic *“Mobile phone makes people anti-social”* used Google Translate. In data 1 with code 1DC1, student 1 translated clauses from Indonesian language *“Sedangkan itu, orang yang sudah kecanduan bermain mobile phone akan lebih parah dari itu.”* became English clause *“Meanwhile, people who are addicted to playing mobile phones will be even worse than that”*. Data 2 with code 1DP2 found that student 1 used Google Translate to translate Indonesian paragraphs. Student 1 opted for the topic "Mobile Phones Make People Anti-Social" and utilized Google Translate for translation purposes. Within the dataset labeled as Data 1 and assigned the code 1DC1, Student 1 employed Google Translate to convert Indonesian language clauses into English. Specifically, the Indonesian clause "Sedangkan itu, orang yang sudah kecanduan bermain mobile phone akan lebih parah dari itu" was translated into English as "Meanwhile, people who are addicted to playing mobile phones will be even worse than that." It is noteworthy that this translation process indicates the use of an automated translation tool, raising concerns about the accuracy and nuance of the translated content.

Furthermore, in Data 2 with the code 1DP2, it was discovered that Student 1 consistently relied on Google Translate for translating Indonesian paragraphs. This reliance on machine translation tools raises questions about the potential impact on the precision and comprehensibility of the translated content, emphasizing the importance of careful consideration when incorporating such tools in academic work. So, it could be concluded that student 1 did not have good English skills because student 1 used Google Translate directly to translate clauses and paragraphs in this stage.

**Student 2** chose topic *"Is it ok for parent to physically his child?"* used Google Translate. In data 1 with code 2DC4 it was found that student 2 translated the clause from Indonesian language *"Pendidikan Orang Tua Mempengaruhi Tumbuh Kembang Anak"* into English clause *"Parenting Education Affects Children's Growth and Development"*. Whereas in data 2 with code 2DP7, student 2 translated Indonesian paragraph. On this basis, student 2 selected the topic "Is it okay for parents to physically discipline their child?" and employed Google Translate for translation purposes. Within the dataset identified as Data 1 with the code 2DC4, it was observed that Student 2 utilized Google Translate to translate an Indonesian clause. Specifically, the Indonesian clause "Pendidikan Orang Tua Mempengaruhi Tumbuh Kembang Anak" was translated into English as "Parenting Education Affects Children's Growth and Development." This translation reveals the use of an automated tool, potentially influencing the accuracy and nuances of the translated content. Additionally, in Data 2 with the code 2DP7, it was discovered that Student 2 continued to rely on Google Translate for the translation of an Indonesian paragraph. This reliance on machine translation tools raises concerns about the potential impact on the accuracy and depth of the translated content, underscoring the importance of a nuanced approach when incorporating such tools in academic endeavors. It is crucial for students to be aware of the limitations of automated translation and to ensure that the translated content accurately reflects the intended meaning and context.

**Student 3** chose topic *"Mobile phones make people anti-social"* used Google Translate. In the data with code 3DP12, student 3 translated paragraphs from Indonesian language *"Penggunaan ponsel ini tidak mengurangi interaksi tatap muka dengan orang lain"*. In the given context, Student 3 has selected the topic "Mobile Phones Make People Anti-Social" and has employed Google Translate for the translation process. Specifically, within the dataset marked with the code 3DP12, it has been observed that

Student 3 utilized Google Translate to translate paragraphs from the Indonesian language. An example of this translation is evident in the Indonesian phrase "Penggunaan ponsel ini tidak mengurangi interaksi tatap muka dengan orang lain," which was rendered into English. The translated content, which may read as "The use of this cellphone does not reduce face-to-face interaction with others," highlights the utilization of automated translation tools to convey the original meaning into English. However, it is crucial to acknowledge the potential limitations of machine translation, as it may not capture subtle nuances, cultural context, or idiomatic expressions accurately. In academic settings, where precision and clarity are vital, students are advised to approach automated translation tools with caution, supplementing them with a deep understanding of the subject matter to ensure the accuracy and contextual fidelity of the translated material. Awareness of the inherent limitations in machine translation contributes to a more discerning and scholarly approach to research and communication.

**Student 5** choose topic "*Mobile phone makes people anti-social*" used Google Translate. Researcher only found data with code 5DC15 which means student 5 used Google Translate to translate clauses from Indonesian language "*Pendisiplinan Bagi Seorang Anak, Apakah Itu Baik Atau Buruk*" into English clause "*Discipline for A Child, Whether It Is Good or Bad*". In this scenario, Student 5 has selected the topic "Mobile Phones Make People Anti-Social" and has utilized Google Translate for the translation process. The researcher specifically identified data associated with the code 5DC15, signifying that Student 5 employed Google Translate to translate clauses from the Indonesian language. Notably, the Indonesian clause "Pendisiplinan Bagi Seorang Anak, Apakah Itu Baik Atau Buruk" was translated into English as "Discipline for A Child, Whether It Is Good or Bad." This translation exemplifies the use of an automated translation tool to convert content from one language to another. However, it is essential to recognize the potential limitations of relying solely on machine translation, as automated tools may not consistently capture the nuanced meanings and cultural context embedded in the original language. In academic research, where precision and accuracy are paramount, students are encouraged to approach the use of automated translation tools judiciously. Supplementing machine translations with a thorough understanding of the subject matter ensures that the translated content accurately conveys the intended meaning, contributing to the reliability and scholarly integrity of the research. The rest student 5

immediately made a draft by copying all the outlines that had been made starting from the introduction, body, and paragraphs into a long essay consisting of 6 paragraphs. Based on this, it could be explained that even student 5 did not have good English skills because student 5 immediately copied all the outlines that have been made and used Google Translate only to translate clauses in making argumentative essay titles.

**Student 6** chose the topic *"Mobile phone makes people anti-social"* and used DeepL Translator. Data with code 6DP18 described student 6 translated Indonesian paragraphs into English paragraphs. "Make People Anti-Social" and has opted to use the DeepL Translator for the translation process. Specifically, within the dataset identified by the code 6DP18, it has been documented that Student 6 utilized DeepL Translator to translate Indonesian paragraphs into English. This choice of translation tool indicates an awareness of alternative automated translation options beyond the more commonly used Google Translate. DeepL Translator is recognized for its neural machine translation capabilities, aiming to provide more nuanced and contextually accurate translations. However, despite the advancements in machine translation, it is essential to recognize that automated tools may still encounter challenges in capturing cultural nuances, idiomatic expressions, and the subtleties of language. In academic contexts, where precision and contextual accuracy are crucial, students are encouraged to approach the use of machine translation tools with a discerning mindset. Combining automated translation with a deep understanding of the subject matter ensures that the translated material maintains fidelity to the original intent and meaning, thereby contributing to scholarly and accurate research.

**Student 8** chose the topic "Do you think that abortion should be made illegal?" using Google Translate. Data with code 8DP19 described student 8 translated paragraphs from Indonesian into English paragraphs. In this framework, student 8 has opted for the topic "Do you think that abortion should be made illegal?" and has utilized Google Translate for the translation process. The dataset labeled with the code 8DP19 indicates that Student 8 translated paragraphs from Indonesian into English paragraphs using Google Translate. This choice suggests that Student 8 may not possess proficient English language skills, as evidenced by the reliance on a machine translation tool for the conversion of text. The direct use of Google Translate for paragraph translation implies a potential limitation in linguistic capabilities, as automated tools may not capture the subtle nuances, idiomatic expressions, and contextual intricacies inherent in language. This

approach may pose challenges in conveying ideas accurately and coherently, particularly in the context of argumentative writing. In academic settings, effective communication is paramount, and students are encouraged to develop their language skills to ensure the clarity and precision of their work. Relying solely on machine translation tools may hinder the development of language proficiency and may compromise the quality of written expression in the long run. It means that student 8 also did not have good English skills because student 8 used Google Translate directly to translate paragraphs at this stage.

Meanwhile, **student 4 and student 7** did not use any translation tools at this stage, but they made a draft by directly copying the outlines that had been made in the planning stage one by one starting from the introduction which consisted of hooks, connecting information, and thesis statements. Then the body essay consisting of 4 paragraphs with 3 paragraphs supporting the thesis statement and 1 paragraph rebuttal. Then it was closed with a conclusion at the end of the paragraph. These were all copied into one unified draft consisting of 6 paragraphs with a minimum writing limit of 700 words.

### c. **Students Used Translation Tool in Students' Editing Stage**

In the editing stage, students carried out the revision process on the draft argumentative writing they have made in the drafting stage. Here students corrected both the grammar of their writing and the content of their writing to reduce and eliminate errors in their argumentative writing drafts. The following was detailed explanation of how students did argumentative writing at the editing stage:

**Student 1** with the topic *"Mobile phone makes people anti-social"* at the editing stage did not use the help of translation tools. Instead, student 1 did a grammatical check used Grammarly application. In addition, student 1 paraphrased the draft used QuillBot application. **Student 2** with the topic *"Is it ok for a parent to physically his child?"* at the editing stage did not use the help of translation tools. Instead, student 2 gave a review comment on the essay sections to identify the structure of the content of the argumentative essay that had been made. **Student 3** with the topic *"Mobile phones make people anti-social"* at the editing stage did not use the help of translation tools. Instead, students provided review comments on parts of the essay to identify the structure of the content of the argumentative essay that had been made. **Student 5** with the topic *"Is it ok for a parent to physically his child?"* at

the editing stage used the help of translation tools. In data with code 5EW1, student 5 translated word from Indonesian language “*Yakni*” to check the meaning in English “*Namely*”. In data 2 with code 5EW2, student 5 translated phrase from Indonesian language “*Dunia ini kejam*” into English phrase “*The word is cruel*”. The rest student 5 gave review comments on parts of the essay to identify the structure of the content of the argumentative essay that had been made. **Student 6** with the topic “*Mobile phones make people anti-social*” at the editing stage did not use the help of translation tools. Instead, student 6 gave a review of comments on parts of the essay to identify the structure of the content of the argumentative essay that had been made. **Student 7** with the topic “*Do you think that abortion should be made illegal*” at the editing stage also did not use the help of translation tools. Rather, student 7 paraphrased the draft made used Quilbot application. **Student 8** with the topic “*Do you think that abortion should be made illegal*” at the editing stage also did not use the help of translation tools. Instead, student 8 provided review of comments on parts of the essay to identify the structure of the content of the argumentative essay that had been made.

#### **d. Students Used Translation Tool in Students’ Final Draft Stage**

In the final draft stage, students had gone through a series of argumentative writing processes starting from the planning stage by selecting topics to be discussed, writing thesis statements, brainstorming, and making outlines. Then at the drafting stage, students developed the ideas into long draft consisting of 6 paragraphs with a minimum writing limit of 700 words. Furthermore, at the editing stage, students checked for content and grammatical errors in the draft that has been made. Based on these process, it can be explained that students were no longer writing in final draft stage. The draft that had been made by students had undergone several changes made in the previous stages. So that in this stage the students draft became the final version and it was then submitted to the lecturer who teach argumentative writing.

### ***Discussion***

Regarding how students used translation tools when writing, researcher found that out of 8 participants all used translation tools during the writing process except the final draft. Harmer (2004), divides the writing process into 4 stages including planning, drafting, editing, and final draft. The following is a discussion of how students use translation tools in the

argumentative writing process: At the planning stage, students used Google Translate to check the meaning of unknown words, translate phrases, translate clauses, and translate sentences. Then, students used DeepL Translator to translate phrases, translate clause, and translate sentences. In addition, students used Microsoft Word Translator to check the meaning of unknown words, translate phrases, translate clauses, and translate sentences. At the drafting stage, students used Google Translate to translate clauses and paragraphs. In addition, students used DeepL Translator to translate paragraphs. Then at the editing stage, students only used one translation tool, namely Google Translate to check the meaning of unknown words and translate clauses. Finally, at the final draft stage, students no longer use translation tools when writing because at this stage their writing was completed.

Based on the discussion above, the findings in this study differed from research conducted by Chandra and Yuyun (2018), Murtisari et al. (2019), Mulyani and Afina (2021), and Inderawati et al. (2023). In the research conducted by Chandra and Yuyun (2018) explained that students only used Google Translate when writing. There was no discussion about how students used the tool at each stage of writing, so the results of the study found that overall students used Google Translate to check vocabulary, spelling, and grammar. According to research, vocabulary consists of three parts: words, phrases, and sentences. Then research conducted by Inderawati et al. (2023) also explained that students only used Google Translate when writing. There was no discussion of how students use the tool at each stage of writing. The results showed that Google Translate was used to improve vocabulary, including finding words, synonyms, and accurate pronunciation. In addition, in a study conducted by Murtisari et al. (2019) on EFL students' attitudes toward using Google Translate for general use and in reading and writing assignments. The findings in the study explained that students used the tool to increase vocabulary. But, there was no discussion of how students used the tool at each stage of writing. Also, research conducted by Mulyani and Afina (2021) who investigated the attitudes of EFL students towards the performance of Google Translate. The results showed students used Google Translate to check the meaning of words and to translate sentences. The study also did not explain how students used Google Translate as translation tool in the process of writing.

Therefore, the findings in this study showed differences with the previous studies. In this study, students used variety of translation tools when writing including Google Translate, DeepL Translator, and Microsoft Word Translator. At the planning stage, students used Google Translate to check the meaning of unknown words, translate phrases, translate clauses, and translate sentences. Then, students used DeepL Translator to translate phrases, translate clause, and translate sentences. In addition, students used Microsoft Word Translator to check the meaning of unknown words, translate phrases, translate clauses, and translate sentences. At the drafting stage, students used Google Translate to translate clauses and paragraphs. In addition, students used DeepL Translator to translate paragraphs. At the editing stage students used Google Translate to check the meaning of unknown words and translate clauses. Finally, at the final draft stage, students have finished their writing, so at this stage they no longer used a translation tool.

## **Conclusion**

The conclusion of this research found that English students used different types of translation tools in argumentative writing process including Google Translate, DeepL Translator, and Microsoft Word Translator. At the drafting stage, students used Google Translate to check the meaning of unknown words, translate phrases, translate clauses, and translate sentences. Then, students used DeepL Translator to translate phrases, translate clause, and translate sentences. In addition, students used Microsoft Word Translator to check the meaning of unknown words, translate phrases, translate clauses, and translate sentences. At the drafting stage, students used Google Translate to translate clauses and paragraphs. In addition, students used DeepL Translator to translate paragraphs. At the editing stage students used Google Translate to check the meaning of unknown words and translate clauses. Finally, at the final draft stage, students finished their argumentative writing, so at this stage they no longer used a translation tool. The use of translation tools in teaching and learning languages refers to the ideas of providing a beneficial experience for language learners. Especially for English as a foreign language student can take advantage of translation tools as technology-based media to make it easier for them to reach the target language. Especially in writing, students could take advantage of various types of translation tools available today to be able to write in English easily, quickly, and practically.



## References

- Ariyanti, A. (2016). The teaching of EFL writing in Indonesia. *Dinamika Ilmu*, 16(2), 263–277. <https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v16i2.274>.
- Bangun, E. U. P. B., & Mustafa, S. M. (2021). Translation tool technology trend: what are the impacts for the students? *International Journal of Educational Management and Innovation*, 2(1), 77–87. <https://doi.org/10.12928/ijemi.v2i1.3174>
- Chandra, S. O., & Yuyun, I. (2018). The use of Google Translate in EFL Essay Writing. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 21(2), 228–238. <https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.2018.210212>
- Cumming, A. (2001). Learning to write in a second language: two decades of research. *International journal of English studies*, 1(2), 1–23. <https://revistas.um.es/ijes/article/view/48331>
- 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>
- Fitria, T. N. (2021). A review of machine translation tools: the translation's ability. *Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature*, 16(1), 162–176. <https://doi.org/10.15294/lc.v16i1.3096>
- Harmer, J. (2004). *How to Teach Writing*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Inderawati, R., Hayati, R., Marlina, R., Novarita, N., Awalludin, A., & Anam, S. (2023). Argumentative Essay and vocabulary enrichment of English students by utilizing Google Translate. *English Community Journal*, 6(2), 131–14. <https://jurnal.umpalembang.ac.id/englishcommunity/article/view/5523>
- Kim, E.-Y. (2011). Using translation exercises in the communicative EFL writing classroom. *ELT Journal*, 65(2), 154–160. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccq039>
- Kroll, B. (1990). *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mahardika, R. (2017). The use of translation tool in EFL learning: do machine translation give positive impact in language learning? *Pedagogy: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 5(1), 49–56. <https://doi.org/10.32332/pedagogy.v5i1.755>
- Marito, S., & Ashari, E. (2017). EFL students perception about machine translation. *Jurnal Dimensi*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.33373/dms.v6i2.1050>
- Mulyani, M., & Afina, F. (2021). The students' attitude towards google translate. *JELA (Journal of English Language Teaching, Literature and Applied Linguistics)*, 3(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.37742/jela.v3i1.36>
- 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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2019.16.3.14.978>
- Odacioglu, M. C., & Kokturk, S. (2015). The effects of technology on translation students in academic translation teaching. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 197, 1085–1094. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.349>
- Pym, A. (2011). What technology does to translating. *Translation & Interpreting, The*, 3(1), 1–9. <https://search.informit.org/doi/abs/10.3316/INFORMIT.409249876138991>
- Susanto, R. D. (2017). Students' attitudes toward the use of Google Translate (Doctoral dissertation, Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris FBS-UKSW). <https://repository.uksw.edu/handle/123456789/14459>